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ABSTRACT

By integrating global citizenship education (GCED) into the curriculum, Colombia aims to empower its students to contribute to a more just and peaceful world. Existing research on GCED, however, has focused on ‘developed’ rather than ‘developing’ and conflict-affected settings. Using critical discourse analysis to analyze education policy and classroom practice in two secondary schools in Bogotá, this research aims to bridge the gap between the critical theoretical debate on GCED and the policies and practices in the field. Despite the challenges posed by an unstable political climate and an education system that reproduces the existing cultural and socio-economic inequalities, the analysis shows that the local implementation of GCED in Bogotá offers space for creative possibilities. Locally-rooted initiatives introduce global citizenship as a possibility to reimagine the unjust social order through collective action, thereby providing powerful clues for a transformative integration of GCED which could strengthen policy and practice in Colombia and beyond.
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RATIONALE

SOCIETAL & ACADEMIC RELEVANCE

During the first decade of the 21st century, the discourse on education and international development has focused on achieving universal access to primary education (UNESCO, 2014a). This focus is notable in the Millennium Development Goals and the “Education For All” movement of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2014a). The discussion on which education-related goals should be included in the post-2015 development agenda, however, has increasingly brought the quality and relevance of education into the equation (Ibid.). The notion of global citizenship education (GCED) in particular has gained prominence in recent years (Ibid.). Simultaneously responding to and enhancing “a popular movement both in schools and among voluntary bodies and many other organizations” (Arthur, 2014:73), fostering global citizenship became one of UNESCO’s key education objectives for the 2014-2022 period as well as one of the three priorities outlined in the United Nations Secretary-General’s Global Education First Initiative (UNESCO, 2014a:5-9). Moreover, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development explicitly mentions global citizenship education under target 4.7, which aims “to ensure that all learners acquire knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development” (UNESCO, 2016a:5).

Despite its prominence on the international education agenda, however, “consensus about what global citizenship means exactly, and consequently what GCED should promote, is yet to be reached” (UNESCO, 2014a:5). Since global citizenship education is an emerging concept, “in many ways, practice is farther ahead than conceptual clarity” (UNESCO, 2013:5). This ambiguity becomes especially apparent while reviewing the academic literature on the topic, in which terms such as ‘international education’, ‘education for international mindedness’, ‘global education/learning’, ‘sustainable development education’, ‘human rights education’ and ‘learning 21st century skills’ are used interchangeably (Standish, 2014:169-170). Since it is often based on the particular beliefs of the author rather than backed by empirical evidence and reflective of its limitations and moral foundations, the literature on global citizenship education has been described as “both inconsistent and not entirely logical” (Arthur, 2014:73); and the GCED movement as a movement “in pursuit of meaning” (Standish, 2014:183).

Since 2013, UNESCO has facilitated important steps towards enhancing conceptual clarity regarding GCED, for example through organizing technical consultations as well as a bi-annual
international forum on global citizenship education (UNESCO, 2014a: 5). This process has so far led to the following definition of the aim of GCED:

“The goal of global citizenship education is to empower learners to engage and assume active roles both locally and globally to face and resolve global challenges and ultimately to become proactive contributors to a more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable world.” (UNESCO 2016a:2)

Despite these transformative intentions which drive the global citizenship education movement, critical scholars (Andreotti, 2011; Shultz, 2007; Tully, 2008; Parmenter, 2011) have identified the risk of GCED becoming yet another tool for reproducing prevailing power imbalances. As put by Parker (in Standish, 2014:169-170), “international education solves a variety of problems, serves an array of masters, and expresses diverse and sometimes conflicting values”. Recent studies have shown how global citizenship education in concrete contexts (such as the case of South Korea) remains “rooted in reproducing and reinforcing global and local inequities” (Cho and Mosselson, 2017:14). It is therefore of crucial importance to be aware of the deeply political nature of the concept and ask ourselves “who is this global citizen?”, “whose interests are represented here?” and “are we empowering the dominant group to remain in power?” (Andreotti, 2006:44).

**RESEARCH OBJECTIVE**

Although the body of theoretical literature regarding global citizenship education is growing rapidly, there is “a continuing lack of critical discussions within empirical studies and actual policy.” (Goren & Yemini, 2017:180). Moreover, western, ‘developed’ countries have been the focus of the knowledge production surrounding GCED to date (Parmenter, 2011; Cho and Mosselson, 2017). In this regard, Quaynor (2012) especially highlights the lack of classroom observations to analyze citizenship education programs in post-conflict contexts, societies in which it is particularly important to assess whether global citizenship education contributes to social transformation rather than reproducing the existing inequalities. Through the case study of Colombia, this research therefore aims to respond to the “need to bridge the gap between the theoretical and critical work within the academy with the practices and policies in the field” (Hartung, 2017:27). Committed to ending half a century of violent conflict, the country recently became one of the four countries worldwide which pledged to make global citizenship education a cornerstone of their curriculum (UNESCO, 2016b).

Concretely, this research examines to what extent global citizenship education in secondary schools in Bogotá can live up to its transformative intentions. In order to achieve this, it will use critical discourse analysis to explore a/ the discourses underpinning education policy; and b/ the implications
of these discourses on classroom practice. The latter is crucial, since “between enunciation (e.g. of a neoliberal educational agenda) and interpretation in a specific context (e.g. teachers ‘on the ground’) lies a space of negotiation and creative opportunity that is always pregnant with (risky) possibilities.” (Andreotti, 2011:395). During my time in Bogotá, I was a research assistant in a GCED-focused participatory action research project undertaken at the Universidad de los Andes in collaboration with UNESCO, which aims to examine how GCED can be best integrated in the Colombian context. More specifically, the project focuses on the final grades of secondary school and promotes the use of ICT as a tool for facilitating international cooperation and developing concrete activities which aim to tackle societal challenges.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

MAIN QUESTION

To what extent does global citizenship education (GCED) in secondary schools in Bogotá contribute to social transformation?

SUB-QUESTIONS

1. Which discourses surrounding GCED can be identified in international, national and local education policy?
2. How are these discourses adopted in classroom practice?

OUTLINE OF THE THESIS

This thesis is structured through the following chapters:

1. The theoretical framework chapter outlines the theoretical underpinnings of critical discourse analysis, before establishing the categorization of GCED discourses used in this research based on the critical-transformative academic literature on globalization, citizenship and education.
2. The research context chapter examines Colombia’s history of violent conflict, the effects on the country’s education system and the citizenship education policy developed in response to this challenging context. Finally, it introduces the research project which provided the local framework for this research.
3. The research design chapter explains the epistemological, ontological and methodological choices made when designing this research and reflects on their implementation. Specific
attention is paid to the ethical considerations and methodological limitations these choices bring about.

4. The two analysis and discussion chapters analyze and discuss the collected data by establishing which global citizenship education discourses are dominant in respectively policy and practice and examining the wider social order these discourses form part of, thereby answering the two sub-questions underlying this research.

5. Finally, the conclusions and recommendations chapter draws on the findings discussed in the analysis and discussion chapters to answer the main research question and examine the implications of this research for theory, policy and practice.
CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In the following theoretical framework, the theoretical underpinnings of critical discourse analysis are elaborated upon. Once it has been established that critical discourse analysis is a suitable framework for analyzing the questions underlying this research, the different discourses on globalization, citizenship and education outlined in the critical academic literature are introduced. Based on this literature review, the categorization of GCED discourses and the conceptual framework underlying this research are presented.

CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AS A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This research draws on discourse analysis as a theoretical position as well as analytical framework. Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) stress that discourse analysis can refer to a range of approaches, notably Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory, critical discourse analysis and discursive psychology, each of which have different interpretations on what discourses are and how they should be analyzed. Importantly, each of these approaches comes with specific philosophical premises, theoretical models, methodological guidelines and techniques for analysis (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002). Broadly speaking, however, the different approaches share a common understanding of discourse as “a particular way of talking about and understanding (an aspect of) the world” (Ibid.:1). Discourse analysis, then, starts from the social constructivist/poststructuralist assumption that these ways of talking “do not neutrally reflect our world, identities and social relations but, rather, play an active role in creating and changing them.” (Ibid.:1). In other words, rather than reflecting a pre-given social world, we shape the social world through our uses of language, in which different discourses compete for acceptance as ‘common truth’. These different discourses lead to different forms of action, thus having real social consequences. According to this anti-essentialist view, all knowledge is contingent: our worldviews are historically and culturally specific and could always have been different. Finally, discourse analysis aims to be critical, that is to contribute to social change by investigating and critiquing assumptions and power relations previously taken for granted (Ibid.).

In this research, critical discourse analysis (CDA) as proposed by Fairclough (2001) will be used as a theoretical and methodological framework. Compared to other approaches to discourse analysis, CDA is particularly useful because of its emphasis on social as well as discursive change. Importantly, Fairclough’s approach distinguishes itself by insisting that discourse, encompassing spoken and written language as well as visual images, “is just one among many aspects of any social practice” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002:61). By analyzing the dialectical relationship between discursive and broader, non-
discursive social practices, CDA aims to critically explore the socio-political consequences of the discursive practice under examination (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002). According to Fairclough (2001:70), every text or “communicative event functions as a form of social practice in reproducing or challenging the order of discourse.”. Order of discourse here refers to a certain structuring of which discourses are more dominant or more alternative in a certain field (Fairclough, 2001). Whereas, at the theoretical level, structure and practice are seen as one unified process, in empirical studies an analytical distinction is forcibly made between the communicative event and the order of discourse to which it relates (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002:140).

Specifically, Fairclough developed a three-dimensional model based on the analysis of “(1) the linguistic features of the text (text), (2) processes relating to the production and consumption of the text (discursive practice); and (3) the wider social practice to which the communicative event belongs (social practice)” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002:68). This last part of the analysis requires the researcher to move beyond discourse analysis and “draw on other theories – for example, social or cultural theory – that shed light upon the social practice in question.” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002:86). Key concepts in Fairclough’s analysis of discursive change are intertextuality and interdiscursivity, referring to the examination of “how specific texts draw on earlier meaning formations (...), how different discourses are articulated together in one particular text and whether the same discourses are articulated together across a series of texts or whether different discourses are combined in new articulations.” (Ibid.:139). CDA allows us to analyze the order of discourse underlying existing local and national education policy within its specific socio-political context and in dialogue with the literature on GCED. Thus, CDA can help us answer the central question of this research: to what extent does global citizenship education policy and practice in Colombia contribute to discursive change, and as a result social transformation, rather than reproducing the existing order?

DECONSTRUCTING GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION

To make sense of the rapidly growing GCED movement and its potential contribution to the transformation towards social justice, the following paragraphs analyze the concepts of “globalization”, “citizenship” and “education” and their relation to social transformation.

GLOBALIZATION AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION

Observing that globalization is a complex and multi-faceted concept, Torres (2015) proposes to talk about globalizations - plural - instead. In particular, he distinguishes between globalization from above and globalization from below. Globalization from above is “framed by an ideology of neo-liberalism
and calls for an opening of borders, the creation of multiple regional markets, the proliferation of fast-paced economic and financial exchanges, and governing systems other than nation-states” (Torres, 2015:263). This is the position taken by so-called hyper-globalizers who “believe globalization is a singular process encompassing all regions of the world and all aspects of human and planetary life and is the solution to poverty, inequality and all other social ills.” (Ibid.:265). On the other side of the spectrum are the skeptics and radical anti-globalizers, “who see an unprecedented wave of inequality worldwide as a consequence of globalization from above” (Ibid.:266). They actively oppose this neoliberal globalization using the motto “no globalization without representation” (Torres, 2015:263). This includes a demand for cognitive justice, a term coined by Santos to refer to the recognition of the diversity of knowledges of the South as opposed to the monopoly of Eurocentric perspectives (Zembylas, 2017).

Globalization from above is connected to a “teleological belief in progression towards a predetermined goal: usually the type of economy and society to be found in the "highly-developed" western countries.” (Castles, 2001:15). Castles (2001) introduces the concept of social transformation as the antithesis of this type of globalization. Rather than assuming a predetermined outcome of globalization, transformationists stress the importance of “examining the different ways in which globalizing forces affect local communities and national societies with highly diverse historical experiences, economic and social patterns, political institutions, and cultures.” (Ibid.:18-19). Situated somewhere between the hyper-globalizers and the anti-globalizers, they recognize that globalization can have both positive and negative consequences, while some communities might be completely excluded. Local responses can range from adaptation to resistance in various forms, from reviving traditions to globalization from below through transnational civil society organizations (Ibid.:19). Castles (2001:19) defines social transformation studies as a “field of research that can and should lead to positive recipes for social and political action to help communities improve their livelihoods and cope with the consequences of global change.”.

**CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION**

During the past decades, several authors (McLaughlin, 1992; Westheimer and Kahne, 2004; Veugelers, 2007) have attempted to provide conceptual clarity within the deeply fragmented and political domain of citizenship education. Starting with McLaughlin’s (1992) distinction between ‘minimal’ and ‘maximal’ citizenship (Johnson and Morris, 2010:84), these authors have distinguished different ideals of ‘the good citizen’. Whereas the minimal citizen is “essentially obedient to government: ‘law abiding’ and ‘public spirited’, with limited autonomy, the maximal citizen ‘actively questions’ and has achieved a ‘distanced critical perspective on all important matters’” (Johnson and Morris, 2010:84).
Since citizenship can be understood to refer both to the formal political level as well as to the interpersonal level (e.g. daily interactions in schools), a further conceptual distinction has been made between civic and civil dimensions of citizenship education (Veugelers, 2007; Cox et al., 2014). Whereas the civic dimension ‘focuses on knowledge and understanding of formal institutions and processes of civic life (such as voting in elections)’, civil education refers to ‘learning to live together’ with those beyond the extended family (Schulz et al., 2010:22). More than being a merely conceptual distinction, these two dimensions have been developed and promoted by different academic fields. In Colombia, civil education (referred to as convivencia or “peaceful coexistence”) has traditionally been the ‘comfort zone’ of psychologists and received the most attention during the past years.

Political scientists, on the other hand, have tended to stress the importance of democratic participation arguing that the civil dimension of citizenship education in and of itself (e.g. fostering responsibility for one’s actions, honesty and good-neighborliness), is not sufficient to create the conditions needed for a democratic and just society (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004; Luschei, 2016). They stress that the emphasis on individual character and behavior in many citizenship education programs can be criticized for obscuring “the need for collective and public sector initiatives” (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004:243). Those programs might end up distracting attention from a more systemic analysis of the causes and solutions of social issues, as they put forward “volunteerism and kindness (…) as ways of avoiding politics and policy” (Ibid.:243). Thus, we need to be aware of the political and ideological interests embedded in different conceptions of citizenship education (Ibid.:263-264).

Both Westheimer and Kahne (2004) and Veugelers (2007) therefore distinguish between citizenship education aiming for personal emancipation and citizenship education aiming for a more collective emancipation respectively. They end up with the following typology: 1) the adaptive/personally responsible citizen, who acts responsibly and obediently; 2) the individualistic/participatory citizen, who participates in society from an individualist perspective within the given structures; and finally, 3) the critical-democratic/justice-oriented citizen, who is motivated to challenge and change those structures which reproduce injustices (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004; Veugelers, 2007; Johnson and Morris, 2010). As discussed in the following section, each of these conceptions of citizenship requires different pedagogical approaches.

EDUCATION AND SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION

In their discussion of education quality in low income countries, Tikly and Barrett (2011) make a useful distinction between three theoretical perspectives when approaching the role of education in development/social transformation: the human capital approach, the human rights approach and the
social justice approach. The human capital approach focuses on the benefits of improving school effectiveness for economic growth and measures education quality through standardized assessments of cognitive learning outcomes (Tikly and Barrett, 2011). The currently prevalent human rights approach, on the other hand, prioritizes the needs, rights, wellbeing and participation of individual learners (Ibid.). What these two approaches have in common is that they “hold an atomistic, “ontologically individualistic” view of learners” which does not take into account the historical, social, political, cultural and economic context in which learning takes place (Ibid.:6). The social justice approach, drawing on Fraser, Sen and Nussbaum, can be seen as “ethically individualistic” in the sense that it focuses on the individual capabilities to participate fully in society (Ibid.). In contrast to the human capital and human rights approaches, however, it takes precisely this interaction between the individual learner and society as its starting point (Ibid.).

The social justice approach is closely intertwined with critical pedagogical thinking. Coined by the American scholar Henry Giroux in his 1983 book Theory and Resistance in Education, critical pedagogy is inspired by the same critical and discursive turn which underpins critical discourse analysis, notably the work of Foucault, Gramsci and the Frankfurt School (Darder, Baltodano & Torres, 2009:2, 6). Like global citizenship education and critical discourse analysis, it is a container term which brings together a broad variety of authors and approaches (McLaren, 2009:61). What unites these approaches is their aim to provide “a means by which the oppressed (or ‘subaltern’) may begin to reflect more deeply upon their socio-economic circumstances and take action to improve the status quo.” (Johnson & Morris, 2010:79). The main lesson of critical pedagogy is that, as these circumstances are historically produced by human beings, they can also be transformed by human beings (Darder, Baltodano & Torres, 2009:11).

While Aronowitz, Apple, Green, McLaren, and many other philosophers contributing to critical pedagogy are based in the United States, the Brazilian educators Paulo Freire and Augusto Boal have had a particularly great influence on the development of critical pedagogical thought and practice with their work on “Pedagogy of the Oppressed” and “Theater of the Oppressed” respectively (Darder, Baltodano & Torres, 2009: 2, 5). Freire and Boal explicitly criticize the traditional ‘banking’ approach to education, which sees students as ‘containers’ to be ‘filled’; as manageable beings who should accept/adapt to a static reality as it is (Freire, 2009:52-53). This way, they argue, education risks becoming a tool for reproduction of the unjust social order.

Instead, education should be transformative by opposing this teacher-student contradiction and fatalistic worldview (Freire, 2009:54). It aims to develop students’ conscientização or “critical consciousness” by stressing the importance of a/ learning through interaction between “teacher-students” and “student-teachers”, b/ deconstructing dominant discourses and c/ presenting reality as a challenge to be addressed rather than a pre-given, fixed structure (Freire, 2009:57). Critical pedagogy
thus sees the personal emancipation of students - developing their critical consciousness - as the first step towards a more just social structure. In practice, then, transformative education can be recognized through this focus on dialogue, critical reflection and intervention.

Critical pedagogy is an especially useful lens for analyzing education issues in settings that, like Colombia, are characterized by inequality, conflict and injustice. As put by Bush and Saltarelli (2000), it acknowledges that education has “two faces”: rather than being innately positive, education might end up “reproducing or exacerbating lingering tensions and inequalities and hence potentially contribute to (new or recurring) conflict” (Lopes Cardozo & Shah, 2016:4). Schools are conceptualized as sites for both domination and emancipation and educational interventions should be analyzed within their wider societal and historical contexts (McLaren, 2009:62-63). Besides being extremely unpredictable, educational interventions might lead to simultaneously positive and negative outcomes as well as turning out to be relatively powerless when facing wider societal or economic dynamics (Davies, 2010:2). Therefore, Davies (2010) suggests that the best education can aim for might be “doing no harm”.

Even though educational interventions are constrained by their wider context, education is a structural force in society in its own right and therefore has an important role to play in fostering social transformation for social justice (Desjardins, 2015; Sher & King, 2015). In this spirit, education in conflict-affected countries like Colombia should go beyond trying to ensure the absence of violence towards aiming to create sustainable peace (Lopes Cardozo & Shah, 2016). This, according to Galtung’s conception of positive peace, requires “the presence of social justice and the conditions to eliminate the causes of violence” in addition to the absence of violence (negative peace) (Smith et al., 2011 in Lopes Cardozo & Shah, 2016:4). Inspired by the work of Nancy Fraser (2005), such a social justice lens requires social transformations which tackle the underlying tensions and inequalities regarding (cultural) recognition, (political) representation and (economic) redistribution in order to ensure “parity of participation, as full partners in social interaction” (Ibid.:5).

THE ORDER OF GCED DISCOURSE

Based on these categorizations of globalization, citizenship and education, the literature on GCED distinguishes between different conceptions of global citizenship education, ranging from “soft” neoliberal and moral-humanistic GCED to the transformative approaches promoted by critical scholars (Andreotti, 2006; Shultz, 2007; Veugelers, 2011; Bates, 2012; Aktas et al., 2017; Hartung, 2017; Cho and Mosselson, 2017).

Following the economically-focused neoliberal discourse, which emphasizes individual responsibility and entrepreneurship, “a global citizen is one who is a successful participant in a liberal
economy driven by capitalism and technology” (Shultz, 2007:249). Globalization is seen as an essentially positive force and the underlying idea is that ‘by serving one’s own self-interests, one is serving the interest of the planet and all its inhabitants’ (Andreotti and Pashby, 2013:428). The more culturally-focused moral-humanistic discourse, on the other hand, is based on normative ideals such as equality, universal human rights and a celebration of diversity. It promotes awareness of global issues and advocates a humanitarian responsibility to strive for a world in which everyone receives equal chances for development (Andreotti, 2006). The moral-humanistic discourse is summed up in the idea of “a common humanity heading toward a common ‘forward’” (Andreotti and Pashby, 2013:425). Despite these clear differences between the neoliberal and moral-humanistic discourse, they share some key assumptions.

Both the neoliberal and the moral-humanistic discourse are arguably “soft” approaches to GCED (Andreotti, 2006), often promoted by Western media, celebrities, international corporations and international development organizations. According to these discourses, the ideal citizen acts responsibly and obediently and participates in society from an individualist perspective within the given structures. In distinct ways, both the neoliberal and the moral-humanistic discourse present globalization as an irreversible reality which students should adapt to economically and/or culturally, while they risk neglecting the political implications (Mannion et al., 2011; Hartung, 2017). It is exactly this gap which the third perspective on global citizenship education, the transformative discourse, aims to address, inspired by critical pedagogy.

The transformative discourse on GCED proposed by critical scholars (Shultz, 2007; Tully, 2008; Andreotti, 2011; Veugelers, 2011; Truong-White and Mclean, 2015; Nieto, 2017), challenges the neoliberal and moral-humanistic discourses by recognizing the so-called ‘darker side of modernity’, specifically the idea that globalization leads to structural inequalities. Convinced that “a better world is possible”, a global citizen according to the transformative discourse acknowledges that globalization is an unfinished process and creates space, dialogue and change across borders based on shared concerns for justice (Schultz, 2007). Rather than promoting adaptation to the new economic order and/or projecting normative, universalist visions based on Western ideas of progress and humanity, transformative GCED is “designed in ways that acknowledges complexity, contingency (context-dependency), multiple and partial perspectives and unequal power relations.” (Andreotti, 2010:241). Such a transformative perspective promotes recognition of complicity based on a political responsibility and requires dealing with the ‘uneasy feelings’ this might provoke (Andreotti and Pashby, 2013).

The previous paragraphs have provided an overview of the different, competing discourses
within the order of discourse of global citizenship education\(^1\). This a common way of undertaking critical discourse analysis, as it enables researchers “to investigate where a particular discourse is dominant, where there is a struggle between different discourses, and which common-sense assumptions are shared by all the prevailing discourses.” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002:142). Moreover, this focus on order of discourse enables an analysis of the distribution of discourses, which is important as not everyone may have access to all discourses equally (Ibid.). It is important to note, however, that this delimitation of competing GCED discourses is an ongoing process, as these boundaries are constructed in order to create a framework for study rather than “found” in reality (Ibid.:143).

CONCEPTUAL SCHEME: TOWARDS A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO GCED

---

\(^1\) This categorization risks homogenizing the diversity within the three discourses. For example, within the transformative discourse on GCED at least three approaches can be distinguished: firstly, an approach emphasizing critical pedagogy and popular education (Veugelers, 2007; Catalano, 2013; Reilly and Niens, 2014; Truong-White and Mclean 2015); secondly, a decolonial approach which also draws on critical pedagogy but more importantly on critical Latin American thinkers such as Mignolo, Escobar, Quijano, Grosfoguel, Dussel, Maldonado-Torres, Castro-Gómez and other academics such as Boaventura de Sousa Santos and Catherine Walsh who think from the global South (Andreotti, 2011; Balarin, 2011; Nieto, 2017); and lastly, a more radical critique, including of GCED as a concept and strategy (Watson, 2013; Pais and Costa, 2017; Jooste and Heleta, 2017).
Taking the transformation of society towards social justice as a starting point, the conceptual scheme (see Figure 1) underlying this research integrates the key ideas from the academic literature on critical discourse analysis, global citizenship education and social transformation described in this chapter. On the one hand, “soft” approaches to global citizenship education - represented by the neoliberal and moral-humanistic discourse outlined above - promote adaptation to the status quo and thereby do not lead to discursive nor social change. Thus, they contribute to the reproduction of an unjust social order. Critical approaches to GCED as represented by the transformative discourse, on the other hand, develop students’ critical consciousness by promoting dialogue, critical reflection and intervention. This personal emancipation can be seen as the first step of social transformation: it results in a transformation of the order of discourse, eventually leading to real life social change towards a more just social order. As will be argued in the following chapter, the Colombian context can indeed be described as an unjust and unequal social order - characterized by sociopolitical and armed conflict - that requires social transformation to build lasting peace.
CHAPTER III: RESEARCH CONTEXT

This chapter describes the context in which this research took place. Firstly, it examines Colombia’s history of violent conflict and the effects of this conflict on the Colombian education system in order to argue that the social order in which global citizenship education is being introduced is indeed marked by injustice and inequality. It then outlines the measures taken in response to this challenging context by the Colombian government, specifically in terms of citizenship education policy. Finally, it takes a closer look at the action research project at the Universidad de los Andes in Bogotá which provided the local framework for my research.

EDUCATION AND CONFLICT IN COLOMBIA

Home to “the oldest war in Latin America”, Colombia has experienced over half a century of violent conflict between the governmental armed forces, right-wing paramilitaries and left-wing guerrilla groups, most notably the Armed Revolutionary Forces of Colombia - People’s Army (the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia - Ejército del Pueblo or FARC-EP (Chaux, 2009:84). The main victim of the conflict has been Colombia’s rural population, leading to a major displacement crisis in several areas of the country (Jaramillo & Mesa, 2009:468). At the end of 2016, a peace accord between the FARC-EP and the government of Juan Manuel Santos was finally approved by the Colombian Congress, after a previous agreement had been rejected in a national referendum (Gill, 2017:157). Exacerbated by drug trafficking, the conflict can be understood as a complex “blend of political ideals, reaction to abuses and social inequalities, state incapacity to mediate/resolve the conflict, and varied international alliances that provide financial support for different sides.” (Vega & Bajaj, 2016:360). The question, then, remains whether the current peace agreement will be the basis for a lasting peace in the country.

The current socio-political characteristics of Colombian society do not allow us to understand it as the kind of post-conflict society in which GCED is incorporated after the war to overcome divisions between diverging social groups (as opposed to the case of Northern Ireland presented by Reilly and Niens, 2014). Nor, however, should Colombia be seen as a conflict-ridden country in which even the Ministry of Education does not seem interested in promoting dialogue (as in the case of Israel analyzed by Goren and Yemini, 2017). On the contrary, Colombia has gone through a post-conflict process since the 2016 signing of the peace agreement. At the same time, however, the country continues to face profound tensions between different social and armed forces: guerrillas (dissidents of the FARC as well as other insurgent groups), criminal gangs involved in narco-trafficking and neo-paramilitary groups...
that oppose the restitution of land to displaced farmers and are responsible for the murder of social leaders and human rights defenders on a daily basis. It is not surprising, then, that issues of peace and security continue to dominate Colombian politics today, especially as Colombians are deciding who will succeed current president Juan Manuel Santos.

Colombian education has been affected both directly and indirectly by the conflict: children were at risk of being recruited by guerrilla groups while at school (Villar-Márquez, 2011:1), whereas their teachers risked falling victim to the “dirty war” waged by the paramilitary on unions and social movements (Novelli, 2010:271). Moreover, the Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack reported high dropout rates and schools were forced to close as a result of the conflict (Vega & Bajaj, 2016:360). More indirectly, instances of school-based violence such as corporal punishment and bullying have increased because of the normalization of violence in society (Chaux, 2009:86). When it comes to redistributing access to safe and secure educational opportunities and resources for all students, “Colombia’s regional, ethnic, and cultural diversity have produced deep stratification that is reflected in an unequal education system” (Vega & Bajaj, 2016:360). As a result, children from vulnerable populations (i.e. poor, displaced, and working children as well as those from Afro-Colombian and indigenous groups) are most affected by the many barriers facing the Colombian education system (Vega & Bajaj, 2016:360).

Two issues stand out as especially pressing: the huge urban-rural divide and the precarious situation of Colombia’s internally displaced people. Regarding the latter, the UN Security Council declared Colombia the country with the second largest population of internally displaced persons in the world in 2009 (Villar-Márquez, 2011:1). Approximately 12% of its population has had to move as a result of the conflict (Vega & Bajaj, 2016, p. 360). According to various sources, up to 50% of all displaced persons are under 18, and according to Save the Children UK, in 2008 74.5% of these displaced children did not have access to education (Villar-Márquez, 2011:2). This violation of the rights of internally displaced persons has led the Constitutional Court of Colombia to determine an unconstitutional state of affairs (Vega & Bajaj, 2016:361). Besides restrained access to education, González (2016:111) argues that the issue of internal displacement has been largely ignored in the classroom.

Regarding the urban-rural divide, the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) and Centre for Conflict Resolution (NOREF) report a 3 year learning gap when comparing education quality in rural and urban areas (González Bustelo, 2006:1). UNICEF, on the other hand, reports that in 2003 drop-out and repetition rates for primary education in rural areas were respectively twice and three times as high compared to the national rates (Beleli et al., 2007:25). Whereas efforts have been made to strengthen rural education, in 2014 only 0.5 of the 4.6 per cent of GDP allocated to education was spent on education in rural areas (González Bustelo, 2006:2). NRC and NOREF estimate that “in order to achieve
substantive changes, the amount dedicated to rural education will need to increase to 1.2 per cent of GDP per year over the next 15 years.” (González Bustelo, 2006:2). Moreover, children in rural areas were especially vulnerable as almost 90% of child recruitment took place in these areas, including in schools (Villar-Márquez, 2011:1).

Like their students, Colombian educators have not been guaranteed access to safe working conditions as a result of the conflict. As stressed by Beleli et al. (2007:25), “not only are teachers often displaced, but they are also a group targeted by both guerrillas and paramilitaries since they are not viewed as neutral actors in the conflict.”. Rather than the obedient civil servants educators are often portrayed to be, teachers have been a radical force in Colombian society as social movement activists fighting for social justice and opposing the neo-liberal reforms which exacerbate inequalities and marginalization (Novelli, 2010:278). Their fight against human rights violations, however, ironically led them to become targets of human rights violations themselves: between 1991 and 2005, the “dirty war” waged by the Colombian state and its paramilitary allies on unions and social movement activists took the lives of 808 educators (Novelli, 2010:271-272). Finally, whereas effective teachers are vital when working with marginalized populations, Colombia faces a lack of teachers trained to work with vulnerable groups (Vega & Bajaj, 2016:361, 365).

As a response to these great challenges, there have been several governmental efforts aiming to overcome discrimination and strengthen social cohesion through (citizenship) education (Vega and Bajaj, 2016). The 1991 constitutional reform and following 1994 General Education Law strongly emphasize human rights and participative democracy, effectively decentralizing education governance and ending the Catholic monopoly on moral education while promoting citizenship education as a core subject (Jaramillo and Mesa, 2009). A decade later, in 2004, the Ministry of Education published its so-called National Citizenship Competencies Standards, proposing standards for ‘good citizen behavior’ based on three categories: peaceful coexistence (convivencia); democratic participation and responsibility; and plurality, identity and enrichment with differences (Jaramillo and Mesa, 2009). Through these initiatives, combatting violence and promoting peaceful relationships through education became an explicit government priority (Chaux, 2009). The Citizenship Competencies Standards were followed in 2013 by the so-called Ley 1620 (Law 1620), which created the national system for peaceful coexistence at school, human rights education, sex education and the prevention and mitigation of school-based violence.

In 2014 and 2015 respectively, Law 1732 and Decree 1038 were issued, introducing the so-called Cátedra para la Paz (Peace Chair) as a mandatory subject “in all educational institutions of
preschool, elementary and secondary education, public and private” (Decree 1038, 2015:2). In 2016, the National Ministry of Education published a document with general orientations for the implementation of the Peace Chair as well as a more specific proposal for curricular guidelines and classroom activities. These documents divide peace education into the following six categories: 1) peaceful coexistence, 2) citizen participation, 3) diversity and identity, 4) historical memory and reconciliation, 5) sustainable development and 6) ethics, care and decisions (Ministerio de Educación, 2016a:15). Moreover, they introduce a global perspective in the Colombian school curriculum by discussing “peace building and post-conflict processes around the world and coexistence and peace challenges in a globalized world” (Camargo, 2016:8).

However, since Colombia has one of the most decentralized education systems in Latin America, however, the Ministry of Education is not in the position to directly impose these guidelines (Chaux, 2009). Instead, local Education Secretaries and schools have the authority to “design their own curricula and choose their own pedagogical practices” (Chaux, 2009:88). In 2015, former Secretary for Education of Bogotá (Secretaría de Educación Distrital or SED) Oscar Sánchez developed his own citizenship and coexistence education project (Proyecto de Educación para la Convivencia y la Ciudadanía, PECC). When developing the PECC, Bogotá’s Secretary for Education looked for community organizations that shared their vision and could offer the necessary expertise to implement the project. For developing and testing the teaching materials, the SED chose the Colombian office of Fe y Alegría, an international network of locally based organisations providing education to the most disadvantaged members of society, as its implementing partner (Fe y Alegría, personal communication, September 29th, 2017). Like the Peace Chair, the PECC included conceptual and pedagogical considerations associated with GCED.

This growing commitment to GCED was taken a step further in 2016 when Colombia, together with Uganda, Cambodia and Mongolia, became one of the four countries worldwide which pledged to make GCED a cornerstone of their curriculum (UNESCO, 2016b). To achieve this, the Ministry of Education of Colombia is currently developing guidelines to support universities in training future teachers in the field of citizenship and GCED. Despite this momentum, GCED is a recently emerging initiative in Colombia and consequently has not been discussed sufficiently. This absence of a national debate is an important limitation, since a situational analysis conducted in 2016 (Camargo, 2016) pointed towards mixed feelings surrounding GCED among educators in different parts of the country. Similar to the findings obtained in other countries (Reilly and Niens, 2014; Goren and Yemini, 2017), Colombian teachers not only associate GCED with new opportunities for citizenship and peace education, but also with the risks related to certain processes that generate discomfort and insecurities: neoliberal globalization, free trade agreements, the extraction of resources or the loss of national identity (Camargo, 2016).
During my time in Colombia, I worked as a research assistant in Bogotá, the country’s capital city, for a project at Universidad de los Andes, one of Colombia’s most elitist private universities. This research project was developed in cooperation with UNESCO/APCEIU and took place in two high schools that are very different from one another: Escuela Mediática, on the one hand, is a small private school in the historic city center which provides alternative education to the intellectual and artistic middle and upper class of the city. All 24 students of the final grade (grado 11, ages range between 16 and 19) participated in the research project. The school has a strong focus on communication and a horizontal structure in which the students are encouraged to express themselves and voice their opinions. The students do not wear uniforms, which is exceptional in Colombia, and rules (e.g. arriving on time) are not observed strictly.

Colegio Venecia, on the other hand, is a public institution educating over 5000 students in the less privileged South of Bogotá. To accommodate this number of students, the school hosts one group of students in the morning and another one in the afternoon. Twice a week, however, the students of the 10th and 11th grade attend additional classes focusing on audio-visual media, communication, programming and project management during the other half of the day as part of a program supported by the local government called “Educación Media Integral” (EMI). These classes consist of +/- 33 students per class, of which 24 students in total participated in the research project. The decision making procedures and power relations at Colegio Venecia can be described as hierarchical (top-down). Students are required to wear the school’s uniform and obey the rules.

What these two schools have in common is that the curriculum, besides standard subjects like English and mathematics, includes a graduation project: seniors are expected to work independently in small groups to research and address a current issue of their choice. In Escuela Mediática, the students create their own documentaries whereas in Colegio Venecia, they develop workshops, apps and other digital tools. The goals of our action research project were (1) to observe, document and analyze this process through observations and interviews; (2) to bring together the students and teachers from both schools and a third school in Chile so they could get to know each other and exchange experiences, both online through social media and offline through workshops; and last but not least (3) to introduce the topics of global citizenship education and cyber activism to the students and teachers through several workshops. My local supervisor was Nicolás J. C. Aguilar Forero, a postdoctoral researcher at the faculty of education of Universidad de los Andes and lead researcher of the project. The following chapter details how the research was designed and conducted.
CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH DESIGN

Keeping in mind the research context described in the previous chapter and the theoretical assumptions outlined in the theoretical framework, this chapter will explain the epistemological, ontological and methodological choices made when designing this research and reflect on their implementation. Specific attention will be paid to the ethical considerations and methodological limitations these choices bring about.

RESEARCH PARADIGM: EPISTEMOLOGICAL AND ONTOLOGICAL POSITION

While this research is a qualitative study, it does not consider the “qualitative paradigm”, relying on induction, subjectivity and context, as competing and incommensurable with quantitative approaches based on deduction, objectivity and generality. Instead, it opts for a pragmatic approach as defined by Morgan (2007:68) which views research conduct as a human, social endeavor worthy of our attention in and of itself. Specifically, pragmatism aims to connect philosophical issues of epistemology with the more technical research design choices made in practice. Consistent with critical discourse analysis, it acknowledges that in reality researchers move back and forward between induction and deduction (abduction), between subjectivity and objectivity (intersubjectivity) and between context and generality (transferability) (Morgan, 2007:71-72). Rather than seeing the pragmatic approach as a pre-defined paradigm, however, Harrits (2011) points to the varying ontological and epistemological positions underlying pragmatic research. He therefore proposes to view pragmatism as “a meta-perspective, from which different research paradigms could be compared and discussed.” (Harrits, 2011:151). The question then remains: what are the epistemological, ontological, methodological and axiological positions underlying this research?

Regarding epistemology and ontology, Morgan (2007:72) argues that, following the pragmatic principle of intersubjectivity, “there is no problem with asserting that there is both a single ‘real world’ and that all individuals have their own unique interpretations of that world”. Similarly, Fairclough’s understanding of critical discourse analysis explicitly dismisses judgmental relativism - the belief that “all discourses are equally good representations of reality” – while still accepting epistemic relativism, “according to which all discourses stem from a particular position in social life” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002:197). His argument is that “the strengths and weaknesses of discourses are continuously being judged in everyday practices” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002:197). This critical realist worldview, which combines epistemological relativism and ontological realism, is the epistemological and ontological position taken in this research. This turned out to be particularly useful in the field, as it allowed me
to uncover the different discourses on global citizenship education present in Colombian policy and practice while explicitly analyzing their respective strengths and weaknesses.

**METHODOLOGY**

**DATA COLLECTION METHODS**

As planned before leaving for the field, the first stage of my data collection focused on GCED policy. I started by identifying relevant **policy documents** representing the local (school/Bogotá), national (Colombia) and global (UNESCO) policy levels (see Table 1). Considering that relying solely on the text without any further context might lead to incomplete and/or distorted results, Fairclough stresses the importance of examining the production and consumption conditions of the text – something only few critical discourse analysts manage to do in practice (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002:82). That is why I conducted **5 semi-structured interviews** with policy-makers at the different levels in order to gather information about the production conditions of the selected documents (see Table 2).

**Table 1: Analyzed policy documents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Issued by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Citizenship Competencies Standards</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>National Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Competencies Standards in Language, Mathematics, Sciences and Citizenship</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>National Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National System for Peaceful Coexistence at School, Human Rights education, Sex education and the Prevention and Mitigation of School-based Violence law (1620)</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Congress of Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework Document: Education for Citizenship and Peaceful Coexistence</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Secretary of Education of Bogotá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for Citizenship and Peaceful Coexistence. Fifth cycle: Youth for Empowerment and Transformation</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Fe y Alegría</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning route for citizenship capabilities.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Secretary of Education of Bogotá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Chair law (1732)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Congress of Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Chair decree (1038)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Congress of Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizenship Education infographic</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizenship Education (GCED) infographic</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizenship Education: Topics and Learning Objectives.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizenship Education (a)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Global Education First Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global citizenship education (b)</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Global Education First Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ABCs of Global Citizenship Education.</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Citizenship Education to prevent violent extremism.</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to live together in peace through Global Citizenship Education.</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General orientations for the Implementation of the Peace Chair</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>National Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal for the Implementation of Peace education</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>National Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Semi-structured interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name interviewee(s)</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Location &amp; date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Group interview: Fe y Alegría coordinators</td>
<td>Bogotá, 29/09/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaime Bejumea Pamplona, Marcela Vega and Amanda Josefina Bravo Hernández</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Deidamia Garcia Quintero</td>
<td>Bogotá, 24/10/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinating team of the National Peace Education Program (EDUCAPAZ); Former</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adviser for coexistence and citizenship education to the Secretary of Education of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bogotá (SED, 2013-2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Camila Gómez Afanador</td>
<td>Bogotá, 16/11/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adviser to the Vice Ministry for preschool, elementary and secondary education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(National Ministry of Education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ana María Vélasquez Niño</td>
<td>Bogotá, 29/11/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate professor Universidad de los Andes (Faculty of Education). Co-author of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“General orientations for the implementation of the peace chair” and “Proposal for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the implementation of peace education”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Enrique Chaux</td>
<td>Bogotá, 29/11/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate professor Universidad de los Andes (Department of Psychology). Co-author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of “Basic Citizenship Competencies Standards”, “General orientations for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implementation of the peace chair” and “Proposal for the implementation of peace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>education”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the second stage, I analyzed the consumption conditions of these policy documents through **non-participant observations** (see Table 3) at the two secondary schools described in the previous chapter. I opted for a case study approach for reasons related to access (I gained access to the case study schools through the action research project I was involved in at *Universidad de Los Andes*) and feasibility (the type of research conducted requires in-depth familiarity with the research context, which is an intensive and time-consuming process). Specifically, I examined how the policies are implemented in practice during class sessions in which the students were working on their graduation projects. The challenge I encountered in this stage was that Colombia’s decentralized education system made it very difficult to trace the policy documents I had selected back to the practice in the schools. This, however, is an interesting finding in and of itself that I will reflect on in my analysis.

In order to obtain a better understanding of how the assumptions behind the policy documents manifest themselves in practice, I attended the annual education forum organized by Bogotá’s Secretary of Education as well as one of the camps on citizenship and peaceful coexistence for students and their teachers organized by the National Ministry of Education. All of these observations resulted in field notes and researcher-generated visuals for further analysis. As argued by Jerolmack and Khan (2014:202), they provide “a first-hand living record of what people actually do in their everyday lives.”, rather than relying on what people say they would do in such situations. In this sense, observations arguably provide more valid data about social behavior than other qualitative methods such as interviewing, since they manage to overcome the so-called ‘attitudinal fallacy’ (Jerolmack & Khan, 2014:202).

**Table 3: Non-participant observations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Name event</th>
<th>Organizing body</th>
<th>Location and date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Communication class</td>
<td>Escuela Mediática</td>
<td>Bogotá, 24/08/2017 (a); 31/08/2017 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Project management class</td>
<td>Colegio Venecia</td>
<td>Bogotá, 25/08/2017 (a): 31/08/2017 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>IV Encuentro de Experiencias Alternativas en Educación</em> (4th Meeting of Alternative Experiences in Education)</td>
<td>Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas</td>
<td>Bogotá, 24/08/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>Foro Educativo Distrital 2017: Ciudad Educadora para el reencuentro, la reconciliación y la paz</em> (Local education forum 2017: the city of education for reunion, reconciliation and peace)</td>
<td>Secretaría de Educación Distrital</td>
<td>Bogotá, 4/10/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite these apparent merits, however, observations often “fall short of explaining why people do what they do” (Jerolmack & Khan, 2014:202); leaving the researcher largely “guessing at meanings” (Geertz, 1973:20). In order to get acquainted with the respondents’ perspective, participatory methods were employed in the final stage of the data collection. I originally planned to use the so-called “photovoice” methodology, a participatory method theoretically grounded in the work of Freire which aims to enable people to (1) record and represent their everyday realities; (2) promote critical dialogue and knowledge about personal and community strengths and concerns; and (3) reach policymakers (Wang, 1997:370). Ultimately, “the images produced and the issues discussed and framed by people may stimulate social action” (Wang, 1997:373). Concretely, the photovoice methodology consists of two workshops. During the first workshop, the methodology is introduced to the participants and a group discussion about power and ethics takes place (Wang, 2006:149-150). During the second workshop, which can be seen as a focus group discussion, the participants present the photographs they deem most significant (Wang, 2006:151). On the basis of these presentations, the participants define and discuss the main issues, themes, or theories (Wang, 2006:152). Finally, the photographs with the strongest message are selected and shared with relevant policy-makers (Ibid.:153).

When I arrived in Bogotá, however, I learned that the students were already working on their own graduation projects (documentaries, applications, etc.). Similar to what is proposed by the photovoice methodology, through these projects the students defined and discussed the issues that are important to them and their communities. This made me decide to use these materials for analysis instead of asking them to produce new visuals. To get a better understanding of the student perspectives, I participated in developing, registering and evaluating the workshops on global citizenship education and cyber activism provided by Universidad de los Andes at the two schools as part of the action research project, as well as the two events during which the students from both schools exchanged experiences and presented their projects (see Table 4). Finally, at the end of the semester, the students shared their experiences during an evaluation session. Participatory workshops make use of the so-called “group effect”: the interaction which takes place between the respondents (Morgan, 1996:139). These discussions among participants can be an important advantage, as they allow the researcher to gather “valuable data on the extent of consensus and diversity among the participants” without having to speculate on (dis)agreement by comparing individual interviews (Morgan, 1996:139). It can also be considered a weakness, however, since it is often hard to assess to
what extent group dynamics have influenced the results and since some topics might be too sensitive to be discussed in group (Ibid.:140).

Table 4: Participatory workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Name event</th>
<th>Organizing body</th>
<th>Location and date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>GCED project workshops Escuela Mediática</td>
<td>Universidad de los Andes</td>
<td>Bogotá, 11/08/2017 (a); 15/09/2017 (b); 17/10/2017 (c); 16/11/2017 (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>GCED project workshop Colegio Venecia</td>
<td>Universidad de los Andes</td>
<td>Bogotá, 18/07/2017 (a); 20/10/2017 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Exchange workshops GCED project</td>
<td>Universidad de los Andes</td>
<td>Bogotá, 08/09/2017 (a); 27/11/2017 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Evaluation session Escuela Mediática</td>
<td>Universidad de los Andes</td>
<td>Bogotá, 7/11/2017 (a); 10/11/2017 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Evaluation session Colegio Venecia</td>
<td>Universidad de los Andes</td>
<td>Bogotá, 30/11/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATA ANALYSIS METHODS

As previously indicated in the theoretical framework, Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis was used as the methodological basis for analyzing the collected data. Concretely, Fairclough (2001) proposes the following five steps:

1. **Define research problem and question**
2. **Collect and prepare data**
3. **Analysis (I): Identify obstacles to the problem being tackled**
4. **Analysis (II): Identify potential ways forward**
5. **Critical reflections**

The first step (defining the research problem at hand) is a controversial undertaking for which the researcher needs to go “outside the text, using academic and non-academic sources to get a sense of its social context.” (Fairclough 2001:129). Fairclough (2001) argues that, since CDA aims to be both problem-based and emancipatory, the research problem should shed light on a certain social issue faced by the less well-off in society as well as providing possible ways of tackling the problem at hand. For this research, I draw on the academic literature on (global) citizenship education to argue that examining existing education policy and practice, to promote a critical and transformative
incorporation of GCED in the Colombian social order marked by structural violence, is a relevant research problem. Specifically, I aim to answer the following research questions:

**Table 5: Research questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAIN QUESTION:</th>
<th>To what extent does global citizenship education (GCED) in secondary schools in Bogotá contribute to social transformation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUB-QUESTIONS</td>
<td>• Which discourses surrounding GCED can be identified in international, national and local education policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How are these discourses adopted in classroom practice?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second step consisted of selecting the relevant policy texts introduced in the previous chapter and summarized in Table 1, keeping in mind that CDA allows for the analysis of written and spoken language as well as (audio)visual data (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002).

Step three consists of a) analyzing the discourse itself, both linguistically and regarding interdiscursivity; and b) analyzing the social order the discourse is located within in order to understand why the problem persists (Fairclough, 2001). The linguistic/interactional level draws on systemic functional linguistics (Halliday, 1994) to examine the function linguistic choices (e.g. words, grammatical structures, etc.) have in constructing a particular discourse. At the level of interdiscursivity, the competing discourses within a single order of discourse, in this case the discourse surrounding GCED as described in the theoretical framework, are examined (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002). This way, “it is possible to investigate where a particular discourse is dominant, where there is a struggle between different discourses, and which common-sense assumptions are shared by all the prevailing discourses.” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002:142). Importantly, this focus on order of discourse enables an analysis of the distribution of discourses, as not everyone might have access to all discourses equally (Ibid.).

The analysis of the social order considers possible reasons why the current social order “needs the problem at hand” (Fairclough, 2001:134). In other words, it examines the social context in which the order of discourse situates itself to understand why this order came to be the way it is and, importantly, what exactly in this social order is preventing the research problem at hand to be tackled. This requires the researcher to move beyond discourse analysis and “draw on other theories – for example, social or cultural theory – that shed light upon the social practice in question.” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002:86). The description of the Colombian context set out in the previous chapter provides a basis for answering these questions in the following analysis and discussion chapters.
Stage 4 of the analysis moves beyond a mere description of the status quo and its possible criticisms, “from negative to positive critique - identification of hitherto unrealized or not fully realized possibilities for change within the way things are” (Fairclough, 2001:126-127). Finally, “Stage 5 is the stage at which the analysis turns reflexively back on itself, asking for instance how effective it is as critique, whether it does or can contribute to social emancipation (...)” (Fairclough, 2001:127). These two final stages will inform the conclusions and recommendations provided in the final chapter.

METHODOLOGICAL REFLECTION: DATA VALIDATION AND LIMITATIONS

As noted by Bryman (2016:383), the criteria traditionally used to assess the quality of quantitative research - notably internal and external validity and reliability – need to be adapted in order to make sense for qualitative studies such as the present research. When it comes to internal validity, for example, several strategies can be employed to establish credibility in qualitative research. Firstly, coherent with the transformative paradigm underlying this research, the findings can be taken back to the participants for member-checking. Unfortunately the language barrier made this option unfeasible for this research. Secondly, as proposed by Guion (2002:1-2), the information obtained from different data sources and informants was compared and contrasted (data triangulation). Finally, disconfirming evidence was reported. Regarding internal reliability, I had plenty of opportunities to discuss my findings with Nicolás Aguilar, my local supervisor at the Universidad de los Andes, and assess to what extent our interpretations coincided. The issue of language deserves special attention at this point, as it is both a strength and a limitation. The fact that my Spanish was good enough to conduct my interviews in Spanish definitely increased the validity and reliability of my data. As this thesis is written in English, however, it is ultimately dependent on the subjective quality of the translations provided.

External validity (generalizability) can be seen as an important limitation of my research, as I have opted for a case study approach. The question, then, is to what extent the results obtained from this research can be transferred to other research locations, for example to other schools within and outside of Bogotá. In this regard, Yin (2008:10) remarks that case studies are often criticized for providing “little basis for scientific generalization”. He replies to this criticism by arguing that “case studies, like experiments, are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes (...) and the investigator’s goal is to expand and generalize theories” rather than achieving statistical generalization. In other words, the aim of this research is not to generalize to the entire city or country. Rather, the question is to what extent and under which circumstances the findings I obtained regarding the policy and practice of global citizenship education can be useful in other cases. Answering this question requires extensive research into the specific factors at play in the particular cases under analysis (e.g. private versus public schools, the effects of my presence, ...).
Rather than aiming for external reliability or confirmability, the crucial importance of positionality and reflexivity in critical research should be stressed. According to Jørgensen and Phillips (2002:183-184; 205), “critique implies that one representation of the world is replaced by another, better representation”, which might lead to an “asymmetrical relationship between those who criticize and those who are criticized” and even freeze and polarize the democratic debate it is aiming for. Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) attempt to solve this inherent contradiction by maintaining that, although “certain representations are more true than others, (...) what is true should not be determined by a scientific elite but by a public, democratic debate in which different representations are compared with one another in relation to both their content and their social consequences.” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002:181).

Nevertheless, CDA’s distinction between more and less ideological discourses and its use of conventional scientific methods, often without reflexive questioning, can be seen as problematic (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002:197-198). To deal with this inherent contradiction, Jørgensen and Phillips (2002:205) point to the crucial importance of positionality and reflexivity:

“Critical research should explicitly position itself and distance itself from alternative representations of reality on the grounds that it strives to do something specific for specific reasons. At the same time, critical research should make clear that the particular representation of reality it provides is just one among other possible representations, thus inviting further discussion.”

Following this argument, critique in this research is seen as a “positioned opening for discussion” (Ibid.:20). As I will reflect on in the following ethical considerations, it is particularly important to be aware of my own positionality in this research since I took an explicitly transformative stance while at the same time being associated with the Universidad de los Andes, one of Colombia’s most elitist private universities.

**ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Pragmatism has been criticized for allowing “whatever works” and therefore not paying sufficient attention to questions of ethics and values (Biddle & Schafft, 2015:323). Responding to that criticism, Morgan (2007:70) argues that the pragmatic emphasis on investigating what we choose to research and which methods we use to do so inevitably brings ethical questions to the forefront since it reminds us that “our values and our politics are always a part of who we are and how we act”. This is especially important when conducting critical research and thus deserves continued reflection throughout my discussion and analysis. I am aware that my positionality, specifically the fact that I was associated with
a very elitist, relatively conservative university like Universidad de los Andes, might have influenced the perceptions and expectations of my respondents. Whereas I did not explicitly stress the critical-transformative stance underlying my research to avoid influencing their responses, neither did I deceive them by representing my research as something other than what it is.

The axiological assumptions underlying this research are the three basic axiological principles of the transformative paradigm as defined by Mertens (2007): respect, beneficence and justice. To ensure this, participation in my research was voluntary and based on trust and informed consent: respondents were informed about the aims of my research, required to formally consent to their participation and could withdraw from the research at any time. I am convinced that many ethical dilemmas were avoided because my respondents were policy-makers rather than vulnerable groups. As the topic of global citizenship education was not perceived as sensitive, my respondents willingly provided me with information and some even explicitly encouraged me to use the name of their organization in my research (after I told them I would protect their confidentiality). As signed consent forms are very unusual in the Colombian context and might leave an unnecessary formal impression, I decided that (recorded) oral consent sufficed. Moreover, I was lucky enough to have Nicolás, an experienced researcher, as my local supervisor throughout my time in Colombia, as he informed me about the things I had to be aware of to avoid ethical issues to the best of my abilities. When I arrived, Nicolás was already working with the two schools I used as case studies and had gained their trust and consent. In short, I do not foresee any considerable issues regarding harm, lack of informed consent, invasion of privacy or deception.
CHAPTER V: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF GCED IN POLICY

The following chapter analyzes international, national and local GCED policy to answer the first sub-question of this research: “Which discourses surrounding GCED can be identified in international, national and local education policy?”. Following step three of Fairclough’s approach to critical discourse analysis, it examines which GCED discourses are articulated in the linguistic structure of the policy documents (the level of text) and their production process as explained in the interviews with policy-makers (the level of discursive practice). Thereby, this chapter starts to discuss whether the discourse on GCED promoted through these documents “reproduces or, instead, restructures the existing order of discourse and about what consequences this has for the broader social practice (the level of social practice)” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002:69).

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY: UNESCO’S VISION

Since 2013, UNESCO has been at the forefront of facilitating the international discussion on global citizenship education and the promotion of GCED around the world. As UNESCO is the driving force behind the global GCED policy agenda, assessing the dominant discourses behind UNESCO’s conception of GCED is of crucial importance to understand its potential impact. Specifically, this section analyzes publications and (audio)visual promotional material published by UNESCO on its GCED website (http://en.unesco.org/gced/resources). These sources were selected since they are the main way for UNESCO to communicate its perspective on GCED to the broader public. The four videos selected from UNESCO’s GCED playlist on YouTube (“Learning to live together”, “GCED to prevent violent extremism” and two “Global Citizenship Education” videos by the Global Education First Initiative) are especially relevant because they (1) explicitly deal with GCED rather than the related topics of education for sustainable development, human rights education or the prevention of violent extremism and (2) present UNESCO’s organizational view on GCED rather than the view of, for example, individual participants in the Forum on GCED.

THE DISCOURSE ON GLOBALIZATION

Linguistically, the “learning to live together” video uses personification to build a rapport between the creators and the audience (“We live in a globalized world.”; “We can all be global citizens.”). The ending of the video uses a conversational style to strengthen this apparently personal and equal relationship
by asking the audience to engage in conversation with UNESCO (“Tell us what it means to you...”).

Similarly, the “GCED to prevent violent extremism” and “Global Citizenship Education” (Global Education First Initiative, 2015b) videos make use of rhetorical questions to stimulate discussion (“But what next? How to build the defenses of peace in the minds of women and men?”; “We need global solutions, but where do we find them?”; “That’s important, but is it enough?”; “What if education was transformative?”). The infographics also use personification and questions (“We need to re-think the role and relevance of education.”; “How can we effectively implement Global Citizenship Education?”; “What can you do?”; “What needs to change in education?”) to stimulate audience engagement.

The use of questions and personification, however, is not intended to stimulate actual discussion, as the authors go on to present exactly what lessons, teachers, learners and the learning environment need to encompass in order to provide the enabling conditions for the kind of education that “we need”. On the contrary: the use of obligational modalities which is particularly prevalent in the 2014 infographic, while increasing the sense of urgency, leaves no room for alternatives. The videos and infographics use several metaphors to strengthen this message (see Figure 2): GCED is presented as bringing light into the darkness, as sowing/watering/spreading the seeds of peace and putting out the fire of violent extremism, as literally (through e.g. ICT) and figuratively bringing the world together, as providing the keys/opening the door to a new, better world. The first Global Education First Initiative video, set in the year 2030, features an African elderly man telling the children of the imaginary village Mannya about the transformation that took place when people starting identifying themselves as global citizens:

“But Muse, what caused the great shift? - The people came together, much like we are gathered tonight, and it changed everything. We began to see ourselves as equals, as global citizens. Every single child was able to go to school. The world came alive. Humanity advanced.” (Global Education First Initiative, 2015a)
In short, the UNESCO infographics and videos aim to ‘sell’ global citizenship education as the solution to the global challenges the world is currently facing and the path to a peaceful, sustainable future. To do this, UNESCO makes use of ‘commodity advertising’ discourse: GCED is branded with its own logo and several marketing techniques are used in the infographics and videos. The “learning to live together” and “preventing violent extremism” videos, for example, use the so-called ‘weasel word’ “help” (“Global Citizenship Education can help us live together”; “It helps learners think critically”; “Education can help prevent violent extremism”; “It helps young people challenge their assumptions”). Weasel words such as “help” or “virtually” avoid making a direct statement or promise: “once the advertisement starts with ‘help’, it can develop to make whatever (insincere) promise or claim, because ‘help’ qualifies all the follow-up of the sentence.” (Cap, 2002:45).

In UNESCO’s conception, GCED marks the transition between a world characterized by global challenges (climate change, violent extremism, poverty, migration, etc.) and a world in which we use our interconnectedness to our advantage to achieve quality education for all, peace and sustainable development (see Figure 3). At the basis of this transition lies a sense of belonging to a common humanity based on universal values (human rights, respect for diversity, ...) and an unquestioned belief in education and (technological) progress.

Whereas UNESCO does not draw heavily on “economic or market-driven rationales” (VanderDussen Toukan, 2017:62), this vision is hyper-globalist in the sense that it advocates for global citizenship as “a singular process encompassing all regions of the world and all aspects of human and planetary life and is the solution to poverty, inequality and all other socials ills.” (Torres, 2015:265). The prevalent message that “We can all be global citizens” is problematic from a critical perspective because it ignores the “dark side” of modernity. As stressed by Andreotti (2006:43), “Globalization is (…) an asymmetrical process in which not only its fruits are divided up unequally, but also in which the very possibility of ‘being global’ is unbalanced”. UNESCO, however, suggests that global challenges affect everyone around the world equally and we are therefore equally responsible for solving them,
thereby failing to recognize the power imbalances and oppression which often caused these challenges in the first place.

THE DISCOURSE ON CITIZENSHIP AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

“The goal of global citizenship education is to empower learners to engage and assume active roles both locally and globally to face and resolve global challenges and ultimately to become proactive contributors to a more just, peaceful, tolerant, inclusive, secure and sustainable world.” (UNESCO 2016a:2)

UNESCO (2015a:15) distinguishes between three conceptual dimensions of global citizenship education: a cognitive dimension concerning “learners’ acquisition of knowledge, understanding and critical thinking”; a socio-emotional dimension referring to “the learners’ sense of belonging to a common humanity, sharing values and responsibilities, empathy, solidarity and respect for differences and diversity.”; and a behavioral dimension which “expects the learners to act responsibly at local, national and global levels for a more peaceful and sustainable world.”. Within the framework proposed by Westheimer and Kahne (2004), the type of citizenship promoted by UNESCO can be described as participatory (someone who participates actively in society within the given structures).

The recent introduction of “combatting violent extremism” into UNESCO’s GCED discourse, however, indicates that this discourse is changing. A review of the UNESCO publications on GCED reveals that, before the end of 2015, violent extremism was not used by UNESCO in relation to GCED. A news article published on the UNESCO (2015) website on November 6th 2015 explains the role of the United States in putting violent extremism on the UNESCO agenda and explicitly linking the promotion of GCED to the anti-terrorism and international security discourse. This is a clear example of how the boundaries of UNESCO’s GCED are shifting through new combinations of discourses, a phenomenon labelled interdiscursivity by Fairclough (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002:73).

The violent extremism discourse frames young people as the problem rather than the solution, thereby attributing societal issues to individual irresponsibility and risking to promote government surveillance and the targeting of specific groups (Nieto, 2017). In terms of citizenship, the emphasis on preventing violent extremism encourages personally responsibility (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004) focused on compliance, value transmission and socioemotional anger management (Nieto, 2017). As argued by Novelli (2017:848), “the security logics of interventions in education (...) reflect a broader reluctance on the part of its architects to openly engage in discussion and debate as to the root causes of conflict”.
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When it comes to pedagogy, the infographics and videos explicitly resist the neoliberal, human capital discourse which increasingly requires “fast, predictable and easily measurable outcomes that provide a sense of immediate reward and satisfaction to client-learners” (Andreotti 2011, 396). Instead, UNESCO stresses the need to “commit to an education that matters, and not only to one that can be measured” (2015 infographic) and stresses the importance of non-and informal learning, dialogue and stimulating learning environments when putting GCED in practice. VanderDussen Toukan (2017:62) argues that, in some sense, UNESCO’s explicit distancing from the prevalent neoliberal approach to education “could be seen as an effort to buck the neoliberal trend often found in more state-authorized forms of citizenship education, by recognizing the inherent contradictions of a competitive market-driven framework to foster the kind of values and attitudes premised on peace building and sustainability.”.

In order to leave room for diverse and context-dependent perspectives on how to achieve these aims, UNESCO purposely refrains from creating a global GCED curriculum (UNESCO, 2016a). In 2015, however, it published a document called “Global Citizenship Education: Topics and Learning Objectives”, which offers some pedagogical guidance by specifying key learning outcomes, learner attributes, topics and objectives of GCED by age/level of education as well as providing advice on how to implement global citizenship education in practice. For example, UNESCO stresses that a student-centered pedagogy and experiential teaching methods are required for teaching GCED, which has clear implications for how assessment is to be approached. UNESCO (2016a) recommends focusing on the learning process rather than outcomes. Whereas the cognitive dimension can be assessed through regular tests, “[t]he assessment of the acquisition of socio-emotional and behavioral skills and competences may require (...) participatory assessments (...) such as assignments, demonstrations, observations, projects and other performance tasks.” (Ibid.:4). Independent of the preferred approach to delivery, UNESCO (Ibid.) considers it to be of crucial importance that the core values promoted by GCED are reflected in and around the (school) environment.

Figure 4: Images from the “Learning to live together” and “GCED to prevent violent extremism” video
While these guidelines point to a **human rights approach** to education, VanderDussen Toukan (2017:62) concludes that the breadth of UNESCO’s approach to GCED leaves the extent to which it can be considered transformative largely ambiguous, “either to invite educators and policy makers to create space for critical engagement with social justice issues or to fill in their own agendas for neoliberal market competition” (VanderDussen Toukan, 2017:62). Thus, to assess to what extent GCED is being ‘hijacked’ by the existing social order and, as a consequence, whether the neoliberal/personally responsible, human rights/participatory or transformative/justice-oriented discourses are stressed in practice, it is crucial to examine the implementation of UNESCO’s GCED discourse at the national and local level.

**NATIONAL EDUCATION POLICY: THE VISION OF COLOMBIA’S MINISTRY OF EDUCATION**

At the national level, combatting violence and promoting peaceful relationships through citizenship education have been an explicit government priority in Colombia since the 1990s. This section will analyze two milestones in this process: the National Citizenship Competencies Standards published by the Ministry of Education in 2004, and the *Cátedra para la Paz* (Peace Chair) introduced through Law 1732 and Decree 1038, issued in 2014 and 2015 respectively. The National Citizenship Competencies Standards outline the learning outcomes individual students need to possess (what they need to “know and know how to do”) in order to be considered “good citizens”. Law 1732 and Decree 1038, on the other hand, introduce peace education as a mandatory subject “in all educational institutions of preschool, elementary and secondary education, public and private” (Decree 1038, 2015:2).

The Citizenship Competencies Standards were written in 2003 under the rightwing conservative government of Álvaro Uribe and his minister of education Cecilia María Vélez, who had previously been Bogotá’s Secretary for Education. They were the result of a short, intensive process led by prominent academics in the field of civil education. Similarly, the Peace Chair law and decree were issued top-down with very little consultation with teachers, or the Ministry of Education (Chaux, personal communication, November 29th, 2017). In 2016, the National Ministry of Education published a document with general orientations for the implementation of the Peace Chair as well as a more specific proposal for curricular guidelines and classroom activities. Importantly, these documents introduce a global perspective in the Colombian school curriculum by discussing “peace building and post-conflict processes around the world and coexistence and peace challenges in a globalized world” (Camargo, 2016:8). Due to Colombia’s decentralized education system, the implementation of the Citizenship Competencies Standards and the Peace Chair is left entirely up to the regional Secretaries of Education.
When comparing the citizenship education in the curricula of Colombia, Chile, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Mexico and Paraguay, Cox et al. (2014) found that the Colombian curriculum largely ignores the wider context (e.g. sustainable development, globalization, etc.). The Citizenship Competencies Standards touch upon the global perspective in the final grades by expecting its students to link global issues to their local environment and participate in local, national or global initiatives which defend human rights and the environment. Similarly, the Peace Chair guidelines urge students to compare peace processes in different countries and protect the environment, with the explicit aim that this will help them to “understand the connections between their local environment and the globalized world (...) and identify as a citizen of the world, with responsibilities that go beyond the national borders.” (Ministerio de Educación, 2016b:207). They introduce war and peace, protection of the environment and human rights as global issues, without explicitly linking these topics to structural power inequalities and exclusion. Thus, both the Citizenship Competencies Standards and the peace chair guidelines present globalization as a reality the students need to understand and adapt to without being explicitly hyper- or anti-globalist. This focus on adaptation, however, implies a hyper-globalist believe in globalization from above.

The National Citizenship Competencies Standards stress the importance of knowing, respecting and positively valuing the law, which applies to everyone equally, even if one disagrees with some of the ruling norms. Students are required to understand that, in order to guarantee peaceful coexistence, the state has to count on a monopoly on the administration of justice and the use of force. Furthermore, students are expected to “express empathy towards groups or persons whose rights have been violated” and “understand that acting corruptly and using public goods for personal benefit affects all members of society” (Ministerio de Educación Nacional, 2004:25). Analyzed through the framework proposed by Westheimer and Kahne (2004), underlying this discourse is the idea of personally responsible citizenship which assumes that “to solve social problems and improve society, citizens must have good character; they must be honest, responsible and law-abiding members of society”. This discourse is reinforced by the quotes and imagery used: the pictures in the Citizenship Competencies Standards refer to knowledge/understanding (books) and peaceful coexistence (holding hands) and the document contains quotes such as “That’s how, step by step... I am achieving it”.
To get their voice heard and avoid abuses, the Citizenship Competencies Standards also expect students to be **participatory citizens** who make use of the democratic participation mechanisms granted to them by the constitution and participate in initiatives or projects which promote non-violence, human rights and protection of the environment. Finally, they encourage students to critically analyze and debate current events, policy decisions and omissions, cases of discrimination and exclusion as well as the general human rights situation (an indication of **justice-oriented citizenship**). In short, the Citizenship Competencies Standards predominantly promote personally responsible citizenship. Simultaneously, however, they acknowledge justice-oriented and participatory citizenship by promoting critical thinking and actively participating within the established normative system respectively.

In their comparison of citizenship education policy across Latin America, Cox et al. (2014:21,23) found that the Colombian curriculum stresses values such as diversity, solidarity, common good and social cohesion, while values of equality, social justice and equity receive considerably less attention. In particular, the Colombian curriculum stands out because of its emphasis on the first priority outlined in the Citizenship Competencies Program: *convivencia*, which can be translated as “peaceful coexistence” (Cox et al., 2014:19). This priority aims to counter the risk of developing aggressive behavior as a result of the normalization of violence in Colombian society by teaching children how to establish caring relationships and resolve conflicts constructively (Chaux, 2009:86-87). While this is arguably an important focus in Colombian society, following Westheimer and Kahne (2004:243) this focus on individual character and behavior cannot be used as an excuse to avoid dealing with more political/collective causes and solutions.

The emphasis on **civil** (coexistence) rather than civic (political) participation is coherent with a general trend among Latin American citizenship curricula (Cox et al., 2014:34). Cox et al. (2014:27-28) found that the Colombian citizenship curriculum is heavily rights-based, but makes no mention of the corresponding responsibilities, largely ignoring topics related to the institutions of a democratic
political system (e.g. the electoral system, decision-making and accountability mechanisms, etc.). This apparent lack of addressing the relationship with the institution ‘State’ and democratic political procedures can be problematic especially in the Latin American context marked by social inequality and institutional weaknesses, as these issues are “essential for societal cohesion as well as the functioning of the national-level democratic political system.” (Ibid.:35).

This focus on individual responsibility and *convivencia* while ignoring political responsibility and the wider historical and socio-political context becomes especially visible in the current “*Gen Ciudadano*” (“Citizen Gene”) campaign developed by the Ministry of Education. Through this campaign, “the Ministry takes on the challenge to make education a tool that promotes respect, confidence, peaceful coexistence and empathy, that is, to help in the formation of good citizens.” (Ministerio de Educación Nacional, 2018a). The premise underlying this campaign is that every person has a “Citizenship Gene” that is activated when he or she acts with respect for others. By choosing to activate this gene, every person and every family has the opportunity — and responsibility - to contribute to building a new, peaceful country.

THE DISCOURSE ON EDUCATION

Through the so-called *Revolución Educativa* (Educational Revolution), Colombia aimed to transform its education system by complementing the traditional focus on knowledge - *saber* - with “*saber hacer*” (“knowing how to do something”) (Ministerio de Educación Nacional, 2004). When Cecilia Maria Velez became Minister for Education, competencies standards had been developed for mathematics and languages and she decided to add citizenship and the natural and social sciences to this list (Chaux, personal communication, November 29th, 2017). The guidelines published by the Ministry of Education promote the human rights approach by stressing the importance of creating a democratic and participatory learning environment:

“It’s crucial that all adults involved in education aim to create truly democratic environments, both at home and at school, to foster the practice of citizenship competencies. If we want contexts for democratic participation, we have to take explicit and conscious decisions to offer those in daily life: spaces that allow for participation and decision-making about real issues, every day, from the moment a child starts attending school” (*Ministerio de Educación Nacional*, 2004:10)

Like for the other subjects, the Citizenship Competencies Standards are evaluated nationally through standardized multiple choice tests (the so-called *pruebas SABER* or “knowing” tests). This focus on standardization and individual learning outcomes has been criticized for promoting a
neoliberal, human capital approach to education following the international push for marketization and privatization (Álvarez, 2003). In his book La contra “revolución educativa” (the educational counter-revolution), Álvarez (2003) argues that, rather than promoting radical change, the “educational revolution” under Uribe can be seen as a neoconservative counter-revolution allowing the state to use education as a technocratic instrument for social control. This focus on competition and privatization becomes especially visible through the so-called “Ser pilo paga” (“Being smart pays off”) programme (Ministerio de Educación Nacional, 2018b), which rewards the best-performing public school students with a scholarship for attending private universities instead of investing in public higher education.

LOCAL EDUCATION POLICY: THE VISION OF BOGOTÁ’S SECRETARY OF EDUCATION

The Citizenship and Coexistence Education Project (Proyecto de Educación para la Convivencia y la Ciudadanía, PECC) developed by Bogotá’s Secretary for Education Oscar Sánchez (2012-2015) was the local answer to these national guidelines. In stark contrast to the somewhat rushed, top-down creation of the National Citizenship Competencies Standards, the PECC materials were developed through an extensive consultation process involving hundreds of teachers and rooted in a well-funded project which included comprehensive, school-based strategies to combat violence and promote active citizenship (Fe y Alegría, personal communication, September 29th, 2017). When developing the PECC, Bogotá’s Secretary for Education looked for community organizations that shared their vision and could offer the necessary expertise to implement the project. To develop and test the teaching materials, the SED chose the Colombian office of Fe y Alegría, an international network of locally based organisations providing education to the most disadvantaged members of society, as its implementing partner (Fe y Alegría, personal communication, September 29th, 2017).

At the time the PECC was being developed in Bogotá, the city was governed by the progressive, social democrat mayor Gustavo Petro. Although Juan Manuel Santos had by then taken over the presidential office from Uribe, the teachers unions vividly remembered their tensions with Vélez’s former administration. Moreover, Uribe’s government had left a bitter aftertaste, notably his ties with paramilitary groups and involvement in various human rights violations (e.g. illegal interception of opposition members). Santos’ peace talks with the FARC clearly differentiated him from his predecessor in political terms, but Vélez’s legacy in terms of educational policy (including the citizenship competencies standards) was left surprisingly intact. In this light, the PECC can be seen as an “act of resistance” by which the Petro administration wanted to differentiate itself from the national governments.
THE DISCOURSE ON GLOBALIZATION

Contrary to the National Citizenship Competencies Standards and Peace Chair guidelines, The PECC explicitly acknowledges the problematic effects of globalization: it discusses the Colombian conflict, structural inequalities and global power relations (income inequality, racism, discrimination against women, etc.) within their historical context (e.g. colonialism) (Fe y Alegría, 2014). In order to denounce these injustices and demand universal human rights, the PECC invites students to ask the questions “What do I have to do myself? What do I have to do together with others? What do I have to do with those further away?” (Fe y Alegría, personal communication, September 29th, 2017). This transformationist view on global citizenship which promotes globalization from below is summarized by the following quote from the lesson materials: “Constructing a more just and equitable social order is a task that can and should be done locally, but it will not be sustainable unless it is developed from a systemic and global perspective” (Fe y Alegría, 2014:292).

THE DISCOURSE ON Citizenship AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Similarly to the Citizenship Competencies Standards, the PECC aims for citizens who take responsibility for their actions and actively participate in democratic spaces. Contrary to the Citizenship Competencies Standards, however, It takes justice-oriented citizenship a step further by inviting students to “collectively question, reinterpret and propose alternatives to” the prevalent norms instead of relying on the law/state to decide what is just and what is not (Secretaría de Educación Distrital, 2014b:50). As they “discuss the relation and tension between law and justice” and learn to “differentiate between the legitimate expression of civil disobedience and delinquency”, students are not expected to act within the established systems and societal structures (Secretaría de Educación Distrital, 2014b:52). Instead, they are invited to actively change these structures by resisting the norms and laws they consider to be unjust through acts of civil disobedience (Ibid.).

Again, this discourse is strengthened by the chosen imagery and quotes: the PECC portrays a diverse group of youngsters organizing and mobilizing for action and uses street art, a symbol of civil disobedience, as a recurring theme throughout its material. Quotes include “Let’s organize and mobilize! Join the cause!” and “A paper democracy doesn’t suffice for me”. In this light, defending human rights is not just understood as an individual responsibility but also as a collective claim and a fundamental responsibility of the state. Likewise, conflict is seen as a desirable and opportunity for change, a “manifestation of the pluralism of ideologies and worldviews, unequal power relations and diverse interests” rather than a problem to be managed (Fe y Alegría, 2014:36). Thus, compared to the
responsible, obedient behavior and citizen participation promoted by the Citizenship Competencies Standards, the PECC promotes a more justice-oriented citizenship.

Figure 6: Images from the PECC material (Fe y Alegría, 2014:280; 289; 305)

THE DISCOURSE ON EDUCATION

The educational approach underlying the PECC, refered to as Reflection - Action - Participation (RAP), is directly based on Freire’s critical pedagogy (Secretaría de Educación Distrital, 2014a). The PECC thus introduces social justice discourse by explicitly drawing on critical pedagogy and social justice theorists – labelled manifest intertextuality by Fairclough (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002). Aiming for social transformation and empowerment, the PECC describes social transformation as the awareness that history is not predefined but rather actively shaped through dialogue and collective action (Fe y Alegría, 2014). Empowerment, then, is understood as the capacity to understand yourself as a social and political agent who has the responsibility to speak up rather than conforming/submitting to the status quo (Fe y Alegría, 2014). This requires both ‘civic’ democratic participation and ‘civil’ personal socio-emotional development (e.g. learning to accept what is different).

To stress that these personal competencies do not exist in a vacuum, the PECC prefers Marta Nussbaum’s term capabilities (Nussbaum, 2011) rather than competencies (Fe y Alegría, personal communication, September 29th, 2017). It thereby explicitly situates the individual within a political, social and economic environment which can facilitate or obstruct the practice of these competencies. Its learning objectives are divided into three levels: the relationship with oneself (personal), the relationship with others (interpersonal, societal) and the relationship with the wider social world (systemic). Besides personal development, then, the PECC proposes societal and systemic citizenship.
practices. Contrary to the Citizenship Competencies Standards, these practices are formulated in first-person plural (e.g. we discuss...) rather than singular (e.g. I participate in...), thereby stressing co-responsibility and collective action rather than personal responsibility towards the state.

The main authors of the PECC and the Citizenship Competencies Standards recognize this difference in emphasis: “What we see is that the Citizenship Competencies Standards tend to emphasize the individual whereas capabilities implies a stronger emphasis on context. But in the citizenship competencies we do mention the importance of the environment, just like they also discuss individual capabilities within the capabilities approach.” (Chaux, personal communication, November 29th, 2017). Comparing the human rights approach promoted on a national level with the social justice approach advocated by the PECC, however, suggests that this “difference in emphasis” indicates a more fundamental difference in pedagogy by which Bogotá aimed to differentiate itself from the national government (Fe y Alegria, personal communication, September 29th, 2017). In this spirit, the PECC promotes alternative forms of evaluation - the so-called pruebas SER or “being” tests which take into account the school context – to complement the national, standardized SABER tests (Fe y Alegria, personal communication, September 29th, 2017).

As usual in Colombia, however, the end of Petro’s term as mayor did imply a sudden change in the capital’s educational policy and the end of the PECC as a comprehensive project (Fe y Alegria, personal communication, September 29th, 2017). Traces of the project are still visible on the city’s website, but the political views of current mayor Peñalosa, who has been criticized for criminalizing urban art forms such as grafitti, in many ways oppose Petro’s. As the previous political commitment to the project has not been continued, the PECC risks becoming yet another guideline added to the inconsistent pile of documents Colombian teachers have to find their way around.

THE ORDER OF GCED DISCOURSE IN INTERNATIONAL, NATIONAL AND LOCAL POLICY

On the basis of the critical discourse analysis of GCED policy documents by UNESCO, the Colombian Ministry of Education and the Secretary of Education of Bogotá presented in this chapter, an answer to the first sub-question (Which discourses surrounding GCED can be identified in international, national and local education policy?) can be formulated.

First of all, the analysis showed that none of the analyzed documents advocate openly for an economically-focused, neoliberal approach to GCED. Whereas the approach taken by UNESCO and the Colombian government show traces of both transformative and neoliberal GCED, the moral-humanistic discourse is the most dominant. Rather than recognizing diverse processes of globalization, they propose “the idea of a common humanity heading towards a common “forward” (Andreotti & Pashby, 2013:425). Rather than reflecting critically on structural inequalities, both UNESCO and the
Citizenship Competencies Standards merely advocate for an awareness of global issues and stress individually responsible citizenship from a humanitarian perspective while ignoring political responsibility. Finally, neither UNESCO nor the Colombian government explicitly promote critical pedagogical approaches to GCED.

The PECC developed in Bogotá, on the other hand, shows what a transformative global citizenship education project can look like. Firstly, it explicitly assumes the current social order and norms as contingent and debatable rather than stable and unquestionable. Starting from the interdependence between the personal, the interpersonal and the systemic rather than global issues, it introduces global citizenship as the possibility to reimagine and change the unjust social order through collective action. Moreover, the learning process of the students is evaluated through alternative evaluation methods which take into account the learning process and context, rather than standardized multiple choice tests aimed to measure learning outcomes. Finally, the PECC materials were part of a coherent, well-funded strategy which was created through an elaborate consultation process with teachers, rather than imposed “top down”.

The fact that Petro’s commitment to transformative citizenship education has not been continued, however, indicates the particularly challenging political environment for promoting a transformative GCED agenda. The current social order, characterized by a lack of political continuity and an outcome-oriented push for standardization and efficiency, arguably favors the kind of “soft” GCED promoted by UNESCO and the National Ministry of Education since this kind of education does not challenge the status quo and tends to close down room for alternatives (Andreotti & Pashby, 2013:426). Thus, the current order of GCED discourse traced in the policy documents risks reproducing the existing inequalities. As stressed by Andreotti (2011:395), however, “between enunciation (e.g. of a neoliberal educational agenda) and interpretation in a specific context (e.g. teachers ‘on the ground’) lies a space of negotiation and creative opportunity that is always pregnant with (risky) possibilities.”. The way in which teachers and students in Bogotá use this space is examined in the following chapter.
CHAPTER VI: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF GCED IN PRACTICE

Having established the dominant discourses underlying international, national and local GCED policy, this chapter examines which GCED discourses are articulated in the process of “consuming” these policy documents in the classroom. It thereby answers the second sub-question underlying this research: how are these discourses adopted in classroom practice? To do this, observations, interviews and participatory workshops were conducted by Nicolás Aguilar and myself as part of the GCED-focused participatory action research project at Colegio Venecia and Escuela Mediática, respectively a public and private secondary school in Bogotá. Besides the discussion at the level of discursive practice, this chapter contributes to answering the main research question by discussing to what extent the discourse on GCED found in practice contributes to social transformation (the level of social practice).

GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AT COLEGIO VENECIA I.E.D.

Colegio Venecia is a public institution educating over 5000 students in the less privileged South of Bogotá. As outlined in the research context, the decision making procedures and power relations at Colegio Venecia can be described as hierarchical, top-down. Students are required to wear the school’s uniform and strictly obey the rules. Twice a week, the students of the final two years of high school (10th and 11th grade) attend additional classes focusing on audio-visual media, communication, programming and project management as part of a program supported by the local government called Educación Media Integral (EMI). The EMI program aims to “foster the development of soft skills and socio-emotional skills, which allow them to define a life project coherent to the personal interests of the students, their families, their territories, in harmony with the demands of the productive sector and the available training opportunities” (Secretaría de Educación Distrital, 2017). As their final project for these subjects, the students of grado 11 develop a portfolio, workshops, apps and other digital tools around a topic of their choice (e.g. promoting healthy food, sports, art, technology, ...).
THE DISCOURSE ON GLOBALIZATION

“The world is more and more global, so digital platforms allow you to venture more into this global world and to be more competitive, let’s say you can make more progress because of digital media. (...) Today all institutions are venturing into this technological world, this world of social networks, this world of ICT. (...) So yes, it is necessary that we start to adapt to this world together in order to move forward.” (Group interview with Colegio Venecia alumni, personal communication, 20/9/2017)

In the majority of the projects developed by Colegio Venecia students, the global dimension was limited to an article in the project portfolio that shows that the issue also exists in other parts of the world. When globalization was mentioned, it was in the context of global competition. One of the alumni, for example, described the aim of his project on foreign language acquisition as contributing to “the quest for a country that is more multicultural and more competitive linguistically” (Group interview with Colegio Venecia alumni, personal communication, 20/9/2017). When asked for the link between his project on improving technological skills and global citizenship, another student argued that “the digital world is the new method of global communication” (Evaluation Colegio Venecia, personal communication, 30/11/2017). Rather than providing room for critical reflection, Colegio Venecia takes neoliberal globalization from above (Torres, 2015) – marked by international competition and technology - as a given context that students need to adapt to. The emphasis put on technological skills in the EMI program can be understood in this context.

THE DISCOURSE ON CITIZENSHIP AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

“A global citizen is a hero that manages to reach his/her objectives with a bit of knowledge and reasoning. (S)he has the skills to reach his/her goal and is capable of getting what (s)he wants.” (First GCED workshop Colegio Venecia, personal communication, 18/7/2017)

“A good citizen is a person who takes care of the place where he/she lives, who defends his/her roots, who keeps his/her city clean and acts in a morally correct way towards society.” (First GCED workshop Colegio Venecia, personal communication, 18/7/2017)
When asked for their interpretation of global citizenship during the first workshop of the project, several of the Colegio Venecia students stressed individual responsibility for success and character traits such as having an entrepreneurial spirit and being respectful and honest. This is reflected in the most prevalent words in their definitions: besides *mundo* (world) and *sociedad* (society), the words that were mentioned most often (*ser capaz*, *habilidades*, *valores*) are being capable, skills and values (see Figure 7). Thus, coherent with the national discourse on citizenship, Colegio Venecia fosters **personally responsible citizenship** (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004). This becomes visible in the final projects, which stress individual responsibility (e.g. promoting healthier and more sustainable lifestyles) and aim to develop individual competencies (e.g. improving (technological) literacy) while ignoring the larger political causes and responsibilities of the societal issue they are addressing.

**THE DISCOURSE ON EDUCATION**

“The EMI program has given us a broad knowledge, enabling us to make our way through an extremely competitive world. We leave school with “a plus”, to put it that way. I’ve seen students enter in tenth grade being really timid, but they leave eleventh grade and they are completely different persons. People who are capable of speaking in front of 1000 people!” (Focus group with Colegio Venecia alumni, personal communication, 20/9/2017)

Colegio Venecia alumni express the benefits of the EMI program in terms of strengthening students’ individual competencies to improve their competitiveness, helping them to get into better universities and get better jobs. Throughout the tenth grade, the program focuses on professional orientation and
the students are encouraged to link their final project to their potential careers. Coherent with this human capital approach, the project portfolio is required to consist of several standardized, graded assignments (e.g. questionnaires, a context analysis, etc.). Moreover, participation in the GCED workshops was reserved for the best performing students and the reward of receiving a certificate of Universidad de los Andes, a prestigious private university, was stressed repeatedly.

GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AT ESCUELA MEDIÁTICA

In contrast to Colegio Venecia, Escuela Mediática is a small private school in the historic city center of Bogotá which provides alternative education to the intellectual and artistic elite of the city. The school has a strong focus on communication and a horizontal structure in which the students are encouraged to express themselves and voice their opinions. The students do not wear uniforms, which is exceptional in Colombia, and rules (e.g. arriving on time) are not observed strictly. As their final project, the students of grado 11 work in groups to create a short documentary on an issue of their choice, which ranged from environmental concerns (e.g. the mining industry and the ban on plastic bags) to the objectification of women in advertisement and the loss of indigenous knowledge. Four documentaries were developed in total, respectively called “Ecoreflexiones” (“Ecoreflections”), “Territorio Muisca, Cuna de la Vida” (“Muisca territory, the source of life”), La belleza (“Beauty”) and “La voz de un pueblo” (“The voice of a people”). Like the students of Colegio Venecia, the Escuela Mediática students developed their projects independently with the support of their teacher (an experienced filmmaker) where needed.

THE DISCOURSE ON GLOBALIZATION

“It is important to understand the concept of global citizenship not as this process of globalization that requires all of us to keep our practices really homogeneous, and think in exactly this manner, follow this one way. Insofar as we are different we can learn many things, we can construct ourselves in different ways.” (“Ecoreflexiones” group, personal communication, November 7th, 2017)

“We know that we’re living in a time of cultural globalization and a lot of things reach us via the internet, but we also need to acknowledge that indigenous populations used to live and still live on this land. If we don’t want to lose their wisdom, we should recognize and revive our indigenous heritage.” (“Territorio Muisca, Cuna de la Vida” group, personal communication, November 7th, 2017)
“Global citizenship cannot be something that stays in the big cities. It is very important that we start identifying ourselves with the countryside, so we can understand it, value it and take care of it. We should think of our natural abundance not only as national patrimony but as patrimony of the planet.” (“La voz de un pueblo” group, personal communication, November 10th, 2017)

In their reflections, several groups shared that their documentary expresses the need to recognize diverse globalizations rather than enforcing one globalization from above. This includes a call for cognitive justice by looking beyond the “big city bubble” and acknowledging the alternative perspectives offered by indigenous groups and villagers.

“One would expect the villagers to take a very radical position against the multinational companies that are coming. (...) But what we found, to our great satisfaction, is that more than saying which part or structure of the government is bad, the population has a very clear, constructive position with respect to the exploration and exploitation of the zone (...)：“More than the multinationals what we want is life, we want water, we want to continue with this land and to know the importance our resources have in the country.”” (“La voz de un pueblo” group, personal communication, November 10th, 2017)

“The referendum was an initiative taken by the village, not by a lawyer or some highly educated person from Bogotá who sees the situation from the bubble of the city. It was a proposal from the people for the people. (...) They don’t just stay stuck in the problems but work towards a solution.” (“La voz de un pueblo” group, personal communication, November 10th, 2017)

In this spirit, the documentary “La voz de un pueblo” (“The voice of a people”) tells the story of Pasca, a town located 70 kilometers outside of Bogotá. From the perspective of the villagers, it discusses the threat posed by the mining industry. The Escuela Mediática students found that the situation in Pasca provides an inspiring example of transformationist globalization from below: rather than waiting passively for the mining companies to arrive, the villagers raise their voice to protect the natural resources in their community.
“A global citizen is an individual belonging to a society, who is born with certain rights known as human rights.” (First GCED workshop Escuela Mediática, personal communication, 11/8/2017)

“The empirical work with the people there was also fundamental in this project. Let’s say there always has to be a contact, a real contact with the situations, with the problems, to go beyond the texts or the news but actually going there and living it, putting yourself in the situation and understanding it from within.” (“La voz de un pueblo” group, personal communication, November 10th, 2017)

Figure 8: Word Cloud showing the most prevalent words in the definitions of global citizenship proposed during the first GCED workshop at Escuela Mediática (11/8/2017)

When defining (global) citizenship, several of the Escuela Mediática students recognize the importance of personal responsibility in the sense of having a respectful attitude towards other citizens and towards the established rules and laws. In contrast to the importance attributed to individual success and entrepreneurial spirit at Colegio Venecia, however, the Escuela Mediática students stressed the human rights the state should guarantee for its citizens, as well as interaction with the environment. Again, this reflected in the prevalence of the words derechos (rights) and ciudad, territorio, conjunto (city, territory, together) (see Figure 8). As becomes apparent in the following discussion on education, this interaction with the environment is exactly the focus of the documentaries.
“It was a learning experience for all of us to understand how every single one of us is constructed through experiences that make us identify with a certain territory, community, person, tradition, art, or with our own family. As individuals, we are composed by those experiences and they transform into collective action when we share them with others. A global citizen is someone who, in this transformation to collective action, accepts that our individual experience isn’t the only one with which we can identify ourselves; seeing difference as one of the many things we have in common with the other. Accepting this means transmitting knowledge, communicating, making friends, but above all: working together.” (“La belleza” group, personal communication, November 27th, 2017)

Contrary to the strictly defined assignments at Colegio Venecia, the Escuela Mediática students receive complete freedom when it comes to the format and production process of their documentaries. Rather than receiving a grade, the entire production process and final product is evaluated in collaboration with the students themselves. The documentaries have in common that they take a locally-rooted, deeply personal problem (e.g. feeling insecure about your body as a teenage girl; or feeling the urge to know more about your indigenous heritage as a young person growing up in the city) as their starting point. Like the PECC, the documentaries revolve around the questions “Who am I?” and “What can I do about this issue from my specific position?”.

“Our way of thinking changed when we approached the issue from who we are. We asked ourselves “Okay, studying in this particular school, growing up in my particular family, what can I do every day to contribute?”. We realized that change really doesn’t need to be big, it starts with a change within yourself.” (“Ecoreflexiones” group, personal communication, November 7th, 2017)

How, then, do these projects contribute to fostering global citizenship? Here, the crucial point is that answering these questions required the students to interact with their environment (analyzing the female beauty ideal promoted in the advertisement that surrounds them, for example, or discovering unknown parts of the country) and the “other” people in it (be it their male classmate or the indigenous community leader they interviewed). They described this experience as a translating exercise: trying to establish dialogue between two different worlds (male and female, modern and traditional, privileged and underprivileged, etc.) who, literally and/or figuratively, speak different languages.

“Entering in contact with such a different reality at such a short distance from Bogotá, with people that are so different, is something
that shakes (...) and really enriches you... To understand how to talk to these people; because you don’t just arrive in a small village and talk like you would with other people from Bogotá.” (“La voz de un pueblo” group, personal communication, November 10th, 2017)

Following a social justice and critical pedagogical approach, this engagement with their environment had a profound impact: it provided the students with new ways of understanding their own identity and helped them to understand that we should be at peace with ourselves and our environment before being able to live in peace with others. Moreover, it allowed them to critically reflect on the root causes and dimensions of the issue at hand as well as creatively imagining their role in bringing about change through individual and collective action.

“If we don’t love ourselves, if we don’t acknowledge ourselves as individuals in the world, if we are not capable of accepting ourselves, how are we going to construct relationships with others? How are we going to be part of a society and have a voice, have a vote?” (“La belleza” group, personal communication, November 10th, 2017)

“I feel like, as the documentary was developing and I got more and more involved in it, I started to change my ways of doing things. (...) Once I started to become more conscious, things started to transform.” (“La belleza” group, personal communication, November 10th, 2017)

Thus, without leaving their own neighborhood, city or country, the students developed key global citizenship competences: knowledge and understanding of local, national and global issues (the mining industry, gender inequality, etc.) and their interconnectedness; attitudes of empathy, solidarity and respect for diversity; and motivation and willingness to take necessary actions – just to name a few.

Although this seemed counterintuitive at first, the experience at Escuela Mediática suggests that, in practice, transformative GCED may not be as international and public as the words “global” and “citizenship” suggest. Global citizenship education is often approached by taking a global issue (for example climate change or poverty) and discussing it through examples that show its international dimension (say a flood in Pakistan or famine in Ethiopia). While this approach might be effective for some students, these examples are so overwhelming and so far removed from the student’s daily experience that they are likely not to be sufficient to really make them care about, let alone feel empowered to tackle the issue at hand. Instead, each documentary developed by the Escuela Mediática students took a locally-rooted, deeply personal problem as its starting point and made use of a critical pedagogical approach based on dialogue, reflection and action to develop the student’s critical consciousness and a transformative sense of global citizenship.
This chapter examined how the GCED discourses present in the international, national and local policy documents discussed in the previous chapter are adopted in classroom practice. Although these documents are not directly used in the two schools, the “soft” GCED discourse promoted by the national government can be recognized at Colegio Venecia whereas the transformative GCED discourse promoted by the PECC was expressed by the Escuela Mediática students. Comparing the experiences of Colegio Venecia and Escuela Mediática suggests that transformative GCED should/cannot be limited to stand-alone projects or subjects: it has to become part of the school culture. The projects developed at Colegio Venecia, a school with a hierarchical structure, big classrooms, uniforms and standardized assignments and evaluation, stressed individual responsibility for success in a globalized world, thereby promoting neoliberal GCED. The Escuela Mediática students, on the other hand, are continuously encouraged by their teachers to express themselves and question taken-for-granted assumptions. Their classes are smaller and they are assessed through alternative evaluation methods. This more critical pedagogy resonated in their projects, which provided a critical analysis of the underlying causes of the issue at hand and pointed out individual responsibilities as well as those of the state/institutions.

Although a sample consisting of two schools is not large enough to draw sweeping conclusions, the difference between the experience at Colegio Venecia and Escuela Mediática points to a larger paradox the Colombian education system is faced with: whereas alternative private schools manage to promote critical, public citizenship, public schools tend to create private, conformist citizens (4th Meeting of Alternative Experiences in Education, personal communication, 24/8/2017). As public schools are dependent on government support, they lack the resources and/or commitment to go beyond the “soft” approach based on standardization and individual learning outcomes promoted by the government. Private schools, on the other hand, have more financial and intellectual freedom to develop their own, more transformative pedagogical project. As a result, students at public schools are left largely excluded from justice-oriented, transformative discourses on (global) citizenship education. Following Jørgensen and Phillips (2002), this indicates the importance of analyzing the distribution of discourses as it confirms that not everyone has access to all discourses equally.
CHAPTER VII:
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

To what extent does global citizenship education (GCED) in secondary schools in Bogotá contribute to social transformation?

To answer the main question underlying this research, the order of GCED discourse in both policy and practice was analyzed using Fairclough’s approach to critical discourse analysis. The analysis of international, national and local policy documents showed that the current social order, characterized by a lack of political continuity and an outcome-oriented push for standardization and efficiency, favors the “soft” kind of GCED discourse promoted by UNESCO and the National Ministry of Education. This kind of education does not challenge the status quo, as political responsibility is largely ignored and students are held individually responsible for succeeding within the given structures rather than encouraged to reflect on and change injustices through collective action. This discourse is reinforced in practice as public schools are dependent on government support and lack the resources and commitment to go beyond the “soft” approach promoted by the government and international institutions. As a result, students at public schools are left largely excluded from justice-oriented, transformative discourses on (global) citizenship education while private schools have more financial and intellectual freedom to develop their own, more transformative pedagogical project. Thus, it becomes clear that the dominant GCED discourse in Colombia is limited by and at the same time reproduces the existing unequal power relations.

Arguing that discourse has the power both to reproduce and to change unequal power relations, Fairclough’s fourth step explicitly aims to move beyond a mere description of the status quo and its criticisms. Once established how discourse is used to reproduce inequalities and how the existing structures limit possibilities for change, this awareness should be used to inform social transformation towards more social justice. Similarly, Castles (2001:19) argues that the outcome of social transformation studies should be “positive recipes for social and political action to help communities improve their livelihoods and cope with the consequences of global change.”. In this spirit, despite the limited space offered by the existing social structures, the analysis presented in this thesis has shown that the local implementation of GCED can and should be used to propose transformative approaches as hopeful alternatives to the status quo. Specifically, the experience of Escuela Mediática as well as the Citizenship and Coexistence Project developed by Bogotá’s former
Secretary for Education Oscar Sánchez contain valuable recommendations for what shape transformative GCED policy and practice in Colombia can take.

Nevertheless, it is unlikely that transformative global citizenship education alone will be enough to create the much needed transformation towards more social justice. Until real mechanisms promoting economic redistribution, cultural recognition and political representation are put in place to ensure parity of participation, students will continue to perceive the disjunction between the transformative GCED discourse used at school and their everyday experience of the socio-economic and political reality in their country. As long as that gap persists, the lingering tensions and extreme inequalities remain potential drivers for recurring conflict and the potential for GCED to contribute to social transformation towards a more just social order remains limited. In any case, the debate on which type of globalization, citizenship and education Colombians want for their country can no longer be avoided. At the time of writing, both Iván Duque, a rightwing conservative supported by former president Uribe and fierce opponent of the peace agreement, and Gustavo Petro, the leftwing progressive who was mayor of Bogotá at the time the PECC was developed, progressed to the second round of the presidential elections. On June 17th, Colombia will get the unique opportunity to decide between Petro’s promise of social transformation and Duque’s choice for neoliberal globalization.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH, POLICY AND PRACTICE

The final step of Fairclough’s CDA “is the stage at which the analysis turns reflexively back on itself, asking for instance how effective it is as critique, whether it does or can contribute to social emancipation (...)” (Fairclough, 2001:127). In this regard, a particularly important takeaway from this research is that the debate on global citizenship education cannot be separated from wider societal dynamics, nor from the individual agency of policy-makers, educators and students. Despite the particularly challenging context, the local implementation of global citizenship education in Bogotá offers some space for negotiation and creative possibilities to go beyond the dominant order by explicitly using a transformative, justice-oriented discourse. These possibilities deserve to be further explored in future research, policy and practice.

Specifically, three main lessons can be drawn from the PECC and the experience at Escuela Mediática. Firstly, the Escuela Mediática documentaries suggest that transformative GCED can/should, based on critical pedagogy, take locally-rooted, personal problems rather than global issues as its starting point. Through dialogue, reflection and action in their local environment, students learn to understand themselves as global socio-political agents. Starting from the interdependence between the personal, the interpersonal and the systemic, the PECC similarly introduces GCED as the possibility to reimagine and change the unjust social order through collective action.
Secondly, transformative GCED cannot/should not be limited to stand-alone projects or subjects that are imposed ‘top down’. Rather, it has to become part of the school culture and be developed ‘bottom-up’. In this spirit, Escuela Mediática students are encouraged on a daily basis to express themselves and question taken-for-granted assumptions, which clearly resonated in their projects. Contrary to the national citizenship policy, the PECC was created through an elaborate consultation process with teachers which took several years rather than hastily imposed ‘top down’. Finally, both the PECC and Escuela Mediática strengthen their vision by promoting alternative evaluation methods which take into account the learning process and context, rather than standardized multiple choice tests aimed to measure learning outcomes.

Generalizing the experience of Bogotá and using it as the basis for developing national GCED education policy, however, risks ignoring the specific needs, challenges and opportunities in the rest of the country. Since the Colombian capital has been relatively far removed from the daily realities of the Colombian conflict, the students did not pay much attention to the past and ongoing violence in their projects. Moreover, Bogotá’s Secretary of Education is the most well-funded in the country. Consistent with the transformationist view underlying this research, it is crucial for future research to examine the specific contexts of Colombia’s diverse rural areas to avoid imposing GCED ‘from above’. Similarly, additional comparative research is required to assess to what extent the findings presented in this thesis are generalizable to other developing and/or conflict-affected contexts. More than aiming for generalizability, however, this thesis proposes a context-dependent, justice-oriented analytical framework that can be used to inform GCED policy, practice and research in Bogotá, Colombia and beyond.
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