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Abstract

The practice of educating young people for global citizenship has garnered a great deal of attention in recent years. Whilst much of the research in this field has focused on pedagogical or curriculum matters, a small body of work has attempted to explore it in a broader sense: viewing it as a process involving the production of global citizen subjectivity. This paper adds to this growing body of research by offering a detailed discursive analysis of empirical data generated in fieldwork in two UK schools. Global travel will be identified as a key practice which was utilised by the students in these schools and it will be used as an interpretive lens through which to further explore their production of successful, mobile, global citizen subjectivities. The paper will argue that this was a dynamic process: negotiated across multiple spaces and through a range of complex and contradictory images and representations. The paper concludes with some thoughts about the practice of school travel and how it might effectively be focused upon in future research.

Introduction

In recent years there has been increased interest in the education of young people for global citizenship (Shultz 2012, Marshall 2009, Haigh 2008, Davies and Reid 2005). Whilst not appearing as an entirely new set of discursive practices, global citizenship has received much wider acclaim and has been taken up with a greater sense of urgency in schools and universities than in previous decades (Demaine 2002). Phrases like ‘developing globally minded citizens’ and ‘preparing young people for life in the global village’ now appear to comprise the rhetoric of a number of school prospectuses and mission statements (Schattle 2008).
Across the world a number of education policy documents have emerged to announce ‘global education’ and ‘increased international outlook’ as priorities for education (DfES 2004, 2005, DEECD 2009, CED 2006). This is particularly the case for Western countries, whose governments have tended to dominate this discursive terrain, although organisations like UNESCO and the OECD, which transcend individual nation states, have also taken up these aims (Dobson 2005). Within these documents it is young people who come to the fore as those most capable of taking these priorities forward: able to rework old and outmoded notions of community and nation in order to create new global versions of citizenship (Harris 2004). Schools also receive some attention, for it is these institutions with their ‘new’ globally-focused curriculums which are considered best placed to help young people achieve these aims.

This paper adds to a growing body of educational research which attempts to speak to and make sense of existing policy and practice debates surrounding the education of young people for global citizenship. Rather than focus on the curriculum or pedagogy, as much of the literature has done previously, this paper will address the social and cultural production of global citizen subjectivity in schooling. From this viewpoint education might be conceived as a process involving the production of particular kinds of subjectivities across multiple spaces and through a range of complex and contradictory images and representations (McRobbie 2009).

Such an understanding rests upon the premise that discourses are groups of statements which structure the way in which things are thought about, and the way individuals act on the basis of this thinking (Rose 2012, St Pierre 2002). Discourses actively construct the world and produce possibilities for subjectivity, as they work to provide positions from which individuals can come to view the world in particular ways and to understand themselves as certain kinds of subjects (Foucault 1988). As Davies (1991) suggests, the range of subject
positions available to individuals will depend on the discursive field in which they are based. A wide array of possibilities will intersect and compete with one another in order to provide meaning.

Drawing on these suppositions, this paper will offer a discursive analysis of empirical data which was generated in fieldwork in two UK schools where global citizenship was considered a priority. Travel will be identified as a key practice taken up by the young people in these settings, and will be used as a lens through which to explore the possibilities which existed for them in their constitution of successful global citizen subjectivities. The paper will seek to demonstrate the importance of engaging in a wider, sociological analysis of global citizenship education – one which moves beyond the space of the formal classroom and the official curriculum, in order to understand how these discourses are produced and reproduced at a variety of different levels (in the official school and amongst the young people and their parents), in a range of different spaces (within school, the home and the wider community) and to examine how they might be cut across by different relations of power.

The paper will begin with a brief review of the recent research literature in this field of interest. A detailed outline of the study and a discussion of the empirical data will follow.

**Review of the Research Literature**

Global citizenship education is a topic which has received renewed academic interest in recent years (Marshall 2009). Some have suggested that this is due to the new and rather different role that the global imagination has come to play in the current era (Appadurai 1996). This contemporary research interest has taken varied forms, though much of it has tended to centre on pedagogical or curriculum matters. Althof and Berkowitz’s (2006) work, for example, has attempted to chart the range of pedagogical practices which have been taken up by practitioners working within the different traditions of citizenship education. These
authors acknowledge that this has been the source of longstanding tension in educational research and, they suggest, that it is a debate which looks set to continue, even in relation to the newest forms of global citizenship.

Others, like Schulz 2007, Dower 2003 and McGrew 2000, have retained a focus on the global citizenship curriculum and have endeavoured to inspect some of its underpinning concepts, like globalisation. Whilst being careful not to conflate the two matters, these scholars have sought to ask what globalisation might mean for those working within the field of citizenship education, and how it may be taught in existing curriculum subjects. Some, like Schattle (2008), have attempted to take this a stage further: suggesting a need to pay attention to the wide array of competing and contradictory discourses which currently work to constitute the global citizenship curriculum.

This large body of curriculum and pedagogy focused research has been significant in helping scholars map the practice of global citizenship education as it has developed and changed over time, in response to different political situations and various theoretical developments. Yet it is a body of research which has sometimes paid limited attention to the wider cultural, social and material processes which shape this practice. Whilst occasional references are made to wider school cultures within this work (see, for example, CIRCLE 2003), these mentions can be fleeting and will sometimes remain unsubstantiated.

Indeed, it is has been suggested that a detailed social and cultural analysis has only arisen in that research which has recently been undertaken by scholars working within a post-colonial theoretical framework. This is a body of work which primarily seeks to address the economic and cultural roots of inequality in power and wealth in a complex global system (Andreotti 2008). As such, it is an approach which raises particular questions about the discourses of
western supremacy which abound in discussions of the global, and which work to disavow the unequal power relations which existed in the past under previous colonial orders.

Andreotti (2008) proposes that this is an approach which might offer a critical edge to global citizenship education, for it is a perspective which holds that knowledge should be considered as partial, incomplete and contextually based and that learning should be conceived as occurring in the multiple spaces of the school and surrounding community, not just in the restricted space or relations of the formal classroom. As such it extends a less didactic pedagogical approach. Practitioners working within this vein will not attempt to unveil universal truths about global phenomena, but rather encourage students to reflect on the individual assumptions which they hold.

An alternative analytical approach to global citizenship education is also thought to have been developed by scholars working with post-structural theory. As Jackson and Mazzei (2012) suggest, these scholars work from the assumption that an individual’s actions must be considered as a local reaction or response to temporally embedded and shifting relations of power. They are interested in, what Foucault refers to as, the ‘little questions’ of power. These questions are inversions of those typically asked of power (e.g. what is power and where does it come from?), as they focus more on its productive effects. In terms of global citizenship, this could mean asking how power is deployed through the different discourses which work to constitute global phenomena and global citizen subjectivities. Rather than asking what global citizenship is, scholars might question how it is shaped through the social and cultural practices which take place in educational institutions.

Rizvi’s (2005, 2008) research is well known in this respect. In some of his earlier work Rizvi examined how Higher Education institutions worked to provide students with an understanding of global interconnectedness and how they ‘used’ these experiences to develop
their own narratives about global citizenship. Rizvi found that multiple discourses were drawn upon in the constitution of global subjectivity in these settings, although he concludes that a number of the students made themselves through narrowly framed corporate discourses and tended to adopt a rather instrumentalist view of the world. In his recent research with Kenway et al. (2012) Rizvi has returned to explore the possibilities for global citizenship subjectivity in one elite school in India. In this project Rizvi (2012) pays particular attention to school history - seeking to examine the ways in which it is being transformed and reproduced in the current era and made to work under new logics.

McRobbie (2009) and Harris (2004) have also taken up this approach in their work, having developed a gendered analysis of the production of global citizen subjectivity. McRobbie argues that young women are currently forced to grow up in a ‘brave, new post-feminist landscape’, where the once hard-won gains of feminism are being perniciously re-worked and offered back to them as a new sexual contract. This new contract is thought to encourage young women to manage themselves as immaculately groomed, sexually adventurous, hard-working and global girl subjects. Following the lead of role models like Madonna and Angelina Jolie, Harris (2004) suggests that it is young women who are now expected to make themselves as pleasing global counterparts and ambassadresses of the nation. It is young women who are considered as those most capable of quelling national fears relating to immigration, multiculturalism and eroding state borders.

Kellie Burn’s (2008) research is particularly significant here, because of the way in which it develops these gendered analyses directly in relation to education. Drawing upon Foucauldian notions of governmentality Burns attempts to explore the role which the global imagination might play in producing and managing normative meanings around gender, citizenship and global living. Viewing the global imagination as a ‘dispositif’ (‘a complex and contradictory set of movements that establish new modes of regulation over the conduct of
individual citizens’) Burns raises questions about the way in which it might work to create, organise, discipline and normalise particular kinds of subjectivities. Burns understands it to be part of a wider neo-liberal project of government, where the global girl citizen is expected to consume and capitalise on herself in order be constituted as a successful citizen subject. She also identifies it as a classed phenomenon, where only those who acquire the correct capital will be capable of inhabiting these positions.

**Aims of the paper**

This paper also adopts this view of education as a ‘teaching machine’ implicated in the practice of producing global citizen subjectivities (McRobbie 2009). Global citizenship education is explored here as part of this wider school subjectivity producing process and not as something which simply exists in the formal space of the classroom or in a fixed body of curriculum knowledge. However, attention will also be paid, in this paper, to the dynamic and everyday nature of this production process.

Indeed, a common criticism levelled against the work which has already been undertaken in this vein is that it has often been unable to account for everyday experience, owing to the fact that it has regularly explored cultural and media representations rather than data generated through empirical study (Rizvi 2005). Another criticism relates to the bleak and melancholic nature of many of these accounts and the fact that they tend to represent this phenomenon in a rather static fashion. Some are considered to have centred on neo-liberal forms of governance in ways which might make them appear almost totalising in their effects (Renold and Ringrose 2008, Gannon 2007).

Thus, by drawing on a wide array of empirical data, this paper attempts to develop an account which further examines the everyday negotiations and mediation of these discourses and subjectivities. By looking at the production of global citizen subjectivity formation from a
variety of different levels (the school, the individuals and the parents) the paper will examine the range of different subjective possibilities that existed for the young people in these educational settings, the power relations which were deployed, and the practices which were used in order to constitute them as successful global citizens.

The Research

The paper draws on data which was generated in a study of 25 young people in 2 private sixth-form departments in the UK: Taylor’s Girls’ School (TGS) and St Mary’s School for Girls (SMS). Both of these schools were located in the private sector, were academically selective and predominantly catered for young women. The sample only included students who had opted into the project after having had the aims and objectives of the research explained to them in a school assembly. These were students who had attended the school for different lengths of time, who were from a range of different family backgrounds and who were studying a variety of subjects. The group included 22 young women and 3 young men, all aged between 16-18 years. The relatively small sample size and the willingness of the students were considered crucial for the success of the study, for both of these factors worked to ensure that rich and multiple data could be generated over an extended time period (Yates 2006). At a later stage in the project 23 of the young people’s parents also participated in a single semi-structured interview.

The private and selective school has often been considered an interesting context in which to explore global citizenship education. As Cookson and Persell (2010) suggest, this might be due to the fact that ‘the global’ has been considered ‘big business’ for these schools for some time now. Global citizenship education was not, however, the primary focus of this research. The project initially aimed to explore the school-based production of classed and gendered subjectivities, and principally in relation to risk (see X 2011). Global citizenship and global
citizenship education were topics which only emerged in the early stages of fieldwork. Initial hunches in this respect were recorded in the form of field notes and memos and were later discussed with participants as they became the focus of a newly devised research question and a substantial category of analysis in its own right. As Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) note, the emergence of secondary topics of interest is not unusual in ethnographic research. Whilst researchers working in this tradition might develop a preliminary set of research questions in a pre-fieldwork phase, they will continue to shape and develop these during the early stages of research, in a period of exploratory orientation.

An ethnographic stance was adopted for the purposes of the study for it was thought to offer the researcher an opportunity to participate in the young people’s everyday lives, to listen to what they said and to ask questions which could ‘throw light’ on the issues which formed the focus of the research (Hammersley and Atkinson 1995). The fieldwork took place over two school years, which meant that the researcher was able to become familiar with the young people and the schools which they inhabited. It also meant that a range of experiences could be encountered (not just those which were superficially interesting or extraordinary, Nayak and Kehily 2008), and that the researcher could retain a commitment to ‘keeping on looking’, in order to collate a large body of responses which could be read against each other (Thomson and McLeod 2010).

In line with a number of other post-structural projects which have sought to question the modernist principles upon which ethnography has traditionally rest, the study maintained a discursive focus. The aim of the research was not to search for the inherent meanings of practices, as if these existed outside of discourse and were the properties of individuals, but to stay close to these practices as they were re-membered and re-told in order to examine the ways in which they worked to disrupt or sustain relations of power and knowledge (Jackson and Mazzei 2012). The first-hand contact which the ethnographic fieldwork allowed was not
considered as a direct route to an objective reality, but rather a means of exploring the unfolding processes of discourse production and reception: a way to map the power deployed in these practices, to explore how statements arose, where they took place and what their effects might have been.

The semi-structured interview was one of the main methods utilised in the research. Each of the young people participated in at least 2 of these interviews over the course of the project, and, in some cases, up to 8. The interviews often lasted for 90 minutes. At first they were less structured: the young people were simply encouraged to talk, in a general sense, about their educational experiences, interests and relationships. An interview guide was developed to ensure that there was some standardisation of questions, though it was used flexibly so that the young people could guide the conversations in relation to their own interests. As the project progressed the interviews became more focused – often following up previous topics of interest, further exploring events which had been observed or asking about hopes and plans for the future. With the participants’ permission each of the interviews were digitally recorded. Comprehensive notes were taken immediately after the interviews had been conducted and as the data were transcribed. These notes focused on what was said during the interview and how it had been said.

Both Pink (2011) and Rose (2013) have commented on the fact that the camera has been a part of the ethnographer’s toolkit for a number of years now. Indeed, Rose proposes that visual methods have provided a useful way for ethnographers to explore the ways in which the world is socially constituted: the visions that they might offer of the social world and the truth effects which they might bring about. In line with these sentiments, the young people in this study were given a digital camera which they were told to use to create a portfolio of images which somehow represented their identities and experiences. These images were then brought to an interview where the young people sifted through, sorted and commented on
them: developing narratives which sought to explain them and describe the processes of their production.

After this point, the young people who wished to continue participating in this way, met on several different occasions, over a period of a year, to engage in a range of collaborative visual activities. These included the development of photomatics (where 10 photographs were edited together in a moving sequence in order to tell a story about a young person’s life), the creation of mini films (individual representations which related to wider research interests), the drawing of storyboards (based on the stories told during individual interviews), and the development of a collaboratively produced film (which attempted to represent the young people’s collective experiences of life in a private school and which was made with the help of a professional film-maker, see X 2011).

Participant observation was also used as a method to engage with the young people over the course of the project. This observation often took place on the days when the interviews and visual activities were undertaken, for the intention of these research exercises was not just to focus on the content that was spoken or produced in the form of images, but also the process which surrounded their production and the meanings with which they were attributed (Mitchell 2012). Comprehensive field notes were taken during these periods of observation. These reported on the activities themselves, the conversations which were engaged in during the sessions and the initial thoughts and feelings of the researcher.

The fieldwork also involved the collection and analysis of a range of documentary material. The documents included: school prospectuses, websites, promotional literature, magazines and correspondence with guardians. These were all documents which were considered integral to the everyday life of the school and a natural part of the way in which they communicated their aims about who they were and the values they stood for. The documents
were regarded as rich sources of data because of the wide array of language, images, formatting, colour and typesetting that were included in them (Macdonald et al. 2012). Each text was read in relation to the context of their production. Questions were asked about how they were written, how they were read, who wrote them and what was or was not recorded.

Towards the end of the project, during a more formal and focused period of data analysis, all of the data was drawn together and analysed as a collective whole. The principle aim of this process was not to focus on what was said, but to examine how it had been said and how it might have worked to sustain, organise and reproduce particular versions of reality. Initially this involved developing a detailed inventory of the data which had been generated – noting when texts had been created, with whom and for what purpose. This inventory was used to assist later phases of analysis and interpretation in order to avoid unnecessarily prejudicial readings of the data. This process was followed by simple and repeated immersion in the data – the reading and re-reading of documents, field notes and transcripts.

Open coding was then used as an initial sensitising strategy. It was adapted to the purposes of discourse analysis in order to grasp basic themes from the data and to generate abstract categories which might contain and describe the individual utterances and discourse constituents (Keller 2013). A second stage of coding focused on the discursive patterns which were shown in the utterances. A series of questions were asked of the categories of data: how they were given meaning, how they worked to persuade, and how they might have produced truth effects. As these codes were tested and developed they were noted down in the form of memos. Essentially this second stage of coding involved developing as many interpretative hypotheses for the categories as possible - checking and rejecting them in relation to the immediate construction of the text so that it best suited the sense making context in the passage (Keller 2013). This was a process which not only paid attention to themes, patterns
and consistencies, but also to silences, absences, contradictions and complexities (Coffey and Atkinson 1996).

In the accounts which follow only a small section of the project data will be discussed. This data was that which was most often coded in relation to the broader theme of global citizenship, and it specifically relates to the travel practices which these young people engaged in. Of course, travel was not the only practice which emerged in relation to this theme and it cannot be considered as the most important just because it was mentioned most frequently. But for the purposes of this paper it will be utilised as an interpretive lens through which to further explore this educative process.

Come ‘fly’ with us: the promise of global mobility offered by the schools

Both of the schools participating in the research had developed a sophisticated set of prospectuses, flyers, brochures and websites. Representing a more corporate form of communication, these were glossy and expensive-looking and they worked to combine a range of rhetorical techniques (images, stories, testimonies, quotations and models) in order to persuade and leverage advantage in the marketplace (Mcdonald et al. 2012). The schools’ aims to develop their pupils as successful global citizen subjects were clearly developed through this rhetoric.

In the TGS documents, for example, the school’s global outlook was explicitly mentioned in the Headteacher’s address which featured in the introduction to the school prospectus. Here the Head claimed that equipping students for ‘life in the global village’ was her first priority. The internet, enhanced telecommunication systems and affordable travel were mentioned as factors causing rapid change in the world, and language and ICT were named as resulting priorities for the school. A motto was developed to the effect of: ‘educating today’s students to become the active, concerned global citizens of tomorrow’.
In both of the schools global citizenship was framed in rhetoric which related to travel. Indeed, the ‘activity’ described in the TGS Headteacher’s address could, in some senses, be interpreted as a promise of, and enticement to, international travel. The documents presented this as something which was expected of all pupils but encouraged and enhanced by the schools. The testimonies which lined the pages of the school prospectuses were often from students claiming that the international travel opportunities offered by the schools accounted for some of their best and most worthwhile experiences.

In the TGS documents sports trips (particularly skiing holidays) or ‘cultural tours’ were those which were most often mentioned or depicted. Global mobility also figured in these documents through the promotion of travel in relation to individual school subjects. This included travel in order to: learn more about the ‘field’ of geography, attend international public debates as part of English education, or engage in the work experience exchange system for modern foreign language courses.

Outside of these textual documents travel also seemed to be represented in the physical objects and artefacts displayed around the school. In the interviews at TGS, for example, some of the young women mentioned the school’s propensity for investing in ‘expensive foreign nick nacks’. This was their rather mocking way of talking about the large amount of money which had been spent on pieces of artwork and sculptures from around the world. Many of these pieces had been purchased on school trips, working as mementos and visual reminders of travel, and put in pride of place in the school entrance hall.

Whilst SMS didn’t appear to have invested in travel memorabilia in quite the same way, some visual signifiers lined the main entrance hall. In the photographs which the young women had taken to represent their lives at this school, many of them had created an image depicting a mural hung at the heart of the main school stairwell. The mural was a patchwork
tapestry which had been handcrafted out of bright silks by a former pupil and it depicted the annual sixth-form trip to India. This, the young women said, was a key event in the life of the school, which is why the mural had been hung where it had and why they had decided to incorporate it in their photographs.

Assemblies were also often given over to the theme of travel and engagement with others from around the world. The sixth-form groups, for example, were often visited by speakers from prominent charities or gap year initiatives who had been invited to ‘share their cause’ and promote particular schemes of travel. The TGS students spoke about a whole week of assemblies centring on one country in Africa. These included reports on political activity, re-enactments of native dancing and stories of trips from teachers who had visited the area. The week of activities had apparently been planned to coincide with a visit from the Headteacher of a school with which TGS was twinned. The events were used to inspire the students to engage in a new ‘exchange’ programme the schools had planned, where every year a small number of pupils would be hand-selected to go on a ‘trip of a life time’ to visit their twinned school.

Young women in both schools also spent some time talking about the ‘charity weeks’ which were held each year. In SMS, charity week coincided with a period of interviewing, and so frequently became the focus of these discussions. The young women proudly discussed their efforts and talked about where their money would be sent. Some of the money was to be sent to a local hospice but the majority of funds would be used to support the sixth-form trip to India. In TGS charity weeks were often used to raise funds for the local school community, though it was quite common for students to develop their own charity initiatives across the course of the year in order to raise money for their gap year travel. In both of these schools it appeared that global travel was regarded as a worthy form of investment.
Picturing lives abroad: young people’s personal investments in global travel

International travel also appeared to play a central role in the personal narratives shared by the young people, particularly in the photographic interviews. In order to prepare for these interviews the young people were allocated a six-week period in which to generate photographs. Yet many of the young people felt that this was restrictive because the limited time period just ‘couldn’t do their lives justice’. It was common, therefore, for the students to bring older sets of photographs with them to the interviews and for them to share narratives based on their previous experiences. Proms, birthday parties, friendships and relationships were often mentioned. Yet travel was also commonly pictured and discussed, with many tales told about recent adventures abroad, particularly late senior school trips, big family holidays and holidays with friends to mark the end of an intense period of examination.

International travel featured heavily in the photomatic sequences too. One of the young men participating in this research activity, Ben, decided not to create a photomatic at all. Instead he opted to bring in a recently collated hard-back book of photographic images. The book was testament to Ben’s recent foreign travel, most of which had been undertaken on a recent family tour of different parts of the world. The photographs contained within the book covered a wide geographical terrain, including: Tanzania, New Zealand, Vietnam, Cambodia, Cuba, Russia and Brazil. The images also varied in content, though they commonly depicted landscapes, architecture or wildlife. The book had been produced by Ben in the year prior to the research, as part of his GCSE art coursework which he had given the title ‘a sense of place’.
Ben shared his images in the interviews with a sense of pride for all that he had achieved in this work and by way of explaining how these images represented his own sense of place and understanding of the world:

‘I told my art teacher about my travel and all of the photos that I had taken and she told me to bring them in to show her. I don’t think she was expecting what I brought in because she said she literally couldn’t believe that I had taken them. She said that I should make a book of them, so I did for my sense of place project. The book...I dunno...I suppose the book is all about my travel...where I have been... but I like to think it’s all about other people’s culture too...like what there is in the world and how people change it. Like look at these pictures of bridges in Vietnam...the one is hundreds of years old and heavily ornate, the other is just a year old and made of scraps of wood. I am really interested in what this tells us about people and culture.’

Ben’s mother also discussed these images, and the travel that they depicted, in her own interview. She described the travel in highly individualised terms: as an important project which all of the family had engaged in as a way of guaranteeing Ben’s success in the future’ and ensuring that he had necessary experiences to help him ‘progress in life’.

Hannah, one of the TGS students, also portrayed travel in her photomatic display. Hannah’s display began with a couple of black and white prints of local streets and buildings which she had encountered on a walk around her local city centre. These images were merged into more colourful prints which depicted parts of central London – images which had been generated during a recent weekend trip to the city. To round off the collection Hannah included some images which had been taken on recent holidays abroad.

Hannah claimed that she had chosen to use her photomatic display as a way of exploring space and place. She explained that none of the places which had been photographed had
been included because they were familiar to her, though she said that if she had to pick a place then it would be New York as it ‘just seemed so her’. Even the local prints hadn’t been chosen to depict a sense of home, as she had chosen areas of the city with which she wasn’t familiar. This, she believed, highlighted her sense of exploration and adventure, because these were ‘spaces still waiting to be discovered’.

Of course, not all of the young people’s collections were dominated by photographs of foreign travel, but even when a singular image from a trip had been incorporated into the displays it was interesting to see how they had been narrated. Caitlin, for example, chose to include just one image of a Chinese temple in her display. This was a photograph which had been taken on a recent school tour around Asia. Caitlin claimed that she had placed this image at the centre of her display for a particular reason, because:

‘...It [the trip] literally changed my life...it was an amazing experience, it taught me so much about different people and different cultures and it has sparked a lifetime interest in travel.’

A number of the young women from SMS also chose to incorporate singular images of travel in their photographic collections. These were often images which had been generated on a recent school trip to India. The trip had been arranged as part of the young women’s service duties for the Duke of Edinburgh award scheme and it involved living and working with the local townsfolk. These young women also used these images to talk about the transforming nature of travel, as Jenna explained:

‘The trip really opened my eyes to how other people live. I mean it was intense...you can’t escape it when you are living alongside them, eating what they eat and riding their elephants! You come home and you just feel weird and you know that you have totally taken things for granted your whole life. I mean...I think it just changes
you...completely changes you as a person. I suppose that’s why I think it’s important...that’s why I have included this picture.’

Accounts like these work to demonstrate the significance that these trips held for the young people. Even when travel didn’t figure heavily in terms of the quantity of images displayed in the portfolios, those which were included, were heavily drawn upon by the young people in their attempts to constitute themselves as mobile global subjects.

**Discussion**

The narratives presented here appear to chime with the accounts of elite transnational citizenship offered by scholars like Lasch (1995), Sklair (2000) and Robbins (1998). Active global citizenship would seem to be easily achieved in these contexts. These young people were represented as living lives where the borders of nation states had been levelled down, where passports provided openings for exploration and learning across the globe, and where a sophisticated sense of cultural sensitivity allowed for conversation with a variety of interesting global others. Ben’s photomatic display appeared to provide firm evidence of this. The narratives which accompanied Ben’s images spoke of his familiarity with a range of transnational places and of his appreciation of their cultures and customs. Whilst other students were more reticent in the claims that they made, those, like Hannah, still claimed travel as a central part of their identities and worked to position themselves as adventurous global explorers.

As Burns (2008) has suggested, accounts like these appear to draw on wider hegemonic neoliberal discourse. The ferocious marketing practices taken up in the prospectuses certainly seemed to draw heavily on this type of consumerist logic. Here the rhetoric of the official school accounts seemed to work to persuade readers of the ‘value-added’ and exclusive nature of the trips. These opportunities supposedly offering students the chance to visit an
even wider range of exotic, far-flung locations and for even longer periods of time than that which might be manageable as part of a family holiday. The address provided by the Headteacher in the TGS documents also appeared to market travel in this way: as an important educational commodity. Although, the talk of producing future-oriented ‘active’ citizens could also be regarded as an incitement for families to take up this project for themselves – a call for self-reliance and individual planning rather than more social forms of engagement (Wallace and Nagel 1997).

The young people’s parents also seemed to speak about travel in ways which reproduced neo-liberal discourse. Ben’s mother spoke at length about it being ‘her right as a consumer of a rather expensive private education’ to take her son out of school for an extended period of travel. She described Ben as someone who only really learnt through doing and never by listening’ and as such she saw the family trip as the ‘only sensible decision to make’ in order to ‘enrich his learning’ and to allow him to ‘experience these sorts of things first-hand’. As she spoke Ben’s mother appeared to be drawing on wider neo-liberal discourses of parental voice and choice, in an attempt to present travel as a more personalised form of learning (Arnot 2009). Her speech also works to remind us of the different spaces and relations in which these subjectivities were being shaped and negotiated. Of course, the school was shown to play an important role in this process, but largely just because they allowed the travel to occur. It was the family who was being charged here with the responsibility of Ben’s learning and of maintaining his competitive edge in the global educational market place.

On the whole, Ben’s mother seemed to speak of this as a positive practice which reflected the new-found freedoms of an individualist neo-liberal era and which would be open to any parent who had decided to prioritise their children’s education in this way. Yet in some instances her speech would seem to offer a different set of interpretations: working to portray it as a process which depended heavily on cultural capital and material wealth. Towards the
end of the interview, for example, Ben’s mother claimed that it was only her position as a senior academic which had afforded her the ‘financial capital to put Ben through a private education in the first place’, to hold a dominant position in the negotiations which were held with the school about the trip, and to travel extensively with little extra personal expense.

Hannah’s talk about travel could also be interpreted in this way. When speaking about her future travel plans, for example, Hannah would often claim a degree of independence for herself in these endeavours:

‘I mean I did used to ask my Dad to take me with him when he travelled, and sometimes I still do, not that he ever listens! But I guess I also want to work these things out for myself. I don’t want to travel to places where my parents have been before. I need to know that I can do this for myself. I need to experience something new and different.’

Hannah’s comments intimate the fact that she came from a family which had a proclivity for travel. Her Father was a journalist who ‘travelled all over the world’, her parents had travelled extensively before she was born, and Hannah declared that she had grown up ‘listening to their travel stories...literally feeding on their photographs’. In order to make herself as an independent, mobile global citizen, it appeared that Hannah was mobilising the resources which surrounded her at home and at school.

At some points Hannah even appeared to be using resources which had been made available to her through the research project. Borrowing the research camera for extended periods of time, she developed a series of films which documented her travel experiences. By offering her a reason to travel, Hannah claimed that the process of creating the films had helped her to ‘come to terms with travel’ and ‘a life lived elsewhere’. The films were also used by Hannah, at a later stage in the project, as evidence of her mobility.
What a discursive analysis like this might demonstrate, then, is how the neo-liberal discourses cited in these contexts worked to produce possibilities for mobile global subjectivity, but also to reproduce classed privilege and entitlement. Far from being a position which was openly available to all, this was a position which even these groups struggled over. Material wealth undoubtedly played an important part in this process, but it wasn’t the only factor at play. This was a practice which was cut across by classed relations of power: a practice where the young people and their parents had to continually work to mobilise the correct forms of capital, confidence, money and skill. In order to be recognised as successful they had to downplay discourses of exclusivity and advantage (at the same time as using them to achieve these aims) and they had to subject themselves to intense forms of individual scrutiny and surveillance (Arnot 2009).

Of course, the fact that the schools, the parents and these young people sought to reproduce these discourses and engage in these pernicious practices cannot be considered surprising, particularly given the aggressive nature of the market place in which they were forced to compete. In contrast to a number of other elite schools, these institutions did not attract a population that was globally or culturally diverse (Kenway et al. 2012). As such, the schools, and those who inhabited them, had to work hard to position themselves as global citizens. Working within these restrictions it would seem that travel was a practice which might best enable them to fulfil their promises of producing ‘savvy’ citizens who would be prepared for future participation in the global village.

But rather than being totalising in their effects, the neo-liberal discourses which were cited in these contexts could be considered to have coalesced with a range of alternatives, as part of a leaky discursive apparatus (Gannon 2007). As Macdonald et al. (2012) propose the rhetoric utilised in texts like elite school prospectuses often works to bring together a range of disparate discourses in an attempt to close meaning and to position certain interpretations as
the norm. In this case, we might conclude that a great deal of performative work was required to achieve the uniformity of meaning which meant that active, mobile citizenship was presented as the norm.

This rather precarious balancing act may be best glimpsed in the young people’s attempts to constitute themselves as authentic ‘global connoisseurs’. Ben and Caitlin appeared to work particularly hard to position themselves as students who had participated in a wide variety of cultures and who were knowledgeable of a range of different people. But not all of the young people could use their travel experiences to easily position themselves in this way. Those who told stories of clubbing holidays in Marbella or shopping trips in Singapore struggled to represent these as anything other than neatly packaged forms of tourism taking place along well-rehearsed corridors of travel (Calhoun 2005). In interviews these trips were often claimed to be solely used by these young women for the purpose of rest and recovery after major examinations. The fun and frivolity experienced on such holidays only appeared to be merited through their prior exertion or because the trips might be considered edifying (e.g. working to inform them of ‘lifestyles and behaviours which were different’ from their own).

The young women’s accounts of the SMS trip to India also appeared to balance a range of disparate discourses and invoke a series of positionings and potential subjectivities. The school represented the trip as one which entailed service, enacted social justice and enabled a more productive moral life. Yet the young people also spoke about it in ways which might enable it to be viewed as an opportunity for appropriation: a chance for them to take from global others in order to furnish themselves. In their talk about the ‘transformative’ potential of the trip, for example, the young women acknowledged the tremendous amount of investment potential which it held. The trip was described as one which might be used to develop a certain form of multicultural competence or cultural sensitivity. This, in itself, could be considered a scarce form of capital which the young people might take up and use to
their advantage in the future as they made applications to universities or prestigious companies for employment opportunities (Khan 2010).

Like Rizvi (2005), then, we might regard trips like these as providing more than a soft form of citizenship education. They might be considered to provide young people with vital opportunities in which to engage in ethical relations with global others and to encounter assumptions about living which dramatically differ from their own. However, like Heilman (2005) we might also be cautious about the discursive contexts from which such practices arise: we might wish to further explore their production in order to understand the different ways in which they may be shot through with classed relations of power.

School travel might, then, require further research attention. Not just because of the traditional learning potential which it is considered to hold, but also because of the possibilities which it might offer for the production of global citizen subjectivity. The data presented here demonstrates the importance of viewing this in relation to the multiple discourses which might be cited in everyday practice (e.g. the combining of cosmopolitan democracy, care for the other and capitalist instrumentalism, Rizvi 2005) and at a variety of different levels of production.

However, the data also demonstrates the importance of considering the spatial nature of this production. Indeed, the young people’s accounts of the school assemblies, charity weeks and travel memorabilia are testament to the tremendous amount of spatial work which was undertaken in the local school context in order to constitute it as transnational in nature. Using Massey’s progressive understanding of space-place (as something which is fluid, lacking in boundaries and produced through interaction) these practices might be regarded as literally speaking global subjectivity into existence in the local space of the school (Milsom 2012, Nespor 2000).
But this educative work did not just occur in the formal space of the classroom or as part of the official curriculum. The rhetoric used in the documents produced by the schools, the family relations which occurred in the young people’s homes, and the actual practice of travel, might all be considered spaces central to this production of successful, mobile global subjectivity (Milsom 2012, Macdonald et al. 2012). The local space of the school might, then, be an important starting point for future global citizenship education research (particularly those spaces which haven’t traditionally been explored in relation to this educative work). But this should not be at the expense of more international spaces or those provided by school exchange and travel. Nor should it be in a way which regards the local school as a neutral container for already existing identities, or as a place of refuge from the monolith of globalisation (Massey 2005).

Conclusions

This paper has worked to demonstrate the utility of viewing global citizenship education as part of a broader social and cultural process of subjectivity production. The discursive analysis, brought to bear here, works to highlight the dynamic nature of this phenomenon. Global citizen subjectivity is shown to be something which was worked out in the multiple relations and spaces which these young people inhabited in their everyday lives. It was something which was discursively produced and reproduced through a range of different texts, including: cultural artefacts, assemblies, presentations, prospectuses, websites, peer and familial talk.

The paper has argued that it is important for educational researchers to examine these discursive contexts, in order to understand the different power relations which might be deployed during this process and the range of subjective possibilities which might be produced. There is no doubt that these configuration processes will differ across school
contexts. Not every young person will want, or be able, to engage in all of the practices outlined here (particularly those forms of travel which might be regarded as exotic, unusual or exclusive in nature). However, this is not to suggest that these practices existed within a vacuum or that they had no relation to life outside of these privileged contexts, for the paper has sought to demonstrate their relational nature. Indeed, it was suggested that a tremendous amount of performative work was required on the behalf of the young people, in order to mobilise the correct forms of capital so that they might be positioned as successful, mobile global subjects.

This was a process which sometimes involved a direct encounter with an ‘other’ (particularly the global other which they encountered on their trips and exchange schemes). At other times this other was silently inferred. But either way, as the young people worked to position themselves, so it seemed that they also worked to position these others and to prescribe and limit the possibilities which were open to them. These practices do, then, hold important implications for those who exist outside of these contexts, and not just for those who inhabit them. As Beck (2007) suggests, this requires much greater exploration, particularly in respect to how this may work as a form of international class-making.

In contrast to many of the arguments which are rehearsed in the wider literature, this paper argues that these privileged forms of global citizen subjectivity cannot simply be understood as ‘soft’ in nature. They were not solely constituted through material wealth and imbibed through tourism, consumption and selfish forms of investment. Instead, they were produced through a range of complex and contradictory discourses which coalesced and worked to offer up an array of subject positions. In line with much of the feminist post-structural work conducted in this field, the paper has argued that these subjectivities were often narrowly framed in the ‘new’ logics of neo-liberalism and that they were often configured in ways which produced and reproduced class distinction and advantage. However, it has also argued
that these discourses were not totalising in their effects. The travel practices which the young people engaged in may well have been laden with power, but they also offered spaces in which they could encounter lives and assumptions which were different from their own, and where they could engage in different kinds of relations with the global other.

Of course, travel was just one of the practices utilised by these young people and it has primarily been used in the paper as an interpretive lens through which to further explore this subjective production process. However, in doing so, the paper has also identified it as a practice which might deserve much greater research attention. A small body of work which takes travel as its focus has already emerged in this field (see for example, Martin 2012). This work has been particularly interested in those school trips which involve some form of cultural exchange.

Yet this work retains a strong focus on learning outcomes and pedagogy, rather than the practice of travel itself. Of course, these are important, but as Heilman (2005) contends, they only represent part of the picture. To conclude, it is suggested that we need to develop a body of research in the future which doesn’t just focus on travel as a point of departure for learning, or in terms of the ‘who’ and ‘what’ is encountered during this process. Instead we need a body of research which seeks to examine the sense that is made of these encounters, and which views travel as a space-in-between where different forms of global citizen subjectivity might be negotiated (Goodman 2012).
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