CRITICAL LITERACY:
Theories and Practices

Volume 1: 2, December 2007

EDITOR: LYNN MARIO T. MENEZES DE SOUZA
ASSOCIATE EDITOR: VANESSA ANDREOTTI

CSSGJ

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL AND GLOBAL JUSTICE

EDITOR:
Lynn Mario T. M. de Souza (University of Sao Paulo)
mdesouza@usp.br

ASSOCIATE EDITOR:
Vanessa Andreotti (University of Canterbury)
vanessa.andreotti@canterbury.ac.nz

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL AND GLOBAL JUSTICE

CRITICAL LITERACY: THEORIES AND PRACTICES

VOLUME 1 ISSUE 2 DECEMBER 2007

Contents

Editor's Preface

Critical literacy is conceptualised in educational contexts according to different theoretical frameworks. In this issue, I would like to draw attention to the conceptualisation which associates critical literacy with the notion of 'deconstruction'. It is also difficult to define deconstruction, but for the purpose of this preface it is useful to say that it aims to interrogate taken for granted assumptions by tracing the cultural biases in the construction of central ideas in texts or discourses. Deconstruction has been interpreted by some as a strategy of critique that is used to undermine discourses in order to expose error and advance the argument for an alternative 'right' way of knowing, thinking or doing things. Some have interpreted it as a way of 'debunking' any truth claim in order to show that there is no such thing as 'a truth'. Others, like Gayatri Spivak, see it as a strategy of engaging critically with what one cannot *not* want to inhabit. She argues that:

> Deconstruction does not say there is no subject, there is no truth, there is no history. It simply questions the privileging of identity so that someone is believed to have the truth. It is not the exposure of error. It is constantly looking into how truths are produced… That is why deconstruction doesn't say logocentrism is a pathology, or metaphysical enclosures are something you can escape. Deconstruction, if one wants a formula, is, amongst other things, a persistent critique of what one cannot not want. (Spivak, 1994:278)

For me, a useful (but limited) metaphor that illustrates her contribution to this discussion is that of a bulldozer demolishing a house (related to the first two perspectives) versus renovating a house from within. For Spivak, one needs to engage critically out of respect and recognition that one's 'house' (or systems of representation) is important and indispensable - and this is precisely the reason why one needs to engage critically with it. In attempting to move some of the walls from within, the first thing one may find is that one is immediately implicated in the building and the renovation process as one's 'investments' are embedded in the bricks, patterns and colours of the walls being moved. This acknowledgement of complicity and implication can be very difficult and disturbing – but also very productive. However, it does not need to happen when one is positioned outside the house driving a bulldozer.

As unsettling as a renovation can be when you are still inhabiting a house, there can also be some pleasant surprises: one may find that some boundaries have no reason to exist, that rooms are connected in ways one has not imagined before, that more windows or doors could improve the flow of air or light, that the house itself can be expanded or that a different foundation, design or outlook are possible. By questioning and moving the walls one is enabling different spaces to be created and different flows, relationships and patterns to emerge. However, it is important to remember that this is an exercise with 'no guarantees', where the responsibility for renovation rests with the inhabitant(s) of the house and where the process of renovation is ongoing - there is no reliance on an all-seeing architect on the outside directing the completion of the work.

In this second issue of the Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices Journal, the first four articles engage in this exercise of moving walls in order to enable the creation of

'other spaces'. The last two articles engage with possibilities emerging in contexts where some 'other spaces' have been – or are about to be – created.

Ingrid Hoofd's article focuses on serious gaming and its claims to enable the use of technology for the promotion of social change. Her sharp analysis suggests that the notion of speed and the aesthetics of serious games can be read as implicated in precisely the social imaginary serious games claim to be opposed to.

Talya Zemach-Bersin critically examines embedded assumptions in 'study abroad' experiences and publicity in the context of higher education in the United States. She analyses how notions of 'global citizenship', 'international education' and 'global understanding' within these discourses can reinforce ideas of the innocence of the U.S. as a nation and the universal validity of American values. She stresses the need for higher education institutions to be sites of dissent and free intellectual enquiry.

Bernadette Macartney's article engages with the construction of notions of 'normalcy' in the experiences of a mother who, like herself, has a child who does not fit the classification of 'normal'. Using Foucault as her theoretical grounding, she draws attention to educational thinking and practices based on development psychology, suggesting that the construction of normative standards in relation to stages of child development can contribute to the subjugation of disabled children and their families. She affirms the need for educational strategies that identify, resist and challenge normalising discourses in society that marginalise and silence specific groups.

Bronwyn Wood's article focuses on the avoidance of conflict and complexity in the teaching of social sciences in schools in New Zealand. She problematises this tendency in the context of complex societies and traces its origin to educational policies that construct passive identities by prioritising standardisation, homogenisation, uniformity and hierarchy.

Matthias Fiedler presents an outline of the argument for rethinking education in the context of a post-industrialised, diverse and globalised 'knowledge society'. He presents the notion of postcolonial learning spaces as an alternative strategy to reinscribe ideas of global citizenship and intercultural education within a more productive debate where identities and difference are constantly negotiated and rewritten in educational contexts.

Lisa Taylor's article looks into a pedagogical framework for critical literary literacy based on feminism, reception theory and anti-colonial pedagogies she has developed for a teacher education course in Canada. This framework invites learners to read their own responses to literary texts through different lenses and to engage in dialogue with each other in the ongoing analysis of their situatedness and the historicity of relations of colonization, marginalization and resistance.

Vanessa Andreotti
University of Canterbury

REFERENCE: Spivak, G. (1994). Bonding in difference. In A. Arteaga (ed.), *An other tongue: nation and ethnicity in the linguistic borderlands* (pp. 273-285). Durham: Duke UP.

The Neoliberal Consolidation of Play and Speed: Ethical Issues in Serious Gaming

Ingrid M. Hoofd

National University of Singapore, Singapore

> "Creation exists only in regard to destruction."
> Paul Virilio, "Cyberwar, God, and Television," (324).

Serious games are a fascinating next stage in the continuous exploitation of digital media technologies over the last decades for training, learning, and education. As formal education and training always involves the transmission and repetition of certain culturally and socially specific sets of skills and moral values, it would be of paramount importance to ensure that developments within the serious gaming industry are in step with the effects of the good intentions of nurturing people within a social framework that emphasises a fair, culturally diverse, and blooming society. In this light, it is interesting that from the very advent of the information society, digital technologies have been depicted as central to the development of a more just and equal society by harbouring the promise of bridging gaps between classes, races, and genders locally as well as globally. Driven by the vision of this utopian potential of new technologies, the education industry and larger policy organisations have been exploring the pedagogical possibilities of these technologies both in- and outside the traditional classroom for the last twenty-five years. Indeed, the implementation of increasingly more sophisticated and technologically mediated methods and tools for learning and education, takes as its starting point the techno-utopian assumption that (new) interactive technologies themselves are the primary harbingers of a fair and blooming society through facilitating (student) empowerment.

This paper takes issue with this widespread techno-utopian perspective by seeking to shed light on the larger ethical implications of serious gaming. It will do so through foregrounding the relationship between global injustices, and the aesthetic properties and discourses of serious gaming. So while reframing serious games themselves in a new ethical perspective constitutes the main objective of this paper, it is equally important to situate serious games within a larger political discourse on the teaching of new skills. Firstly then, policy papers and academic studies on serious games all display an assumption of the inherent neutrality of gaming technologies, as if these technologies were mere tools equally suitable for all. What also becomes apparent in the language used in these studies and proposals, is how this instrumentalist vision of gaming technologies for learning goes hand in hand with a particular neo-liberal assumption of what constitutes a fit individual, and by extension of what the hallmarks of a 'healthy' society may be. For instance, in the European Union study "Serious Gaming – a fundamental building block to drive the knowledge

work society" by Manuel Oliveira on the merits of serious games for education, justification runs along the lines of gaming 'encouraging risk-taking and a winning attitude' and creating a 'performance-oriented individual.' Similarly, Michael Guerena from the US Orange County Department of Education proposes in one of the Department's web-casts that serious games instil "twenty-first century skills" like risk-taking, adaptability, self-direction, interactive communication, and 'planning and managing for results' in the students through the "channelling of fun." Likewise, the UK-based Entertainment and Leisure Software Publishers Association last year published their white paper *Unlimited learning - Computer and video games in the learning landscape*, in which they argue that serious games will "create an engaged, knowledgeable, critical and enthusiastic citizenry" whose "work practices will be geared towards networked communication and distributed collaboration" (49).

Concerns around the ethical implications of serious games regarding their entanglements with larger social (gendered, classed, and raced) inequalities have until now largely been coined in terms of game content or representation. In a recent case in Singapore, the government's proposition of using the RPG *Granado Espada* in secondary school history classes was followed by an outcry from various local academics condemning the stereotypical characters and simplistic representation of medieval Europe in the game. Likewise, various authors have critiqued current serious games not only because of simplistic representation of characters and surroundings, but especially because simulations generally tend to oversimplify complex social problems and situations. Gibson, Aldrich, and Prensky's *Games and Simulations in Online Learning* (vi - xiv) for instance discuss these demerits of serious games. While such a critical analysis of how game *content* contributes to the reproduction of dominant discourses is definitely helpful, I would argue that the aesthetics of serious games involve much more than mere content. Instead, this paper will argue that the *formal* quest for *instantaneity* that research around digital media has displayed through the development of interactive technologies for education is already itself by no means a neutral affair. This is because the discourses that inform this quest and that accompany this search for instantaneity arguably enforce the hegemony of a militaristic, masculinist, humanist, and of what I will call a 'speed-elitist' individual. Moreover, I suggest that the propensity of current games to have sexist or racist content, is merely symptomatic of gaming technology's larger problematic in terms of the aesthetic of instantaneity. In short, (serious) computer games have become archives of the discursive and actual violence carried out in the name of the utopia of technological progress and instantaneity under neo-liberal globalisation. This archival function is possible exactly because cybernetic technologies promise the containment and control of such supposedly accidental violence, while in fact exacerbating these forms of violence. This leads me to conclude that such violence is in fact structural to new serious gaming technologies, rather than accidental. I will elaborate this hypothesis by looking at various theorists who seek to understand this structural imperative of new technologies, and their relationship to the neo-liberalisation of learning and education. In turn, I will look at how this problematic structural logic informs the two popular serious games *Real Lives* and *Global Warming Interactive.*

Secondly, the advent of serious gaming interestingly runs parallel with the contemporary dissemination and virtualisation of traditional learning institutions into cyberspace. While the existence of learning tools in other areas of society besides actual learning institutions has been a fact since the advent of schools, the shift of methods of learning into online and digital tools is symptomatic of the decentralisation of power from 'old' educational institutions and its usurpation into instantaneous neo-liberal modes of production. I am summarising the work of Bill Readings on the university here, because it sheds light on the shift in education *tout court* towards virtualisation, and its relationship to the 'new hegemony of instantaneity.' In *The University in Ruins*, Readings argues that the shift from the state-run university of reason and culture to the present-day global knowledge enterprise must mean that the centre of power in effect has shifted elsewhere. More important, says Readings, is that the function of the new 'university of excellence,' one that successfully transforms it into yet another trans-national corporation, relies on the fantasy that the university is still that transcendental university of culture in service of the state and its citizens. So the invocation of the fantasy of an 'originary' university of reason and progress, that produces unbiased knowledge for the good of all, facilitates the doubling of the production of information into other spaces outside the university walls proper.

While Readings surely discusses only higher education institutions in *The University in Ruins*, I would argue that the logic of a shifting centre of power from the state into the technocratic networks and nodes of speed operates quite similarly in the case of primary, secondary, and other types of formal education. Indeed, the current virtualisation of learning and the emphasis on lifelong learning marks a dispersal of traditional learning institutions into online spaces. This dispersal works increasingly in service of the 'speed-elite' rather than simply in service of the nation-state. The heralding of serious games for education can therefore be read as a *symptom* of the intensified reach of the imperatives of neo-liberal globalisation, in which consumption enters the lives of locally bound as well as more mobile cosmopolitan citizens of all ages through harping on the technological possibility of the confusion of production and play. Through the imperative of play then, production increasingly and diffusely colonises all niche-times and -spaces of neo-liberal society. In other words, (the emphasis on) play allows not only a potential increase in production and consumption through the citizen-consumer after her or his formal education of 'skills', but starkly intensifies flows of production and consumption already at the very moment of learning.

While such an integration of play and production is generally understood within the framework of the neo-liberal demand for the circulation of pleasure, it is useful here to widen the scope from understanding the learner as a mere consumer of pleasure into the larger set of problematic interpellations that marks subjugation in contemporary society. Intriguingly, a host of research has emerged over the past years pointing towards the intricate relationship between subjugation, military research objectives, and videogame development. Such research suggests an intimate connection between the C3I logic and humanist militaristic utopias of transcendence, which incriminates interactive technologies as inherently favouring culturally particular notions of personhood. In the case of

computer- and video-games for entertainment, researchers have argued that the aesthetic properties of gaming technologies give rise to so-called 'militarised masculinity.' In "Designing Militarized Masculinity," Stephen Kline, Nick Dyer-Witheford, and Greig de Peuter argue for instance that interactive games open up very specific subject positions that "mobilize fantasies of instrumental domination" (255). This specific mobilisation that video-games invoke, is not only due to the remediation of violent television- and film- content, but also due to the intimate connection between gaming- and military industries which grant these technologies their particular cybernetic aesthetic properties (see also Herz 1997).

This element of militarisation partly informs my concept of 'speed-elitism.' I extrapolate the idea of 'speed-elitism' largely from the works of John Armitage on the discursive and technocratic machinery underlying current neo-liberal capitalism. In "Dromoeconomics: Towards a Political Economy of Speed," Armitage and Phil Graham suggest that due to the capitalist need for the production of excess, there is a strong relationship between the forces of exchange and production, and the logic of speed. In line with Virilio's argument in *Speed and Politics*, they argue that various formerly the less connected social areas of war, communication, entertainment, and trade, are now intimately though obliquely connected. This is because all these forces mutually enforce one another through the technological usurpation and control of space (and territory), and through the compression and regulation of time. Eventually, Armitage and Graham suggest that "circulation has become an essential process of capitalism, an end in itself" (118) and therefore any form of cultural production increasingly finds itself tied-up in this logic. So neo-liberal capitalism is a system within which the most intimate and fundamental aspects of human social life – in particular, forms of communication and play – get to be formally subsumed under capital. In "Resisting the Neoliberal Discourse of Technology," Armitage elaborates on this theme of circulation by pointing out that the current mode of late-capitalism relies on the continuous extension and validation of the infrastructure and the neutral or optimistic discourses of the new information technologies. Discourses that typically get repeated – like in the policy papers – in favour of the emerging speed-elite are those of connection, empowerment and progress, which often go hand in hand with the celebration of highly mediated spaces for action and communication. Such discourses however suppress the violent colonial and patriarchal history of those technological spaces and the subsequent unevenness brought about by and occurring within these spaces.

I would claim that Armitage's assessment of accelerated circulation, and the way new technologies make play complicit in the techno-utopian endeavour of speed, is crucial for understanding the larger ethical issues surrounding serious games. It is helpful at this point to look at Paul Virilio's and Jacques Derrida's work because this helps us understand the complicity of the aesthetics of interactive and visually oriented gaming technologies in speed-elitism. In "Cyberwar, God, and Television," Paul Virilio talks about the simulation industry's function of "exposing [one] to the accident in order not to be exposed to it" (322). What is according to him 'accidented' through the virtualisation of accidents and violence, for instance in video-games, is reality itself. This 'accident of reality' that virtuality brings about, argues Virilio, is due to the fact that simulation technologies

fragment space through their property of instantaneous connection with previously far-away places. The hallmark of this fragmentation is therefore that it brings about an intensification of forms of in- and exclusion through actual *dis*connection. Eventually, there will be "two realities: the actual and the virtual" (323), and I would claim that consequently the privileged speed-elite will be able to live in the illusion of engaging with social reality that the virtual grants, at the cost of the (s)lower classes who will suffer the social and ecological effects of the accidents of virtualisation. The illusion of mastery for Virilio consists in the sense of the "incorporation of the world within oneself" that "real time technologies permit" (328) due to their militaristic compulsion that seeks to "reduce the world to the point where one could possess it" (329). I maintain that these statements spell out exactly the function and logic of serious gaming.

Virilio elaborates the idea of the 'museum of accidents' later in his infamously apocalyptic "The Museum of Accidents." His evaluation of certain visual simulation technologies as 'museums of accidents' and in particular in how these accidents involve the increasing stratification of individuals within a new global imperative of speed, resonates well with Jacques Derrida's work on the 'archiving' properties of new technologies and their implications. In *Monolingualism of the Other, or The Prosthesis of Origin*, Derrida parallels the concept and the technique of memory and archiving with these new technologies. He argues that the tragedy of the disappearance of various cultures calls forward a desire in the R&D community – like teachers and developers of serious games – to prevent this from happening by using the immense possibilities of present-day archiving technologies. However, he cautions that this scientific quest to rescue through archiving languages and cultures from going extinct due to ongoing globalisation processes, once more presupposes that cultures and peoples are pre-given static entities, or simple identities, that can then be simply 'stored'. Moreover, it falsely presupposes that archiving technologies are neutral tools, as well as that the ideology behind this archiving desire is a universal or neutral one. But since the very technicity of archiving is one that is already entangled with the same dominant culture that archives, the necessary translation or recognition of materials fit for archiving will have as its logical parameters this dominant culture. This kind of messianistic desire, as much as the quest for understanding the other (or rather, the claim that one does empathise with and understand the other), is therefore actually a violent, neo-colonialist, and possessive sort of encapsulation. Similarly, the well-intended pedagogical aim to 'salvage otherness' from the tragedy of disappearance under globalisation works completely *in accordance with* that very tragedy. One could compare this well-intended encapsulation for instance with the anthropological display of artefacts of certain cultures in Western museums. It may be far more important to save actual humans than to salvage, understand, and store their perceived culture or language, and Derrida warns that the choice for one generally does *not* imply a choice for the other.

This 'virtual empathy' that new simulation technologies endow, which sadly works in accordance with the 'structural accident' of disenfranchisement under neo-liberal globalisation, is indeed present in the aesthetic of many serious games currently available. The widely praised and sympathetic game *Real Lives* is a

good example of this. The pedagogical objective of *Real Lives*, as its website declares, is to "learn how people really live in other countries." The producers maintain that *Real Lives* is an "empathy-building world" which will grant the students an "appreciation of their own culture and the cultures of other peoples." The game opens with assigning a character who just got born at any place in the world to the player. Since the attribution of the character is based on actual statistical possibilities of place of birth and economic status, the character has a high propensity of being born poor in countries like India, Mexico, or in other highly populated places. During the course of the game, the player can take actions like deciding to go to school or staying home to help her/his parents, which hobbies to take up, what job to take, and so forth. The game time takes one-year leaps in which the player can see the outcome of outside events, like disease or floods, and of his or her own actions. The software shows a map of the character's birth region and its statistics, like population density, gross annual income, currency, health standards, and etcetera. The character is also assigned traits, like happiness, athleticism, musicality, health, and so on. While the player's actions definitely influence the health and economic status of the played character and her family, the potentially interesting part of the game lies in the fact that events and situations that are ostensibly beyond the player's control influence the outcomes. Such a game structure potentially endows the student with a sense that simple meritocratic discourses are flawed. However, what is also obvious in *Real Lives*, is that the attribution based on statistical facts may very easily lead to a simplistic view of a country and its inhabitants. While India for instance surely has many poor people and girls often are not allowed to go to school, to have the student chance time and again on these representations can easily lead to the repetition of stereotypes and a failure to grasp the complexity of Indian society.

More serious however is the formal technological mode of objectification and its distancing effects that the game generates. This objectification resides in how the 'clean' interface – the 'flight simulator' like visual layout on the screen with the overview of categories and character attributes, the major actions and events in the character's life induced at the stroke of a few keys – in reality grants the player a sense of control by engaging with a machine programmed in such a way that it appears to let the student identify with and act out his or her empathy vis-à-vis a 'real' child in need. This discursive confusion of reality and virtuality is for instance also present in the web-game *Darfur Is Dying*, in which the player and virtual character get confused through the problematic claim that you can "start *your* experience (as a refugee)" and that it offers a "glimpse of *what it is like*" (emphases mine) to be a refugee. At the same time, the actual children in need on the ground disappear from the player's radar, turning them into a distant and vague large group of 'others' who are effectively beyond the student's reach of immediate responsibility. As Virilio suggests, the time spend through engaging in virtual empathy eclipses the 'real accidents' from the student's view and experience. What is more, *Real Lives* eclipses the larger social and economical relationships between the material production and consumption of such virtual engagement and the continuous exploitation and 'museumising' of peoples on the brink of (social, economical, and environmental) accident, disenfranchisement, and even death. While relatively well-off youth may indulge

in turning other peoples' distress into a 'fun' educational game, such indulgence is precisely based on a neo-liberal structure that exploits the environment, especially of the poor, and allows for the outsourcing and feminisation of ever cheaper third-world labour. As Derrida proposed, the archiving into visual technologies of certain cultures and peoples threatened with extinction does not at all imply saving these actual people and their cultures – in fact, it may very well do exactly the opposite. Long-term minor attitudinal changes in the student notwithstanding, the disconnecting properties of the new cybernetic technologies of speed that *Real Lives* is part of therefore displace the effect of the producer's and student's good intentions and empathy into an *instantaneous* technocratic violence that effectively 'plays with lives.'

Another telling example of this displacement of well-intended interactive play is the environmental game *Global Warming Interactive – CO2Fx*. This web-based game, funded by the United States National Science Foundation and developed by a group of people from various American consultancies and educational organisations, aims at teaching the student about the kinds of decision making involved in global warming. The game invariably starts with a map of the country of Brazil in the 1960s, and gives statistics about the carbon emission, air temperature, and general welfare of the population. The player can then control government budget expenditures for science, agriculture, social services, and development initiatives, after which the system jumps ten years into the future, generating results based on these expenditures. The game eventually ends by showing the relative increase in temperature in the virtual year of 2060, warning the player that more international cooperation is required to really tackle global warming.

The major issue with *Global Warming Interactive* is once more that it completely obscures the relationship between the computing technology itself that allows the *CO2Fx* simulation, and global warming. A telling moment of this *dis*simulation is when the game urges the player to "switch off the television!" because television uses quite a bit of energy, while the energy consumption of the infrastructure, mode of production, student consumption, and tools that sustain the game itself is being blissfully ignored. Armitage's claim that increasingly modes of thought, learning, and exchange are formally subsumed under capital through the new technological infrastructure certainly rings true here. The game is also a stark simplification of how government decisions affect a complex issue like climate change, and is fraught with problematic and often techno-utopian assumptions about how to tackle the climate change problem. A good example of this assumption is the recurring recommendation throughout the game to the player to spend more money on scientific research, as this expenditure supposedly promises to solve or alleviate the warming problem. The speed-elitist, humanist, and techno-utopian discourses that permeate American academia and consultancy firms are clearly reflected in *Global Warming Interactive*, leaving the student inculcated with a currently dominant belief system that lies precisely at the base of environmental pollution and economical disenfranchisement that urges certain groups of poor people in a country like Brazil to survive on environmentally unfriendly business solutions, like slash-burning the forests. One is also left to wonder why the game uses the country of Brazil in the first place,

and not the United States – arguably the largest global polluter today. There is indeed a problematic (neo)colonialist undertone to the current one-country version of *Global Warming Interactive*. Extending the content of the game, as the developers seeks to do, by including more countries in the simulation, would not alleviate this problem, but would simply concur with the actual contemporary shift from previous colonialist social hierarchies into speed-elitist hierarchies. But more seriously, giving the player simulated government omnipotence through the Virilian 'museumisation' of the economical and social structures underlying global warming in that 'other' country of Brazil, grants a the player an *illusion* of mastering and of dealing constructively with the major 'accident' of climate change and its impact on the (s)lower classes while actually fuelling it. Meanwhile, player or student empathy is displaced into instantaneous networks of ever increasing neo-liberal circulation and production.

Scholars like David Leonard in "'Live in your world, play in ours?': Race, video games, and consuming the other" and Lisa Nakamura in "Race in/for Cyberspace" have in the past argued that many entertainment games contain elements of racial and gendered stereotyping allowing the gamer to engage him- or herself on the basis of what Nakamura calls 'identity tourism' and Leonard calls 'blackface.' These problematic modes of (dis)identification allow the user not only to enter the game via dominant modes of representation, but also entail a form of 'safely experiencing the other' through cybernetic technologies, where the (imagined) other effectively becomes consumed through the high-tech prosthesis of the self. Neither Nakamura nor Leonard however elaborate how and why this element of a 'safe prosthesis' appears to be a central aesthetic of gaming technologies. After all, much media content suffers from stereotypical representation, and one could argue in line with Derrida's *Monolingualism of the Other* that media are always prostheses to the self. I would argue that what is specific about serious gaming technologies that emerges from my interpretations of Derrida's, Armitage's, and Virilio's assessments is the *illusion of control by the self* that these technologies facilitate, due to their element of interactive instantaneity. It is the new technologies' aesthetic properties themselves – rather than simply a narrative and its repetition of dominant ideologies – that grant a 'fantasy of connection, wholeness, and mastery' through interactivity *as if* it was an immediate and transparent property of the gaming subject. What is therefore at work in serious games like *Real Lives* and *Global Warming Interactive* is a form of *double* objectification. The illusion of constructive engagement with a pressing social issue through these seemingly 'clean' and 'neutral' technologies, combined with the distancing effect brought about by these technologies from their actual (social and environmental) implications, make the gamer complicit in the neo-liberal endeavour that paradoxically precisely leads to contemporary speed-elitist disenfranchisement. In short, interactive technologies like serious games bring about a displacement of good intentions through claims of technological progress and empowerment for all. So despite (or perhaps because of) the good intentions of game designers and publishers, these games then in fact exhibit the doubling of the colonialist logic that inspired humanist narratives of progress. This doubling runs parallel to the virtualisation of learning that is taking place under neo-liberal globalisation and its speed-elitist modes of intensified in- and exclusion this shift incurs. These games can therefore, in line

with Virilio's argument, be understood as attempts at (eventually unsuccessfully) containing the accident of the real and its social repercussions brought about by these technologies of speed.

To conclude, the development of serious games is implicated in what Derrida in *Monolingualism* refers to as a 'disappearance' of those cultures, idioms, and ways of being that do not conform to these tightening particular hegemonic structures of acceleration. 'Healthy' personhood becomes singularly understood through a restrictive and stratifying emphasis on mediated learning as more pleasurable, as well as on humanistic character traits like creativity, activity, risk-taking, mediated empathy, mobility, and competitiveness, as the rhetoric in policy papers and optimistic studies also shows. Such particular valorisations are problematic because they recreate a meritocratic, masculinist, militaristic, and speed-elitist hierarchy between economically as well as otherwise diverse groups and communities within a global community which understands individuals solely in terms of active and productive citizenship. In line with this, serious games themselves can in their very *form* be understood as Virilian 'museums of accident.' This means that the virtualisation of social engagement and sense of social and environmental 'accident control' that these games call forward is obliquely yet intrinsically related to new modes of 'accidenting' material reality. This potentially disenfranchises those who are not (positively) addressed within these properties of subject-formation, and leads to increasing levels of stress and competitiveness in individuals and students as it becomes progressively more imperative for individual survival to conform to the demands of the speed-elite. Without doubt, this paper has analysed only a few serious games currently available and surely more analyses need to be conducted. I suggest nonetheless that since the problematic of speed, which gives rise to double objectification, is structurally present in all visual interactive technologies, it is by default at work in all serious games. As I suggested at the start, the pedagogical and ethical enterprise of serious gaming is therefore serious indeed, as its aesthetic properties become increasingly implicated in precisely the opposite of what serious gaming promises to help make possible – the fair, culturally diverse, and blooming society that we all want.

REFERENCES

1. Armitage, John and Phil Graham (2001). "Dromoeconomics: Towards a Political Economy of Speed." In: *parallax.* vol. 7, no. 1. London: Routledge, pp.111-123.

2. Armitage, John (1999). "Resisting the Neoliberal Discourse of Technology. The Politics of Cyberculture in the Age of the Virtual Class." In: *CTheory.net.* URL (consulted April 2003) http://www.ctheory.net/printer.asp?id=111.

3. Derrida, Jacques (1998). *Monolingualism of the Other, or The Prosthesis of Origin.* Transl. Patrick Mensah. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

4. Educational Simulations (2005). *Real Lives.* Downloadable from URL (accessed December 2006): http://www.educationalsimulations.com/.

5. Entertainment and Leisure Software Publishers Association (2006): *Unlimited learning - Computer and video games in the learning landscape.* URL (accessed March 2007):

http://www.elspa.com/assets/files/u/unlimitedlearningtheroleofcomputerandvideogamesint_34
4.pdf.

6. Gibson, David, Clark Andrich, and Marc Prensky (2007). "Preface" and "Foreword." In *Games and Simulations in Online Learning.* London: Information Science Publishing, pp.vi – xiv.

7. Gudmundsen, Jinny (2004). "Learn about others' lives with interactive role-playing." In: *USA-Today.com.* URL (accessed June 2007):
http://www.usatoday.com/tech/columnist/jinnygudmundsen/2004-04-13-jinny_x.htm.

8. Guerena, Michael (2006). Orange Country Department of Education web-cast on Serious Games. In: *Serious Games Initiative*. URL (accessed June 2007):
http://www.seriousgames.org/index2.html.

9. Herz, Jesse Cameron (1997). "The Military-Entertainment Complex." In: *Joystick nation: how videogames ate our quarters, won our hearts, and rewired our minds*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co.

10. Kline, Stephen, Nick Dyer-Witheford, and Greig de Peuter (2003). "Designing Militarized Masculinity: Violence, Gender, and Bias of Game Experience." In: *Digital Play: The Interaction of Technology, Culture, and Marketing.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

11. Lee U-Wen (2006). "Learning by Joystick. Schools may swap pencils for pixels." In: *Today – Singapore Mediacorp Press,* January 19, 2007, p.1.

12. Leonard, David (2003): "'Live in your world, play in ours?': Race, video games, and consuming the other." In: *Studies in Media and Information Literacy Education*, 3(4). URL (accessed May 2007): http://www.utpjournals.com/simile/issue12/leonardX7.html.

13. Lexicon Systems (2007). *Global Warming Interactive: CO2Fx.* URL (consulted July 2007):
http://www.globalwarminginteractive.com/.

14. MTV Networks On Campus Inc (2007). *Darfur Is Dying*. URL (accessed June 2007):
http://www.darfurisdying.com/.

15. Nakamura, Lisa (2000). "Race in/for Cyberspace." In: David Bell and Barbara M. Kennedy (eds): *The Cybercultures Reader*. London: Routledge.

16. Oliveira, Manuel (2005). "Serious Gaming – a fundamental building block to drive the knowledge work society." In: *Workshop on Game Structures & Collaborative Environments, Brussels, 12 May 2005*. URL (accessed July 2007):
http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/atwork/hot_news/eventspages/2005_05_12
_gamestructures/index_en.htm.

17. Readings, Bill (1996). *The University in Ruins.* Cambridge/Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

18. Virilio, Paul and Louise Wilson (1996). "Cyberwar, God and Television: Interview with Paul Virilio." In: Timothy Druckrey (ed): *Electronic Culture*. New York: Aperture.

19. Virilio, Paul (1986). *Speed and Politics: an essay on dromology.* Transl. Mark Polizzotti. New York: Columbia University Press.

20. Virilio, Paul (2006). "The Museum of Accidents." Transl. Chris Turner. In: *International Journal of Baudrillard Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 2. URL (accessed July 2007):
http://www.ubishops.ca/BaudrillardStudies/Vol3_2/viriliopf.htm.

Global Citizenship & Study Abroad: It's All About U.S.

Talya Zemach-Bersin

> *To argue… that… the historical experience of the United States has been characterized by "discovery" not "imperium," "global power" not "imperialism," "unipolarity" not "hegemony" is to perpetuate false notions of "American exceptionalism" and to engage psychologically in denial and projection.*
>
> (Gilbert, 1998:5)

While studying abroad for a semester in Ghana in 2006, a white American student named Patrick was asked to become a small village's "Inconswahane"— the Chief of Development. According to Patrick, "The village had taken me in as one of them. And they gave me this chief kente cloth and hat and sandals and all these things." "Everywhere I went I was treated like a god," Patrick reported with elation; "It was amazing." Now back at his university in the U.S., Patrick's responsibility as Chief of Development is to "keep a watch on their village from over here." America's own Ghanaian chief comments, "I think of that village as my home in Africa, for sure" (personal interview, November 6, 2006). Patrick is one of 205,983 American students who studied abroad in the 2005-06 academic year, participating in a major rite of passage for U.S. undergraduates attending liberal arts universities in the twenty-first century (Institute of International Education [IIE], 2006). Patrick's story is more than a dramatic and unsettling reproduction of colonial fantasy and desire, complete with submissive natives who bear gifts and grant godlike authority to the white, western, developed man. It is, in fact, an explicit fulfillment of the imperialist and power-seeking goals imbedded within the American discourse of study abroad.

"Like it or not," the American Council on Education (2002) announced, "Americans are connected with people the world over" (p.7). Indeed, the social, political, technological, and economic developments of globalization have led to an interconnected and interdependent world system in which nations cannot exist in isolation. Despite the fact that the United States has largely been the "beneficiary and enforcer of this new world order" (Loomba, 2005:221), Americans have voiced a rising concern that globalization may be a threat to U.S. global hegemony and supremacy. Particularly after the World Trade Center attacks of September 11, 2001, public policy in America has been characterized by defensive anxiety and offensive aggression. Not only is the U.S. vulnerable to foreign attack, but anti-Americanism is more prolific than ever before; nations such as China and India appear to be gaining international and economic strength; and the American citizenry has been declared globally incompetent for its widespread ignorance of geography, international politics, foreign languages, and cultural difference. In *Flagging Patriotism: Crises of Narcissism and Anti-Americanism*, Robert Stam and Ella Shohat (2007) explain that current global affairs have signaled "a moment of double crisis for Americans, one external –

Anti-Americanism—and the other internal— American self-doubt and division"
(p.xi). Many politicians and educators have drawn attention to the value of
international education as an antidote to both the external and internal aspects of
U.S. global anxiety.

Proponents of international education identify study abroad as a remedy for
widespread cross-cultural misunderstanding, prejudice, global ignorance, and
failed international policy. Such enthusiasm, however, overlooks the many ways
in which the discourse of study abroad surreptitiously reproduces the logic of
colonialism, legitimizes American imperialist desires, and allows for the interests
of U.S. foreign policy to be articulated through the specious rhetoric of global
universality. Though presented with an appealing veneer of multicultural
understanding and progressive global responsibility, the current discourse of
study abroad is nationalistic, imperialist, and political in nature. Government
documents and national reports on the importance of international education
assert that study abroad is critical to gaining international power and defending
the national interest. Encouraged by the federal government, institutions of higher
education are endorsing study abroad under the falsely depoliticized rhetoric of
producing "global citizens." Beneath such a facade, however, American global
citizens are not only dependent on U.S. supremacy, but are educated to actively
endorse and advance U.S. interests while studying abroad. Mimicking the
dynamics of imperialism and colonialism, global citizens extract the resources
necessary for the maintenance of U.S. power while simultaneously functioning as
diplomatic envoys spreading pro-U.S. sentiment throughout the world. This essay
examines study abroad as a political and educational response to the challenges
of living with globalization that calls for increasing U.S. power, security, and
worldwide influence through the internationalization of higher education. [1]

American self-doubt and anxiety has manifested itself in a national conversation
concerning the prevailing paucity of international knowledge held by American
citizens. The American Council on Education (ACE) (2002) "the nation's unifying
voice for higher education," depicts a complex and challenging situation caused
by "the rapid movement of people, goods, financial transactions, and ideas" in
which the U.S. is "unready," lacking the required "global competence of our
people" to cope with such conditions (p.7). In this view, globalization is a threat to
the United States largely because American citizens do not know how to succeed
in a globalized world. ACE argues that without the cross-cultural skills needed to
stay on top, Americans are a threat to the success and viability of their own
country. Displaying a similar logic, The Lincoln Commission (2005), a federally
appointed council of politicians and educators dedicated to promoting study
abroad, gravely avers that because the U.S. is not globally competent, it "is not

---

[1] It is important to note that the contemporary discussion surrounding study abroad is not an entirely
anomalous occurrence. Throughout modern U.S. history study abroad has been employed as a political tool.
For example, after World War II, the Department of State donated several decommissioned warships to the
Council on Student Travel so that American student ambassadors could "improve international
relations…and cultivate cultural awareness at the same time" (Covell, 2007: para.3). Today, however, study
abroad has reached new and intensified levels of popularity, participation, accessibility, and support from
nearly all sectors of American society. Furthermore, the contemporary context of globalization and the
"War on Terror" has led to new articulations of the importance of international education.

as well equipped to exercise its leadership role as it could be. The situation is dangerous. It threatens our capacity to defend our values. Above all, it threatens the national interest" (p.iii,8).[2] The Lincoln commission indicates that unless the United States is in a position of international control and supremacy, the welfare of the nation is threatened, implying that it is within America's best interest to be an imperial power. Educators and politicians have announced that an internationally ignorant citizenry is a risk the U.S. cannot afford to take in the globalized age. "What Nations don't know can hurt them," the Lincoln Commission (2005) warns, "the stakes involved in study abroad are that simple, that straightforward, and that important" (p.8).

> Since the World Trade Center attacks of September 11, 2001, increasingly significant national attention has been placed on study abroad. Two months after 9/11, President Bush (2001) released a statement in honor of International Education Week, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education and the Department of State, in which he explained, "America's leadership and national security rest on our commitment to educate and prepare our youth for active engagement in the international community"(para.4). International education, the President argues, is necessary for the continuing prosperity, power, and security of the United States. ACE echoes the President's sentiments by asserting that study abroad produces the global competency necessary for national security. Using hyperbolic language that capitalizes on the national trauma of 9/11, ACE (2002) writes, "the tragic events of September 11, 2001 crystallized in a single, terrible moment, the challenges of globalization and the importance of international research and education to our national security"(p.7). The urgency of the situation established as such, study abroad has emerged as a solution to the challenges of the globalized world, expected to buttress America's position of global power and defend homeland security by producing a new generation of globally competent Americans.

The federal government and institutions of higher education alike have warmly lauded this cry for international education. In 2005 the U.S. Senate declared 2006 the "Year of Study Abroad" on the grounds that "the security, stability, and economic vitality of the United States in an increasingly complex global age depend largely upon having a globally competent citizenry" (United States Senate, 2005:para.7). Senate resolution 308 affirms the belief that it is the responsibility of "the educational systems of the United States" to ensure, through the internationalization of education, "that the citizens of the United States are globally literate" (para.1). As a bipartisan congressional effort, the Lincoln Commission (2005) has established the goal of sending one million U.S. undergraduates abroad annually by the year 2017 "to study other lands, languages, and cultures" (iii). Institutions of higher education are rising to the challenge, eagerly "internationalizing" their campuses by increasing the accessibility and variety of study abroad programs for their students. Study abroad has become more prominent and integrated into American higher

---

[2] Himadeep Muppidi (2004) points out that "Global leadership, in the U.S. imaginary, is essentially a mandate that the American Self gives to itself," making claims to global leadership suspect (p.61).

education than ever before. The number of U.S. students studying abroad has increased 8 percent between 2005 and 2006, and has more than doubled over the past decade (IIE, 2006). Universities throughout the country are turning their attention to the values of "global citizenship education" and the development of "cross-culturally competent," and "globally literate" students.

The institutional discourse of international education found in the mission statements of colleges, universities, and programs throughout the nation contains few of the explicit trappings of the nationalist political drive that ACE and the American government so openly expound. Instead, institutions of higher education frequently employ the vague and depoliticized rhetoric of "global citizenship" to describe the goals of study abroad. Wesleyan University's Office of International Studies (2006) explains that study abroad is "integral to the University's efforts to internationalize the curriculum and prepare students for global citizenship" (para.1). The President of Ithaca College has gone so far as to announce the school itself as "an innovative institutional global citizen" (Williams, 2007:para.9). Schools such as Haverford College, Lehigh University, Drake University, and Elizabethtown College have even established special centers and institutions for global citizenship on their campuses. So ubiquitous is the term "global citizen" in the discourse of study abroad that Thomas V. Millington, program officer for Brethren Colleges Abroad, recently wrote decisively of his colleagues that "we all agree that one of our goals as international educators is to produce global citizens" (personal correspondence, SECUSS listserv, October 18, 2007). Even the theme of the U.S. Department of State's International Education Week 2007 was dedicated to "fostering global citizenship" (U.S. Department of State & U.S. Department of Education, 2007). From Temple University's Office of International Programs (n/d) mission statement; "Prepare yourself to be a global citizen. Study abroad" (para.2), to Colgate University's (2006) exclamatory statement "Become a global citizen and study abroad!" (para.1), the rhetoric of global citizenship abounds.[3]

The citizen of the world ideal is gaining popularity and cultural legitimacy in the popular imagination as it becomes easier than ever to envision a global community. Globalization enthusiasts often describe the process of globalization as having created a deterritorialized and "seamlessly wired global village" (Shohat & Stam, 1996:146), or what Kwame Anthony Appiah (2006) calls a "global tribe" (p.xiii). With boundaries and borders weakened by the forces of globalization, some Americans conclude that global citizenship is the key to a peaceful and prosperous future. Nicole Price Fasig (2007), editor of *Abroad View: The Global Education Magazine for Students*, writes, "the days of thinking of ourselves as Californians, as Midwesterners, as Americans, are drawing to a close" (p.6). As the terms globalization, transnationalism, and even postnationalism challenge the status of the nation as a "viable economic unit, a

---

[3] Despite the frequency with which the term global citizenship is implemented in conversations about international education, rarely is a concrete definition presented or explored. Typically, the term is employed as an empty signifier, without even a contextual definition. Rather than attempting to deconstruct what global citizenship is intended to mean, I will critique the language of the term itself and analyze who can become a global citizen and to establish the relationship between global citizenship and U.S. imperialism.

politically sovereign territory, and a bounded cultural sphere" (Cheah, 1998:22), a new understanding of citizenship is on the rise. Increased communication across cultures, nations, and borders has led to notions of a global community imagined by the privileged of the "developed" world, who have access to globalized forms of communication, media, mobility, and cross-cultural consumption.

The strategic use of global citizenship in the discourse of study abroad lies in the ways in which the term disguises the politics and power structures that are tied to the interests of and allegiances to the nation-state. In *Imagined Communities,* Benedict Anderson (1996) writes that national narratives depend on a similar method of imagining unity by overlooking difference. Anderson understands the nation as an imagined brotherhood, a collective kinship that constructs an "us" and a "we," to which citizens belong and owe protection and loyalty. The building blocks of national identity are often mythologies or stories, narrated according to political agendas and perceived need. "National mythologies," writes Stam and Shohat (2007), "provide warm and fuzzy fables of unity to 'cover over' what are actually extremely conflictual histories," in an effort to construct a strategic understanding of shared commonality (p.8). Timothy Brennan (1990) similarly explains, "Nations…are imaginary constructs that depend for their existence on an apparatus of cultural fictions" (p.49). The cultural fiction of global citizenship functions as a "warm and fuzzy" fable, a feint of universal kinship and belonging to obscure the severe inequalities, injustices, and acts of violent exploitation that not only persist in the globalized age, but of which study abroad is an active participant and beneficiary.

The interests of the nation are often executed under the rhetoric of universality, human rights, and global citizenship. Pheng Cheah (1998) notes that "even official U.S. nationalism feels the need to put on nonnational costume now and then" in an effort to gain the power that comes with claims to cosmopolitan universality (p.20). Laying claim to apolitical universality is a powerful political tool, one particularly valuable to a nation whose international reputation is, like that of America, far from benign. While the rhetoric of global citizenship displays what Bruce Robbins (1999) describes as "morals and sentiments rather than agents and politics" (p.18), American students who study abroad cannot be removed from the political and national contexts from which they come. Global citizenship, to use Timothy Brennan's (2001) contention, is "a discourse of the universal that is inherently local – a locality that is always surreptitiously imperial" (p.81).

Like nations and national citizenship, global citizenship is not a predetermined or preexisting constant. Citizenship is a social construction strategically crafted by those in power. Although people may be born into a particular institution of citizenship, the process of becoming a citizen goes beyond a birthright claim. In "Admission to Citizenship," Herman R. van Gunsteren (1988) identifies knowledge, defined as including "communicative competence, culture, [and] information" (p.733), as a condition for citizenship. Shared knowledge of culture, language, and history creates a sense of community and belonging that has often been established as a prerequisite to citizenship. International educators likewise establish knowledge of another place, gained through a study abroad experience,

as a prerequisite for attaining the privilege of global citizenship. Despite the rhetoric of the global village, individuals are not global citizens simply by virtue of living on planet Earth. There is no law of *Jus Soli* (birthright citizenship) when it comes to global citizenship. Rather, students must be constructed and created into global citizens through study abroad and international education.

In the modern era, many view it as the responsibility of educational institutions to produce competent citizens and to instill in them a sense of national belonging, or, in the case of global citizenship, a sense of universal entitlement. Ian Lister (1995) writes that since the nineteenth century,

> The school promoted a sense of nationhood through its rituals (such as flag ceremonies, national days, and even the layout of the world map on the classroom wall) and through its curriculum, which stressed the national language, the national literature, and the national history, in which history was related as the story of the making of the nation (pp.110-111).

Education works to socialize students into citizenship, transmitting particular worldviews and instilling in them knowledge of, and obedience to cultural beliefs and practices. Education, then, is an assimilative force, attempting to construct – or imagine – shared understandings of national citizenship as determined by those in power. School systems develop loyalty to the nation and standardize education in an effort to produce the desired ideal of national citizens. Similarly, study abroad programs and institutions of higher education socialize students into the new national ideal of global citizenship.

As there is no global sovereign power ruling over the world, global citizenship has no legal or political basis for legitimacy. The global citizen license is granted to study abroad students by institutions of higher education, not official international or national government establishments. Thus, the ability to become a global citizen is dependent on the extent to which an individual is able to attain international knowledge through pre-approved and closely monitored educational channels that are based in the United States. The attainment of such knowledge is further dependent on the privileges of mobility, economic comfort, and socio-political freedoms. Global citizenship, therefore, is an identity available and granted to some but not to others.

Current statistics show that particular demographic groups study abroad far more than others.[4] Despite the fact that nearly 40 percent of all U.S. undergraduates attend community colleges, these students account for just 2.5 percent of those studying abroad (Lincoln Commission, 2005:15). Most students who study abroad are enrolled in liberal arts colleges, and Lincoln Commission research

---

[4] One group that is overrepresented in study abroad is women. Currently, two-thirds of study abroad participants are female and only one-third is male. It is likely that this has more to do with academic interest and programs offered rather than relative levels of gendered privilege. However, the fact that women are the dominant group in study abroad signals a unique moment in which the female gender is employed to serve the political interests of U.S. empire abroad at higher rates than their male counterparts.

shows that "just 108 institutions (out of over 4,200 American colleges and universities) account for 50 percent of all the students abroad" (ibid). Moreover, students of color are significantly underrepresented in study abroad programs (p.17). While "Black, non-Hispanic" students make up 12 percent of total student enrollment in higher education, only 3.4 per cent of students who study abroad are placed in the "Black-non-Hispanic" category. Similarly, only 5.1 percent of those who study abroad are identified as Hispanic, while that same group constitutes 12 percent of total student enrollment in U.S. educational institutions. Meanwhile, white students are overrepresented in study abroad enrollment by 15.6 percent, constituting 83 percent of students who study abroad (Lincoln Commission, 2006).

Far from embodying universality, individuals are constructed into global citizens through their ability to access elitist modes of attaining citizenship. In "Broken Promises," Arjun Appadurai (2002) criticizes the "international community" as "less a community than a club for the world's wealthiest nations" (p.43). Despite its "nonnational costume," the discourse of global citizenship does not, Himadeep Muppidi (2004) notes, "speak for 'citizens of the world, members of the human community' who are not Americans" (p.102,73). The U.S. ideal of global citizenship is not directed in the study abroad discourse to anyone other than Americans, producing an understanding of the global that is bound only to the advancement of the United States. "As a result," writes Muppidi (2004), "the global is consistently colonized by the American national" (p.74). Furthermore, despite a glaring lack of institutional legitimacy, the use of the term *citizen* itself implies certain rights, privileges, and powers. Claiming global citizenship in the context of American students studying abroad is symptomatic of U.S. narcissism, entitlement, and fallacious claims to universality that function hand in hand with projects of cultural imperialism and neo-colonialism. The American global citizen refuses to be limited by nation-state borders. The global citizen assumes the right to travel unhindered, to penetrate cultures without the hassle of boundaries, to extend his or her rights of citizenship transnationally, and to unabashedly profit from this imperialist global arrangement. Thus, while global citizenship is described in the cosmopolitan spirit of commonality and shared experience, it is actually an identity deeply invested in the advancement and development of American power and success.

Ania Loomba (2005) defines colonialism as a system under which "In whichever direction human beings and materials traveled, the profits always flowed back into the so-called 'mother country'" (p.9). The metropole extracting resources from the periphery is additionally used as a framework for understanding imperialism and the capitalist world system. Through study abroad, global citizens enact a similar colonial process by harvesting the resource of international knowledge to strengthen and benefit America. In the case of study abroad, knowledge unequivocally means power. ACE (2002) states that study abroad programs "produce the core knowledge experts need for national security, economic competitiveness, and U.S. foreign policy leadership"(p.15). It is made clear that knowledge extracted through study abroad is expected to move beyond the individual student and into the realm of national profit. As U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings (2007) explains, "International

education enlarges our perspective, as individuals and as a nation" (para.4). Knowledge acquired by global citizens makes the world beyond U.S. borders legible, readable, knowable and therefore both consumable and controllable. That which is exposed and understood through the acquisition of knowledge is no longer urgently perceived of as a threat to U.S. international strength and can be inserted and incorporated into national projects of global hegemony and supremacy.

Increasing the "global competency" and "global literacy" (Lincoln Commission, 2005:ix) of the U.S. citizenry is a project in the production of knowledge. By studying the context in which knowledge is produced, the political implications of such knowledge become explicit. In *Orientalism*, Edward Said (1979) addresses the relationship between academia and political projects of power. He identifies "the extent to which 'knowledge' about 'the Orient'…was an ideological accompaniment of colonial 'power'" (Loomba, 2005: 42). Orientalism, Said (1979) explains,

> Can be discussed and analyzed as the corporate institution for dealing with the Orient – dealing with it by making statements about it, authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it; in short, Orientalism is a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient (p.3).

Educational institutions often enact such a task, as intellectuals are in the position of claiming authority to produce knowledge about and over the Other. Mimicking the methodology of Orientalism, ACE recognizes study abroad as a tool for producing knowledge connected to national, political, and economic power. The group's executive summary states: "the United States must invest in an educational infrastructure [identified as study abroad programs] that produces knowledge of language and cultures…to meet the needs of government agencies, the private sector, and education itself" (ACE, 2002:7). Ricardo Salvatore (1998) calls quests for the acquisition of knowledge, such as study abroad, the "enterprise of knowledge," a project often undertaken by intellectuals that is key to the construction of "arguments of economic interest, benevolence, moral reform, knowledge, and the 'national interest'" of empire (p.72).

Knowledge and global competency are continuously articulated within the discourse of study abroad as essential to U.S. 'national interest' in world leadership, homeland security, economic achievements, and foreign policy success. Ulf Hennerz (1996) explains the relationship between knowledge and control, writing, "Competence with regard to alien cultures itself entails a sense of mastery, as an aspect of the self. One's understandings have expanded, a little more of the world is somehow under control" (p.103). The definition of global competency provided by ACE (2002) similarly connects competency to leadership and power:

> Global competency is a broad term…It involves, among other things, foreign language proficiency and an ability to function effectively in other cultural environments and value systems,

whether conducting business, implementing international development projects, or carrying out diplomatic missions (p.7).

This definition of global competency highlights the importance of international education and its relationship to producing the knowledge that will establish and maintain U.S. power, unhindered mobility, and international strength. To "function effectively" here means the ability to fulfill one's desires, to achieve one's goals unilaterally without the onerous limitations and barriers of cultural difference. For example, because of the knowledge that global citizens gain through study abroad, they are better equipped to establish contracts in Nigeria for U.S. development corporations, more able to run a factory of Indonesian laborers, or more successful at implementing U.S. policy in the Middle East. Global citizens advance the "national interest" of the United States by perpetuating colonial and imperial patterns of strategic resource extraction.

In addition to extracting resources, study abroad students join their historical predecessors; the ranks of missionaries, colonizers, anthropologists, and humanitarian aid workers who have served as "goodwill ambassadors," promoting the soft power interests of the metropole. The two way flow of strategic information conducted by global citizens is illustrated by an article published by the Online NewsHour of PBS which alerts the public to a "growing class of global citizens— voracious learners, cultural sponges, and unassuming ambassadors— who have chosen to take international detours for study, work and fun" (Wasey, 1996:para.6). PBS describes students as "voracious learners," alluding to the conviction with which global citizens harvest knowledge, but also conflictingly refers to students as "cultural sponges," open and passive vessels for resource extraction and transportation. Simultaneously, global citizens are identified as "unassuming ambassadors," veiled and covert champions of American diplomacy. In specific and controlled ways, U.S. students studying abroad are employed to change the beliefs of hosts throughout the globe.

U.S. international strength is greatly aided by foreign consent and approval, which reduces resistance to the global desires of American citizens. Many on all sides of the political spectrum, however, have recently pointed out that resentment and ill-will toward the United States "has become virtually universal" (Stam & Shohat, 2007:xi). Stam and Shohat (2007) explain that while discussions of anti-Americanism "largely involved the Arab/Muslim world, recent times have seen a growing rift between the United States and its allies" (ibid). Indeed, Stam and Shohat apprise, "the majorities in most countries in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America oppose American foreign policy and the U.S. role as self-appointed global 'leader'"(p.xiv). Joseph Nye (2007), the father of "soft power" theory, argues that study abroad is essential to the replenishment of international pro-American sentiment that "has diminished in recent years" (p.4). Nye explains that that soft power, defined as the ability to "attract followers through the strength of a country's values and culture," decreases resistance to U.S. foreign policy and reduces the need for military action (ibid). Furthermore, soft power is indispensable to imperialist projects. "The first task of Empire," write Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2000), "is to enlarge the realm of the consensuses that support its own power" (p.15). By spreading pro-U.S. values and ideals, global

citizens help to produce a favorable climate for the globally encompassing extension of American power.

One of the widely recognized goals of study abroad is to "promote knowledge and understanding of the United States in other countries" (ACE, 2002:19) that will better position the U.S. for international success. According to the U.S. Senate (2005), "educating students internationally is an important way to share the values of the United States [and] to create goodwill for the United States around the world"(para.2). Students studying abroad are often referred to as global ambassadors, described as one of America's most valuable foreign policy assets. John O' Harney (2006), Editor of *Connection: The Journal of the New England Board of Higher Education*, writes, "there's a better way to spread democracy around the world…and boost America's economic competitiveness at the same time"(p.5). Study abroad goodwill ambassadors do not fight on battlefields, O'Harney notes, but they can fight for America abroad. Students studying abroad are "unassuming ambassadors," charming young people who make friends abroad and promote goodwill toward their home country through these relationships and patronages. Study abroad students are expected to actively combat anti-Americanism, disabusing foreign "natives" of their misconceptions and prejudices toward the United States. This process of "re-education," now enacted by global citizens, has long been a tool of imperial and colonial powers.

A *Washington Post* editorial by foreign correspondent David Ignatius (2005) titled "Replant the American Dream" exemplifies the elements of cultural imperialism found in the discourse of study abroad. "America isn't just disliked or feared overseas – it's reviled," Ignatius explains, and so "The United States must begin to replenish this stock of support for America in the world" (p.A37). The government, Ignatius laments, is unable to take the lead because "sadly, when President Bush eloquently evokes our values, the world seems to tune out." Ignatius alleges that the task of creating goodwill toward the U.S. "falls instead to the American public. It's a job that involves traveling, sharing, living our values, and encouraging our children to learn foreign languages and work and study abroad" (ibid). Unable to accept a world in which Americans are not consistently "admired" and "wanted," Ignatius calls on students to "Replant the American Dream" abroad. Ignatious's use of the word *replant* evokes the sexual and gendered language of imperialism and colonialism, in which the United States reaps power and control through a seminal act of replanting in feminized land.[5]

The very foreign policy that has led to the downfall of America's international reputation is allowed to persevere and perhaps escalate while students "soften" opposition through their travels, foster goodwill, and weaken resistance to American economic, cultural, and political advancements. Additionally, global citizens act as a smokescreen to the expansion of U.S. imperialism and military aggression. By lending a strategically friendly face to the violence and arrogance of American foreign policy, study abroad students distract from politics while

---

[5] For more on the gendered discourse of imperialism, see Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest, by Anne McClintock. McClintock writes that colonized land was gendered female by male, European explorers as a way to rationalize the assertion of patriarchal authority.

simultaneously fortifying U.S. international power. Just as the language of "global citizenship" functions under a guise of humanitarian universality, so do the actions of American global citizens.

The discourse of study abroad appropriates the global to service the interests of the U.S. by re-naming imperialist and nationalistic projects with the rhetoric of "global understanding," "international education," and "global citizenship." The "globe" is something to be consumed, a commodity that the privileged American student has the unchallenged and unquestioned right to obtain as an entitled citizen of the world. The participation of institutions of higher education in this political and nationalist project raises serious concerns about the role of education in the globalized world. Loomba (2005) writes, "If universities are to remain sites of dissent and free intellectual inquiry, if scholarship is not to be at the service of American or any other power, critiques of past and ongoing empires are going to be more necessary than ever" (p.228). To do so, American institutions and American students must resist the urge to recede into an alluring yet erroneous discourse of the global. "Americans' most dangerous quality," writes Jedediah Purdy (2003), "is our belief in our own universality and innocence" (p.62). The discourse of study abroad embodies both such beliefs, allowing students to become global citizens while perpetuating systems of power and imperialist desire under the rhetoric of universality and innocence.

REFERENCES

1. American Council on Education (2002). Beyond September 11: A Comprehensive National Policy on International Education. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

2. Anderson, B. (1996). Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism, revised edition. London: Verso.

3. Appadurai, A. (2002, Sept/Oct). Broken Promises. Foreign Policy 132 (no.132).

4. Appiah, K.A. (2006). Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

5. Brennan, T. (1990). The National Longing for Form. In Bhabha, H. (Ed.), Nation and Narration. London and New York: Routledge.

6. Brennan, T. (2001, Jan/Feb). Cosmopolitanism and Internationalism. New Left Review 7.

7. Bush, G. (2001). International Education Week. Retrieved October 31, 2007, from http://exchanges.state.gov/iew2001/message.htm.

8. Cheah, P. (1998). The Cosmopolitical – Today. In Cheah, P. & Robbins, B. (Eds.), Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation (pp.20-41). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

9. Colgate University Abroad (2006). About Colgate. Retrieved October 30, 2007, from http://www.colgate.edu/DesktopDefault1.aspx?tabid=987&pgID=103.

10. Covell, L.J. (2007). Council on International Educational Exchange Inc. Origins. Retrieved on March 29, 2007, from http://www.answers.com/topic/councilon-international-educational-exchange-inc.

11. Fasig, N.P. (2007). Thinking Globally. Abroad View 9 (issue 2), 6.

12. Gilbert, J.M. (1998). Toward a new cultural history of U.S.-Latin American relations. In G.M. Joseph, C.C. Legrand, & R.D. Salvatore (Eds.), Close Encounters of Empire (pp.3-46). Durham: Duke University Press.

13. Hannerz, U. (1996). Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places. New York: Routledge.

14. Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). Empire. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.

15. Ignatius, D. (2005, November 25). Replant the American Dream. The Washington Post, A37.

16. Institute of International Education Open Doors (2006). U.S. Students Abroad Top 200,000, Increase by 8 percent. Retrieved March 20, 2007, from http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=89252.

17. Lincoln Commission, (2005). Global Competence & National Needs: One Million Americans Studying Abroad. Washington, DC: Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program.

18. Lincoln Commission (2006). Trends and Barriers in Study Abroad. Washington, DC: Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program.

19. Lister, I. (1995). Educating Beyond the Nation. International Review of Education 41 (no1/2).

20. Loomba, A. (2005). Colonialism/PostColonialism. New York: Routledge.

21. Muppidi, H. (2004). The Politics of the Global. London and Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

22. Nye, J. (2007, Jan/Feb). Squandering the U.S. soft power edge. The International Educator 4.

23. O'Harney, J. (2006, Fall). An International Strategy. Connection: The Journal of the New England Board of Higher Education 2 (vol. XXI).

24. Purdy, J. (2003). Being America: Liberty, Commerce, and Violence in an American World. New York: Knopf.

25. Robbins, B. (1999). Feeling Global: Internationalism in Distress. New York: New York University Press.

26. Said, E. (1979). Orientalism. New York: Vintage Books.

27. Salvatore, R.D. (1998). The Enterprise of Knowledge: Representational Machines of Informal Empire. In G.M. Joseph, C.C. Legrand, and R.D. Salvatore (Eds.), Close Encounters of Empire (pp.69-104). Durham: Duke University Press.

28. Shohat, E. & Stam, R. (1996). From the Imperial Family to the Transnational Imaginary: Media Spectatorship in the Age of Globalization. In Wilson, R. & Dissanayake, W. (Eds.), Global Local: Cultural Production and the Transnational Imaginary. Durham: Duke University Press.

29. Spellings, M. (2007). Statement on International Education Week 2007. Retrieved November 17, 2007, from http://iew.state.gov/statements/sec-ed.htm.

30. Stam, R. & Shohat, E., (2007). Flagging Patriotism: Crises of Narcissism and Anti-Americanism. New York: Routledge.

31. Temple University International Programs (n/d). Why Study Abroad?. Retrieved October 31, 2007, from http://www.temple.edu/studyabroad/students/index.html.

32. U.S. Department of State & U.S. Department of Education (2007). International Education Week 2007. Retrieved November 18, 2007, from http://iew.state.gov/.

33. United States Senate, 109th Congress, 1st Session (2005). S. Res. 308 Designating 2006 as the 'Year of Study Abroad.' Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

34. Van Gunsteren, H.R. (1998, July). Admission to Citizenship. Ethics 98(no. 4).

35. Wasey, A. (2006). Studying and Working Abroad a Growing Passion for Young Americans. PBS Online NewsHour. Retrieved October 31, 2007, from http://www.pbs.org/newshour/generation-next/demographic/abroad_10-25.html.

36. Wesleyan University Office of International Studies (2007). About Us. Retrieved April 2, 2007, from http://www.wesleyan.edu/ois/aboutus.html.

37. Williams, P.G. (2007). President's Corner: Worldwide Web of Learning. Retrieved October 30, 2007, from http://www.ithaca.edu/icview/765/.

What is normal and why does it matter?: Disabling discourses in education and society

Bernadette Macartney
University of Canterbury, New Zealand

This paper draws from data I have gathered as part a qualitative study focusing on the narratives of three parents of disabled children including their experiences with early childhood education, primary school, medical and special education personnel. This research uses an approach to ethnography that combines both critical and auto-ethnographic methodologies (Bruni, 2002; Ellis & Bochner, 1996; Lather, 2003; Lather & Smithies, 1997; Richardson, 1998; Ronai, 2002; Wasserfall, 1997). My family and I are co-participants in the research. This paper primarily considers the experiences of one research participant, Fran. The implications of a worldview that privileges a construction and image of the 'normal' child is examined through considering Fran's experiences as a mother of a child who does not fit the classification of 'normal'. I draw on post-structuralist theories of power/knowledge to explore the meanings that parents might make of living with a disabled child and how their experiences interact with normalising discourses of disability and education (Arkwright, 2005; Ballard, Purdue & MacArthur, 2003; Davis, 1997; Foucault, 1977, 1980; Graham, 2005; Kelly, 2005; Tremain, 2002, 2005). Some central questions addressed in this paper are: 'What implicit messages do parents receive about their disabled children?' 'What possible effects might these messages have on how parents view their child, and experience day-to-day living? 'How are dominant power/knowledge relations expressed and maintained through normalising discourses at the level of lived experience?' 'What possibilities are there for parents and teachers to resist or challenge normative discursive practices?'

As well as being the researcher, my family and I are participants in the study. My partner is Tony and our children are Maggie-Rose (11yrs) and Sally (6yrs). Maggie was diagnosed as 'being disabled' as an infant. Sally is a typically developing child. The other co-participant in the research is Fran. Pseudonyms have been used to refer to Fran and members of her family. Fran's experiences are the focus of this paper. Fran is a mother of two children, Clare (5yrs) and Amber (1.5yrs). Fran describes Clare as 'special' in preference to describing her as disabled or as having disabilities. Amber is a typically developing toddler.

My interpretation and re-presentation of the narratives are filtered through my personal and professional experiences as a mother of a disabled child, and an early childhood educator. I believe that re/presenting family perspectives and experiences through narrative is a powerful tool for illuminating and problematising practices and approaches based on deficit discourses of disability and difference (Ballard, 1994; Ferguson & Ferguson, 1995; Raymond, 2002).

This research combines three methodologies: critical/auto-ethnography, symbolic interactionism, and discourse theory. I am using analytical tools based on both symbolic interactionism, and discourse theory for developing theory and insights about the relationships between the micro and macro contexts families negotiate, and their impact on how disability is constructed and experienced.

A symbolic interactionist perspective focuses on how people construct, interpret and negotiate meaning, and make sense of their world through their everyday actions and interactions (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Nuttall, 2003). What is of particular interest from this perspective are the processes that people develop and use to construct, define, and consequently act, on their reality using symbolic interaction (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). Kelly (2005) discusses a recent development of theoretical understandings of disability as including a growing acknowledgement of the need to consider the personal experiences of disabled children as well as a consideration of the disabling barriers in society. This research seeks to listen to, represent and interpret the experiences of parents of disabled children and the multiple influences on how they construct a view of their own child. During my preliminary analysis of interview data, I focused on understanding and looking for emerging themes based on Fran's definition of her situation (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). Themes were developed in relation to how Fran viewed and made sense of her disabled child, her role as a mother; processes that she identified such as 'coming out of the closet' and questions her stories raised around: 'What is normal?' and 'What is perfect?'.

A social constructionist approach has been taken in this research, based on the epistemological view that knowledge and reality are socially co-constructed. Social constructionism assumes that people participate actively in the social construction and interpretation of their world (Burr, 1995; Ballard, 1994; Crotty, 1998; Ferguson & Ferguson, 1995). Such an approach views reality as something to be interpreted rather than discovered, and meanings as multiple and situated, rather than singular and fixed (Crotty, 1998; Ferguson & Ferguson, 1995). Crotty (1998, p.42) suggests that from a social constructionist perspective:

> …all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context.

The three data gathering methods used in this project were: in-depth interviewing, journal/diary keeping, and document analysis. The main method was semi-structured, in-depth interviewing. An interview schedule was developed for each interview based on the research questions, and preliminary analysis of the previous interview/s. Each participant, including myself, was invited to keep a journal over the course of the project. Fran, was interviewed for two hours on four occasions over a period one year. My family's data consisted of two interviews with my partner Tony and myself carried out by other researchers, my personal

journal recordings, and family, early childhood, primary school and special education assessment and planning documents.

Like Fran, Tony and I have an acute awareness of how other people might view our children. As well as direct experience of other people's views, I have a constant internal awareness of dominant ways of thinking about and framing disability and difference. It is like having a voice speaking to me from outside, except that it is inside myself and through everyday life that multiple and conflicting ways of viewing and thinking about disability are played out. I often say that it is not Maggie who is the problem; it is the 'rest of the world' with its limiting attitudes and barriers. But this separation of individual experience and 'society' as expressed through dominant discourses does not allow for a consideration of the complex ways in which power, subjectivity and identity might intersect.

Graham (2005, p.2) uses a Foucauldian framework for explaining power and power relations to inform her analysis of the social construction of 'Otherness' and the differential treatment of children who are seen as having behaviour problems in the Queensland school system. Quoting Tabboukou, (1999), Graham (2005, p3) suggests that analysis based on Foucauldian work: "…makes the effort to look directly at what people do, without taking anything for granted…The researcher looks to the present as an effect of power relationships" rather than to the intended outcomes of individual actions. Drawing from a poststructuralist theoretical perspective, the exercise of power is viewed as diffuse, and as being expressed in multiple ways rather than being exercised through some intentional, straight forward and centralised means (Foucault, 1980; Graham, 2005). Foucault (1980, p.98) argued, that power is not merely a repressive force inflicted by a powerful group or institution onto another, instead:

> …individuals circulate between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. They are not only its inert or consenting target; they are also the elements of its articulation.

Tremain (2005, p.6) suggests that a key implication for analysis of Foucault's theory of the workings of power is that:

> …analyses of power should not aim to identify some overarching or distant font of subjecting power, but rather should try to grasp subjection in its material instance as a constitution of subjects.

Foucault (1977, 1980) argued that individuals, as subjects, are subject to someone else's control and that they are also active subjects in controlling or disciplining themselves. As Tremain (2002, pp.35-36) puts it:

> In both cases, one is subjugated and made subject to. By a process of division either within themselves or from others, subjects are objectivized as (for instance) mad or sane, sick or healthy, criminal or good…through these objectifying procedures of division, classification and ordering, subjects become attached to a personal and social identity.

Foucault (1980) argued that social and cultural mechanisms or technologies that objectify groups of people through categorising, naming, and defining them, provide the pre-conditions for controlling them. The central classification that underpins dominant discourses and practices related to disability, and education is the notion of the 'norm'. The construction of what is 'normal' requires a classification and delineation of what is 'abnormal' or 'deviant' in relation to the norm. Foucault viewed the development and use of statistical scientific knowledge as a disciplinary mechanism (Tremain, 2005). He contended that the construction and use of statistical knowledge was a pre-condition for the development of the dominant mode of "bio-power" or "bio-politics" in the modern world (Tremain, 2005, p.4).

Once named and classified, particular groups can be controlled and disciplined through normalising strategies embedded in discursive practices. Because the knowledge produced through dominant discourses is largely accepted as the 'truth' the assumptions and ideas that underpin that knowledge and its associated practices are often seen as unproblematic and not in need of scrutiny or challenge. The development of the construct of statistically defined norms in relation to human attributes and behaviour and the belief that human traits and characteristics can and should be defined, measured and ranked in relation to established 'norms', is relatively recent in human history (Davis, 1997). For example, the word "normal" meaning conforming to standards accepted as regular and usual has only been in common usage in the English language since around 1840 (Davis, ibid). The concept of there being a norm, which is subsequently positioned as the ideal, brings into existence the construct of 'deviance' in relation to the norm. The development and advancement of medical science and developmental psychology have contributed to our understandings and practices around notions related to the 'norm'.

The Medical Model

The dominant framework for creating, understanding and responding to disability in Western society since the nineteenth century has been the medical (or individual) model (Hughes, 2002; Barnes, Mercer & Shakespeare, 1999). The creation of the 'bodily conditions' of impairment and disability and the division of 'disabled' and 'able' bodies is a process and effect of bio-power (Tremain, 2002; 2005). Knowledge based on the medical model characterises disability as a biological, pathological (abnormal) condition contained within individuals that requires professional intervention and management. The role of medical and educational 'experts' is to cure, 'fix' or lessen the 'problem' through treatments and interventions designed by medical and quasi-medical ('special education') experts. From a medical standpoint, people with disabilities are contrasted with the classifications of 'healthy', 'normal', 'fully participating' members of society. This model constructs and portrays disability as a personal tragedy – the individual person is dependent on others for support and is viewed as a victim of great misfortune, in need of pity, help and charity (Brett, 2002). Hughes (2002, p.60) describes the thesis of the medical model in regards to disability as: "The ontological essence of disability (being) a physical or mental impairment or a

biological 'deficit' or 'flaw' that limits what disabled people can do." An effect of such a medicalised and individualised view is that it ignores or silences the social construction of disability and impairment, and the negative effects of that construction on people who are classified as impaired through the discursive practices that sustain it.

Normalising Discourses and Education

In relation to educational norms constructed through the knowledge base of developmental psychology, Graham (2005) suggests that the articulation of ages and stages of development, and the production and use of normative standards and practices in education constructs and reifies the 'abnormal' and views this perceived deviation as a deficit. The pedagogical response to this perceived lack or deficit is the construction of particular groups of children as 'non-achievers' who are seen as being: "…in need of remediation/support/cure in the form of 'correct training'" (Graham, 2005, p.6). This results in the separation and delineation of the 'abnormal' from the normal and results in the child becoming subject to an: "…uninterrupted play of calculated gazes" (Foucault, 1977, p.177).

Graham (2005, p.6) argues that this binary division between normal and abnormal in developmental psychology paves the way for differentiation and treatment of children defined as abnormal and is a site where 'disciplinary power' can be exercised. How might this power - that disciplines people's lives and identities in ways that are generally accepted, unquestioned and taken for granted – operate on the level of lived experience? In a discussion of discourses relevant to disability, Ballard, Purdue and MacArthur (2003, pp.134-135), suggest that a discourse:

> …can be seen as a set of ideas that shape our knowledge and understandings of disability. Some discourses can be very powerful; they are accepted as "the truth", and influence, reinforce, and control our thoughts, ideas, language, actions and practices as teachers, and our reactions to people with disabilities. Other discourses, however, may be viewed as less important and are marginalised or rejected.

Edgar and Sedgwick (2002, p.117) describe a discourse as: "…a means of both producing and organizing meaning within a social context." They note that a key function of discourse is not only what it includes but also what it excludes. The voices and perspectives of disabled people and their family members are marginalised and excluded within a deficit discourse that draws from medical and developmental discourses of disability and education (Ferguson & Ferguson, 1995; Ferguson, 2001).

Family narratives: 'What is normal?'

The importance and influence of what is 'normal' or 'perfect' on how Fran, Tony, and I construct a view of our children and how we experience our lives has been a central and recurring theme in the research. Although Fran and I have quite

different perspectives and ways of viewing our experiences as mothers of disabled children, our talk about our experiences illuminates a process of being engaged in a struggle with dominant ways of our children and ourselves being viewed and positioned by others. This engagement in struggle is often not conscious, and it has been through analysing our talk that I have become more aware of the processes and expressions of power that are involved in negotiating, constructing and making meaning of our lives in relation to disability.

Following are some stories from interviews with Fran that are indicative of her subjective experiences of living and being positioned in relation with normalising discourses. I explore some of the mechanisms of power/knowledge and how these might operate through considering some of the lived *effects* of normalising discourses that Fran enacts, uses and resists in her efforts to negotiate and make sense of her life. I suggest that these stories reflect sites where individuals: "…are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this (disciplinary) power" (Foucault, 1980, p.98).

Fran's Story: "The Perfect Child"

Clare, who was four years old when our interviews took place, was Fran and Mark's first child. When I asked Fran to describe Clare, Fran said that Clare: "… was supposedly born normal, normal being whatever 'normal' is... she has global developmental delay and she has Myoclonic jerks." When Fran talked about Clare as a baby (pre-diagnosis), she described her as "a healthy, chubby baby", "she was very laid back", "she was perfect".

Fran's talk uses and takes the classification of normal and not normal ("delayed") for granted at the same time as questioning what "normal" is. Her description of Clare as having a "global developmental delay" is a term that has been constructed through a process of power/knowledge production involving the classification and separation of bodies and minds that have deviated from the norm. To be 'delayed' is to deviate from prescribed 'norms' in the form of ages and stages for 'developmental milestones'.

Fran's view of Clare as being "the perfect child", because she was quiet, contented and undemanding, changed over time. Before Clare was labelled as 'delayed', Fran had viewed her laid back behaviour as a positive attribute. Post 'diagnosis', Fran began to question her view of her child as 'perfect'. She expressed anger about other parents who regularly made comments about her being so "lucky" to have such an 'easy' child:

> Fran: "You could take her out – people think we're so lucky. I'm sick of hearing that: "You're so lucky! She's the perfect child – you're so lucky! She just sits down when you put her down." I'm sick of hearing that. If I hear that again, I'm about to boof somebody! She's got her advantages, put it that way, but there are disadvantages as well."

Fran no longer felt fortunate or lucky to have an undemanding child because her child was "delayed". Clare's temperament, indeed her former positive attributes, were discursively transformed by virtue of being viewed through a normalising,

disciplinary lens. Although it might appear that Fran had accepted and wholly adopted a deficit view of her child, the situation is more complex than this. Fran's rejection of seeing Clare as "perfect" was also mixed up with wanting the 'best' for her child. The best includes the best possible chances to learn, develop and get on in the world. In a society that privileges normalcy and creates barriers to participation and learning for people who are 'different', the "best" *was* being normal. From this perspective, "perfect" has the same meaning as "normal". To use Foucault's (1980) metaphor of power/knowledge relations as a web, Fran was caught within a taken-for-granted, pre-scribed, binary social arrangement of normal/perfect and abnormal/imperfect. This dominant belief in differences as being deficits encouraged Fran to interpret her reality and respond in particular ways in line with the dominant discourse. The process of Fran redefining her view of her child, is relevant to Foucault's argument that power is not embedded in the intentions or motivations of individual subjects but in the effects of what they do: "The individual is an effect of power, and at the same time…its vehicle" (Foucault, 1980, p.98).

"What's wrong with her?" Coming out of the closet

Although Fran's perception of Clare as "the perfect child" had changed, she was resistant to a view that there was something "wrong" with Clare. Fran's awareness of and resistance to a view that something was "wrong" with Clare increased through Clare's recent acquisition of a wheelchair. Being in a wheelchair increased Clare's visibility as being disabled, different or 'other'. Clare's deviation from the norm became more visible and that resulted in Fran being acutely aware of the gaze and scrutiny of others. She talked about the effects of this gaze on her everyday life:

> Fran: "All of a sudden we've got a wheelchair and people are looking and saying: "there's something wrong with that child." Whereas before she could happily sit in the buggy and no one would be any the wiser."

> Fran: "Cause she doesn't need to be felt sorry for. So I guess that's why I don't like going out—I'm better in the wheelchair now. But for me, the first time going out in the wheelchair, well, everybody looks. They all have a look and see what's going on. Why's that little girl in a wheelchair?"

> Fran: " I don't want everybody looking at her and feeling sorry for her because she's happy. She doesn't need anybody to be feeling sorry for her. But anyway, that's that, isn't it? That's life. I've got the wheelchair and we're stuck with it. Although we're not, though, because when I've got two (children) I've got them in the double (pushchair)."

> Fran: "We've had a wheelchair for a month, and suddenly we're not in a buggy, and suddenly people are looking…You're insignificant while you're quiet and sitting in the buggy, but once you're out of the closet and in that wheelchair, you are noticed."

Fran's view of Clare is interwoven with how her family and Clare are viewed and positioned by others as well as how she personally feels about Clare being

'special'. She uses the metaphor of "coming out of the closet" to describe her experience of parenting a child with a professionally 'diagnosed' and visible disability. The "closet" may refer to the spaces where Fran feels safe, comfortable and not vulnerable to the negative judgements of others. This is at home and among family and some friends, where Clare's differences are not constantly highlighted or the major focus of attention.

The feeling of "coming out of the closet" implies that Fran feels a desire or compulsion to hide. She talks about how she can hide Clare's physical disability by using the pushchair when she has both of the girls with her. She also talks about not wanting to go out because of feeling uncomfortable about people looking at and judging her and her family. This is related to disability and difference being constructed as something to feel shameful about and as 'other'. The effects of this view can also be seen in the very recent practices of separating people classified as deviant from the rest of society by consigning them to separate institutions such as 'residential homes' and hospitals, 'sheltered workshops' and 'special schools' (Barnes, Mercer & Shakespeare, 1999). The same underlying message or assumption of tragedy and shame associated with disability is at play here. When in public and other 'unsafe' spaces Fran feels exposed, and judged by others. She senses and sometimes overtly experiences a pitying gaze, which she is resistant to because she doesn't want her or Clare to be pitied. Fran is a person who does not like to 'stand out in a crowd'. In New Zealand, the colloquial term we use to express contempt for those who stand out, and our desire to 'fit in' is the 'tall poppy syndrome'. Perhaps this 'syndrome' has developed in relationship with normalising discourses, which privilege homogeneity or sameness and punish difference.

'Nothing's "wrong" with my girl'

> Int: "And also – is it like maybe in some way – people will think it's (that Clare is disabled) your fault for some reason?"

> Fran: "Yeah, because, and I guess that's part of, you know, everybody, first thing people say – or, not first thing, but when you talk to them about Clare, "well, what's wrong with her?" And you say "Nothing.""

> Int: Yeah. "She's got a bit of a cold at the moment, but you know, apart from that…"

> Fran: "We had a thing at preschool – a picnic at preschool the other night, and I was talking to a lady whose wee girl is very friendly with Clare, and she said to me, "Well, what is wrong with Clare?" And I said "Nothing." And she looked at me as if to say "What?!" And I said "Nothing. She's had muscle biopsies; she's had MRI scans. There's nothing wrong with her." She went "Ohh." So, yeah, that was a – so I guess my "nothing's wrong with my girl" is actually out there when she's in a wheelchair."

This encounter exemplifies the complexity of power relations and dynamics that are operating at the level of lived experience and interaction. For example, at the same time as challenging the dominant view that children classified as abnormal

have something wrong with them, Fran uses a medical discourse to support her claim that there is nothing wrong with Clare. The other parent's surprised response communicates the taken-for-grantedness of the assumption that if you are different, there has to be something wrong with you. Fran's last statement: "…so I guess my "nothing's wrong with my girl" is actually out there when she's in a wheelchair" indicates that she is aware of the contentious nature of asserting that someone who is classified as 'other' does not have anything wrong with them. She feels uncomfortable at having found herself in a position where she is at odds with the dominant way of thinking, being and behaving.

> Fran: "So I guess some people – I mean, you're probably the same with Maggie Rose – we just cruised along thinking that she would maybe come right one day, and we just took one day at a time, and we do take one day at a time, and integrate it but all of a sudden, we've been, it's like a smack in the head, you know, you have got a – It's the coming out of the closet thing. We have got a special needs child. So yeah, that's probably the difficult part of that."

Although Fran is aware of and resistant to some negative views about Clare, her conclusion indicates a belief that her difficulties are a result of Clare having "special needs" rather than as a result of discrimination and the effects of society's disabling views of disability and difference. In this way, Fran complies with the dominant medical discourse.

Possibilities for Resistance - Producing Ourselves as Discourse Users

I hope for a time where we will create enough space to construct a different, ethics based, discourse to describe and make sense of our children, our experiences and our lives. A space in which experiences and struggles such as Fran's: "…my "nothing's wrong with my girl" is actually out there when she's in a wheelchair", are no longer marginalised, silenced or ignored. A space in which we can work to identify, resist and transform such disciplinary forces rather than accepting or putting up with them as a natural or unshakeable part of life.

Arkwright (2005, p.35) describes discourses as: '…ideas and practices that share common values, which construct and reflect a worldview that then constitute and shape the meanings we have of experience.' He (Arkwright, 2005) discusses how the concepts of discourse, multiple subjectivity and agency might be significant for disability theory and useful as tools for disabled people in understanding and negotiating their lives and experiences. He (Arkwright, 2005, p.33) suggests that:

> …producing oneself as a discourse user is a means for furthering our current understandings of disability, one that is both conceptually and practically useful for disabled people.

There are possibilities for resistance, transformation and change, at least on the level of lived experience, in Arkwright's suggestion that individuals position

themselves as discourse users. Shuttleworth (2002, p.121) in a discussion of Foucault's later work, on 'practices of the self' in relation to others, states that:

> A key to political change …becomes the self's practices in relations with others… I would argue that resistance to the normative gaze, coercive social practices and negative cultural images, while it has importantly led to collective political action, sometimes also manifests as everyday practices of self in relation with others.

If the exercise of power/knowledge is web-like and diffuse, evident in its (unpredictable) effects, and articulated through the actions of individual subjects, then developing skills around identifying, resisting or challenging dominant discourses might be enabling, on the subjective levels of experience and identity development for example, for people who are marginalised and silenced by a discourse. Shor (retrieved 2007, p.1), in a discussion of the meaning and foundations of critical literacy for social, political and educational change, identifies two important questions as starting places for a critical interpretation of language and social relations: "How have we been shaped by the words we encounter?" and "…how can we use and teach oppositional discourses so as to remake ourselves and our culture?"

Challenging and resisting power relations and pedagogies that serve to subjugate disabled children and their families requires teachers and others to develop an understanding of *how* discourses are produced, their lived *effects* and how they can be negotiated and resisted. Challenging and resisting dominant discourses can open the way for the emergence and communication of different, silenced and emancipatory possibilities and discourses. For example, Giroux (1997, p.198) suggests that such a critical stance and approach to knowledge and experience can provide:

> …an important theoretical and political service in assisting those deemed "Other" to reclaim their own histories and voices… postmodernism has developed a power-sensitive discourse that helps subordinated groups to make sense out of their own social worlds and histories while simultaneously offering new opportunities to produce political and cultural vocabularies by which to define and shape their individual and collective identities.

Like Giroux (1997) Shor (retrieved 2007, p.2) suggests that there is a productive power relationship between language, discourse and identity when he defines language as a: "…social force constructing us" and critical literacy as "…language use that questions the social construction of the self."

Therefore is no power neutral or value free position in relation to power/knowledge expressed through normalising discursive practices. There is no place we can stand outside of the technologies and mechanisms of normalising power/knowledge. Freire (1998, p.68), in a discussion of the role of teachers in relation to critical pedagogy and students' learning, encourages teachers to be open about their position in relation to politics and inequality:

…my position has to be of a person who wants or refuses to change. I cannot deny or hide my posture, but I also cannot deny others the right to reject it. In the name of the respect I should have toward my students, I do not see why I should omit or hide my political stance by proclaiming a neutral position that does not exist. On the contrary, my role as a teacher is to assent the students' right to compare, to choose, to rupture, to decide.

I argue that the ownership and communication of our views about social inequalities and injustices should be extended more widely to also include the adults in the early childhood centre/school community such as parents, teachers and administrators, and our wider professional networks. Otherwise we become implicit in the silencing and marginalising of others, and diminish possibilities for social change.

Conclusion

In this paper I have argued that we could use a critical awareness of ourselves and others as discourse users to reflect on how we are positioned by normalising discourses as teachers and/or parents, how we position ourselves and others and how disciplinary power operates in our settings. I argue that those of us who are privileged by, or are required in our work to act in accordance with normalising discourses, are in a position to comply with, ignore, challenge or resist relations and technologies of power and control in our educational settings. I suggest that, through taking a critical stance, teachers, and parents, can expose and challenge limiting discourses as they are played out by ourselves and others through language, practices, encounters and experiences. This process of critique could lead to and open up other emancipatory possibilities for our pedagogy and relationships and, consequently, children's and family's learning, participation and lives.

REFERENCES

1. Arkwright, J. (2005). Disability: Theorising experiences in the critical analysis of discourse. *New Zealand Journal of Disability Studies*. 10, 33-56.

2. Ballard, K. (Ed), (1994). *Disability, family, whaanau and society.* Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.

3. Ballard, K., Purdue, K. & MacArthur, J. (2003). Competent and confident children?: Te Whaariki and the inclusion of children with disabilities in early childhood education. In J.Nuttall, (Ed.), *Weaving te whaariki: Aotearoa New Zealand's early childhood curriculum document in theory and practice.* (pp. 131-160). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

4. Barnes, C., Mercer, G. & Shakespeare, T. (1999). *Exploring disability: A sociological introduction.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

5. Bogdan, R. & Taylor, S.J. (1998). *Introduction to qualitative research* (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

6. Bogdan, R. & Biklen, S. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods.* (2nd ed.). USA: Allyn and Bacon.

7. Brett, J. (2002). The experience of disability from the perspective of parents of children with profound impairment: is it time for an alternative model of disability? *Disability & Society,* 17, 825-843.

8. Bruni, N. (2002). The crisis of visibility: Ethical dilemmas of autoethnographic research. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 2 (1), 24 – 33.

9. Burr, V. (1995). *An introduction to social constructionism*. London: Routledge.

10. Crotty, M. (1998) *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

11. Davis, L. (1997). Constructing Normalcy. In L.Davis (Ed.), *The disability studies reader*. (pp. 9-28). New York: Routledge.

12. Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. (1996). Telling and performing personal stories: The constraints of choice in abortion. In C.Ellis, & M.Flaherty (Eds), *Investigating subjectivity: Research on lived experience*. (pp. 79-101) London: Sage Publications.

13. Edgar, A., & Sedgwick, P. (Eds). (2002). *Key concepts in cultural theory.* London: Routledge.

14. Ferguson, P., & Ferguson, D. (1995). The interpretivist view of special education and disability: The value of telling stories. In T.Skrtic, (Ed), *Disability & democracy: Reconstructing (special) education for postmodernity.* (pp. 104-121). Colorado, USA: Love Publishing Company.

15. Ferguson, P. (2001). Mapping the family: Disability studies and the Exploration of parental responses to disability. In L. Albrecht, K. Selman & M. Bury (Eds.), *Handbook of disability studies*. (pp.373-395). California: Sage Publications.

16. Fine, M. (1993). (Ap)parent involvement: Reflections on parents, power, and urban public schools. *Teachers College Record*, 94(4), 682-729.

17. Fine, M., & Weis, L. (2002). Writing the 'wrongs' of fieldwork: Confronting our own research/writing dilemmas in urban ethnographies. In N.Denzin, & Y.Lincoln (Eds), *The qualitative inquiry reader* (pp.267-297). California, USA: Sage Publications.

18. Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.

19. Foucault, M. (1977) Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison. New York: Vintage Books, Random House.

20. Foucault, M. (1980) Truth & power. In C. Gordon (Ed.). *Michel Foucault Power Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972 – 1977*. pp109-133. England: The Harvester Press Limited.

21. Giroux, H. (1997). *Pedagogy and the politics of hope: Theory, culture and schooling*. USA: Westview Press.

22. Graham, L. (2005). *The incidental "other": A Foucaultian interrogation of educational policy effects.* Paper presented at the AERA Conference, 11-15 April 2005, Montreal.

23. Hughes, B. (2002) Disability and the body. In C.Barnes, M.Oliver & L.Barton, (Eds), *Disability Studies Today* Cambridge: Polity Press*.*

24. Kelly, B. (2005). 'Chocolate… makes you autism': impairment, disability and childhood identities. *Disability and Society*, 20 (3), 261-275.

25. Lather, P. (2003). Issues of validity in openly ideological research: between a rock and a soft place. In N.Denzin, & Y.Lincoln, (Eds), *Turning points in qualitative research: Tying the knots in a handkerchief* (pp.185-215). USA: Altamira Press.

26. Lather, P., & Smithies, C. (1997). *Troubling the angels: Women living with HIV/AIDS.* USA: Westview Press.

27. Macartney, B. (2002). Maggie-rose: A parent's story. *The First Years/Nga Tau Tua Tahi: New Zealand Journal of Infant and Toddler Education,* 4 (2), 29-31.

28. Munford, R. & Sanders, J. (2003). (Eds), *Making a difference in families: Research that creates change*. Australia: Allen & Unwin.

29. Nuttall, J. (2003). *Why don't you ask someone who cares?: Teacher identity, intersubjectivity, and curriculum negotiation in a New Zealand childcare centre*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University.

30. Ogonowska-Coates, H. (Interviewer/Documentary Maker), (2003). *Meet Maggie-Rose*. Wellington, New Zealand: Radio New Zealand.

31. Raymond, H. (2002). A narrative inquiry into mother's experiences of securing inclusive education. Alberta, USA: University of Alberta.

32. Richardson, L. (1998). Writing: A method of inquiry. In K.Denzin, & Y.Lincoln, (Eds), *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*. (pp.345-371). California, USA: Sage Publications.

33. Ronai, C. (2002). The next night sous rature: Wrestling with Derrida's mimesis. In N. Denzin, & Y.Lincoln (Eds*), The Qualitative Reader.* (pp. 105–124). California, USA: Sage Publications.

34. Shor, I. (retrieved 22/11/2007). What is critical literacy? In: *Journal for pedagogy, pluralism & practice*. (pp.1-25). http://www.lesley.edu/journals/jppp/4/shor.html

35. Shuttleworth, R. (2002). Defusing the adverse context of disability and desirability as a practice of self for men with cerebral palsy. In M.Corker & T.Shakespeare, (Eds), *Disability/Postmodenity: Embodying disability theory*. (pp. 112--126). New York: Continuum

36. Skrtic, T. (1991). Behind special education: A critical analysis of professional culture and school organization. Colorado, USA: Love Publishing Company.

37. Tremain, S. (2002) On the subject of impairment. In M.Corker & T.Shakespeare, (Eds), *Disability/Postmodenity: Embodying disability theory*. (pp. 32-47). New York: Continuum.

38. Tremain, S. (2005) Foucault, governmentality, and critical disability theory: An introduction. In S.Tremain (Ed) *Foucault and the government of disability*. (pp. 1-24). USA: University of Michigan Press.

39. Wasserfall, R. (1997). Reflexivity, feminism, and difference. In R. Hertz (Ed), *Reflexivity & Voice* (pp. 150-168). California, USA: Sage Publications.

Conflict, controversy, and complexity:
Avoiding the 'slippery stuff' in social studies

Bronwyn Wood

University of Victoria, New Zealand

A quick scan of the news recently reveals some of the following newspaper headlines:

Israel renews strikes across Gaza
Resentment as refugee arrivals grow
Global poverty gap widens

Imagine examining these global issues without acknowledging that there are multiple perspectives and conflicting values embedded within them. And yet, it would appear that in many social studies classrooms, this is exactly what happens. Students are taught the 'facts' about a context but rarely engage with the conflict, controversy, and complexity embedded within such contexts.

In this paper I will argue that the current Scientific Management of Education model (SME), with its strong emphasis on outcomes-based indicators, 'standardisation, homogenisation, uniformity and hierarchy' (Neyland, 2007), has favoured concrete and factual-based content and knowledge within social studies over the 'hard bits' (Keown, 1998) of conflict and contentious issues. For the sake of this essay I will refer to these controversial issues as the 'slippery stuff' in social studies. I will assert that a SME model promotes passive learners and teachers that are more akin to technicians than creative artists and performers. Exploring conflict and controversy is fraught with difficulty for the classroom teacher and yet along with Keown (1998) I would argue that these areas are so critical to real understanding of a complex society that to avoid them is to the detriment of real teaching and learning in social studies. Finally, I will consider some alternative models to the SME system that promote teachers and students as active participants in teaching and learning within a complex society.

The scientific management of education: a contemporary context

Teaching and learning in many western nations today takes place within a context of high levels of legislation and bureaucracy. Attempts have been made to 'measure' almost every aspect of teaching and learning. The origins of this focus of efficiency' and accountability can be found in industrial management principles proposed by Frederick Taylor in the United States from 1903-1925 (Lee, O'Neill, & McKenzie, 2004). The integration of these policies into education can be referred to as the scientific management of education or SME. In order for Scientific Management theory to begin to influence legislation, Neyland (2003, p. 216) argues that four following aspects are required: '(i) a statement of

unambiguous outcomes, (ii) a theory of compliance, (iii) a system of auditing, and (iv) the provision of instrumentally-oriented research.'

While there have been many gains made by the SME model, there have also been many 'hidden injuries' (Neyland, 2007). In the following section, I will consider how the SME model has significantly impacted on three key areas of the educative process – on the type of knowledge favoured, on the learners involved in the process and on the teachers delivering the model.

The impact of the SME model

Firstly, implicit within an SME system is the assumption that knowledge is measurable. '[T]he procedures of objective setting, sequencing learning activities, assessing attainment of objectives, and so forth, at least tacitly presumes that knowledge is predetermined' (Cornbleth, 1990, p. 16). An outcomes based model relies on the packaging of knowledge as measurable at every step of the learning process. However, outcomes models are '…unable to accommodate the processing of more complex knowledge requiring thinking that is creative, problem-based, individual and open-minded' (Lee et al., 2004, p. 60). This favours knowledge that is factual, technical, applies well to rules and conventions, and is able to be 'pinned down'.

Secondly, the mechanistic constructs of the SME system also have a negative impact on learners. Within an SME system, the pressure to produce outcomes compels the teacher to become the power holder and the student to become the recipient of their knowledge. Lee et al. (2004) argue that 'outcomes models construct learners instrumentally as passive objects rather than active beings – people that can be controlled, directed and moulded and evaluated…' (p. 62). Learners become 'vessels' to be filled with content and knowledge. More creative expressions (such as critical thinking, inquiry learning, active questioning, and student-led learning) become marginalised within the mechanistic constructs of an outcomes-driven system.

Freire (1970) states that a 'banking' or a linear approach to learning 'anaesthetizes and inhibits creative power whereas as in contrast, teachers should be prepared to engage themselves and their students in the process of 'conscientization' including problem posing, reflection, analysis and challenge. Students who emerge from this system who do still challenge authority are likely to do from a predefined framework that will not threaten existing societal structures (Openshaw, 2004). For a subject like social studies, where critical thought about underlying structures of society and participatory engagement with societal issues is an essential part or learning, a passive model of learners is a tragedy.

Finally, on top of this, SME models 'deskill and de-professionalise teachers as they inhibit their autonomy and that of learners' (Hyland, cited in Lee et al. 2004, p. 62). The theories of learning that underpin that SME model share the premise that 'behaviour and cognition are mechanical processes…[g]ood teaching is thus highly technical work, involving abilities to isolate factors, monitor circumstances,

and manipulate causes' (Davis, Sumara, & Luce-Kapler, 2000, p. 62). Putting together programmes that best fit the outcomes and assessments required by 'the system' has become the central role of teachers. In short, the teacher becomes a technician. Lee et al (2004) argue that rather than improving the quality of teaching and raising achievement levels, outcomes-driven models serve to 'de-professionalise teachers, they reduce knowledge to information, learning to test scores, and the educative process to a linear-technical formula rather than an intellectual journey of personal growth and discovery.' (p. 48).

The overwhelming 'utalitarian discourse of efficiency, effectiveness, performance and productivity…combine to constrain schools and teachers whilst increasing central control over the school system' (Gewirtz, 1997, pp. 220-221). Neyland (2003) argues that variants of contract theory provide an explanation for the 'theory of compliance' that he states is necessary to produce teachers that will deliver the outcomes of the system. Under contract theory, the outcomes-based curriculum forms a type of contract in which the 'principal' (the government) monitors the 'agent' (the teacher) by a system of auditing (educational reviews) and assessment to ensure they have met the outcomes laid out for them to achieve. Failure to do so enables schools (and teachers) to be branded as winners (effective) or losers (ineffective) (Lee et al., 2004). Within the SME model, few curriculum areas have 'suffered' more than the social sciences. I will explore this further in the next section drawing from experiences in New Zealand social studies classrooms.

Favouring the facts and avoiding the 'slippery stuff' in social studies

The 'hidden injuries' of the SME model in education have indeed been significant, and many curriculum areas have been affected by the processes required to implement a SME system (for examples, see (Neyland, 2003), for Mathematics, and (Elley, 2003), for English. I would argue that few curriculum areas are more negatively impacted on by an SME model than social studies. Studying social studies involves examining the diverse actions and multiple perspectives of individuals and groups in society. This distinguishes social studies as a curriculum area, from 'more canonical and examination syllabus-driven subjects' (O'Neill, 2005, p. 23) and highlights the unique role of teachers within this domain to present a society that contains conflict, controversy and complexity. In fact Meyer (1998) argues that 'because it is contentious, social studies gives us the ideal set of circumstances for developing young people who are critical thinkers and responsible decision-makers'. And yet, it would seem that teachers of social studies are avoiding the exploration of controversial and conflict-ridden areas of social studies.

Referring to the New Zealand social studies curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1997) Keown (1998) refers to the two inquiry processes of values exploration and social decision making as 'doing the hard bits'. For the sake of this essay, I wish to extend his definition of the 'hard bits' to include all social studies topics and issues which involve controversy and conflicting values. I will refer to these as the 'slippery stuff' of social studies. Slippery, because they are hard to quantify, measure, produce outcomes for and ultimately rely more on beliefs and opinions

than facts. In this section, I will examine why this could be the case, especially within the framework of a SME system.

According to a recent New Zealand report, about fifty percent of New Zealand teachers of years 4 and 8 rarely manage to use aspects of social studies inquiry effectively, especially in the areas of exploration of values and social decision making (New Zealand Education Review Office, 2001). Instead, '[t]hese teachers' plans focused mostly on the increasing knowledge of a topic and literacy development' (ibid, p. 12). These findings are supported by Keown (1998), who states that topics involving conflicting values are often avoided or dealt with very superficially. Similarly, Harrison (1998) found social studies teachers preferred studying 'safer' issues at a distance (such as nuclear testing in the Pacific) rather than local issues controversial issues – such as Maori activists beheading a statue at Motua gardens in Wanganui as this was deemed 'too hot' and could result in resistance and antagonism from students or parents (Harrison, 1998). She questions: will social studies students only become 'informed and active citizens over "safe" controversial issues?' (ibid, p. 68).

Keown (1998) suggests three main issues are involved in the avoidance of controversy and conflict. Firstly, western thought and western education is dualistic. Western traditions place a high value on reason, knowledge and tend to under value feelings and the affective. Knowledge and facts are deemed as more reliable and trustworthy and values as irrational and unpredictable. Yet, '[t]eaching Social Studies is always a value-loaded act' (Hill, 1994, p. 6) - a conclusion many social studies teachers appear to deny. Secondly, teachers are apprehensive about the contentious nature of values and social action. Which values are considered? How can values be explored with accusations of social indoctrination and social engineering? Thirdly, Keown (1998) argues that there is a lack of knowledge about how to approach the study of values and contentious issues in social studies. While there are many models for introducing and assessing factually-based material, there are far fewer for a creative and indefinable pathway to exploring values. The net effect of all this…

> '…is that the teacher, while knowing values and social action are important, feels that the problems and risks are just too great and it is safer to stick to knowledge and skills and avoid values and social action' (Keown, 1998, p. 14).

The SME system further compounds this tendency to avoid the slippery stuff' in its emphasis on measurable outcomes and the production of technicist teachers – able to fix all things by reading the right reports and improving aspects of teaching and knowledge.

Let me illustrate with a personal example, of why it would be easier to avoid the 'slippery stuff' in social studies. As a young first-year teacher in a multicultural, West Auckland school in New Zealand, I set about teaching a unit on human rights in New Zealand, using the example of the Poll Tax on Chinese immigrants in the early 1900s. The text book had illustrations of cartoons from these times depicting the Chinese in a number of stereotypical roles and caricatures. The set

activity involved some critical thinking about how stereotypes are generated and perpetuated in society. While I had all the intentions of eliminating stereotypes of Chinese in New Zealand today, the lesson, to my horror, somehow turned into discussions of labels used for other races to the great discomfort of a number of students in the class. I doubt I had any impact in reducing racist attitudes of any of my students as a result of my teaching that day!

Under an SME system, the most likely response to perceived failure of any kind is to 'seek a solution-instrument from the same tool bag that may have initially led to the problem' (Neyland, 2007). These solutions are largely 'complicated' using the Davis, et al (2000) definition, in that they are mechanical, and linear - rather like clockwork. For example, to address 'problems' in this area, I could gain more knowledge about stereotypes and racism in society; I could read some research or attend a course which illustrated the 'best evidence' of approaches for teaching and learning about racism or I could just avoid the whole issue in the future and concentrate on the facts. All these 'solutions' fail to engage with the emerging issues in this context:

> 1. that the teaching of 'slippery issues' in social studies is fraught with difficulty; for example, dealing with racism in society, let alone outside the classroom is complex;
> 2. that there is no 'one correct approach' in dealing with topics such as racism. Nothing in my teacher training had provided me with 'tools' in a technical sense that could have prevented the lesson melt-down in a class where certain individuals were looking for opportunities to express racist sentiments;
> 3. that at the end of the day, it was creative, improvised responses which were needed, not another course. These responses require a level of 'ethical know-how' (Varela, 1999) an immediate coping, or a way of making a spontaneous decision that is the 'right' one for that situation. The teaching of 'slippery issues' requires significant levels of ethical know-how for teachers to cope with the unpredictable nature of contentious issues and complex societies.

The actual response I made as a first year teacher after this situation was some careful, reflective and critical thinking about the teaching of stereotypes in social studies. I sought advice from more experienced teachers and deducted that I needed to sharpen my approach. The use of real stories and videos that elicited a more empathetic response from students was an option I considered in my future teaching. But even after all this consideration, I realise as a teacher that the same scenario could happen again because society, social studies and students are complex; - and complex, improvised responses are required daily from teachers.

A complex society: issues for social studies teachers and learners

> 'There is a certain irony in the fact that the very challenges confronting us in [social studies] are also the golden opportunities for the development of

the most important understandings we might nurture in our students' (Meyer, 1998, p. i).

It is my belief that without the teaching and learning of values, controversy and conflict, we render students ill-equipped to deal with a complex and conflict-ridden world. There is no better place to start exploring some of this 'slippery stuff' than in the social studies classroom. Yet, it would appear that the system such a context is embedded in, serves to further restrict teachers and students from access to complex learning. In this final section I will consider some alternatives that may challenge the notion of teacher as technician, students as passive vessels and knowledge as purely factual.

Hill (1994) argues that '[t]he first step in our attempt to develop more adequate and ethical approaches to assessment in social studies is to break out of the addiction to the principle that everything that is learned must be measurable and measured. Hill (1994, p. 137) cites Eisner, 1969, who argued for the use of a complementary category to outcomes-based assessment criteria which he called 'expressive objectives'. These were the kinds of teaching objective which had to be open-ended because the teacher would necessarily be unable to predict in advance what would result from an 'imaginative lesson journeying into new experiences'. The slippery stuff in social studies would fit into this category well – an exploration into controversial issues or conflict situations is likely to have an unknown path ahead.

An associated alternative is to promote a more 'holistic' approach to teaching and learning in social studies. Davis et al. (2000) suggest that a holist understanding of a phenomenon, using complex learning theories promote seeing that phenomenon is its entirety – rather than reducing it to its most basic components. Complex learning theories regard the learner as dependent on, but not entirely determined by teaching. Knowledge is 'contingent, contextual and evolving; never absolute, universal or fixed' (Davis et al., 2000, p. 78). A much more holistic view of education would see both knowledge and values as important (Keown, 1998) and society and communities as entities undergoing constant change. Rather than trying to meet narrowly defined signposts on the road, students would be encouraged to have a 'holistic approach' to their learning where values and social action are weighed up and evaluated in the light of society's full complexity.

The role of the teacher of social studies needs to be re-drawn. Rather than a technician who structures teaching and learning round blocks of knowledge that can be divided up, labelled and assessed, a social studies teacher needs to be seen as a creative, innovative decision-maker - a performer rather than a passive member of the audience. Humphreys and Hylands (2002, p. 9) refer to the 'complexity of criteria' which need to be satisfied for the completion of any performance, particularly those involving a professional knowledge, judgement and expertise.' Instrumentalist outcomes-based strategies, designed in a linear and technical way for the teaching of controversial topics, have some merit, but

the teaching process also call for 'intuition, creativity, improvisation, and expressiveness (Gage, 1978, in Humphrey and Hyland, 2002, p. 9).

Ultimately some aspects of social studies are a rather slippery fish to pin down, divide and quarter in sections of bite-size pieces of knowledge because social studies reflects society – and society is complex and 'slippery'. A social studies teacher who can acknowledge this complexity and provide exposure to the rich learning experiences found within the 'slippery stuff' in society, will serve her students well.

REFERENCES

1. Cornbleth, C. (1990). Curriculum in context. London: Falmer Press.

2. Davis, B., Sumara, D., & Luce-Kapler, R. (2000). Engaging minds: Learning and teaching in a complex world. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

3. Elley, W. (2003). Curriculum reform in retrospect: was it forward or backward? . In A. O'Neill, J. Clark & R. Openshaw (Eds.), Reshaping culture, knowledge and learning: Policy and content in the New Zealand curriculum framework (pp. 91-108). Palmerston North: Dunmore.

4. Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Continuum.

5. Gewirtz, S. (1997). Post-welfarism and the reconstruction of teachers' work in the UK. Journal of Educational Policy, 12(4), 217-231.

6. Harrison, K. (1998). Social studies in the New Zealand curriculum: dosing for amnesia or enemy of ethnocentrism? In P. Benson & R. Openshaw (Eds.), New horizons for New Zealand social studies (pp. 63-82). Palmerston North: ERDC Press.

7. Hill, B. (1994). Teaching secondary social studies in a multicultural society. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire Pty Ltd.

8. Humphreys, M., & Hyland, T. (2002). Theory, practice and performance in teaching: professionalism, intuition and jazz. Education Studies,, 28(1), 5015.

9. Keown, P. (1998). Values and social action: Doing the hard bits. In P. Benson & R. Openshaw (Eds.), New horizons for New Zealand social studies (pp. 137-159). Palmerston North: ERDC Press.

10. Lee, H., O'Neill, A., & McKenzie, D. (2004). "To market, to market"…The mirage of certainty. In A. O'Neill, J. Clark & R. Openshaw (Eds.), Reshaping culture, knowledge and learning: Policy and content in the New Zealand curriculum framework (pp. 47-70). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

11. Meyer, L. (1998). Preface. In P. Benson & R. Openshaw (Eds.), New Horizons for New Zealand social studies (pp. pp i–iii). Palmerston North: ERDC Press.

12. Ministry of Education. (1997). New Zealand Social Studies Curriculum. Wellington: Learning Media.

13. New Zealand Education Review Office. (2001). The New Zealand Curriculum: An ERO perspective, Part 4: Social Studies. New Zealand: New Zealand Education Review Office.

14. Neyland, J. (2003). An ethical critique of the paradigm case: The mathematics curriculum. Unpublished paper Victoria University of Wellington, School of Education.

15. Neyland, J. (submitted 2007). The hidden injuries of the literary curriculum.

16. O'Neill, J. (2005). 'Getting started': shaping social studies teachers' thinking through formal professional development. . In P. Benson & R. Openshaw (Eds.), Towards effective social studies (pp. 19-34). Palmerston North: : Kanuka Grove Press, Massey University.

17. Openshaw, R. (2004). Able to take their part? Social studies and the curriculum framework. . In A. O'Neill, J. Clark & R. Openshaw (Eds.), Reshaping culture, knowledge and learning: Policy and content in the New Zealand curriculum framework (pp. 245-264). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

18. Varela, F. (1999). Ethical know-how: Action, wisdom and cognition. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Postcolonial Learning spaces for Global Citizenship

Matthias Fiedler

The Church of Ireland College of Education, Ireland

It is a prominent feature of liberal literature on education in the 20th century to emphasise the role of education in imbueing children with the values of a society, and the consequent power of education to bring about change in society. (Baere & Slaughter, 1993) Post-structuralist concepts like critical literacy have qualified this emphasis by highlighting the connection between education and social justice. (Gilbert, 2005: 55) In the preface to the first volume of Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices the editor, Lynn Mario De Souza, identifies educational approaches like "citizenship education, development education, foreign-language education and teacher education as sites of various socio-cultural crises in the form of continuously contested meaning construction and negotiation." (De Souza, 2007: 4) In this perspective crises are perceived as something productive that education should continue to generate since this is exactly what 'good' education should be about: The creation of sites of enquiries and the design of platforms where values and perceptions of the world and society can be constantly negotiated, questioned and challenged. The following article investigates how these sites of enquiry should be designed in order to allow for a critical and self-reflective encounter for global citizens in what could be called a postcolonial learning space.

As identified by De Souza (2007) an education that challenges preconceived knowledge and defined ways of learning will create crises on both sides of the learning process and, inevitably, a crisis of the education system itself. As an initiator of crises education should, therefore, be about analysis, reflection, action, understanding and transformation of knowledge and not about accumulating preconceived academic knowledge. Unfortunately, it is the latter upon which our Western education system continues to focus: A notion of knowledge that can be compartmentalized into different academic subjects with clearly defined boundaries and power relations between them. For the learner this means that learning is mainly about taking in and storing what has been taught in his or her mind in order to be assessed at a later stage by standardized tests. Education in other words is ultimately not about how we learn but what we learn and as such it is failing to prepare learners to live in a diverse and globalised society.

In her book *Catching the Knowledge Wave* the educational researcher Jane Gilbert criticises this approach as a form of education that has failed to adapt to contextual changes that have occurred in the 20th century. Talking about the so called "knowledge society" she describes this society in line with post-modern thinking as one which forms "people's social identities" (Gilbert, 2005: 29) through discourses and patterns of consumptions rather than through a fixed set of values and socio-economic status. This societal "paradigm shift", Gilbert argues, has altered our understanding of how knowledge is perceived. Our

present "production-line model of education" (Gilbert, 2005: 68) "is a product of the industrial age" (Gilbert, 2005: 47) where knowledge was seen as a "thing, a product" (Gilbert, 2005: 71) and was perceived as a factual and true outcome of a thinking process that could be 'stored' in our minds and that established the foundation of what we have learnt to know as academic disciplines. In this view knowledge is objective and it exists independently of people as a factual 'thing' that can be accumulated, i.e. learnt over time. While this type of education system might have served its purpose during the industrial age by preparing students for industrial age society and workplaces, this is no longer the case. Her study concludes in arguing for a new approach to education in order to prepare learners adequately for the challenges of the 21st century. Even though she does not conceptualise this process as a crisis, the similarities are striking. Crises occur where preconceived, defined and therefore 'safe' spaces are challenged by new ideas or concepts. They also, if productive, follow certain stages from challenging the old order to negotiation of that order which finally results in the establishment of a new or the reinstating of the old order. Thus, it could be argued that the fact that education does not produce any crises but ensures that knowledge is safely compartmentalized into different subject areas, has resulted in a deep crisis of education in general. Without being challenged, it simply does not prepare learners for the realties of our post-industrialised, diverse and globalised society.

But how has education to change in order to adapt to these new realities? The answer here seems to be very simple and extremely difficult: People involved in education have to take risks and create productive crises that allow us to re-think and re-orientate our approach to education in general. In a knowledge society (where, by the way, risk takers are often awarded) future citizens will be required to be 'Global Players' and, if education wishes to contribute to a sustainable future for our planet, it should ideally ensure that those global players perceive themselves as conscientious global citizens with an ability to think critically. In their handbook Global Teacher, Global Learner Graham Pike and David Selby identify the four dimensions of global learning as Systems Consciousness (the ability to think in systems), Perspective Consciousness (recognition that own worldview is not universal and other perspectives are possible), Health of Planet Awareness (development of understanding of global and social issues and the future orientation of those concepts) and finally Involvement Consciousness (awareness of the responsibilities for the choices made) (Pike&Selby, 1988: 34/35).

Many educational approaches to global citizenship have followed this conceptualisation with very encouraging results and have initiated debates on critical citizenship (Andreotti, 2006). It is, therefore, not necessary to re-invent the educational wheel in the attempt to adapt the way we educate our children to deal with the challenges of the 21st century. Approaches like development education (DE) and intercultural education (ICE) have already paved the way for the opening up of sites of enquiry where assumptions and perceptions can be challenged and critiqued from a global and social justice perspective. In general, both concepts can be seen as educational responses to the need to empower young people to think critically, independently and systemically about the (often

unequal) state of our world and the society we live in. Both concepts are, therefore, intrinsically linked to historical processes like imperialism and colonialism that have shaped the world we live in today. With their strong emphasis upon values and perceptions DE and ICE also prepare learners to participate effectively in society, both locally and globally, so as to bring about positive change for a more just and equal world. In relation to DE these challenges are echoed in the definition of this term given by the Irish Development Education Association (IDEA):

> DE is an educational process aimed at increasing awareness and understanding of the rapidly changing, interdependent and unequal world in which we live. It seeks to engage people in analysis, reflection and action for local and global citizenship and participation. It is about supporting people in understanding, and in acting to transform the social, cultural, political and economic structures which affect their lives and others at personal, community, national and international levels. (www.ideaonline.ie)

Process, analysis, reflection, action, understanding and transformation; all these key words emphasise the dynamic nature of this educational approach. As such DE contains a number of elements summarised by Roland Tormey in his introduction to Teaching Social Justice:

> It [DE] is education as personal development, facilitating the development of critical thinking skills, analytical skills, emphatic capacity and the ability to be an effective person who can take action to achieve desired development outcomes. It is education for local, national and global development, encouraging learners in developing a sense that they can play a role in working for (or against) social justice and development issues. It is education about development, focused on social justice, human rights, poverty, and inequality and on development issues locally, nationally, and internationally (Tormey, 2003: 2).

If we look at various definitions of what intercultural education entails the similarities are striking. Echoing the dynamic understanding of development education A.M. Sedano, for instance, identifies a framework in which intercultural education should operate:

> Understanding of the cultural diversity of contemporary society; increasing the possibility of communication between people of different cultures; creating positive attitudes towards cultural diversity; increasing social interaction between culturally different people and groups (Sedano, 2002: 268).

Both the definition of Sedano and Tormey refer to another skill that is key to DE and ICE; the ability to think systemically. In a diverse society and multi-faceted world, where one needs to make meaningful connections between a multiplicity of things and systems, this seems to be one of the key 'survival thinking skills'. And it is, again, reinforcing the argument for a more integrated way of teaching

different subjects. Indeed, the fact that development education and intercultural education transgress the traditional boundaries of academic subjects supports the argument of seeing them as prime examples of how teaching in the knowledge society may be enhanced and furthered in the future.

Global Citizen and Intercultural Spaces

With their existent repertoire of teaching methodologies, research and reflection upon education in general DE and ICE could play a pivotal role in crafting an education system that is capable of educating learners for a knowledge-based and equal society. Both, DE and ICE, should, therefore, be seen as much more than 'just' additions to the existing curriculum. However, as I have mentioned above, there is still serious work to be undertaken: In order to play a leading role in new thinking about education, further research in DE and ICE is necessary, especially in relation to what Pike and Selby have called the Perspective Consciousness of the global dimension. While it is important to "develop receptivity to other perspectives" (Pike&Selby, 1988: 34), I would argue that it is equally important to analyse how these perspectives have been constructed by historical processes such as colonialism and imperialism which have shaped our perceptions and which are still at work today. If we are talking about opening up sites of enquiry, spaces where global citizens can be educated and where assumptions and perceptions can be critiqued, more research is required into the conception, design and fabric of these spaces or sites of enquiries. However, before we explore the contribution postcolonial theory can make to this area a brief exploration of what global citizenship entails is necessary.

The concept of global citizenship is at the heart of any discussion within DE and ICE as it acknowledges our responsibility both to each other and to the earth itself. It is about conceptualising (and acting upon) injustice and inequality both locally and globally, and it intrinsically values concepts like alterity, difference and diversity. Acknowledging responsibilities, conceptualising injustice, valuing diversity; each of these 'operations' has different implications for pedagogical considerations in the field of global citizenship. There is, however, one implication that is shared by all; becoming (and staying) a global citizen requires a critical engagement with diversity in and between different cultures as well as a critical examination of one's own assumptions and perceptions vis-à-vis the world and other cultures. In other words, education for global citizenship has to take place on a site where identities and intercultural encounters are negotiated. Therefore, any investigation into the concept of global citizenship should, in my view, be informed by the analytical framework that post-colonial theory provides in relation to the notion of intercultural engagement.

Today we live in a context that is determined by and dependent on such intercultural encounters and connections, as they are a reality of our globalised world. However, talk about the 'global village' and the 'knowledge society' has not yet conceptualised the fact that global inequalities are as much a reality as our perceptions and assumptions which are formed by historical processes such as imperialism and colonialism. Thus, if we want to re-align our education system in accordance with the concept of global citizenship we have to explore the

historically evolved connection between 'us' and 'them', which involves a critical engagement with the history of this 'engagement'.

In interrogating models of polarity such as the tension between colonizer and colonized or dominated and dominating societies and by scrutinizing the underlying patterns of colonial encounters postcolonial theory has reinforced the importance of investigating the historical evolution of our engagement with the developing world. Theorists such as Homi Bhabha have pointed out that "in colonial discourse the space of the other is always occupied by an idée fixe […]" (Bhabha, 1994: 110). In other words, colonial discourse is primarily structured by a lack of recognition: the stereotype that 'occupies the space of the other', gestures of superiority that translate contact into domination, evolutionist perspectives that perceive so-called 'primitive cultures' as living fossils of the past and the representation of indigenous people as 'children', yet to be educated by their European 'master', all these perceptions have established what Marie Louise Pratt has called "the imperial eye." (Pratt, 1991: 5) By looking at the colonised culture from a superior perspective, 'the imperial eye' generates a colonial object that is dislocated and displaced through integration into the system of European representation. Accordingly, nowhere is the totality of colonial discourse more noticeable than in its modes of representation.

Intercultural contact between colonizer and colonised culture was, therefore, not designed as an equal dialogue between partners but as a process in which the superiority of the colonizer's own culture was generated, established and reinstated over time. This partly explains why the establishment of a meaningful dialogue between these 'unequal partners' has been, and still is, very challenging. In the 1980's postcolonial theorists have identified the notion of 'writing back' in postcolonial literature to explain how colonized cultures have reacted to this unequal encounter after they became independent. In 1989, Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin published a seminal study on postcolonial literature entitled The Empire writes back. (Ashcroft et al, 1989) Soon after its publication, Salman Rushdie's phrase that in postcolonial literature 'the Empire writes back to the centre' became commonly and widely used in thinking and writing about postcolonial discourses. The notion of writing back was understood to radically question "the bases of European […] metaphysics" and challenge a "world-view that can polarize centre and periphery in the first place." (Ashcroft et al. 1989: 33) From a geo-political perspective, it appears as if cultures or societies that were affected by colonialism wrote back to the 'imperial centre' reclaiming the right to represent themselves by juxtaposing colonial inscriptions. However, not only was political domination legitimised through representation in the Western world, but the construction of 'colonial objects' also ensured that even the possibility of writing back was substantially hindered. Because consigning colonized cultures to a framework of European representations during colonialism lead to the fact that in order to reach the imperial centre they had to write back from a place of non-existence. That is why postcolonial texts, through strategies of subversion and mimicry, first had to establish a narrative between cultures in order to question and negotiate the framework of communication between colonized and colonising cultures. Thus, it could be argued that through the practice of "reinscription and rerouting the

historical" (Spivak, 1987: 14) this 'writing back' created an intellectual sphere between different cultures: an inter-cultural space.

And yet, the hypothesis of generally viewing the postcolonial discourse as an intellectual intercultural space is not without its difficulties. Firstly, the adjective intercultural carries the danger of reintroducing essentialist concepts that conceive cultures as fixed or sphere-like entities. In other words, considering the concept of intercultural space as a place that provides an encounter between two distinct cultures would obscure the fundamentals of postcolonial theory and its critical assessment of traditional European concepts of culture. Secondly, in its neutral designation the term intercultural space carries a somewhat utopian and benign vision of evenly balanced cultural encounters and therefore the risk of ignoring questions of power, domination and superiority. Consequently, an approach that views postcolonial discourse as an intellectual intercultural space has to emphasise the 'inter' acknowledging that in this inter-sphere questions of history, power and domination are not excluded but, instead, raised and openly discussed. Therefore, similar to what Homi Bhabha has called the "Third Space" (Bhabha, 1988: 208) it should not be primarily perceived as a place of encounter but of negotiation and discussion.

But how are these insights into the difficulties of creating an intercultural space related to the concept of education for global citizenship? I would argue that if we see education as such a site of enquiry where meaning construction is negotiated and contested the question arises what kind of negotiations have to take place on such a site in order to allow a focus on "the production of meaning […] in the passage through a Third Space." (Bhabha, 1988: 208)

Postcolonial Learning Spaces

New thinking often starts with the invention of new metaphors or the re-assignment of old metaphors to new contexts. In relation to the opening up of a new intercultural learning space for global citizens I would like to conclude by further exploring the metaphoric notion of writing back. First of all, I would argue that there is even now the need for letters to be addressed and written to the Global North from what is still perceived as the peripheries of our postcolonial world. It is important, however, to see this not as a one-way process but as the opening up of a space were a meaningful dialogue between 'us' and 'them' can be established. Facilitated by an education system that takes the notion of intercultural encounter seriously, such a dialogue would have to negotiate existing power relations in intercultural spaces as well as perceptions and assumptions in relation to two concepts that have shaped the production of meaning since the age of the great 'explorations': Identity and difference. And again thinkers associated with postcolonial discourse have paved the way in this respect by exploring the hybrid nature of modern identities.

In an essay Salman Rushdie, for instance, has opted for accepting the fact that he as a "British Indian writer" is a "translated man" and therefore has to embrace his hybrid "British Indian identity." (Rushdie, 1991: 17) However, as Rushdie's novels elucidate, the acceptance or embrace of a hybrid identity can initiate and

establish a constant questioning of patterns of Western representations. In calling the place from which he is writing "imaginary homelands," (Rushdie, 1991: 9) Rushdie has found an expression that aptly describes the ambiguity of any negotiation of postcolonial identity, one which is firmly rooted between identity and difference, and which is as real as it is constructed and imagined. Especially for education the metaphor of the "imaginary homeland" is a very persuasive one since an education that allows a debate on identity to unfold has to ensure, at the same time, that this negotiation is adequately grounded in a safe space. In other words, if education were to question and challenge the knowledge of a society it also has to find ways of dealing with the anxieties such crises will generate.

Notwithstanding these difficulties, framing the intercultural spaces in which global citizens are educated as 'imaginary homelands' would open up a debate that could re-invigorate the discussion about what a 'good' education should aim to achieve in the 21st century. Such postcolonial learning spaces would facilitate a process in which the fixed nature of Western ideas and concepts such as identity, culture, knowledge or meaning are questioned by positive notions of hybridity and diversity. They could become 'third spaces' were all knowledge is questionable and at the same time they could be 'imaginary homelands', providing the safety of the familiar without lying about the constructiveness of such spaces. As imaginary homelands they are as real as they are constructed.
Thus, if education were to create intercultural spaces where meaning and knowledge is generated through negotiations it could also facilitate a learning space for global citizens. In such spaces dialogue concerning difference had to be re-instated (taking historical baggage into account), rather than initiated, and identities had to be re-negotiated, rather than formed and fixed. Thus, based on the postcolonial notion of writing back, education should dare to create such sites of enquiry and design them as postcolonial learning spaces where identities and difference are constantly negotiated and re-written. Ultimately, such processes of critical engagement with identity and difference will facilitate the creation of a learning space for global citizens that allows learners to be adequately prepared for the challenges of the 21st century.

REFERENCES

1. Andreotti, V (2006) 'Theory without Practise is idle, Practice without theory is blind', DEA Journal, Vol. 12.3., pp.7-10.

2. Ashcroft, B et al (1989) The empire writes back. Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures, Routledge, London/New York.

3. Beare, H and Slaughter, R (1993) Education for the 21 Century, Routledge, London.

4. Bhabha, H (1994), The Location of Culture, Routledge, London/New York.

5. Bhabha, H., (1988) 'Cultural diversity and cultural differences' in B. Ashcroft et al. (eds) The post-colonial studies reader, Routledge, London/New York, 206-209.

6. De Souza, L M (2007) 'Editor's Preface', Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, Vol. 1:1, pp. 4/5.

7. Gilbert, J (2005) Catching the Knowledge Wave? The Knowledge Society and the Future of Edcuation, NZCER Press, Wellington.

8. Pike, G and Selby D (1988) Global Teacher, Global Learner, Hodder&Stoughton Edcuational, London.

9. Pratt, M L (1992), Imperial Eyes. Travel writing and Transculturaion, Routledge, London/New York.

10. Rushdie, S (1991), Imaginary homelands. Essays and Criticism 1981 – 1991, Hamondworth.

11. Sedano, A.M. (2002) 'Teacher Training and Intercultural Education' in A.C. Del Canto et al. (eds.), Intercultural education: A Present-Day Challenge for Europe, Comunidad de Madrid, Madrid.

12. Tormey, R (2003) Teaching Social Justice. Intercultural and Development Education Perspectives on Education's Context, Content and Methods. Centre for Educational Disadvantage Research, Mary Immaculate College, Limerick and Ireland Aid, Limerick/Dublin.

Developing Critical Affective Imagination: Building feminist anti-colonial embodied reading practices through Reader Response

Lisa Taylor
Bishop's University, Canada

> "Education in the Humanities attempts to be
> an *uncoercive* rearrangement of desires"
> (Spivak, 2004, p. 526)

The challenge of global education can be located within a famous query by postcolonial theorist Gayatri Spivak (1988): in asking "[c]an the subaltern speak?", Spivak directs our attention to the relations of power governing the circulation and reception of the forms of knowledge articulated by "those removed from lines of social mobility" (Spivak, 2004, p. 531). In raising issues of voice and representation in 'North-South' engagements, her question is necessarily a pedagogical one, in that it implies an examination of the conditions under which privileged listeners might comprehend the subaltern's speech. That is, she calls upon educators to study and construct conditions and pathways within which students positioned in relations of dominance and coloniality of power (Quijano, 1998) might come to look and listen differently, both in relation to others and themselves. What habits of apprehension, imagination and interpretation does this entail, and can these ever exceed ethnocentric and egocentric projection?

We need to ask these questions, not in a vacuum, but with close attention to the geopolitical contexts within which global relations of power, ethnocentrism, indifference and suspicion are currently shaped. In a post-9/11 bellicose landscape, subaltern subjects are increasingly positioned not only as the abject or pitiful Other, but also the shadowy, lurking potential enemy. Education for global justice must now grapple with this corrugated 'structure of feeling' (Williams, 1977)—pity/desire and fear/enmity—rippling through powerful mediascapes (Appadurai, 1996) which folds and doubles particular subaltern groups into an ambiguous undifferentiated Other. That is, as educators we need to attend to the *contexts of reception* that furnish powerful discursive, interpretive, imaginative and emotional vocabularies through which our students approach learning from subaltern subjects' forms of knowledge, expression and claims.

This article takes up Spivak's challenge in the literature classroom: in my own teaching, I've been spurred to develop a framework for embodied reflexive reading by my horror at the successful kidnapping and deployment of feminist concepts like 'gender equality' within racist and imperialist militarized rhetoric justifying invasion, domination and xenophobia (Eisenstein, 2006; Ware, 2006). For those of us who turn to literature education to create spaces of sustained critical embodied reflection, there is a particular challenge to think through the kinds of reading practices which might intervene in the "slow acculturation of

imperialism" (Spivak, 1996, p. 248) in both it's violent and liberal paternalist/maternalist manifestations.

This is, however, a fraught enterprise: as a white[i], Canadian-born academic I recognize that Western feminists such as I are inextricably 'embedded' in imperialist patriarchal wars and ongoing colonialism. I also recognize that the hegemonic discourse framing most teachers' reception and teaching of literature outside the Eurocentric canon—multicultural education—offers culturally reductive and relativist interpretive frameworks insufficient and possibly detrimental to the ethical demands of such texts. In terms of my own teaching, then, this raises a particular problematic: how might critical anticolonial feminist reading strategies structure First World readers' aesthetic and critical engagements of literature in ways that work both within and against the geopolitical, institutional and social formations we inhabit?

The pedagogical framework described below draws from reception theory (Amireh & Majaj, 2000; Bogdan, 1992; Jauss, 1982), feminist reader response (Davis, 1995, 1999; Schweickart & Flyyn, 2004) and anticolonial pedagogies (Boler, 1999; Spivak, 1988, 1996, 2004) in order to support students in developing particular forms of critical literary literacy as they inquire into the discursive roots that nourish and structure the emotional, psychic and imaginative forms of fulfillment they seek in reading literature of indigenous, colonized and marginalized peoples. In this article I'm particularly concerned with thinking through the kinds of reading practices which might intervene into the dual economies of antipathy and desire animating Orientalism in the age of Empire (Sharma & Sharma, 2003) and manifesting in the increasingly enthusiastic Western reception of "Third World" and Muslim women authors (Amireh & Majaj, 2000). So engrained are the habits of empire that I believe this may only happen at the intersection of several strategies. I describe below a pedagogy of reading and rereading through social difference which involves critically interrogating and supplementing our imagination and affective pleasures as readers through a series of 'lenses' in order to develop a repertoire of critical and reflexive approaches to learning from transnational women's literature.

Set in the context of a small liberal arts university and a predominantly white, female student population, this paper examines the pedagogical method of a teacher education course focused on developing critically reflexive, ethical and aesthetically complex approaches to reading and teaching what David Palimbo-liu (1995) terms the 'ethnic canon'. While the course curriculum—novels whose authorial or narrative voices are inscribed within hegemonic relations of ablism, heterosexism, classism, racism, Islamophobia and colonialism[ii]—invokes discourses of critical multicultural education, the course pedagogy elaborated below is anchored in feminist postcolonial reception theory. Charting this tension between the pedagogical strategies and institutional and geopolitical formations shaping our reading encounters, this narrative study explores the forms of reflexivity and interrogation of readerly desire made possible within the structured dialogic and recursive spaces of feminist postcolonial reader response. My analysis below focuses on student responses to *Persepolis I and II,* Marjane Satrapi's formally innovative graphic novels recounting her childhood growing up

in revolutionary and war-besieged Iran, her struggling adolescence studying in Vienna, her return to her family, marriage and final decision to leave behind Iranian life for France[iii]. Considering the scope and focus of this article, I present quotes from a single student demographically representative of the entire data set whose reflections suggest possibilities for pedagogies of learning to read 'through other eyes' (a broader data set is examined in Taylor, 2007). In arguing the insufficiency of prevalent multicultural and reader response approaches to teaching literature by and about racialized and indigenous peoples in schools, I argue for a recursive pedagogy of rereading that critically historicizes and interrogates "the conditions of literary experience" (Bogdan, 1992, p. 187; Davis, 1995),

The problem with 'Good Intentions': Killing them Softly through Multicultural Literature Education

"Multicultural education" is a polysemic and internally contentious formation which, nevertheless prevails as the dominant institutional placeholder in Anglophone societies for a broad range of equity-seeking, social justice-oriented pedagogies of social difference. Historically, feminist, postcolonial, indigenous, antiracist and queer pedagogies have opened up multiculturalism's hegemonic technologies of power and liberal strategies of knowledge to deconstruction of Western Enlightenment and Eurocentric, androcentric subject formation[iv]. These critiques point to the crisis of representation in much multicultural practice, in which attempts to reflect and 'affirm' subaltern knowledges and identities work to commodify them within Eurocentric hierarchies of authenticity and cultural particularism. In staging racialized knowledges as culturally determined objects of study, liberal multicultural education is critiqued as "[reinstating] a version of the sovereign subject of knowledge": the privileged 'universal' reader who 'overcomes' the Other's difference and 'understands' her in her particularity (Gunew, 2005, p. 15; Meyer, 2002).

Palimbo-liu (1995, p. 11) traces a parallel commodification of racialized cultural difference in multicultural literature education, especially the institutional canonization and deployment of selected 'ethnic' texts in ways that are profoundly *catechistic*: that is, instrumentally focused on the production of morally sanitized selves rather than counter-hegemonic ruptures and transformation. In much multicultural practice, he argues: "the reading of ethnic literature may be taken as an occasion for … the 'recovery' of equilibrium that creates social subjectivities now 'educated' as to the proper negotiations of race, ethnicity, gender, and class".

Palimbo-liu reminds us that while literature education has long pursued twin agendas of socialization and enculturation, the aims of liberal multiculturalism mean that the canon is opened up to not just *any* excluded works, but those which stage difference in particular ways in order to produce particular 'structures of feeling' (Williams, 1977). Essentially, the 'right' response—empathy and understanding towards predefined difference—is secured through selection of the 'right' texts (Bogdan, 1992, p. 105). This selective and instrumental construction of cultural difference is obscured, however, as literary texts are staged not only

as objects of study but also as tutorials. As aesthetic experience is positioned as "a sounding board", a rehearsal of schooled responses to forms of difference presumed to exist in the "outer world", texts under study take on an aura of verisimilitude, authenticity and transparency. In this "deployment of ethnic texts as proxies for ethnic peoples", incommensurable embodied knowledges and historical specificities are flattened and abstracted, "subordinated to the general category of [individual] experience of the unfamiliar" (Palimbo-liu, 1995, pp.12-13)[v].

Willinsky (1998) finds this catechistic agenda especially disturbing when pursued through the study of autobiographical and testimonial literature of subaltern authors. In many Canadian literature classrooms he discerns what he terms imperialist "educational commodification[:] … a will to know that is capable of turning the testimony of others into 'learning experiences'" (Willinsky, 1998, p. 333). The specificity and testimonial address of this literature is commodified, he argues, as it is reduced to a curative object of knowledge offered to the privileged First World readers normalized within multicultural education´s address: a successful 'learning experience' promises moral sanitization and absolution from the complex, historically implicated locations inhabited by privileged readers. The will to know is mobilized, Willinsky holds, as "[e]ducation forms its own culture of redemption for the 1st world … Whether to preserve the heritage of Western Civilization or absolve it of past sins, the common theme is that education will make [First World readers] free" of prejudice, violation, implication, blame or obligation (Willinsky, 1998, p. 349).

The ways multicultural education positions texts as ethnic proxies and transparent objects of knowledge within a moral programme of privileged self-care, edification and redemption is not unique to schools: examining the marketing of book club novels, Meyer (2002, p. 92) has identified the mobilization of 'multicultural enlightenment': a "unique amalgamation of sincerity and exoticization, the market value of difference" anchored in a fear of appearing culturally ignorant and the corresponding drive for 'authentic' knowledge of otherness. I recognize, then, that the libidinal economy of multicultural literature education structures instrumental desires in students not only to know the Other, but also to demonstrate one's morally sanctioned understanding of and cosmopolitan enlightenment regarding the Other.

At the same time, reader response-based pedagogies have explicitly invoked and recruited a readerly desire to empathetically identify with the Other within a programme of moral literary education dating from Rosenblatt (1938) to Nussbaum (1990) and beyond. Rosenblatt's proposal that pedagogies of literary reception might *unsettle* and galvanize readers to reach out for new forms of social relation was predicated on what in retrospect will strike feminist educators as a naïve and paternalistic conception of the transformative force of empathy. Building on Deweyan progressivism, she argued that through the literary cultivation of imaginative empathy, "nowhere in the world would there be a child who was starving. Our vicarious suffering would force us to do something to alleviate it" (1938, p. 135). The notion of empathy is slippery and highly romanticized, however: while I examine different conceptions below, it bears

remembering Davis' (2005) argument that empathy is always egocentric and self-serving: "We may think that when we empathize we see and feel through the eyes of [the textual other], but in fact what we are doing is reducing their Otherness to what can be misrecognized as their sameness to our imagined Selves". Furthermore, it is this "untheorized gap between empathy and acting on another's behalf" that concerns Boler (1999, p. 157) as she speculates on the ways her students' empathetic readings of literary difference "[flatten] historical sensibility" through selective, self-serving and politically sanitized reconstructions of literature's specific contexts of narration, production and reception.

This course must be situated, then, within an institutional "site of consumption" (Ghosh, 2000, p. 39) characterized by a multicultural appetite for idealized literary subjects of empathy and knowledge. In our reading of *Persepolis I/II,* this institutional site articulates with literary commercial fields structured by resurgent Orientalism, Islamophobia and global feminism which construct Muslim women as a homogenized object of pity, exotification, romanticized sisterhood (Amireh & Suhair Majaj, 2000, pp. 6-8). The image of a veiled Satrapi featured prominently on both the cover of *Persepolis I* and publisher's website (Random House, 2007) cannot be separated from this retrenched Orientalist field of cultural production and marketing in which historically salient tropes of gendered victimization condense around the veil's charged image: "'Islam was innately and immutably oppressive to women [and] the veil and segregation epitomized that oppression'" (Leila Ahmed in Kahf, 2000, p. 150). A recent series of attacks on the veil in defense of secularism and Quebec's 'cultural heritage'—banning veiling in municipal 'civil codes', soccer fields, the workplace, *taekwondo* competitions and voting booths[vi]—attest to the volatility of this trope in the immediate context. At the same time, the promotion of Iranian women's memoirs[vii] mobilize Orientalist curiosity and desires for authentic Others (Mottahedeh, 2004).

Other authors insist on more complex readings of Iranian women's writing. Milani (2004) has argued that the veil is not a "timeless phenomenon" but rather, a politicized sign of the sexual de-segregation of the public sphere, allowing greater public participation and mobility that are at the heart of contemporary Iranian feminist movements. Questioning the timing the Western embrace of Iranian women's memoirs, Mottahedeh (2004) cautions against ahistorical readings of Satrapi and Nafisi's (2003) texts, which are best considered "capsules in ink and paper of a particular time and place". She argues that these accounts of bourgeois urban Iranian women's ambivalence towards the initial imposition of the chador – a sentiment she describes as "the recognition that one's own body -- a female body -- is a fundamental constitutive force in the coming into being of a new era in national history"—play into larger imperialist designs and fetishisms when read as metonymic for the entire nation, particularly for post-revolutionary generations of politically active and assured Iranian women.

Striated by ambivalent tensions, *Persepolis I/II* both invite and resist such Orientalist worlding. There are recurrent dichotomies: the plucky young protagonist vs. fundamentalist guardians of the revolution (both crones and bearded bullies); decadent Vienna vs. dogmatic Tehran; a rich Persian heritage (implied in the title) vs. a contemporary oppressive Muslim regime[viii]; the veiled

border of public and private life. The author's identity as an unveiled artist residing in France, her family's socioeconomic and political class and her early love of Michael Jackson: all facilitate a particular reading desire to find in young Marji a recognizably "Westernized" heroine (class notes, October 11, 2005) battling and finally escaping her backward, patriarchal culture (Lazreg, 2000; Kahf, 2000). At the same time, Satrapi is openly critical of geopolitically driven American Orientalism and the stereotypes of Iranian women it generates (Satrapi, 2005). To the extent *Persepolis* addresses Western audiences in correcting these stereotypes (Satrapi, 2004b), the text may whet Orientalist appetites for the unveiled truth of Iranian women's lives: as both memoir and graphic novel, Satrapi's integration of text and image produce powerful truth effects and author effects. Yet my students' responses suggest the format and narrative voice may work to refuse such effects.

The novels read in this class—"The Honorary Shepherds" by Greg Maguire (1994), *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Nighttime* by Mark Haddon (2003), *The Bean Trees* by Barbara Kingsolver (1988), *Persepolis I & II* by Marjane Satrapi (2003, 2004), *The Bluest Eye* by Toni Morrison (1994), and *Sundogs* by Lee Maracle (2000)—are clearly loaded choices for a largely white, female, Canadian-born teacher education course on multicultural youth literature. Yet it is specifically the popularity of these texts and their increasing entry into the canon of multicultural high school literature which the course sets out to examine through a framework of critical feminist deconstruction. Conscious of the risks of hegemonic, instrumental readings, I believe the terrain of multicultural literature education is too influential to abandon (Palimbo-liu, 1995, p. 3), but, rather, calls for teachers' preparation in interrogating the regimes of truth within which they select and present transnational literature to their own students. Below I describe my use of structured rereadings, supplementary texts and research assignments to interrupt, problematize and diversify the "libidinal economies"[ix] of reading mobilized by multicultural and Orientalist formations of emotional tourism, epistemic commodification and pity.

Course Design: Reading Others, Reading Ourselves

I have developed the framework presented in this article in the context of a course entitled "Introduction to Multicultural Young Adult Literature" which I teach to predominantly white-identified, Canadian-born Anglophone women aged 19-24 from ethnically homogeneous communities.[x] This is largely consistent with the predominance of Euro-Canadian middle class candidates in teacher education programmes across the country (Levine-Rasky, 1998). Confirming much antiracism research (e.g. Levine-Rasky, 2002; Sleeter, 2001), my experience teaching this course suggests that Canadian-born, White-identified preservice students tend to bring a poverty of cross-cultural experiences or analysis of structural discrimination and privilege. Egalitarian ideologies of North American society as an immigrant meritocracy figure prominently in many students' conception of multicultural education as a fairly straightforward programme of liberal colour-blindness, 'open-mindedness', and occasional additions to the mainstream curriculum.

The evolving course design aims to problematize two dominant modes of reading observed amongst past students and suggested by the critiques of hegemonic multicultural literature education above: one mode is animated by the desire for an apparently seamless psychic union with characters (referred to below as 'Reading for Empathetic Identification'); the other mode (not treated below) I term "Reading for Enlightenment", or reading a novel as history or documentary all Iranian, African American or First Nations Peoples. Drawing from feminist reader response, transnational feminist reception theory and psychoanalytic educational theory (Amireh & Majaj, 2000; Britzman, 1998; Davis, 1995, 1999; Schweickart, 2004; Spivak, 1996), the course design invites students to undergo the aesthetic experience of literature (Bogdan, 1992) as part of developing multiple strategies for reading against the grain of these interlocking geopolitical, institutional and libidinal formations.

Response Logs, Literature Circles and 'Lenses of Re-reading'

The central course assignment—keeping a response journal to be shared with literature circles as we read the six course texts and a range of supplementary texts selected to critically recontextualize the novels—focuses students' attention on their responses as a text in and of itself. Building on Davis' (1996) model of 'recaptivation', students write and reread their written responses through a series of 'lenses' (or pedagogically structured reading modalities) which disrupt both the presumed neutrality and coherence of the reader and the supposed transparency of the text. These five lenses are:

1. *Proliferating and diversifying identifications*
2. *Situating ourselves as readers and learning to read our own readings symptomatically*
3. *Reading like a writer*
4. *Learning to listen, learning to witness*
5. *Reading as a social justice teacher*

The course presumes a certain *recursivity* rather than a teleology or hierarchy of literary experience and literary literacy (ie. of aesthetic and affective engagement and of critical or deconstructive reading strategies): following Bogdan (1992) I assume that readers' 'direct' responses to novels are not pre-critical, 'stock' or 'wrong' but rather, a form of situated knowledge essential to a both *affectively* and *critically* engaged dialectical process of "extension, reflection, deepening, and possibly strengthening" of interpretation (Bogdan, Cunningham & Davis, 2000, p.498)[xi]. To this end, this assignment folds and doubles readers' engagement of each text into several moments within this process (Bogdan et. al., 2000). The first journal response, written individually as students read the first half of the book, documents their initial reactions to the text and their experimentation with forming diverse, unexpected, ambivalent or complex identifications with characters. Reading through this first lens or modality aims to stage an expanded range of identifications that are less a reconfirmation of entrenched self-images than "a means to exceed—as opposed to return to—the self … [as a practice] of working the capacity to imagine oneself differently

precisely in one's encounters with another and in one's encounters with the self" (Britzman, 1998, p. 85).

In the second moment, as students listen to each other's log entries in Literature Circles and class discussions, they are challenged to re-read and recontextualize their responses. Student presenters and the instructor introduce activities and supplementary texts aimed at situating ourselves and the particular discursive contexts articulated within the reading engagement, and at historicizing relations of colonization, marginalization and resistance within which we may find ourselves implicated as readers. In the third moment, course members individually finish reading the book and compose a 2nd response (or reflection) which rereads their 1st written response through any of the five lenses listed above. For example, students may choose to reread their initial response through Lens #2, which asks them to examine the socio-cultural and political context of our reading engagement, the cultural context (competing imaginaries within different media and sites of cultural production), and their own particular life histories, communities of historical memory, belief- or value-systems (inseparable from the former), in order to speculate on how these may have shaped the expectations, curiosity or burden of representation they invested in the text. Here, the questions posed by the OSDE methodology as part of an examination of "where this is coming from" are key to learning to read the "structures of feeling" (Williams, 1977) and "horizons of expectations" (Jauss, 1982) organizing one's desires for a recognizable textual Other. Taking up Lens #3, students are encouraged to identify points when the text confounded, frustrated or deferred their readerly expectations or desires in order to speculate on the author's rhetorical or narrative strategies in addressing different audiences and fields of reception.

The design of these second and third moments of this structured (re)reading process reflects feminist anticolonial approaches to response-based criticism which presume a complex, dynamic reader who acts not as a sovereign, universal subject, but observes, historically situates and intervenes in her responses to the text as a member of a dialogic reading community (Schweickart, 1986, 2004; Amireh & Majaj, 2000). The lenses structure the second moment into a *symptomatic* rereading of students' first response (Felman, 1987, pp. 23-4; Britzman, 1998) which treats it as a point of embarkation, launching an investigation into the situated textuality of the reading encounter, the discursive construction of these texts and ourselves as readers. As students compare responses, discussion focuses less on notions of meaning as pregiven than on our active processes of meaning making (Davis, 1996, p. 473). Staging our responses and feelings as reflective of the larger "structures of intelligibility" (Britzman, 1998) and "horizons of expectations" (Jauss, 1982) shaping our engagement of the novel, I ask students to identify and sit in the points of friction, dislocation, and ambivalence they are experiencing, not as products of the text itself but our embodied engagement of it (Felman, 1987, p. 80). The use of Lenses 2 and 3 and supplementary texts opens possibilities for developing interpretive frameworks to appreciate the novel's literary craft, textuality and discursive embeddedness (Amireh & Suhair-Majaj, 2000; Ghosh, 2000).

Each time teaching this course, a student articulates her frustration at hitting a wall in her desire to identify with different characters, as she grapples with the distance and disparities she is coming to appreciate between her world, that of the characters and even the author. The fourth lens asks students, as the pedagogy increasingly troubles unproblematic identification, to consider what other approaches we might take to listening to this story. It demands that we take responsibility for the affective genealogies and social performativity of our readings, that we first ask how to listen before rushing to identify, and prepare to read as witnesses rather than as consumers. Students may also reread earlier written responses through the fifth lens, in order to extend insights from this process to their own teaching philosophy and practice.

Rereading Thwarted Desires for Empathetic Identification

While students overwhelmingly seek some form of empathetic identification with characters in the novels we read, there are very real risks associated with reading for "projective" (Verducci, 2000) or "passive empathy" (Boler, 1999): 'noticing' a character's (imagined) sameness and 'unnoticing' difference or disparity from oneself (Bogdan, 1992, p. 231). In this "projection of the self into the conditions of the other", empathy depends upon the degree to which the reader would feel or respond the same way to these circumstances: that is, the reader takes the role of "arbitrator and judge of the other's actions and possibilities" (Britzman, 1998, pp. 83).

For many students, it proves helpful to come back to their initial expressions of confusion, disapproval or impatience with characters' actions in their Reading Response #1 though Lens 2, and to situate these reactions explicitly within their sociopolitical, cultural and historical context—to ask where these reactions might be "coming from". Several moved in their second responses from Lens 2 to an observation of the ways their inability to empathize with a character snapped into moral judgment of that character's actions (see Taylor, 2007 for examples).

Rereading through Lens 2 thus led several students to question their use of empathetic identification as an interpretive tool, based on a growing suspicion that such feelings were inextricably symptomatic of their own particular embeddedness and investments in horizons of expectations inscribed by discourses of global feminism, Third World Difference (Mohanty, 1997), and the 'clash of civilizations' (Huntington, 1997).

There is evidence that several students moved between Lens 1 and 2—between seeking the confirmation of a recognizable Other and "learning to unlearn"—and that it was in the tension between these that they began "learning to listen" (one of the strategies of TOE):

> [I] think back on my many experiences with varied forms and levels of literature in which I did not take into account *how* I was reading what I was reading and *how* I was changing what I was reading by reading it. … I have been catered to in all my years of being a student by the literature I read/was asked to read … now I wonder if I stepped out at all [of my shoes]. When I first began to read *Persepolis* I immediately fell into a

familiar routine of finding something that I could relate to easily – I had remarked on Marjane's childhood and family (the structure was not unlike my own) and the way that Marjane spoke and related to those around her (imaginative and real). What I struggled with was what she would talk about, the topics and activities her family were (sic) involved in and her surrounding 'world' (war, revolution, etc.). This was her context – one that was so different from mine I was unable to do the familiar thing and 'step out of my shoes' … I had to watch out for my shoes getting in the way of the 'walk' I had to take with Marjane. This clumsiness affected what I saw (or maybe what light I saw it in) and what questions I asked. (Elizabeth)

As Elizabeth begins "making the connections between social-historical processes and encounters that have shaped our contexts and cultures and the construction of our knowledges and identities" (TOE) she consciously estranges and reads against the normalized practices of privileged reading she has previously been afforded by Eurocentric literature curricula of her past schooling. The 'clumsiness' of her 'shoes' seems to refer to the discursive resilience of the Eurocentric structures of intelligibility she identifies through Lens 2 as defining the limits of her imaginative identification across literary difference. She also takes up Lens 4 (Reading as a Witness) as she explicitly chooses to read Marji's story, not as a consumer, spectator or judge but as a companion "walking with" the character (and perhaps the author). This challenges her to "learn to listen" as she develops the habit of scrutinizing the origins and implications of her perceptions and interpretations:

> My imagination had a hard time with some of the pictures Marjane drew (in words and images) because my context/shoes told me that it couldn't be that way. Choosing to be aware of *how my 'shoes' were 'getting in the way'* of what I was reading was a task – I had to be consciously aware and reflect.

Elizabeth concludes that she has been educated in narrow, self-affirming practices of empathetic reading which limit her range of the 'thinkable' (Britzman, 1998) as well as the response-able. The first lens (proliferating and diversifying identifications) draws our attention as educators, then, to the need for emotional or aesthetic investment by readers as part of the 'undergoing' of literature (Bogdan et. al., 2000, p. 495): readers need to *care* enough to keep reading. As I argue above, multicultural education offers consumerist identification (with proxy or surrogate textual Others) as the principle modality of emotional engagement or *caring* and as an antidote to indifference. Another student, Sylvie, affirms this: "I have a lot of trouble seeing the importance of a situation if I cannot picture how I would feel in that situation."

Historicizing her response to a child character living in a context of war focuses Elizabeth's attention on the ways her 'shoes' were 'getting in the way': the way the her ways of knowing, capacities and desires to know were situated and needed to be exceeded. Elizabeth's recursive reading practice begins with her investigation of where her reading of the text broke down: mapping, situating and interrogating the contours of her reading desires and habits are a vital part of

developing new identificatory practices in reading, ones in which identification is less of an egocentric projection than an ethical relation of reflexive attention; less a 'walking as' than 'walking with'.

> The topic that struck me the most … revolved around the concept or issue of 'context' the novel forced us to consider. What I am discovering – I cannot say that I have finished this definition of *my* and *their* contexts because it seems to be ever evolving and far from static as well as obviously situational – is that the action of finding out how far my context reaches out around me as I interact with others and their contexts is not easily undertaken or understood.

As she resists ahistorical leaps of empathy, her struggle to contextualize herself and the protagonist re-articulates the two contexts in a relation not of comparison or contrast but of *implication.* As she comes to see reading as a process of interaction in which ways of knowing are unmade and remade, Elizabeth begins "learning to learn" (TOE). Rather than turning the textual other into her self or presume to dissolve herself into the textual other, she takes up the challenge of redefining herself through a relation of implication rather than sameness or difference. She resists fixing the end of this exercise, but rather opens herself to the unpredictability of "learning to reach out" (TOE). The disposition of self-exposure she appears to be cultivating in these excerpts from her journal carries a tone, not of self-congratulation or heroism, but of accountability and a reorganization of desire.

Conclusion

Spivak argues for the crucial role played by Humanities education in "rearrang[ing] desires noncoercively", a capacity I believe is central to the project of global justice education. It is particularly to the noncoercive nature of Spivak's project that I believe feminist arts and literature education address themselves as they have grappled with the dynamics of desire/identification and the contexts and logics of interpretation across social difference and coloniality. Spivak argues: "I would not remain a teacher of Humanities if I did not believe that … the teacher can try to rearrange desires noncoercively … through an attempt to develop in the student a habit of literary reading, even just 'reading', suspending oneself into the text of the other – for which the first condition and effect is a suspension of the conviction that I am necessarily better, I am necessarily the end product for which history happened, and that New York is necessarily the center of the world" (Spivak, 2004, p. 532). Elsewhere she has described these reading strategies as "resisting the temptation of projecting oneself or one's world onto the Other" (Spivak 2002, p. 6 cited in Andreotti, 2007, p. 76). The feminist anticolonial reading practices described above ask readers to observe themselves as they seek a recognizable, identifiable Other in transnational women's literature. They also offer a repertoire of strategies to revisit and learn from these sanctioned projections and ignorances (Spivak, 1988) as part of a larger process of 'learning to learn from below' (TOE): of developing habits and capacities of reflexivity at the affective and psychic level as readers prepare to listen and be redefined in the process of listening. Elizabeth's reflections above

attest to the complexities of this process: as students in this case study ran up against their limits of knowing or imagining, they struggled to name what their lives *have to do* with the stories they were reading. The interpretive frameworks offered through the lenses allowed them to explore the *to-do*-ness of their relation as embodied implication. This opened up their initial instrumental reading modes to critical, affectively engaged dialogue, rendering these practices points of departure rather than arrival.

REFERENCES

1. Amireh, A. and Majaj, L. S. (2000) Introduction, in: A. Amireh & L. S. Majaj (Eds) *Going global: The transnational reception of Third World writers* (New York & London, Garland), 1-25.

2. Andreotti, V. (2007). An ethical engagement with the Other: Spivak's ideas on education. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices, 1,* 1, pp. 69-79.

3. Appadurai, A. (1996) Modernity at large: cultural dimensions of globalization. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.

4. Bogdan, D. (1992) Re-Educating the imagination: toward a poetics, politics, and pedagogy of literary engagement (Portsmouth, New Hampshire, Boyntown/Cook Publishers).

5. Bogdan, D., Cunningham, J. E. & Davis, H. E. (2000) Reintegrating sensibility: reintegrating sensibility: situated knowledge and embodied readers, *New Literary History*, 4, (31), 459-99.

6. Boler, M. (1999) The risks of empathy: Interrogating multiculturalism's gaze, in: M. Boler, *Feeling power: Emotions and education*. (New York: Routledge), 155-174.

7. Britzman, D. (1998) *Lost subjects, contested objects: Toward a psychoanalytic inquiry of learning (*Albany, State University of New York Press).

8. Cai, M. (2002) *Multicultural literature for children and young adults: Reflections on critical issues* (Westport, Conn., Greenwood Press).

9. Centre for the Study of Social and Global Justice (CSSGJ). Through Other Eyes Methodology. http://www.throughothereyes.org.uk/ (accessed 19 November 2007).

10. Centre for the Study of Social and Global Justice. Open Spaces for Dialogue and Enquiry. http://www.osdemethodology.org.uk/ (accessed 19 November 2007).

11. Davis, H. E. (1995) Pleasure, pain, and ethical responsibility: A felt-situated reading of *Menace II Society*, in: M. Katz (Eds), *Philosophy of education 1994: Proceedings of 50th annual meeting of the philosophy of education society* (Urbana, University of Illinois), 143-151.

12. Davis, H. E. (1996) The phenomemology of a feminist reader: Toward a recuperation of pleasure. *Educational Theory, 46, (*4), 473-499.

13. Davis, H. E. (1999). Course Outline: EDUC 5650A.03 *Ethical possibilities in education.* (Toronto, York University).

14. Davis, H. E. (2005) Ethical possibilities in feminist readings of Nafisi's memoir, unpublished ms, *Canadian Association for Women's Studies in Education,* May 28, London, Ontario, Canada.

15. Dei, G. J. S. & Kempf, A. (2006) *Anti-colonialism and education: The politics of resistance.* (Rotterdam; Taipei, Sense Publishers).

16. Eisenstein, Z. (2006). Is 'W' for women? In K. Hunt & K. Rygiel (Eds.), *(En)gendering the War on Terror: War Stories and Camouflaged Politics* . U.K: Ashgate Publishing (pp 191-200)*.*

17. Felman, S. (1987) *Jacques Lacan and the adventure of insight: Psychoanalysis in contemporary culture* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press).

18. Ghosh, B. (2000) An affair to remember: Scripted performances in the "Nasreen Affair", in: A. Amireh & L. S. Majaj (Eds), *Going global: The transnational reception of Third World women writers* (New York & London, Garland), 39-83.

19. Grobman, L. (2004) Rhetorizing the contact zone: Multicultural texts in writing classrooms, in: P. Schweickart & E. Flynn (Eds) *Reading sites: Social difference and reader response* (New York, Modern Language Association of America).

20. Gunew, S. (2004) Haunted nations : the colonial dimensions of multiculturalisms (London, New York, Routledge).

21. Haddon, M. (2003) *The curious incident of the dog in the nighttime* (New York, Doubleday).

22. Huntington, S. (1997) *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order* (New York, Simon and Schuster).

23. Jauss, H. R. (1982) *Toward an aesthetic of reception* (Minneapolis, Minnisota, University of Minnesota Press).

24. Kahf, M. (2000) Packaging 'Huda': Sha'rawi's memoirs in the United States reception environment, in: A. Amireh & L. S. Majaj (Eds), *Going global: The transnational reception of Third World women writers (*New York and London, Garland),148-172.

25. Kingsolver, B. (1989) *The bean trees (*New York, Harper & Row).

26. Lazreg, M. (2000) The triumphal discourse of global feminism: Should Other women be known? In: A. Amireh & L. S. Majaj. (Eds) *Going global: The transnational reception of Third World women writers (*New York and London, Garland), 29-38.

27. Levine-Rasky, C. (2002) Introduction, in: L. Rasky (Ed) *Working through whiteness: International perspectives* (Albany, NY, SUNY Press), 1-24.

28. Maguire, G. (1994) The honorary shepherds, in: M. D. Bauer (Ed.) *Am I blue? Coming out from the silence (*New York, Harper Collins), 63-84.

29. Milani, F. (2004) Iranian women writers and the public sphere, Paper presented at *Women's Literary and Artistic Creativity In Contemporary Iran Conference* (University of Toronto, November 6-7).

30. Mohanty, C. T. (1997) Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourse, in: A. McClintock, A. Mufti & E. Shohat (Eds), *Dangerous liaisons: Gender, nation and postcolonial perspectives* (Minneapolis, MN & London, University of Minnesota Press), 255-277.

31. Morrison, T. (1994) *The bluest eye* (New York: Plume Book).

32. Mottahedeh, N. (2004) Off the Grid: Reading Iranian Memoirs in Our Time of Total War, *Interventions: A Middle East Report Online Feature.* Available online from http://www.merip.org/mero/interventions/mottahedeh_interv.html (accessed September 11, 2005).

33. Nussbaum, M. (1990) Finely Aware and Richly Responsible: Literature and the Moral Imagination, in: M. Nussbaum (Ed), *Love's knowledge: essays on philosophy and literature* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).

34. Palumbo-Liu, D. (1995) *The ethnic canon: Histories, institutions, and interventions (*Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press).

35. Pinar, W. F. (1998) *Queer theory in education (*Mahwah, New Jersey, L. Erlbaum Associates).

36. Quijano, A. (1998). La colonialidad del poder y la experiencia cultural Latinoamericana, in: R. Briceño-León & H. R. Sonntag (Eds), *Pueblo, Época y Desarrollo: La Sociología de América Latina,* pp. 139-55. Caracas: Nueva Sociedad.

37. Random House. (2007) Persepolis website. Available online at: http://www.randomhouse.com/pantheon/graphicnovels/persepolis.html (retrieved January 1, 2007).

38. Rogers, T. and Soter, A. (Eds) (1997) *Reading across cultures: Teaching literature in a diverse society* (New York, Teachers College Press).

39. Rosenblatt, L. (1938) *Literature as exploration* (New York, Noble and Noble).

40. Said, E. (1978) *Orientalism* (New York, Pantheon Press).

41. Satrapi, M. (2003) *Persepolis I* (New York, Pantheon Books).

42. Satrapi, M. (2004a) *Persepolis II: The Story of a Return* (New York, Pantheon Books).

43. Satrapi, M. (2004b) An interview with Marjane Satrapi *Bookslut.* Available online at: http://www.bookslut.com/features/2004_10_003261.php (retrieved January 5, 2007).

44. Satrapi, M. (2005) *Sexual revolutionaries*. Available online at: http://archive.salon.com/books/int/2005/04/24/satrapi/index_np.html (retrieved November 30, 2006).Schweickart, P. (1986) Reading ourselves: Toward a feminist theory of reading, in: E. A. Flynn & P. P. Schweickart (Eds), *Gender and reading: Essays on readers, texts and contexts* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press).

45. Schweickart, P. (Ed.) (2004) Introduction, in: P. P. Schweickart & E. A. Flynn (Eds), *Reading sites: Social difference and reader response* (New York, Modern Language Association of America).

46. Spivak, G. C. (1988) Can the subaltern speak?, in: Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg

(Eds) *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (London, Macmillan), 271-313.

47. Spivak, G. C. (1990) *The postcolonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogues,* S. Harasym (Ed) (New York, Routledge).

48. Spivak, G. C. (1996) How to teach a 'culturally different' book, in: D. Landry & G. Maclean (Eds), *The Spivak Reader* (New York & London, Routledge), 237-266.

49. Spivak, G. C. (2004). Righting wrongs. *South Atlantic Quarterly, 103,* 2/3, pp. 524-581.

50. Todd, S. (1997) Introduction: Desiring desire in rethinking pedagogy, in: S. Todd (Ed), *Learning Desire: Perspectives on Pedagogy, Culture and the Unsaid* (New York & London, Routledge).

51. Taylor, L. (2007). Reading desire: From empathy to estrangement, from enlightenment to implication. *Intercultural Education Vol. 19,* 4, pp. 297-316.

52. Verducci, S. (2000) A conceptual history of empathy and a question it raises for moral education, *Educational Theory, 50*, 63–80.

53. Ware, V. (2006) Info-War and the politics of feminist curiosity: Exploring new frameworks for feminist intercultural studies, *Cultural Studies,* 20, 6, 526-551.

54. Williams, R. (1977) *Marxism and literature* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).

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

---

i I use the term *white* not as an absolute identity, but as a contextually specific position of power and status vis-à-vis racialized groups constructed through modernist discourses of racial purity, moral authority and legal entitlement to naturalize white ethnicity as an authoritative and neutral, *unmarked* norm.

ii Central course texts (Maguire, 1994; Haddon, 2003; Kingsolver, 1988; Satrapi, 2003, 2004a; Morrison, 1994; Maracle, 2000) ask students to grapple with divergent articulations of social difference, disparity and memory as they develop interpretive strategies to read outside familiar canons.

iii "You're a free woman. The Iran of today is not for you" (Satrapi, 2004, p. 187).

iv See, for example, Dei & Kempf, 2006; Mahalingam & McCarthy, 2000; May, 1999; Pinar, 1998.

v Space does not allow an elaboration of this study's premise that Palimbo-liu's analysis is borne out by a review of much current scholarship on multicultural literature education. See, for example, Cai, 2002, Grobman, 2004; Rogers & Soter, 1997.

vi See Au (2007), CBC (2007), CTV (2007), Toronto Star (2007) and the Ottawa Citizen (2007).

[vii] Eg. Nafisi, 2003, Dumas, 1994, Hakakian, 1994. Since this study, the course readings have included a growing range of counternarratives to this body of memoirs (Azam Zanganeh, 2006; Hussain, 2006; Keshavarz, 2007).

[viii] Recurring images of oppressive Islamist authorities and Satrapi's erasure of the multiethnic, multilingual and multifaith nature of Iranian society--"Like all Iranians, I don't understand Arabic" (Satrapi, 2004, p. 130)—render Arabness foreign in ways congruent with a longer Iranian literary tradition of Aryanization (Saad, 1996; Asgharzadeh, 2007) (I am grateful to my reviewers for this point).

[ix] With this term, Todd (1997, p. 2) emphasizes the ways the affective dimensions of learning are structured through psychic dynamics of desire that inscribe the learner in hegemonic relations of power.

[x] 11.7 per cent of the students are Francophone, less than 3 percent are Allophone (their first language being neither French nor English), 35.6 per cent are from outside Quebec and less than 10% are visible minority.

[xi] This distinction refers to a long debate within feminist reader response and critical pedagogies. See Bogdan, 1992, esp. chapter 7; Davis, 1995, 1999. Considering the scope of this article, I'll merely gesture here to my conviction that this debates speaks directly to the twin weaknesses identified by Andreotti (2007, p. 77) within liberal and postcolonial educational frameworks.