Global Citizenship Education in and for Israel

Heela Goren

UCL Institute of Education

Supervised by Professor Paul Morris and Professor Miri Yemini

This thesis is submitted for the doctorate of Philosophy, PhD

I, Heela Goren confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without the proper acknowledgement of the author.

Word Count (exclusive of endnotes, references and appendices): 82,915

Signature: Heela Goren

Date: 31/08/2021

Abstract

Processes of globalisation, driven and enhanced by global organisations and agencies, have contributed to an increased interest in global citizenship education (GCE). This can be attributed to (and at the same time-is manifested in) the inclusion of GCE in UNESCO's sustainable development goals, and its subsequent measurement through the OECD's PISA in 2018. GCE has many applications and meanings, but it generally refers to educational policies and curricula aimed at preparing or encouraging pupils to partake, compete, and thrive in global society or help to solve global problems. In Israel, the intractable conflict and the highly diverse population have led to a divided education system that is very nationalistic; however, the nation has high aspirations in terms of its role in the global economy and its place in a global society. Thus, with regards to GCE, Israel is caught between its will to internationalise and its sectarian nature. This creates an interesting case through which to examine GCE, with a particular focus on the extent to which approaches and understandings of GCE within Israel differ from those devised by scholars with different contexts in mind. In this thesis, through interviews with teachers from different sectors and geographic areas, focus groups with pupils, and a documentary analysis of an official course produced by the Israeli MFA and MOE and additional sources, I explore the distinct meanings attributed to GCE across and within different groups in Israel. I argue that the extent and ways that different populations relate to it are informed by notions of peripherality across three levels- geographic, national, and social. The differential meanings of GCE that arise from my analysis based on this framework suggest that the discourses and tests produced and promoted by global organisations are neither relevant in global terms (i.e., global north/south) nor between or within countries.

Impact Statement

This thesis has implications for academia as well as educational policy and practice. It synthesises and integrates a large portion of the academic literature concerning global citizenship and global competence, tying these concepts to existing debates in the field of comparative education and, more broadly, sociology of education. It highlights some of the ways in which global citizenship education, which is bound to remain a key term in the global education discourse at least for the next decade, can deepen social inequalities if not properly adapted, while taking into consideration the needs of different populations.

The thesis raises important critiques regarding the OECD's framework for measuring global competencies in PISA 2018, that are based on grounded research with teachers and pupils, rather than theoretical ideological debates – these critiques can impact future attempts to standardise, operationalise, and measure global citizenship/competence as well as other soft skills, as the thesis shows quite clearly that there are many aspects of context, culture, and values that are neglected and overlooked in the current approaches.

Parts of this thesis have been adapted for publication and published in scholarly journals with a wide readership, and others have been presented at academic conferences and webinars to disseminate its findings. I have also developed a course based on some of my findings that I have been teaching at Seminar Hakibbutzim Teaching College in Israel over the last two years. Through this course, I help pre-service teachers develop a better understanding of how their pupils' place of residence, socio-economic background, and lived experiences can shape the extent to which they relate to different educational concepts and the way they understand them. I also enable future educators to identify ways of adapting and relaying information about the world to their pupils, promote awareness of inherent bias that could shape the contents they choose to expose their pupils to, and help them see how they can help pupils imagine futures that are not bound by either geographic or financial constraints. In addition to this active dissemination I am personally performing, the thesis will also be made available to the Israeli Ministry of Education and relevant professional networks in Israel, in the hope that its lessons will be applied.

Finally, this thesis offers a novel multi-faceted approach that integrates conceptions of peripherality and centrality on different levels (national, regional, and social) that can have an impact on how context is viewed both by practitioners, national policy makers, and scholars both

locally and globally. The approach I suggest could be useful in improving processes of international policy adaptation and transfer, as well as local policy development, by providing a framework for assessing the needs and characteristics of different populations within national settings in a more nuanced manner. This could improve educational outcomes and achievements, reduce inequality, and promote inclusiveness.

Acknowledgements

I could not have completed this thesis without the support, guidance, advice and the perfect mix of patience and impatience of my supervisors, Professor Paul Morris, of UCL Institute of Education and Professor Miri Yemini of Tel Aviv University, as well as my original primary supervisor for a short time, Professor Claire Maxwell.

Paul's sharp and accurate feedback, and his ability to identify weaknesses and turn them into strengths was immensely helpful and crucial to this thesis and my work over the past three years. Since our first encounter, every time we have spent together has been enlightening, and I have learned a great deal not only from our meetings and his comments on my own work – but also from the comments I have heard him give to others on various occasions. His habit of sending me articles related to my research with no subject line when he hadn't heard from me in a while nudged me forward gently, and the knowledge that he would be available whenever I was ready to share an idea, or a chapter was a great comfort and created an excellent balance between the supervision styles of my two supervisors. Miri provided the other side of this balance. She has been by my side for over six years, constantly making me strive to improve, pushing me forward and upwards – sometimes in spite of my protests. She supervised me through my MA dissertation, encouraged me to pursue my PhD at UCL, introduced me to both Paul and Claire, and coached me through every step. Without her, I would not have developed a passion for research, but more so, I would not have had a fraction of the confidence that I have today – the confidence that enabled me to leave my comfort zone and apply to UCL, to reach out to all the participants in this thesis and many other strangers I met along the way, to present my work at conferences and submit my articles for publication. Although Miri's academic contribution to this thesis is valuable in its own right, I want to acknowledge her for helping me to become the person I am today.

Beyond my formal supervisory team, I am also eternally grateful to my informal supervisor and colleague, Dr. Annette Bamberger, without whom I would have probably given up this arduous process numerous times. Annette became my closest friend throughout my work on this thesis, but she has also been my role model, my proof-reader, my brainstorming partner and my technical and emotional support provider. She helped me understand, process, and incorporate feedback; deal with institutional and bureaucratic requirements; learn how to use

semi-colons properly, and so much more. I also want to thank Rony Ramot, who was always on my side and told me exactly what I needed to hear.

In addition to my formal and informal supervisors, I am extremely appreciative of Paul's tutorial group, which I have had the privilege to be a part of, and particularly: Maryam Mohamed, Sue Grey, Laura Oxley, Diana Sousa, Heather Kinuthia, Xiaomin Li, Euan Auld and Yuval Dvir – thank you for your feedback, critiques, comments, and support. I am honoured to have been able to partake in so many intellectually stimulating discussions with all of you, each of which helped me further refine and develop my thesis along the way.

Finally, I want to especially thank my parents for all their support, their encouragement and high expectations – for always asking me 'what's next' and never allowing me to settle for anything but the best. I hope this makes you proud, and yes, I will begin to pursue my next step as soon as this is over.

Abbreviations Used in the Thesis

DfESD – Decade for Education for Sustainable Development

ESD – Education for Sustainable Development

GC – Global Competence

GCE – Global Citizenship Education

GEFI – Global Education First Initiative

GEG –Global Education Governance

GEO – Global Education Organisations

INAMEE – Israeli National Authority for Measurement and Evaluation in Education

MFA – Ministry of Foreign Affairs

MOE – Ministry of Education

OECD – Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

PISA – Programme for International Student Assessment

SDG – Sustainable Development Goals

SES – Socio-Economic Status

STEM – Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics

TIMSS – Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study

UAE – United Arab Emirates

UN – United Nations

UNESCO – United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Global citizenship education (GCE) and global competencies are key terms in the global education landscape. While the emergence of global citizenship as a concept can be traced back to cosmopolitan ideologies that originated in ancient Greece (Schattle, 2008), it is only since the late 1980s and more so since the early 2000s that it has become a more tangible concept embedded in curricula and policy around the world (Davies, 2006). Since the 1980s, GCE has steadily and increasingly become a global education trend. Global competencies, another term central to this thesis, is much newer and is usually used in relation to measurement or to reference concrete or operational components of global citizenship (Dill, 2013).

As they are used today, both terms tend to be regarded by education systems and organisations as pupil-level manifestations of internationalisation (Deardorff, 2006) or as an imperative brought on by globalisation (Gisolo & Stanlick, 2012). However, within scholarship and policy exist an abundance of definitions and categorisations that try to encapsulate them; these definitions reflect a myriad of meanings, values and characteristics associated with each term. There is general agreement that GCE and global competencies are interconnected with contemporary globalisation, and that they embody an assumption that the interconnectedness of the world today calls for skills, dispositions, as well as a sense of belonging and purpose that extends beyond the confines of national borders.

Curricular and policy manifestations of GCE are widespread, and they have been incorporated to different degrees in countries around the world (See Engel & Siczek, 2018; Katzarska-Miller et al., 2012). However, the rationales underpinning each of these appearances can be vastly different and can be characterised as driven by social, economic/utilitarian, humanitarian, nationalist, and other motives (Sant et al., 2018). Despite these stark differences in rationales, outside of critical scholarship, GCE is broadly presented positively. It is often introduced by international global education organisations (GEOs) as a form of education that promotes opportunities for meaningful engagement with the world, peace, harmony, cross-cultural understanding, and sustainability (UNESCO, 2019).

Over the past two decades, however, a new wave of critical literature has emerged, which questions the meanings and outcomes of GCE, and has called attention to the way inequalities can be preserved and furthered through it, both within countries and across hemispheres. This shift towards a more critical focus is part of a broader trend towards more critical engagement

with global education and internationalisation, both of which are associated with positive, humanitarian ideas. The unequal distribution and incorporation of GCE and the use of the term as a floating signifier in the higher education arena as well as in secondary education, have been at the centre of this wave, as have critiques regarding the way it often embodies neoliberal ideals while disregarding the transformative potential and humanitarian ideals some scholars attribute to it (de Oliviera-Andreotti & de Souza, 2012; Pais & Costa, 2020; Parmenter, 2011; Pashby, 2015). Moreover, political shifts in many western democracies and a subsequent rise in nationalism have challenged even the most basic assumptions underpinning GCE, that people (and specifically pupils) should strive to be part of a global community, that the nation is becoming less relevant, and that borders are becoming more porous (Franch, 2020; Sant et al., 2018).

In spite of the criticism and perhaps in an adverse response to some of it, GCE and GC have recently been institutionalised in the education agenda of the two largest GEOs: in UNESCO's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (UN, 2015) and in the OECD's PISA (OECD, 2018). SDG 4.7 refers to global citizenship education as one of the main priorities of the 2030 agenda, while PISA 2018 included a measure of global competencies, indicating that these concepts are (or should be) universal and ensuring that national policymakers continue to increase their efforts to incorporate them into policy and practice. The OECD framework references UNESCOs SDG 4.7 and presents its measure of global competence as a way to assess global citizenship to advance the SDGs. The global competencies framework states: 'The PISA 2018 questionnaire will provide information on innovations in curricula and teaching methods aimed at preparing pupils for global citizenship' (pg. 36).

The aforementioned assumptions that underpin conceptions of GCE have been further challenged recently by the consequences of the Covid-19 pandemic. At the height of the pandemic, many countries closed their borders, and foreigners in many countries reported a rise in hostility towards them as well as xenophobia from communities in their host countries (Li & Nicholson, 2021). Although the SDGs and OECD framework were developed and administered prior to the pandemic, their importance has been said to rise significantly as a result of it (Lynegar, 2020).

In Israel, GCE has barely received any formal recognition from the Ministry of Education (MOE). The absence of GCE from the formal, state-issued curriculum is not surprising, as the

term itself could be perceived as threatening in conflict-ridden states, which often develop more nationalistic education systems (Banks, 2008). The ambiguity with which Israeli society relates to global society (Goren & Yemini, 2017a; 2018a; Goren et al., 2018 b) poses an interesting case for examining the way spatial location and the way pupils experience their area of residence can shape their global identities, especially when there is no policy in place to mediate or encourage exposure to GCE related contents. This is not to say that the notion of global citizenship is completely absent in the Israeli context. Israel takes great pride in its technological and scientific contributions to the world, its participation in the OECD as well as other global organisations, along with the success of Israelis and, in fact, all Jewish people abroad. This pride, however, has not translated into a clear curricular or educational policy goal, likely because as Bekerman and Zembylas (2016) argue, there is a high value placed on national loyalty in conflict-ridden societies, and the education system plays a crucial role in promoting this loyalty.

Another characteristic of Israel that is central to this thesis is its clear division between peripheral and central places of residence, based on their historic socio-economic composition and their distance from large and developed cities and economic centres (Tzfadia & Yacobi, 2011). This division is accompanied by differential resource allocation and use as well as significant educational achievement and attainment gaps between pupils' education in each of the settings (Soen & Davidovich, 2004). These inequalities mirror those present in other places and connect to a wide body of literature that calls attention to how places of residence can impact and shape pupils' identities and imagined futures (Hardgrove et al., 2015; Prince, 2014).

In this thesis, drawing on interviews with teachers from different sectors of the Israeli education system and fieldwork in schools in a peripheral city and a central city, in which I asked teachers and pupils to comment on the PISA global competence questionnaire, I challenge uniform definitions and conceptions of global citizenship and global competencies in different settings. Then, in order to further and more broadly demonstrate how the understanding and construction of these terms in the Israeli context diverge from the existing institutionalised definitions, I apply thematic analysis to the central policy document, mandatory preparation course materials and media items related to pupil trips abroad, an activity strongly associated in the literature with global competencies. In doing this, I reveal the absence of the assumed relationship between global competence and pupil trips abroad. Overall, this thesis provides a grounded and critical analysis that casts doubt on the ability to measure and standardise these

concepts across and within national contexts. By contrasting the myriad of meanings and values attributed to these concepts by scholars and global education organisations with the way they are constructed through policy and understood by pupils and teachers in different settings in Israel, I shed light on discrepancies that could arise in other national settings as well.

Throughout the thesis, I also show how notions of peripherality beyond those related to the geographic place of residence, shape understandings and meanings of global citizenship. I explore this on three levels- the geographic (which strictly relates to areas of residence), the social (which extends beyond place of residence to include marginalised populations as well), and the national - drawing on notions of ideational semi-periphery to show that Israel is situated outside the global consensus, and this impacts how global citizenship is interpreted by its residents.

1.1 Personal Motivation

My personal history is entrenched in concepts of mobility, cosmopolitan capital, privilege, and global citizenship. I was born in Israel to parents who worked in global professions, and when I was between the ages of three to five and eleven to sixteen, our family temporarily relocated to an upper-middle-class suburb of Boston, Massachusetts. Upon my return to Israel (both times), I recognised how my experiences abroad distinguished me from my peers. I had developed different interests, different cultural references, acquired skills that were barely taught in the Israeli education system and learned to speak and write fluently in English.

As I grew older and entered a bachelor's degree program at a local college in Israel, and later my master's program at TAU, I found that my knowledge of English and other academic skills I had acquired during my middle and high-school years abroad became even more useful. In my bachelor's degree, I studied behavioural sciences and majored in sociology. This was when I was first exposed to sociology of education as an elective course. I was fascinated by hidden and systemic inequalities in the education system and by the exposure to education as both a functional tool for the preservation of social class and compliance and an emancipatory practice with transformative potential.

This elective course led me to study educational management and administration and major in sociology of education at Tel Aviv University for my master's degree. As part of my studies, I took part in a seminar by my second supervisor, Professor Miri Yemini, who first

introduced me to my field of study - global citizenship education. My first project with her was a paper based on interviews I had conducted with teachers at an international and a local secondary school in Israel. This revealed disparities in the extent to which teachers of pupils from different populations perceived global citizenship to be relevant or appropriate for their pupils. I was intrigued by the different perceptions and sought to further explore them in my master's dissertation (supervised by Professor Miri Yemini).

My master's dissertation (submitted to Tel Aviv University), which serves as the backdrop and foundation of the proposed study, explored the perceptions of GCE among teachers at six Israeli high-schools from the Jewish-secular sector of the education system, which serve populations of pupils from low, middle and high socioeconomic backgrounds (Goren & Yemini 2016; 2017a; b). All schools were located in Tel Aviv, a cosmopolitan city with many immigrants. My findings suggested that teachers of pupils from all groups perceived pupils of high socio-economic status (SES) to be more suitable candidates for GCE, that it was more relevant and accessible to them, and to some extent that these pupils absorbed GCE through experiences of travelling and having parents who placed a high value on cosmopolitanism. In addition, my findings showed that teachers perceive pupils of different backgrounds and particularly from different areas of the city to experience globalisation 'at home' in vastly different ways. These differences in teacher perceptions of GCE's relevance for their pupils who reside within different areas of the same city raise questions regarding the extent of the 'GCE gap' in provision and engagement for all young people today; specifically, the way variations in the types and abundance or scarcity of global influences in the cities and neighbourhoods in which pupils reside shape the pupils' own notions of global citizenship.

While working on my thesis, I also conducted a systematic review of 99 empirical studies published between 2005 and 2015, parts of which have been incorporated and adapted for this thesis. Through this review, I discovered that research on global citizenship (until that point) had a tendency to ignore social context and differences within national contexts especially, and this further provoked my interest in exploring the intricacies of different educational settings. As such, this thesis is an extension of the path that I have been on since 2014, in which I aim to show differences and discrepancies not only in how global citizenship is perceived among different populations but also which factors shape these differences. Along the way, my research focus has shifted based on each study I conducted, from SES to places of residence; from a

broad, abstract conception of GCE to one that critically reflects on bodies of global education governance and the definitions they have composed; and from relying on teachers to reflect the views and experiences of their pupils to speaking directly to pupils in order to gain deeper insights into the opportunities for global engagement afforded to them and the extent and ways in which they take advantage of them.

1.2 Central Argument and Aims

Pupils' formal educational spaces, as well as other parts of their environment, can have a profound influence on the way they construct their own understandings of GCE and imagine their place in a globalised world. In this thesis, I examine the intersections between pupils' background and the way they perceive their position in the world, and the spatial boundaries of their possible futures, in a way that challenges the types of GCE currently being promoted and sheds light on informal forms of GCE that have not been considered in the past. More broadly, this work problematises the 'one-size-fits-all' or universalist assumptions underlying many efforts at GCE and calls attention to the importance of understanding contextually - unique bottom-up perceptions of the term as a way of accommodating differences in the needs of different populations while promoting equality of opportunity for global engagement.

Thus, I focus on the following overarching research question: How does the sociopolitical context of Israel shape the meanings attributed to global citizenship education and the skills associated with global competencies?

I explore this question through three separate but intertwined lines of inquiry, guided by the following questions:

1.	How do pupils residing in different cities (global/peripheral) perceive GCE, their place in a global world, and their imagined futures? To what extent is this shaped by their place of residence?

2.	How do teachers of pupils residing in different cities construct meanings of GCE and perceive their role in preparing pupils for global society? How does place of residence shape these constructed meanings and roles?

3.	How does Israel's position in the global arena engender manifestations and perceptions of GCE within and across the education system?

These questions are examined through a variety of data sources to look at the state and policy levels as well as the grounded school environment through interviews, focus groups, and documentary analysis. As will be elaborated in section 1.4 of this chapter and in the methodology chapter, the first question is addressed mostly through data from focus groups with students in a peripheral and a central school, in which students were also presented with and asked to comment on the PISA global competence questionnaire; the second question is answered mostly based on data from interviews with teachers in the different sectors of the education system and in a peripheral and central school (in these interviews teachers were also asked to review and comment on the PISA global competence questionnaire), and the third primarily relies on an analysis of a mandatory course created by the Israeli Ministry of Education (MOE) and Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) for students embarking on school-based trips abroad, and of news excerpts that report on these trips. However, it should be noted that each type or source of data contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of more than one research question.

As such, the purpose of this research is to contribute to the development of more contextually informed understandings of what GCE means to different populations and how globalisation manifests and shapes pupils' lives differently by exposing discrepancies in how pupils from different backgrounds relate to GCE and the types of opportunities and means for engagement they are exposed to in different places of residence.

I aim to delineate strategies and contents that different populations (of both teachers and pupils) associate with GCE and examine the extent to which these are compatible or contradictory to the type of GCE promoted and delineated by GEOs and scholarly definitions, as well as critically examine institutional forms of GCE with relation to bottom-up conceptions of the term by different actors (pupils, teachers, and policy makers) and challenge the dichotomous separation between the global and local by examining the extent to which perceptions of the global are shaped by local socio-spatial factors. Finally, through a focused examination of a specific global education phenomenon (pupil trips abroad) and the way it is constructed and controlled by government agencies in Israel, I aim to show how manifestations and understandings of GCE reflect national goals as well as cultural, political, and historical factors, that in Israel can be attributed to the concept of semi-peripherality.

1.3 Situating the Study and the Research Approach

There are a few key concepts that are central to framing and situating this thesis but lie beyond the scope of the literature review, which is centred around a more in-depth account of the development of global citizenship and the Israeli context. These include the research approach that stems from the field of comparative education; debates surrounding definitions of globalisation and internationalisation, and the way I interpret and make use of these concepts; and the use of periphery and core as organizing concepts that I will use to frame the findings, but have thus far not played a major role in the field of research on GC. These concepts are introduced in the following sections.

1.3.1 The Approach: Comparative Education

This thesis is situated in the field and epistemology of comparative education research and responds to a recent shift in this field towards contextually grounded comparisons that take into account the multitude of factors that shape and impact the way education policies are framed, formed and enacted in different settings and examine how the local navigates the global. This shift is not representative of the entire field, and others have rightly argued that the reigning 'new paradigm' in comparative education holds large-scale comparative measurements in high regard and is characterised by a desire to 'discover' best practices at the national level for the sake of 'successful' transfer (Auld & Morris, 2014). As such, the growing calls for contextualisation and nuanced interpretations to which my thesis responds could be viewed as a pendulum-swing reaction to the placement of data above all.

Comparative education is a highly developed field in education aimed at identifying and producing educational patterns, approaches, practices and policies through national, international, and intranational comparisons. The field began to form in the early 1800s in the works of Marc-Antoine Jullien, who began to initiate and develop questionnaires aimed at creating a shared framework for comparing and formulating education reform policies that could be shared across countries (Fraser, 1964). At these early stages there were debates among German, American and French scholars concerning what the field should be named and what its focus should be, which have been explored by others at length (e.g., Manzon, 2018). What is important to note for the purpose of this thesis is that the beginning of the field largely focused

on countries as units of analysis, and research was framed as a scientific endeavour, largely relied on inductive comparisons based on secondary analysis of documents, and was much more descriptive and historical than critical. Since then, the field has undergone many changes and shifts (Bray et al., 2014; Turner, 2019); new methodologies have been incorporated, and new lines of inquiry have emerged, which have led to a shift from purely describing educational systems, policies and practices to critically assessing them while taking into account cultural, historical, and social developments. These shifts can be attributed to developments in the broader social sciences, as well as to technological advancements that have made data more readily available and facilitated travel between places.

One widely cited definition of the field and its purposes was put forth by Noah and Eckstein (1969, p. 127), in which they described comparative education as 'an intersection of the social sciences, education and cross-national study [which] attempts to use cross-national data to test propositions about the relationship between education and society and between teaching practices and learning outcomes'. This definition is largely reflective of the times in which it was written; it addresses the nation as the unit of analysis and mentions teaching practices and outcomes as the main focal points of the field, while also taking into account the social aspects that were less central in the earlier stages of the field. However, since the turn of the millennium in particular, the field has changed significantly, and scholars seem to be warier of constricting definitions of this sort (Cowen & Kazamias, 2009); This is not to say that all comparative education scholars and scholarship have suddenly become aware of complexities, caveats, and abandoned their hope of transferring policies and best practices from one national sphere to the other verbatim. In fact, it may be better termed as a rift (or even a war, as per Cowen, 2014) than an overall change. Some key scholars in the field have become highly critical and reflective of both its past and its future trajectories, its purposes, as well as the challenges those operating within it face (and the fact that many of them seem to disregard these challenges), as can be seen in the contemporary writings of Cowen and Kazamias (ibid), Cowen (ibid), Sobe and Kowalczyk (2012) as well as many others. These scholars have identified many issues of concern within the field; they argue against the valorisation of global actors and international large-scale assessments, tendencies to portray research and objective as external to the researcher and the context in which it is produced, and static notions of space that portray it as peripheral, static, and ahistorical, and are therefore reductionist and inherently flawed.

One key aspect which has been the focus of much criticism in this 'war' is how context is constructed and understood. Crossley (2009) identified that context should no longer be described as a 'backdrop' to education systems, addressed at a national level, but rather represented as a multi-layered and entangled term that shapes every aspect of education and is inseparable from the meaning of education in general (Crossley, ibid). Sobe and Kowalczyk (2012) present a much blunter critique, problematising the very notion of context as it is constructed in comparative education, using Latour's (2004) distinction between matters of fact and matters of concern. Sobe and Kowalczyk argue that the multi-layered approach to context addressed by Crossly and informed by Bray and Thomas's (1995) cube (which provides a framework for deconstructing context into a variety of demographic, geographic, and systematic/institutional levels) does not go far enough and instead of opening up the research agenda and trajectories, it continues to constrict and refine it, thus cementing it as a 'matter of fact'. Sobe and Kowalczyk call on scholars to 'explode the cube' and treat context as a matter of concern, by addressing knowledge and power as the starting and end points of research; this, they say, will enable us to gain more informed and in-depth insights into how education practices and systems are enacted, shaped, and changed, as well how these institutions and practices shape and create contexts in an ever-evolving process.

The critiques I have presented here and the processes of contesting what comparative education is and what it should be, have affected (and been affected by) the focal points of studies. Whereas in the past, the nation was the main unit of analysis and a comparison between nations was a precursor for any comparative education study, today there is much more fluidity in what can be compared; this enables comparative studies which focus on different groups, regions, religions, cultures, genders, and more within comparative education, which also draw on and compare phenomena at the global level. The same can be said about the abundance of methods in the field today. Although these developments are still criticised and cannot be said to have thoroughly internalised and adopted the broad range of critical scholarship and the lessons it has tried to bestow, they do represent a shift that should be acknowledged.

While much of comparative education scholarship continues to utilise methods informed by positivism and realism (scientific approaches/epistemologies that claim reality can be identified, quantified and measured with the right tools), there is also a large school of thought within the field that critiques and rejects these notions and thus prefer methods informed by

constructivism and interpretivism (epistemological stances that say reality is constructed by human experiences, and can only be interpreted through deeper studies of those experiences using mostly qualitative methods and tools) (Epstein, 2008). The interpretivist and critical schools of thought in comparative education tend to address context in a much broader sense and are less geared towards generalisations (Manzon, 2011). This thesis is situated within the latter school of thought, as I employ a qualitative comparative approach and explore the Israeli context from different angles to focus on how global education concepts are understood across sectors and populations within the education system and how these understandings are informed by a variety of socio-spatial factors.

1.3.2 Methodological Nationalism

Some of the shifts in the modes of inquiry in comparative education can be attributed to critiques of methodological nationalism. Ulrich Beck (2007) coined the term methodological nationalism at the beginning of the 21st century, to denote a problem with the social sciences at the time (that is still prevalent): the tendency to seek explanations for social phenomena and solutions to global social problems at the national level, and more broadly, to use the national level as the natural and main unit of analysis. Beck claimed that globalisation is a catalyst of the movement from the first modernity (the rise of the nation-states) to the second modernity, in which global threats and the global movement of goods, money, and technology, as well as a rise of mobility and liquefaction of national boundaries, have (with the help of international and supra-national organisations) weakened the nation-states, causing them to become a hollow 'zombie category' (Beck, 2002; Beck & Lau, 2005). This argument is rooted in the assumption and claim that in the age of globalisation, the nature of events and relations cannot be understood through a strictly local prism, and all a priori judgments regarding class differences within nation-states should be abandoned. Beck essentially called on scholars to look to the global realm and seek similarities among groups and classes beyond the nation-state because he posited no pattern within a nation could be explained without being attributed to the broader, global picture.

However, Beck's notion of methodological nationalism, a critical concept itself, has been criticised for being somewhat reductive. Wimmer and Glick-Schiller (2002) developed a typology that includes three types of methodological nationalism which are not mutually exclusive: disregarding the importance of nationalism for modern societies, naturalisation

(observing the nation as the natural unit of analysis and comparison), and confining studies to geopolitical boundaries of a particular nation-state. The first type is where Beck's definition falls short, as it deems the nation-state irrelevant, ignoring its importance which has since only grown. Furthermore, Wimmer and Glick-Schiller (ibid) note that although global processes can be an explanatory factor for phenomena at the national level, scholars must not disregard local histories, cultures, norms, and distinct characteristics in analysing the effects of globalisation.

The main critique of methodological nationalism in comparative education aligns with the typology presented by Wimmer and Schiller but goes further as it calls on scholars to look not only outwards beyond the nation-state as a unit of analysis, but also inwards to explore how different groups within nations interpret global phenomena, while taking into account the geo-political and national factors, the groups' global status as it relates to the status of similar groups in other nations, and the individual characteristic and realities of the groups' members (Robertson & Dale, 2008). Robertson and Dale connect their critique to a broader one, which also concerns methodological stateism (an assumption that states all have comparable structures, responsibilities, institutions, etc.), educationism (an assumption that education refers solely to compulsory schooling and has similar characteristics and goals across contexts), and spatial-fetishism (an assumption that space is ahistorical, immune to change and social influence) each of which refers to a way in which scholars often overlook differences in the construction and manifestations of each concept to try and facilitate making coherent arguments, sometimes at the expense of accurate representations and in-depth analyses. These critiques have two main implications for this thesis: the 'case' of Israel will be deconstructed to highlight distinct characteristics of the state and its population, and findings will be framed in a conscious effort to avoid sweeping generalisations as to their implications.

1.3.3 Periphery and Centre as Organising Concepts

While the field of comparative education provides the backdrop for this thesis and sheds light on its broader purpose, limitations, as well as scope, periphery and core are organising concepts that comprise an analytical lens through which the study's findings will be presented. The word- periphery- originally served purely as a relational and spatial term denoting outskirts or a boundary. In the 1800s, it was mostly used in geographic scholarship to define national or regional contexts. In the context of geographic scholarship, the term evolved over time and

25

particularly as nation-states became more prominent and developed categories that were used to describe regions on the outskirts of nations (rather than regions). Within the field of geography today, it is widely used in Urban Studies and incorporates spatial, social, and economic factors (Caldeira, 2012; Green & Letts, 2017; Kuhn, 2015).

In the 1900s, the distinction of periphery and centre began to be used in social sciences to express marginality as well, with the introduction of the term 'social periphery', used synonymously with the term 'social distance' (another term that merges spatial and social spheres). Simmel (1908) is considered the first or most prominent figure in conceptualising the notion of social periphery, as part of his influential book 'The Stranger', where he explored how social groups construct themselves in relation to the proverbial stranger, and explored how social distance dictates group relations and individual experiences. The concept was later taken up and developed by Robert Park (1950) and his student Emory Bogardus (1960), who utilised it to specifically explore racial and ethnic group relations and social place, and posited that social distance was integral in shaping societies and human interactions. Since then, the use of social distance and periphery as descriptive terms for explaining intergroup relations has become widely popular, as has the concept of marginalised populations or groups (Kuhn, 2015). The difference between how the terms are used can be highlighted through the descriptive nature of the word periphery, as opposed to the more critical term of marginalised, which holds an implicit reference to an active process by which groups or people are pushed towards the social outskirts. Throughout this thesis, I will use social periphery as an organising term to refer to marginalised groups in order to maintain clarity and consistent terminology. However, I will also refer to processes of marginalisation where appropriate to avoid overlooking these active processes. To avoid cementing these social positions and perpetuating a false dichotomy, I will also incorporate the concept of liminality, originally developed by anthropologists Arnold van Gennep (1909) and later Turner (1969), to describe phases of transition in rites of passage and ceremonies. More recently, the term liminality has been used by Wood (2016), who demonstrates its potential for providing an explanatory framework that illuminates youth experiences of inclusion and exclusion in physical and imagined spaces and borders. Thus, I will use liminality to describe processes of transition and practices or perceptions that connect the centre and periphery in the eyes of participants.

In parallel to the sociological use of the concepts of periphery and centre to distinguish social positioning, these terms also became widely used in economic scholarship around the same time, as they were introduced by dependency theorists Singer (1975) and Prebisch (1950). Dependency theory scholars offered a bimodal model of core and periphery, wherein metropolitan states that had historically conquered and colonised regions consisted of the core, and the colonised regions that became satellites formed the periphery (Ferraro, 2008). The original dependency theory model saw capitalism as the ultimate sign of development and placed nations and regions on a spectrum to assess which 'stage' of development they were in. This model was then further developed by world-systems theorists, who claimed that rather than portraying nations or areas as being located on a spectrum of development that ends with capitalism, the categories of periphery and centre should serve as organizing categories that better capture the reciprocal relations between nations, without assuming a particular direction of progression and attributing exploitive practices to the developed, capitalist nations (Chirot & Hall, 1982).

World-systems theory was advanced in the 1970s by Emmanuel Wallerstein (1974), who coined the term 'semi-periphery' as an intermediate category between the core and the periphery. Its role goes beyond a distinct middle position in the international division of labour, as it also plays a political role in the system, diverting pressures from the periphery similarly to the role of the middle class in defusing tensions between workers and capitalists. The critiques lodged against methodological nationalism are also in many ways relevant to this categorisation, which, like other developments of world-system theory, has been critiqued for promoting a somewhat reductionist and deterministic world view. Lee (2010, pg. 3) claimed the key problem with the world system approach was demonstrated in 'the way the emergence of the capitalist world-economy was handled; a perceived reductionism in the mode of argument; the treatment of how surplus was appropriated and accumulated, including the question of class; and the general exclusion of an analysis of any role for 'culture' with the associated concern for what seemed to some the Eurocentrism of the project'. Although Wallerstein and other scholars in this area claim that the core/periphery theory can be applied in a more nuanced manner, taking into account differences within nations, they rarely used it this way.

In this thesis, I draw upon three conceptions of periphery. First, I draw on the concept of semi-peripheries, and argue that Israel is a semi-periphery, despite being largely capitalist and

democratic and despite its trade relationship with powerful nations, because it is somewhat outside of the global consensus about human rights and democracy (similarly to South Africa in 1948-1994 [Camody, 2002]). I show how this peripherality is interpreted by teachers and pupils across different groups and geographic areas of Israeli society, how it reflects different experiences of marginalisation and liminality, and how it plays into their conceptions of global citizenship and of their place in a global world. I also show how this peripherality is reflected in the Israeli education system, specifically with regard to the uncoupling of global citizenship and pupil trips abroad.

Second, I draw on geographic/regional notions of peripherality to address differences in how pupils and teachers residing in different areas understand global citizenship education and their place in a global world with reference to the extent they construe their environment as central or peripheral.

Third, I explore how GCE is perceived by teachers from the different sectors of Israeli society, and how teachers' belonging to the social periphery (minority ethnic/religious groups) or social core (majority) shape these perceptions. I highlight the marginalisation teachers belonging to the religious-state system experience as they sense the education system veering away from a locally constructed curriculum that placed Jewishness above all; the inherent liminality experienced by the Arab-Palestinian teachers who perceive GCE as a way to connect with the world while circumventing the national citizenship framework which marginalises and pushes away their pupils as a result of the intractable Israeli- Palestinian conflict; and the differences between these experiences and those of secular Jewish teachers in the state system, who construct GCE as an opportunity for pupils to take advantage of a wide range of opportunities, while reflecting on the strategies employed by the education system, create and maintain liminality as policy rather than as part of a process.

These all amount to my overarching argument, that notions of peripherality and centrality mediate and shape the way global citizenship education is perceived, imagined, and enacted in the Israeli context and beyond it.

1.3.4 Internationalisation and Globalisation

Internationalisation and globalisation are both terms that I have already mentioned in the introduction and will continue to use throughout this work, as they are both critical to

understanding what GCE means and how it came to be. However, because these terms are often used interchangeably or uncritically in the literature, it is important to clarify what each means within the frame of this thesis. Furthermore, the field of comparative education, briefly introduced in the previous section, is often represented as a product and driver of processes of globalisation and internationalisation, and thus, cannot be fully understood without introducing and dissecting these terms.

Since the early 1990s globalisation has become a sweeping term and one of the key concepts of research in social sciences; the term is used in different ways, often presented as an all-encompassing process that spans across three main areas: economic, cultural, and political globalisation (Held, 2000). Most of the literature surrounding globalisation comes from the economic sphere, as globalisation has a profound effect on the economic interdependency between countries. Martin Albrow (1997, p.88) describes globalisation as 'the diffusion of practices, values, and technologies that affects people around the world'. Castells (2010) highlights the quick move of information in the global economy, which enables countries to work as a single unit in real-time on a world scale. Some claim the process of globalisation is not a new phenomenon and that the global economy has been developing and evolving for over 500 years (Eštok, & Bzdilová, 2011). The flow of capital and human capital around the world have connected different places since colonial times. What separates globalisation today from previous times is the speed, intensity, and extent of the movement of capital which have been more pronounced since the 1970s (Giddens, 2003).

Giddens (1990) defines globalisation as '[the] intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa' (pg. 64). This definition is widely used, as it is broad enough to encompass many manifestations of globalisation. However, Giddens' definition lacks a critical component, as it neglects the causes or catalysts for globalisation- why are these relationships intensifying, who benefits from this, and who drives or promotes globalisation. This critical angle is the core of the definition offered by Robertson and Dale (2015), who argue globalisation is 'a witting attempt by a range of national and transnational organisations to bring about a set of interventions around the globe aimed at extending the role of the market and reducing the role of national states' (Robertson & Dale, ibid, pg. 159). This places the focus on the causes rather than its effects.

29

Robertson and Dale present their definition as part of what they term a critical cultural, political economy framework for studying and analysing processes of globalisation of education (ibid). In education scholarship, similarly to the broader social sciences, globalisation is often portrayed as an external, uncontrollable force to which states and institutions respond, or a set of conditions that facilitate or necessitate changes to education delivery and contents (Robertson & Dale, 2008). However, Robertson and Dale, as well as other scholars (e.g. Bartleson, 2000; Brenner, 2003), posit that globalisation is itself propelled and driven by tangible forces, organisations, and stakeholders, and thus needs to be deconstructed rather than taken at face value. Robertson and Dale present three competing approaches to the globalisation of education that their approach improves upon world polity (culture), world systems, and globalisation as providing a 'structured agenda for education'. World culture theory (Meyer & Ramirez, 2000) posits that a universal, transnational, cultural environment serves as an explanation for the globalisation of education- as it manifests in the apparent similarities between education systems around the world. World-systems theory, on the other hand, places the explanatory power on economic factors and processes, and more specifically, the emergence and needs of the global economy. Education systems, according to this theory, embed 'the global division of labour within the world system between core, semi-peripheral, and peripheral states' (Roberson & Dale, 2015, p. 158). Consequently, the education system adjusts itself based on the nation's placement on the spectrum of innovation, production, and consumption, to produce citizens with the necessary skills and values. Finally, the structured agenda approach highlights the role of transnational organisations as key actors in promoting the globalisation of education, turning its focus to the global political economy. These organisations, according to this approach, carry out global projects of neo-liberalism and modernisation.

Robertson and Dale (ibid) argue that each of the approaches they critiqued neglect at least one factor that is highlighted by one or more of the others and offer their approach as a synthesis that overcomes these blind spots and takes into account political, economic, and cultural factors from a critical standpoint, analyzing the roles and agency of states, the global polity, and global or transnational organisations in producing, shaping and adapting the scripts that direct the globalisation of education. In another publication (2008), they draw on Brenner's (2003, pg. 28) concept of spatial fetishism to highlight the difference between the common use of globalisation as '…a conception of social space that is timeless and static, and thus immune to the possibility

of historical change' and a more dynamic approach required to understand differential and distinct manifestations of globalisation as they relate to education systems and phenomena.

Rappleye (2015) offers another robust critique of the way world culture theory explains globalisation, and offers this view of globalisation as 'a multiplicity of 'mini-projects' involving pluralities of actors who assign different meanings to similar events, given different positionalities, projects and structural limitations rooted in divergent histories, contexts and conceptual/discursive schemes' (pg. 82). The approaches presented by Rappleye and by Robertson and Dale both call on scholarship to be mindful of the actors who promote globalisation and its differential and varying effects on different aspects of life and culture within and across societies.

Beyond (but not disconnected from) the implications of globalisation for the way nation-states are perceived, the role of many education systems has also shifted, from preparing pupils to thrive in their local settings and become productive citizens to a broader aim of educating 'global citizens' whose interests, rights, and responsibilities extend beyond the national realm (Banks, 2004; Nussbaum, 2002; Sant et al., 2018). This aim of education systems can be geared towards economic/neo-liberal goals of making graduates competitive candidates in the global workforce or be articulated in terms of social or environmental responsibilities (Bamber et al., 2018; Bourn et al., 2017; Davies et al., 2018). Globalisation of education can also refer to less-active ways in which educational systems become more global through cultural diversification as a result of immigration- which can also drive more active processes of adapting curricula and policies to accommodate populations of non-citizens or citizens who are excluded from national narratives (Banks, 2004; 2008).

These patterns of change in education systems are often referred to under the name internationalisation, which refers to the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions, or delivery of post-secondary education. (Knight, 2003, p. 2). This definition, offered by Knight, was developed with post-secondary education in mind but has since been used many times to describe education systems as a whole- because it is modular and offers flexibility that accommodates a wide breadth of phenomena. Most processes of globalisation of education can fit into this definition. Knight's definition for internationalisation and scholarship that utilises it has been criticised and modified, including by Knight herself (2008), with some scholars arguing that it is too ambiguous to be a useful

analytical framework, and others noting that it disregards motives and rationales which should be closely examined when trying to understand changes in education systems (Yemini, 2015; Stein, 2017). It has also been suggested that the way the definition is worded makes institutions appear passive in this process, instead arguing that internationalisation requires clear intent and goals to be considered as such (de Wit & Hunter, 2015). In 2015, de Wit and Hunter employed a Delphi panel exercise (in which a wide range of scholars are asked to reach a unanimous definition or conclusion) which produced the following definition: '[internationalisation is] the intentional process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all pupils and staff, and to make a meaningful contribution to society (pg. 3).'

With regards to the intended products of internationalisation, Yemini (2015) offered another definition, where she defined internationalisation 'as the process of encouraging integration of multicultural, multilingual, and global dimensions within the education system, with the aim of instilling in learners a sense of global citizenship (p.21)'. Yemini argues that this definition builds on Knight's definition with several major changes- the substitution of international for multilingual (and thus combining the global and international aspects), and, more importantly, the addition of a goal or product of internationalisation- the creation of global citizens. This change, Yemini claims, 'brings the learner and the learning action itself back into the centre of focus and reopens the discussion by determining the significance of the process, its priorities, and its contribution to the advancement of human society as a whole (p.22)'. This definition is normative/prescriptive, rather than descriptive as opposed to Knight's seemingly neutral definition. It limits what processes are included and excluded from the discourse of internationalisation.

Yemini's definition is informed by some of the critiques of the internationalisation literature and definitions, including De Wit's (2011) list of nine misconceptions regarding internationalisation of higher education. These misconceptions include: (1) education in the English language; (2) studying or staying abroad; (3) an international subject (referring to curricula); (4) having many international pupils; (5) few international pupils guarantee success; (6) no need to test intercultural and international competencies; (7) the more partnerships, the more international; (8) higher education- international by nature; (9) internationalisation as a precise goal. According to De Wit, each of these clauses represents a common but misinformed

assumption of what constitutes internationalisation, which is supposed to be (as per De Wit) a positive process: 'Internationalisation is a process to introduce intercultural, international, and global dimensions in higher education; to improve the goals, functions, and delivery of higher education; and thus, to upgrade the quality of education and research' (p.6). De Wit, like Yemini, offers a prescriptive definition that limits the goals that drive internationalisation and the outcomes that should be expected from it. However, I would argue that both de Wit and Yemini's definitions exclude too many processes and motives that should be taken into account when examining internationalisation, and focus entirely on what internationalisation should be and the correct types of internationalisation, as opposed to what it is and how it manifests across systems and settings.

Knight, on the other hand, identifies a wide breadth of rationales that can underpin attempts at internationalisation. She points to existing and emerging rationales on the national and institutional levels that drive the different forms of internationalisation. These rationales are organised according to social/cultural, political, economic, and academic types, ranging from [strengthening] national and cultural identities to creating international academic standards. This framework looks at internationalisation as something that is actively driven and enacted, while accommodating a wide range of activities and goals by different actors, allowing many processes to be identified as attempts at internationalisation.

For this thesis, informed by these definitions, I think it is pertinent to distinguish internationalisation of education and globalisation of education. I will use the term internationalisation to refer to actions purposefully taken by education institutes and systems to prepare pupils for global citizenship, as Yemini suggests- while incorporating a broader notion of global citizenship that will be detailed in the literature review. Globalisation of education, on the other hand, is the term I will use to refer to processes and conditions external to the nation that facilitate or necessitate internationalisation in education systems and impact education outside of formal school or university environments.

This is not to say that globalisation is simply the backdrop to internationalisation. Internationalisation can be conceptualised as a ripple effect of the force of globalisation, or an active response to it. Robertson and Dale's definition of globalisation of education (2015), similar to the definitions of internationalisation presented earlier, assigns agency and purpose to institutions (in this case international and transnational), as well as a specific aim- however, this

aim is much broader than those presented by Yemini, de Wit and Hunter, and Knight. Robertson and Dale's view, rather than treating globalisation as abstract, random, empirical generalisation, treats it as a project which serves organisations with specific values and interests. Globalisation of education, Robertson and Dale argue, cannot be understood outside of cultural, political, and economic factors, nor should it be presented as a process that occurs passively. As such, globalisation of education can refer to the ways cultural, political, and economic factors that are influenced by stakeholders on different levels shape the audience, goals, and modes of delivery for education globally, and one of its products is internationalisation, where local actors enact processes in response to this globalisation. In line with this definition of globalisation of education, I see global citizenship as a vehicle promoted, defined, and used by various actors pursuing distinct agendas, rather than a neutral byproduct of globalisation or a form of internationalisation through which education systems simply respond to global mandates. The appearance of GCE within an education system is the result of an active process of translation, in which a concept pushed down by GEOs with explicit and implicit motives, is adapted to fit the culture, politics, and aims of the particular state that adopts it. In the thesis, I expand this notion and show that this process of translation and adaptation also extends into schools and classrooms.

1.4 Thesis Structure

Following this introductory chapter, the thesis is comprised of seven additional chapters. A literature review (Chapter 2), methodology (Chapter 3), three findings and discussion chapters (Chapters 4, 5, and 6) and overarching discussion and conclusions (Chapter 7). In the literature review (Chapter 2), I address a wide breadth of the scholarship surrounding global citizenship education and its critiques; then, I explore the different ways that pupils' area of residence within and across national contexts can impact their futures, particularly in relation to global trajectories. Finally, I delve into the Israeli context. In the methodology chapter (3), I present my data collection process for each part of the study, the considerations and obstacles I faced, the mode of analysis, and the ethical implications of the study.

There are three findings and discussion chapters. In the first (Chapter 4), I present findings from interviews with teachers across the sectors of the Israeli education system, which display widely differing understandings of global citizenship, its dangers, and the opportunities it

could pose. In the second (Chapter 5), I present the findings of a multiple case study which delineates the differences in opportunities and strategies for global engagement among pupils from a school in a peripheral city and a school in a global city, through interviews with teachers and focus groups with pupils. These parts of the thesis problematise the very notion of making assumptions regarding the global competence of a nation's pupils, in view of the vast differences in experiences and exposure between regions and even within cities. In this same chapter, I also present, using those same cases, the differential understandings of the specific constructs that compose the PISA measure of global competence and show how these are shaped by the Israeli context. Specifically, I concentrate on how seemingly universal terms such as immigration, multiculturalism, diversity, and more are in fact contested, reframed, and given new meanings embedded in the sociopolitical context.

In the third findings chapter (6), I focus on one aspect of the PISA measure of GC, the existence of pupil exchange programs and trips abroad as part of pupils' schooling experience, showing how this can serve as a false signifier for global competence. I show this using an analysis of news excerpts that depict the goals and outcomes of pupil trips and delegations and the mandatory course developed by the MOE for pupils going abroad to prepare them to be ambassadors for the state of Israel. I argue that these practices disconnect the international experience from the global competence they are expected to foster.

In the concluding chapter (7), I present the wider implications of my research in problematising the universality of definitions and constructs developed by organisations that partake in global education governance; question whether measuring global competence and similar concepts can have benefits at the national level, and delineate a more contextually grounded approach for developing understandings of global citizenship that are customised and sensitive to local needs and circumstances.

The main novelty of the thesis lies in suggesting peripherality/centrality as a framework/perspective that can contribute to a better understanding of differential perceptions of GCE, while taking into account both the settings from which they emerged and the goals they aim to achieve. I show throughout the thesis that empirical literature tends to over-simplify context, particularly as it relates to GCE (Chapters 1 and 2); that notions of peripherality/centrality at both the social and geographic levels can shed light on some different notions of GCE and their aims (Chapters 4 and 5); that some of Israel's features such as the

controversial nature of its policies related to the conflict and the occupation and its efforts to get closer to the West, while maintaining its national identity are characteristic of a semi-periphery (Chapters 1 and 6); and that in turn, this semi-peripherality engenders a particularistic type of GCE that is subsumed to the national goals so as to not threaten the nation (Chapters 6 and 7).

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In this chapter I introduce literature relevant to the three key areas of this thesis, each of which is addressed in a separate part: GCE; spatial theories and how they relate to education and imagined futures; concluding with a part that specifically introduces relevant literature pertaining to the Israeli context. The literature review strategy included the use of academic search engines such as Ebsco, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, as well as my existing knowledge of key scholars, definitions and debates in each of the relevant fields. I used broad search terms (i.e. global citizenship + education; Israel + education system; regional inequality + education) as a starting point, without limiting results to specific periods, and as I became acquainted with key works within each topic, I was able to identify additional relevant sources through citations and concepts they referred to.

The first part (2.1) addresses a wide breadth of scholarship and is divided into three sections. In the first (2.1.1), I outline the conditions that gave rise to GCE as a concept and as a global education trend; then, in the second section (2.1.2), I present definitions, typologies, and categorisations of GCE, while separately introducing those developed by scholars and by GEOs; following this (2.1.3), I present theoretical critiques of GCE related both to the underlying assumptions inherent to the concept and its potential for inequality. I then conclude this part with a section that presents a critical review of empirical literature concerning GCE (2.1.4), which I use to explore the different ways the concept is utilised in literature emanating from different regions in the world, as well as critically outline some caveats and common issues I identified in this literature, which I then address throughout this thesis.

The second part covers literature concerning place, identity, and social inequality, and it is divided into two sections. In the first section (2.2.1), I introduce literature on the spatial turn in education and the way global-local dichotomies have been challenged in the literature; in the second section (2.2.2), I demonstrate how geographic and social place have been demonstrated to shape pupils' achievements and their imagined futures, both in the local (national) sphere and in terms of opportunities or thoughts regarding mobility. I then relate these effects to my own thesis and explain their role in shaping the arguments I later develop.

The third part (2.3) introduces the key features of the Israeli context by touching on the divided nature of the education system as it relates to historical processes since the nation's establishment in 1948. In this part (2.3.1), I present literature that highlights distinct aspects of

Israeli citizenship and how it shapes debates surrounding civic education in Israel; finally, I introduce scholarship that demonstrates the patterns of internationalisation in Israel, which I refer to as 'selective internationalisation'. In this final section (2.3.2) I also discuss how these patterns might influence the inclusion, or more likely, exclusion of GCE from the official curriculum.

2.1 Background, Development, and Conceptions of GCE

The concept at the heart of this thesis is GCE, a contested concept that entered the global education discourse in the late 1900s and has since evolved into a variety of forms and meanings. The concept has been deemed irrelevant by some and utopian by others, but over the past decade in particular, with its institutionalisation by the world's leading GEOs and specifically in the SDG's, it has become ubiquitous. In this chapter, I elaborate on the variety of forms, definitions, and manifestations of GCE, its institutionalisation through the formal agendas of GEOs, and critiques that have been raised of the concept from different angles. Before turning to this main concept, I provide some detail on the global turn in education and explain how the conditions that have been created through this process (such as the rise of global education governance and international large-scale assessments) created fertile ground for its spread, acceptance, and reception.

2.1.1 Setting the Stage: The Global Turn in Education

The Rise of Global Education Governance and GEOs

Since the end of the Cold War in the 1990s, global politics have undergone significant changes. These were associated with the opening up of new markets, processes of privatisation and de-regulation associated with the spread of neoliberal agendas, ideologies and technological advancements. These changes created new spaces for new actors in the global policy arena to advance novel forms of governance, termed - global education governance (GEG) (Mundy, 2007; Sellar, 2015; Sellar & Lingard, 2013). Global and international organisations existed prior to this time, of course, but as communications between nations and regions became more common and accepted due to technological and political developments, their strength and influence grew significantly in many fields, including the field of education. While prior to this time, although comparative education existed, nations were perceived to have very distinct educational needs and capabilities, this perception shifted because markets, communities, etc.

were seen as converging/Global and the borders of education policy became more porous as systems began to acknowledge a growing corpus of 'global education policy'.

The emergence of GEOs and GEG is of course both a product and driver of globalisation. Dale (2003) presented a typology of three distinct ways in which globalisation shapes education governance: neoliberalism, multilateralism, and the globalisation of production. The spread of neoliberalism led to processes such as deregulation, privatisation, and perhaps most importantly, decentralisation, which is critical to the creation of external spheres of influence and control; multilateralism characterises the way national governments responded to IOs and GEOs to protect their interests and consolidate their own goals, while still making room for external influences by different actors; finally, the globalisation of production, Dale argues, has changed the scale and patterns of educational governance by creating openness to the idea that material and immaterial goods produced elsewhere can be transported and used nationally.

The transnational organisations that most strongly promote global education policy are the OECD, the UN, and the World Bank (Auld et al., 2019; Elfert, 2021; Mundy & Verger, 2016). Each of these has explicit and implicit agendas and goals, which they promote on global and national levels, using different approaches. These organisations hold symbolic as well as economic power over many nations and have vested interests in the policies enacted in countries all over the world (Elfert, ibid). These organisations rely on globalisation because it justifies their existence, and thus they have a vested interest in promoting it - however, their interests are more complex (Auld et al., ibid). In order to thrive and maintain their influence over economic, cultural, and political realms, they also promote values and ideals associated with neoliberalism, such as capitalism, libertarianism, competition, and privatisation (in the sense of limiting the control of the state - but not necessarily giving it to the citizens). They exert their influence through mechanisms of soft power (Nye, 2004), which are addressed in the following paragraph.

The OECD has been used as an example to demonstrate the mechanisms and forms of soft power used by these organisations and the way they implement new modes of global governance. Woodward (2009) developed a typology that identifies four modalities of global governance demonstrated by the OECD: cognitive, normative, legal, and palliative cognitive governance refers to the way organisations embody the common values and beliefs of their members; normative governance describes their reach and ability in terms of shaping the beliefs or mindsets of its members; legal governance relates to the legislative power of the organisation

in forming binding agreements or laws among and with its members; palliative governance is demonstrated through the inclination and actions of an organisation in relation to issues and problems that do not fall under the purview of other organisations. Sellar and Lingard (2013) extended this typology to include infrastructural governance, which deals with the role of the OECD's data collection tools in consolidating its power and epistemological governance, which, similar to normative governance, refers to its ability to shape agendas and mindsets, but refers more broadly to how it does this while addressing different actors on local national and global scales.

International Large-Scale Assessments

One of the most powerful tools GEOs have for consolidating and maintaining their influence is international large-scale assessments (ILSAs), the most prominent example of which is the OECD's PISA. The PISA test is administered every three years since 2000, and 79 countries participated in the most recent round, administered in 2018. The test consists of three main parts, which assess literacy, math, and science among pupils aged 15 in all OECD member states and some additional countries; it also includes questions that assess pupil socio-economic background, well-being, school climate, and other variables. Since 2012, additional constructs that change every year have been added to the test; these usually assess soft skills such as financial literacy, collaborative problem solving, global competency (Zhao, 2020).

Sellar and Lingard (2013) refer to previous works by Tucker (2011) as well as Brown and Tannock (2009) to present one main rationale used by the OECD to justify PISA. This rationale suggests that globalisation and neo-liberalism prompted states to demand data and information about the performance of their education system, and the OECD complied by developing PISA. This rationale has been challenged by Sellar and Lingard as well as others (see Addey et al., 2017; Auld et al., 2019), but regardless of the OECD's motives, the test created a new form of comparison of education systems and contributed greatly to the development of the field and practices of global education governance.

The test itself has been critiqued for its sampling method (Freitas et al., 2016); the lack of transparency in the calculation of scores (Prais, 2003); the culturally-skewed phrasing of questions (Dohn, 2007) (which will be elaborated on later in this thesis); and, perhaps most often, for the neoliberal ideology it embodies and drives - in ways that perpetuate and deepen

inequalities within and between nations, creating competition rather than unifying (Engel & Frizzell, 2015; Sellar & Lingard, 2013).

PISA rankings have a powerful effect on some national education policies, often because of media coverage that is skewed by policymakers to support their agendas (Grey & Morris, 2018). It has been argued that PISA has perfected this mechanism of governance through the media, and this is the reason the OECD provides colourful charts that can easily be distributed by the media and easily understood by the public, in accordance with the way media sources choose to frame them (Grey & Morris, Ibid; Yemini & Gordon, 2017). Grey and Morris (ibid) argue that the mediatised scandalisation of PISA results can lead to the adoption or borrowing of policies and practices that have been 'proven' to work in countries that lead the rankings, without paying enough attention to the unique characteristics of the local education systems that may make these policies irrelevant (Auld & Morris, 2016; Grey & Morris, 2018; Kamens, 2013). Nonetheless, although participation in PISA is voluntary, states continue to partake in the test. Addey and colleagues (2017) analyse the reasons for national participation in PISA and suggest a framework of seven main rationales for participation: (1) evidence for policy; (2) technical capacity building; (3) funding and aid; (4) international relations; (5) national politics; (6) economic rationales; and (7) curriculum and pedagogy. These rationales are neither mutually exclusive nor are they exclusively related to PISA. They can manifest in a wide variety of ways in different countries, in accordance with national needs, culture, history and characteristics of the education system (Fischman et al., 2019; Kamens, ibid).

Thus, PISA remains a powerful tool in the hands of the OECD to maintain its power, spread its ideology, and solidify its relevance. However, the critiques of PISA have not fallen on deaf ears. This is exemplified by the defensive fortifications often employed in the presentation of data by OECD to place agency at the hands of policy makers (Auld & Morris, 2016); harsh responses to critiques in academic journals (see Adams, 2003 in response to Prais, 2003); but also - changes and additions to the PISA test and the OECD's educational agendas from time to time that *supposedly* signal shifting priorities to a more holistic, humanitarian view of pupils and the purposes of education, termed by Li and Auld (2020) as PISA's 'humanitarian turn'.

The most recent example of this humanitarian turn can be demonstrated by the addition of global competence in the 2018 PISA, which I will elaborate on - in section 2.1.2. However, another prominent example that has been researched and analysed at length is that of the

OECD's conception of 'life-long learning'. Elfert (2015; 2019) traces the origins of life-long learning in the global education discourse back to two reports commissioned by UNESCO in 1972 (The Faure report) and 1996 (the Delors report). Elfert shows that both reports have many similarities in terms of complementing an enlightenment tradition that characterised UNESCO's goals and visions for education at the time, and both present utopic views which view education as a life-long human right and place great value on its emancipatory potential. Elfert (2015, pg. 88) claims these reports presented 'a political utopia which is at odds with today's utilitarian view of education'. The OECD began to engage with the terminology of life-long learning in the 1960s but only truly incorporated it into its own agendas in the early 1990s in collaboration with the World Bank (Rubenson, 2009). Both Elfert (2015) and Rubenson (2009) provide elaborate accounts of how the term was disconnected from its utopian/humanist and transformative roots until it ultimately became synonymous with skills education, in line with human-capital theory approaches. This shows two patterns in the OECD's uptake of educational concepts, which will be demonstrated later in this chapter. The first, is shifting attention to concepts that sound more humanistic than neoliberal, in a possible attempt to subdue criticisms. This pattern is best demonstrated by Li and Auld (2020), who point to attempts at creating 'humanitarian assessments' by blending economic competitiveness and social inclusion as indicative of the ideology of the OECD's education agenda for 2011-2030; the second, is changing the meaning of those concepts and disconnecting them from their humanitarian roots so that they better fit into the organisation's agenda which remains neoliberal (Auld & Morris, 2019; Rubenson, 2009; Unterhalter, 2018).

These two patterns can occur simultaneously, and while they seem to contradict each other, this is not necessarily the case. The uptake of humanitarian concepts is done on the discursive level, and the concepts serve as buzzwords that can be used to ameliorate the OECD's image. The meaning poured into the concepts can sometimes only be discovered when looking more deeply at the nuances of the language used to rationalise and explain how they will be measured and assessed. This could point to a much broader issue of whether humanitarian or value-laden concepts can be measured and quantified without being reduced and adapted - an issue that this thesis will expand on.

The Global Turn in Educational Concepts

The rise of GEG and GEOs and the conditions that facilitated their growing influence, have had major implications on national education systems, their goals, and agendas. Naturally, these implications have also trickled down to shape curricular contents which reflect these agendas. This process is exemplified by 'internationalisation' (Knight, 2004) as noted in the introduction to this thesis, but it specifically addresses compulsory (rather than post-secondary) schooling, and is expressly formulated as a response by education systems to external global pressures and processes. The global turn is demonstrated by the adoption of a wide range of terminologies, and the curricular aspects of it are most often associated with the introduction of new models of citizenship and an emphasis on skills that would prepare pupils to participate and succeed in a global society through schooling (Bamber et al., 2018; Davies et al., 2018; Mannion et al., 2011). Schooling now, more than ever, seeks to prepare pupils to take part in the 'global competition' for future education and employment destinations, participate in 'global problem solving,' and, broadly, be better equipped to face the challenges that globally connected contemporary societies must engage with (Bourn, 2020; Bray, 2017; Dill, 2013; Reilly & Niens, 2014).

Practitioners and the research literature refer to the multi-faceted manifestations of the global turn within schools as promoting 'GCE' (GCE), teaching '21st-century skills,' developing 'intercultural competencies,' and offering a 'cosmopolitan education.' (Goren et al., 2020). These terms and some others (such as international mindedness, education for global competencies, education for world citizenship, education for world competencies and education for global consciousness) are all used synonymously in many cases (Caruana, 2014; Kerkhoff, 2017; Goren & Yemini, 2017). In this thesis, I will focus on GCE, its distinct characteristics and the controversies it raises.

2.1.2 Conceptualisations of Global Citizenship and GCE

Global citizenship is not a new concept, although the acceleration of globalisation in the last few decades has caused a peak in scholarly interest in the term and led to much theorizing regarding its applications in this new age. Global citizenship and related terms such as cosmopolitanism, global-mindedness, global consciousness, and world citizenship have been used for centuries as part of both religious and secular discourses (Oxley & Morris, 2013;

Unterhalter, 2008). However, although the earliest manifestations of these ideas—particularly the cosmopolitan vision Kant articulated—were abstract and generally addressed individuals' global orientation and (usually elite) citizens' perceptions of themselves as part of a world culture (Schattle, 2008), today they form part of the attempts that scholars and educators worldwide make to define or mediate identities in the age of hyper globalisation (Davies, 2006; Oxley & Morris, 2013). The manifestations of global citizenship in education will be addressed in this thesis as GCE, whereas the term global citizenship will be used when referring to identifying traits, dispositions, or values that characterise global citizens.

Typologies and Definitions of GCE Developed by Key Scholars

No single, agreed-upon definition for GCE exists—partly due to the term's broad range of applications. In fact, many researchers prefer to create scholarly conceptualisations that categorise specific phenomena relating to or embodying GCE (Oxley & Morris, 2013; Schattle, 2008), while definitions pertaining to the concept as a whole are scarce and usually more operational (e.g., Davies' use of OXFAM's guidelines detailing particular characteristics of global citizens, 2008).

Several key typologies and models have been developed over the past two decades, which enable scholars as well as policy developers to identify, articulate, and assess the goals of GCE. Veugelers (2011; 2020), for example, distinguished between three categories of GCE: open GCE, which recognises the interdependence between nation-states in the global age and recognises opportunities for cultural diversification; moral GCE based on equality and human rights and emphasizing global responsibility; and socio-political GCE, which is meant to shift the balance of political power so as to promote equality and cultural diversity. These categories are hierarchical, with open GCE representing a shallow form of GCE and socio-GCE representing a profound form. These definitions support the framework Schattle (2008; 2009) suggested, which categorised the definitions of GCE according to four ideologies: moral cosmopolitanism, liberal multiculturalism, neoliberalism, and environmentalism. Andreotti (2006) offered another broad conception, differentiating between soft and critical GCE. While soft GCE could be equated with 'education about global citizenship' (as per Dobson, 2003; Marshall, 2011), providing pupils with an understanding of the world and cultural tolerance, critical GCE requires a deeper engagement. Critical GCE, which Andreotti (2010) later developed into post-critical and post-colonial GCE, provides pupils with the skills to reflect upon and engage with global issues

involving conflict, power, and opposing views; to understand the nature of colonial, liberal and western assumptions; and to strive for change.

The categorisation systems presented here all attempt to differentiate the forms of GCE to recognise which ones embody different notions of universalism and western values, valorise western culture and knowledge, and promote the preservation of a global hierarchy. The 'preferred' type of GCE, according to these models, promotes not only an understanding of economic relationships between countries or an ambivalent notion of human rights, but also much deeper forms of identification, the will to act, and appreciation for diversity—as opposed to ideals of universalism, which erase cultural differences (Bosio & Torres, 2019).

Oxley and Morris (2013) attempted to bring some order to the chaos of definitions and conceptions by creating an integrative and extensive model that reveals overarching themes. Their comprehensive model encompasses many of the categorisations and scholars introduced in this section, including Andreotti (2010), Schattle (2008), Veugelers (2011), and others. Oxley and Morris (2013) categorised conceptions of GCE as either cosmopolitan or advocacy modes. While cosmopolitan conceptions refer to more traditional aspects such as identification, global consciousness, and understanding of global relations, advocacy-based conceptions concentrate on global problem-solving and action. In a recent article, Pashby and colleagues (2020) use social cartography methodology to map and identify overarching themes in the nine most used typologies of GCE (most of which have been addressed in this chapter). This meta-review, which draws on decolonial critiques, is not prescriptive. It highlights patterns across the typologies and identifies conflated terms while drawing attention to absences, silences, and overlooked topics. Although this meta-review was not available to me while analysing the findings, I refer back to it in Chapter 7, to show how this thesis relates to their critique.

Although different categorisations of GCE will be applied throughout this thesis to characterise its manifestations or perceptions that arose in the study, I feel it is pertinent to emphasise that one of my main aims in this thesis is to explore bottom-up conceptions of GCE and identify how they reflect different aspects of social and cultural context. As such, for the purpose of this thesis, I do not apply a single definition, but rather take most of the definitions presented here into account throughout the analysis and refer to them where appropriate.

International and supra-national organisations which concentrate on solving global problems and promoting global action through education have shown interest in and contributed vastly to the spread of GCE around the world (Stein et al., 2019; Tarozzi & Torres, 2016). The establishment of the UN and the development of its universal declaration of human rights are often cited as milestones in the development of the very concept of GCE(Russel & Suarez, 2017).

The UN has also taken a significant part in the spread and institutionalisation of GCE, particularly since the publication of the United Nations Secretary, the General's Global Education First initiative in 2012, which named GCE as one of its chief priorities[1]. Most recently and perhaps most notably, UNESCO embraced GCE in 2015 as one of its sustainable development goals for its 2030 agenda and framework for action[2]. UNESCO's approach to GCE, encompasses many of the prevalent approaches to the concept of global citizenship but concentrates particularly on the '…need to foster the knowledge, skills, values, attitudes and behaviours that allow individuals to take informed decisions and assume active roles locally, nationally and globally'. The organisation could therefore be said to be more concerned with universal values and promoting empathy, tolerance, and sustainability, than the individual, utilitarian benefits of GCE for individual pupils. UNESCO also connects GCE to the prevention of violent extremism, 'supporting countries seeking to deliver education programmes that build young people's resilience to violent extremist messaging and foster a positive sense of identity and belonging [through GCE]'.

Although in this thesis I focus on the current UNESCO education agenda as it relates to GCE, it is important to note that the concept also played a role in the former decade's agenda promoted through the UN education for sustainable development (DfESD) agenda for 2005-2014, although the term global citizenship was not explicitly mentioned (Chung & Park, 2016). Chung and Park (ibid) provide an in-depth analysis of the different ways GCE was manifested in documents produced by the UN and in policies produced as part of efforts to incorporate ESD into national education systems. They show that the meaning of the concept changed over time from one that is framed abstractly to a more critical, action-based framing. This related to

---

[1] http://www.unesco.org/new/en/gefi/about/

[2] http://en.unesco.org/gced/approach

another critique raised by Bourn (2005) and later Bourn, Hunt, and Bamber (2017) regarding the UK's efforts to implement ESD in response to the DfESD agenda, they lamented the lack of actionable, value-based directives in related policies; furthermore, they argued that GCE should play an essential role in linking ESD to actions and values, and that without it ESD remains vague, abstract, and compartmentalised.

This critique raised by Bourn and others at the time may have contributed to later developments in UNESCOs agendas, in which GCE and ESD were often mentioned in tandem, with the focus later shifting to GCE as an overarching term that encompasses ESD as one of many objectives (Chung & Park, 2016). VanderDussen Toukan (2017) examined how GCE was portrayed in three key documents produced by the UN and UNESCO between 2012-2015: (1) a section from the Secretary-General's 2012 initiative 'Global Education First Initiative [GEFI]: An initiative of the United Nations Secretary-General' – 'Priority area three: Foster Global Citizenship'; (2) UNESCO's 2014 document 'GCE: Preparing learners for the challenges of the 21st century' and (3) UNESCO's 2015 document 'GCE: Topics and Learning Objectives'. Toukan shows how these documents reflect a shifting discourse, even in a short amount of time. This shifting discourse is demonstrated through a deficit approach highlighted in the GEFI document, which concentrates on what education systems and particularly teachers are lacking, a focus on specific examples, presented uncritically and without much explanation in the 2014 document, and ultimately a fully developed vision of GCE in the 2015 document, that combines critical and humanistic approaches and focuses on the transformative potential of GCE rather than the shortcomings of current systems.

The 2015 document produced by UNESCO defines global citizenship as: 'a sense of belonging to a broader community and common humanity. It emphasises political, economic, social and cultural interdependency and interconnectedness between the local, the national and the global' (pg. 15). Later in the document, the aims of global citizenship are listed as follows (pg. 16):

- develop an understanding of global governance structures, rights and responsibilities, global issues and connections between global, national and local systems and processes.
- recognise and appreciate difference and multiple identities, e.g., culture, language, religion, gender and our common humanity, and develop skills for living in an increasingly diverse world.

47

- develop and apply critical skills for civic literacy, e.g., critical inquiry, information technology, media literacy, critical thinking, decision-making, problem-solving, negotiation, peace building and personal and social responsibility.

- recognise and examine beliefs and values and how they influence political and social decision-making, perceptions about social justice and civic engagement.

- develop attitudes of care and empathy for others and the environment and respect for diversity.

- develop values of fairness and social justice, and skills to critically analyse inequalities based on gender, socio-economic status, culture, religion, age and other issues.

- participate in, and contribute to, contemporary global issues at local, national and global levels as informed, engaged, responsible and responsive global citizens.

One interesting aspect of this detailed list of aims is that it lacks reference to economic or market-driven rationales that are commonly referred to when discussing GCE. The way UNESCO presents the conditions that raised the importance of GCE and led to the development of the framework is also noteworthy, particularly in light of Robertson and Dale's (2008) view of globalisation. The conditions are detailed by UNESCO as follows (pg. 14):

'An increasingly globalised world has raised questions about what constitutes meaningful citizenship as well as about its global dimensions. Although the notion of citizenship that goes beyond the nation-state is not new, changes in the global context – for example, the establishment of international conventions and treaties, the growth of transnational organisations, corporations and civil society movements, and the development of international human rights frameworks.'

This explanation presents globalisation as a backdrop, without acknowledging the roles of GEO and UNESCO itself in promoting and bringing about the treaties, movements, and frameworks listed here.

As demonstrated through some of the approaches and definitions of GCE in the previous section, GCE can also be framed in individual, neoliberal terms, concentrating on the personal benefits this type of identity can provide, as demonstrated by the introduction of global

competencies into PISA's set of tested skills in 2018 (OECD, 2018)[3], further cementing the recognition of the importance these skills have for individual success in the global market. However, PISA's conception of global competence and the way it explains the rationales for measuring it reveals a complex picture that seems to incorporate both humanistic and economic approaches.

The OECD (2018, pg. 5) defines global competencies as:

> 'a multidimensional capacity…. [through which] globally competent individuals can examine local, global, and intercultural issues, understand and appreciate different perspectives and world views, interact successfully and respectfully with others, and take responsible action toward sustainability and collective well-being'.

This definition references many key terms in UNESCO's framework and discourse and focuses on both the individual and a more abstract global community. This is in stark contrast to the language often employed by the OECD that is much more centred on either national or individual needs and development, and specifically tends to address employability and economic development. (Li & Auld, 2020).

Another example of this humanistic framing can be found on the first page of the PISA global competence framework. The introduction begins with a quote from Andreas Schleicher, head of the OECD Directorate for Education and Skills, and Special Advisor on Education Policy to the Secretary-General:

> 'In 2015, 193 countries committed to achieving the UN's 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), a shared vision of humanity that provides the missing piece of the globalisation puzzle. The extent to which that vision becomes a reality will depend on today's classrooms; and it is educators who hold the key to ensuring that the SDGs become a real social contract with citizens. Goal 4, which commits to quality education for all, is intentionally not limited to foundation knowledge and skills such as literacy, mathematics, and science, but places a strong emphasis on learning to live together sustainably. But such goals are only meaningful if they become visible. This has inspired the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), the global yardstick

---

[3] Colvin, R. L., & Edwards, V. (2018). Teaching for Global Competence in a Rapidly Changing World. *OECD Publishing*.

for educational success, to include global competence in its metrics for quality, equity, and effectiveness in education. PISA will assess global competence for the first time ever in 2018. In that regard, this framework provides its conceptual underpinning' (OECD, 2018, pg. 2).

This statement points explicitly to the relationship between the UNESCO's SDGs and PISAs GC, stating that the SDGs and particularly goal 4, which deals with GCE (not explicitly mentioned) inspired the framework. Later in the document (pg. 6), it is stated that 'Education for global competence builds on the ideas of different models of global education, such as intercultural education, GCE and education for democratic citizenship [….] Despite differences in their focus and scope (cultural differences or democratic culture, rather than human rights or environmental sustainability), these models share a common goal to promote pupils' understanding of the world and empower them to express their views and participate in society'. Thus, the measure is presented as a way of integrating these models and assessing them.

However, while the economic rationales that usually frame PISA and characterise OECD endeavors are not at the forefront of the examples presented so far, they are not absent. The full report of the results (OECD, 2020, pg.55-56) and the framework document each state four main rationales that answer the question: 'Why do we need global competence': 'to live harmoniously in multicultural communities'; 'to thrive in a changing labour market'; 'to use media platforms effectively and responsibly'; and 'to support the Sustainable Development Goals.' This is perhaps the most prominent example of the mixed approaches underpinning the measure. The goal of thriving in a changing labour market is placed second in the list, in a way that moves the spotlight, but still reveals that the OECD has not completely abandoned its neoliberal roots and purposes, which appear sporadically throughout the report detailing the results of the assessment.

The tool formed by PISA to assess global competence and critiques concerning it will be addressed in Chapter 5 of this thesis. What is important is that both UNESCO and the OECD have invested a great deal of effort in institutionalising GCE in recent years, each developing definitions, curricula, policy, and tools aimed at disseminating it – and measuring it - into national policy spheres. These definitions, while related to one another as I have shown, also echo some of the different academic typologies and rationales detailed in the previous subsection, and should be read critically in a way that also takes into account the role and interests of these organisations in globalisation, GEG, and global influence in general.

2.1.3 Critiques of GCE

Critiques of Underlying Assumptions

The concept of GCE is not devoid of political and academic criticism (Bowden, 2003; Pais & Costa, 2020; Parekh, 2003). One of the possible risks associated with GCE is the possibility that, like globalisation, GCE would mostly benefit members of elite groups, therefore deepening societal inequality and gaps (Gardner-McTaggart, 2014; Roman, 2003). Moreover, many critics argued that the concept could weaken nation-states by providing citizens with an alternative identity (Bowden, ibid) or called attention to the fact that the concept itself is moot since there is no global governing body that could assume responsibility for the global society we aim to foster (Bates, 2012). Parekh (2008) takes this argument further, arguing that if we are to take the term global citizenship at face value and imagine the model of a global government that emerges from it, the society that would emerge is 'bound to be remote, bureaucratic, oppressive, and culturally bland' (p. 12). However, some scholars have challenged these arguments, instead claiming that citizenship, as it is defined today, is not sufficiently inclusive and adapted to the global era. These scholars argue that the definition of citizenship itself must be expanded, and see the term GCE as a call for change in outdated perceptions of nationality and identity (Bosio & Torres, 2019; Davies et al., 2005; Schattle, 2008).

Much of the criticism voiced by those who oppose globalisation is echoed with regards to GCE, with the harshest critics referring to the literature around the concept as unpatriotic and claiming that rather than responding to an already-changing world, promoters of GCE are actively bringing about unwarranted societal changes (Bowden, 2003). Other critics have acknowledged the relevance of the concept but emphasise its underlying perils (Roman, 2003; Pais & Costa, 2020). Myers (2006; 2016) warned of a perception of GCE as unpatriotic or anti-American and viewed GCE and patriotism as two ends of a spectrum (see also Rapoport, 2010). This criticism is not unique to the American context, of course; nationalists worldwide voice the claim that GCE and related ideas could threaten the sovereignty of nation-states, and scholars have called on policymakers to be aware of these potential challenges when articulating policy (Banks, 2008; Sant et al., 2018).

The critiques surrounding the idea of GCE are not limited to its potential effect on the standing of the nation-state and extend to some of the underlying assumptions supposedly rooted in the concept, which can be associated with attempts to extend western values and ideas and

apply them globally (Pais & Costa, 2020; Pashby & Sund, 2020; Peterson, 2020). Bowden (2003) and, more recently, Torres and Bosio (2020), expressed concerns that Western liberal-democratic values are placed above non-western values as part of the discourse of GC, thus promoting intolerance under the guise of a greater good. Banks (2008) furthers this argument by claiming ideas of universalism that are sometimes associated with GCE can overshadow attempts to promote diversity and appreciate differences by asserting that everyone is essentially the same.

This position against the universalism promoted through GCE has been greatly driven forward by post-colonial critiques raised by scholars such as Andreotti (2006), Handler (2013) and others (Sant et al., 2018; Wang & Hoffman, 2016; 2020). These scholars uncover cultural and class biases that are embedded in both the discourse and practices of GCE; these biases are said to hold Western worldviews and are influenced by 'unexplored cultural, class, and moral/ethical orientations toward self and others, potentially leading GCE to become another tool for cultural or class-based global domination' (Wang & Hoffman, 2016, pg. 3). Pashby and Sund (2019) further advance this argument, claiming that colonial power structures are (potentially) inadvertently reproduced through GCE, which often builds on a discourse that distinguishes the Global North, which holds the solutions – and the Global South, which has the problems. On the other hand, Bok (2002) claims it is counterproductive to deny any common values in the age of globalisation, and asserts that human coexistence depends on a global imaginary with at least some shared values. Disconnecting GCE from the universal and humanistic values associated with it could be detrimental to working towards a better future (Dower, 2003).

In their most recent critique of GCE, Pais and Costa (2020) also refer to the idea of values embedded in GCE but present a more nuanced approach that sheds light on some of the seemingly contradictory arguments presented in this chapter. They present the two opposing discourses within GCE slightly differently than the humanitarian/neoliberal approaches presented previously, instead framing them as the neoliberal, utilitarian discourse and the critical democratic one. They argue that this dual discourse and the ambiguity that ensues from it could lead to paralysis. Their main argument is best summarised in their own words: 'Both agendas [neoliberal and critical-democratic] thus perform a very important role within today's neoliberalism: they provide us with rationales for action, thus keeping us occupied, while at the same time inhibiting a structural analysis and a possibility of a change beyond individual agency

(pg.11).' Thus, in their critique of the critical approaches to GCE, as well as the soft approaches that merely see GCE as a tool for learning about the world, they point to the impossibility of reconciling differences between these approaches, particularly without explicitly acknowledging the way the mere existence of GCE perpetuates and consolidates the systems within which it is articulated.

In this thesis, while demonstrating an awareness of these different critiques of what GCE means or *should mean* in reference to the type of dispositions, actions, and awareness it tries to promote, I try to look beyond the arguments raised in this section. I suggest, in line with Pais and Costa's (ibid) arguments, that the perpetual discussion of the purpose of GCE is somewhat moot and beside the point - but this is not to say that I believe it should be abandoned altogether. In the next section, I present literature relating to critiques of GCE with regard to deepening inequality within the national sphere, much of which has influenced my own research prior to this thesis and within it. This, I argue, is the more pressing issue regarding the concept and its manifestations: a one-size-fits-all approach that overlooks different worldviews, experiences, and knowledgebases within states and is consistently geared towards the global sphere and its inequalities. This argument will be further demonstrated in my findings chapters (4, 5, and 6).

Inequality and GCE

One of the potential risks associated with GCE is the possibility that it would only be made accessible to members of elite groups through the differential emphasis put on it in different educational settings, thereby deepening societal inequality and gaps (Gardner-McTaggart 2014; Goren & Yemini, 2016; Sant et al., 2018). It is important to note that the critiques presented in this sub-section have a common tendency of referring to a utilitarian and neo-liberal approach to GCE, as they concentrate on pupils' ability to compete and take advantage of the opportunities offered by the global economy.

Pike (2008) casts doubt on the true audience of GCE, claiming that while members of elite groups have the resources and ability to experience and practice global citizenship '…for the countless millions of people worldwide who daily struggle for survival and satisfaction of basic human rights, or for recognition of their cultural identity, global citizenship is not even on the agenda' (p. 48). Balarin (2014) raises a similar critique, referring to those groups that are left out of GCE as a '…transnational class of marginalised citizens, who are not mobile, who are the main users of state-maintained education, often of a dwindling quality, that will not grant them

the kinds of knowledge, skills or character traits needed to access better jobs and better quality of life' (p. 52).

Whereas the aforementioned critiques point to the concept itself and the policies devised to disseminate it, schools also play a crucial role in the social reproduction of inequality in global exposure and preparedness through education. One form of social reproduction through education has been explored at length through literature concerning the civic education gap (Levinson, 2010). This term describes differences in the opportunities provided to pupils of different backgrounds to learn about and practice their civil rights and become citizens who are politically aware and involved. This gap is perpetuated through education policies, usually developed without proper input from oppressed and underprivileged groups (Levinson, 2010).

Several studies have provided evidence of the various ways the civic education gap manifests and is perpetuated within schools (Cohen, 2019; Ho et al., 2011; Ichilov, 2003). Ichilov (2002) compared teachers' and pupils' conceptions of citizenship and the purpose of civic education at a vocational and academic school in Israel and found discrepancies pointing to a bleak situation. Her study reveals that while pupils in academic tracks were being taught an active and complex model of citizenship, pupils in vocational programs were imparted with practical knowledge of the welfare system and basic rights and were not encouraged to critically reflect upon citizenship. These results were also echoed in Levinson's (2010) examination of the gap in the United States, Ho, Alviar-Martin, Sim and San Yap's (2011) study in Singapore, and a comparative study of six societies performed by Morris, Cogan, and Liu (2002).

Although some studies concerning civic education gaps in diverse settings reference global dimensions of citizenship (e.g., Wood, 2014), few have explicitly addressed GCE as an independent concept. Wood (2014) studied the ways in which different forms of capital manifest themselves through social studies education in four diverse school communities in New Zealand and found that teachers of high SES pupils place greater emphasis on the global dimensions of the curriculum. Wood explained her findings using Bourdieu's (1986) concept of symbolic capital and provided a model for participatory capital, referring to the ways various forms of social capital that affect pupils' citizenship practices.

In particular, Wood's study demonstrated that pupils' social, cultural, and global capital relate to the way they and their teachers perceive citizenship and its various dimensions. Similar to the studies mentioned earlier, Wood (ibid) examined a spectrum between the active,

participatory citizenship prevalent among the high-SES participants and the passive, non-participatory citizenship characteristic of lower-SES groups.

The similar goals underlying both civic education and GCE of preparing pupils to function as citizens within society (regardless of how their society is defined) could indicate that manifestations of GCE could be explained within the same theoretical framework as the research on the civic education gap. However, the links between GCE, GEOs, and internationalisation suggest that this analysis could fall short in terms of explaining the myriad factors that shape GCE in different contexts.

Brooks and Waters (2014), Yemini (2014) as well as Yemini and Fulop (2015) reviewed the internationalisation strategies of schools catering to different populations and showed both the extent to which the schools are internationalised as well as the form in which internationalisation is developed and pursued are highly related to the pupil's socio-economic and cultural backgrounds. GCE is, of course, only one strategy or mark of internationalisation, but in recent years the production of global subjectivities, promotion of global citizenship, and preparing pupils for the global workforce have all become key characteristics of elite schools' representations of their goals and target audience (Howard & Maxwell, 2018; 2020; Loh, 2016). For example, some elite schools internationalise to maintain ties with overseas elite schools for pupil exchange programmes that increase the pupils' cosmopolitan capital (Kenway & Fahey, 2014); other schools promote internationalisation to compete with other schools in their local area (Howard & Freeman, 2020; Yemini, 2014). Finally, schools serving diverse populations can choose to focus on cultural dimensions of internationalisation aimed at facilitating group cohesion. Furthermore, Igarashi and Saito (2014, pg.1) show through an analysis of policy and research that 'Education systems legitimate cosmopolitanism as a desirable disposition at the global level, while simultaneously distributing it unequally among different groups of actors according to their geographical locations and volumes of economic, cultural, and social capital their families possess', indicating that inequality in GCE is determined by policy-makers and stakeholders who have control over resource-distribution and the funding allotted to different schools for the purpose of developing the desired global disposition, for some (Engel & Gibson, 2020; Gilbertson, 2016).

The evidence regarding internationalisation strategies of schools and studies addressing the importance placed by pupils from different backgrounds on cosmopolitan capital as part of

their school choices points to differential strategies of GCE at schools catering to different populations as well. While some schools are preparing pupils to be global citizens, able to compete and navigate in a global society, other schools could be preparing their pupils for a localised life in a globalised country by not providing them the knowledge, skills and dispositions that are relevant to the global workforce (Cho & Mosselson, 2018; Choi & Kim, 2020). These discrepancies could shape pupils' perceptions of their potential mobility and the way they imagine their futures.

Studies exploring the implementation of GCE in schools often highlight the important role of teacher agency. The studies examining teacher perceptions and practices regarding GCE can perhaps be best summarised by the title of Rapoport's (2010) study of teachers in Indiana: '*We cannot teach what we do not know.*' In his study, social studies teachers teaching a curriculum supposedly aimed at fostering global citizenship reported that teachers had a lack of understanding of the concept of GCE, which resulted in an aversion to teaching it. Seemingly, regardless of the approach policymakers select in framing GCE within the curriculum, teachers' perceptions and stances profoundly impact GCE's outcomes, even if the school or national education policy explicitly mentions GCE as a priority. This is particularly acute as an issue if national or school-level policy has not articulated a clear approach to GCE (Reilly & Niens, 2014; Schweisfurth, 2006). Research conducted in the US (Rapoport, 2010), Canada (Schweisfurth, 2006), South Korea (Pak & Lee, 2018) and Northern Ireland (Reilly & Niens, 2014) reveal similar struggles for teachers to those described by Rapoport (2010).

In my MA dissertation (submitted to Tel Aviv University, also see Goren & Yemini, 2016; 2017b, 2017c), I interviewed 16 teachers from schools that cater to students from high-, middle-, and lower-class backgrounds in Tel Aviv and found that their perception of the meaning of GCE and its relevance for their own pupils were deeply shaped by their pupils' backgrounds and depended upon how they perceived their pupils' relationship to global society. Teachers in all three groups perceived GCE as more appropriate and relevant for pupils of strong socio-economic backgrounds, citing various reasons ranging from the international experiences the pupils from strong backgrounds have often had, to the everyday struggles that overshadow any attempts to expose pupils from underprivileged groups to global issues or ideas. I termed the differences in pupil experiences and exposure to GCE that could result from differential perceptions of teachers the 'GCE gap.' While GCE is often criticised for its western assumptions

and neoliberal foundations, these critiques imply disparities in its applicability in different cultures and contexts. In my MA dissertation, I further rejected the one-size-fits-all approach to GCE by highlighting evidence of disparities in the applicability of GCE *within* westernised societies as well, and even between pupils of similar backgrounds residing in the same area. In this thesis, I expand on this work by exploring the pupils' first-hand perceptions of GCE and how these relate to the teachers' views.

Teachers I interviewed also all referred to the pupils' place of residence in Tel Aviv as a mediating factor in shaping the extent to which they see their pupils engaging with the global in the present or future; Tel Aviv was seen as a global and cosmopolitan city that provides pupils with opportunities to engage with global culture and other global phenomena not afforded to pupils in the Israeli periphery. Teachers also referred to this as a double-edged sword, suggesting that pupils in Tel Aviv might feel like the global comes to them or think they are at the centre of the world, perhaps leading them to be less open to contents associated with GCE. This study piqued my interest in exploring the way GCE is perceived in other sectors of Israeli society as well as in other cities or areas that are considered less global, which will be one of the main issues covered in this thesis.

2.1.4 A Critical Review of Empirical Literature Concerning GCE from 2005 to 2015

In 2016, before beginning my PhD, I co-authored a systematic review of 99 empirical studies concerning GCE between 2005 and 2015. This was published in the *International Journal of Educational Research* (Goren & Yemini, 2016). In this section, I first introduce a regional analysis that was included in the published review, which demonstrates the multitude of ways that GCE is articulated and understood in different contexts. I then present a previously unpublished analysis of the 99 articles, through which I reveal some patterns and caveats in this body of literature, some of which formed the base for this thesis. As the literature I have discussed so far in this chapter has been mostly conceptual, this chapter complements it by shifting the focus to empirical, grounded research which concentrates on primary and secondary schooling, closer to my own research. The review reflects the state of the empirical literature on GCE at the start of my PhD, and thus sheds light on my point of departure for this thesis.

Scholarship Collection Procedure

For the review, I compiled a list of search terms that I assumed would enable me to track most of the relevant literature. The term 'global citizen/citizenship' was included in all my searches, each time coupled with a different keyword from the field of education. These keywords included: teach* (teachers, teaching, teacher), education, pupil*, student*, school*. I chose to concentrate on articles dealing with primary and secondary education and related policy, curricula, and personnel (school staff and pre-service teachers); I selected this framing because in the higher education context, GCE is a much broader concept often mentioned in relation to study-abroad service-learning programs, and the goals of higher education institutions in terms of GCE are very different from those of schools and school systems, as explained in the previous section. The initial search was conducted using ERIC. All searches were logged in by protocol entries' stating date and included search terms, database, and the number of items found. The search results were limited to the years 2005-2015 so as to maintain a manageable and relevant cohort of articles while still enabling the identification of patterns of change over time.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Initially, I judged all results against broad inclusion or exclusion criteria: I included only peer-reviewed articles and books published between 2005 and 2015, with abstracts that mentioned the term 'global citizenship', and one of the additional terms listed in the previous section. All search results were logged into the reference-management software Refworks, and after each round of results was added, duplicates were removed. This process left me with 762 unique articles. These articles were then judged against an exclusion criterion; namely, journals dealing with higher education or professional training (other than teachers) were removed, leaving 435 results. I then applied my next inclusion criterion: empirical studies dealing with GCE. Operationally, I defined this criterion as articles with clear methodological descriptions that involved the collection or analysis of data from the field (including curricular texts and policy documents). I read the abstracts of all 435 articles to classify their approach as theoretical or empirical. Articles whose abstract alone failed to enable identification of the study therein as empirical or theoretical were read in full. After the exclusion of all non-empirical articles, 90 empirical articles remained that met the inclusion criteria. Nine additional articles were added based on the reference lists of the selected articles.

Regional Analysis

The regional analysis consists of three parts: conceptual framework, detailing the use of Oxley & Morris's (2013) typology for GCE; findings, in which the number of articles from each region is presented and discussed; and analysis, in which overarching themes and issues from each region and from the entire cohort are presented.

Although many of the particularities of how GCE is manifested in different countries are discussed below, I begin with some insights that are only attainable through a regional perspective. I used Oxley and Morris's (2013) framework, in which they suggest that scholars break down curricula into antecedents (the motives or rationales that lead to the development of GCE policy) and expected outcomes to reveal nuanced differences embodied within them. I also applied their categorisation to show which types of GCE were most prevalent in each region or country.

Oxley and Morris' (2013) typology distinguishes between types of GCE based on cosmopolitan and advocacy approaches. Cosmopolitan GCE is divided into four categories: political GCE, which focuses on the changing relations between states and individuals or other polities; moral GCE, which focuses on ideas such as human rights and empathy; economic GCE, which focuses on power relations, forms of capital, the work force, and international development; and cultural GCE, which emphasizes symbols and cultural structures that divide or unite members of different societies and considers the globalisation of different cultural forms. The advocacy type of GCE is also comprised of four categories, whose presence in the curriculum requires a more critical, action-based approach: social GCE focuses on ideas such as global civil society and advocacy for the 'people's voice' even when those people are abroad in other parts of the world; critical GCE focuses on inequality and oppression, critiquing the role current power relations and economic agendas play in these issues through what Oxley and Morris call a post-colonial agenda; environmental GCE encourages advocating for environmental sustainability and preservation through striving to change the negative impacts of humanity on the environment; and finally spiritual GCE concentrates on connections between humans based on spiritual aspects including religion.

Notably, the original, comprehensive typology Oxley and Morris (2013) developed was intended for the analysis of curricular contents and goals, while I use it to explore what GCE means in various contexts extending beyond the curriculum. My analysis was also secondary,

rather than primary, because it often relied on the authors' interpretation of antecedents and the desired outcomes of GCE rather than on the original texts or materials upon which their interpretations were based. Still, several interesting insights can be gleaned from the regional analysis.

In the regional analysis, I chose to separate the studies that concentrated on the US from those on Canada due to vast differences between these countries in the way GCE and its purposes are perceived and due to the relatively large number of articles concerning each country. Notably, small comparative studies that included less than five countries were counted once if all countries were in the same region and twice if they involved more than one region. Large-scale comparative studies of more than five countries were grouped together with studies concerning supranational organisations, because no clear regional understanding of the antecedents and outcomes can be attributed to any particular region through these studies. Table 1 displays the number of studies within each country or region, the common antecedents and outcomes of GCE for each country or region, and the most common models of GCE that emerged from these studies, as per Oxley and Morris's (2013) categorisation.

Table 1: Regional Analysis Results

Region/ Country	Number of articles	Common antecedents for GCE	Common expected outcomes of GCE	Most common model for GCE according to Oxley & Morris (2013)
North America: USA	19	World political changes	Maintaining US status as world-leading nation and enabling students to understand the nature of the changing world	Cosmopolitan: Political; Economic
North America: Canada	15	Immigration, the multicultural nature of the country	Promoting tolerance	Cosmopolitan: Moral; Cultural
Europe	28 (16 UK, 6 Northern Ireland, 6 others; all western Europe except for 1 concerning Turkey)	Immigration, war (particularly in Northern Ireland), adjusting to multiculturalism	Promoting tolerance and creating a common ground for citizenship	Cosmopolitan: Moral; Cultural
Australia & New Zealand	9	Immigration, Environmental concerns	Promoting Environmental awareness and Tolerance	Cosmopolitan: Moral; Cultural Advocacy: Environmental
Asia Pacific	21 (10 China; 11 Japan, South Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong)	World political changes	Strengthening the relationship with the West, enabling students to understand the nature of the	Cosmopolitan: Political; Economic

			changing world, preparing students to participate and compete in the global economy	
Central and South America	4	World political and economic changes	Preparing students to participate in global society (often through learning English in order to study abroad)	Cosmopolitan: Economic; Cultural
Africa	2	Need for empowerment	Empowerment of students through understanding world responsibility towards their countries and promoting an understanding of human rights	Advocacy: Social Cosmopolitan: Economic; Moral; Political
Cross-National/ Supranational	7 (4 large cross-national studies of more than 5 countries; 3 studies concerning supranational organizations, i.e., UNESCO, IBO)	-	-	Studies of UNESCO policy and schools referred to Advocacy models, particularly social; studies of IBO and international schools referred to Cosmopolitan models, usually political,

				economic, and cultural.

The largest regional category was Europe which included 28 articles, 16 of which focused on the UK, six on Northern Ireland, and the rest on other countries (Finland, Spain, France, Turkey, and Germany). The analysis indicated that in Europe, GCE is often framed as a response to national population changes due to immigration and as the result of a need for a more inclusive model of citizenship. This point is well demonstrated in Engel's (2014) study of curricular changes in Spain, in which she provided quantitative data regarding the rise of foreign residents in order to explain the rationale for changes in the citizenship curriculum. Moreover, authors of European studies tended to present global citizenship alongside European citizenship as alternative models to the traditional national citizenship (e.g., Marshall, 2009). The expected outcomes of GCE as described in European studies almost always involve promoting social cohesion and acceptance of minorities and immigrants, but very rarely feature ideas that could fall under Oxley and Morris's (2013) advocacy models of GCE.

The second-largest regional category was Asia-Pacific (21). This included ten articles dealing with GCE in China, while the rest focused on Japan, Singapore, Hong Kong, and South Korea. Studies from this region primarily reflected a view of GCE as a response to political and economic changes worldwide and recognition of the need for global skills and knowledge of the English language in order to compete in the global age (Ee Loh, 2013; Pan, 2011; Law, 2010). These studies, particularly those performed in China, constructed GCE as providing skills rather than dispositions and often overlooked issues commonly associated with GCE elsewhere, such as human rights or global responsibility. In terms of Oxley and Morris's (2013) model, the forms of GCE prevalent in the Asia-Pacific region usually fell under the economic and political models in the cosmopolitan category, meaning GCE focused on enabling pupils to function and compete in the global economy and understand the way states influence each other.

Nineteen articles covered GCE in the US and voiced more criticism regarding the state of GCE in their country than did authors in other regions; authors focusing on the US (particularly on curricular issues) often argued that GCE there does not demonstrate in-depth critical perspectives. For example, in his study of curricular texts of various US states, Rapoport (2009) described GCE as a forgotten concept. Rapoport showed that only 15 states in the US include the

word globalisation and its derivatives in their social studies or history curricula, and only two refer specifically to GCE. In cases where GCE *is* introduced in the US, it is often observed as a response to globalisation in economic and political terms, occasionally involving moral forms, which include a concentration on human rights, but without a clear directive for advocacy or action (Myers, 2006; Rapoport, 2010). Myers (2006) outlines the purpose of GCE in terms of its benefits for the country itself as a way to maintain its status as a global leader or to prepare American pupils to compete in the global economy.

The Canadian sample included 15 articles. Similarly to the European sample, these articles presented widespread immigration as an antecedent to GCE, although Canada's self-conception as a multinational, multicultural nation is far more developed (Banks, 2008), such that GCE elicits less criticism and opposition than in Europe. In the Canadian sample, the expected outcomes of GCE were often the promotion of multiculturalism and inter-cultural sensitivity, which can sometimes be hindered in countries attempting to cultivate a cohesive national identity (Pluim & Jorgenson, 2012; Schweisfurth, 2006). The Canadian models of GCE that emerged from the sample fall under the cosmopolitan category in Oxley and Morris's (2013) typology. These models usually do not encourage advocacy, as many of the authors note (Evans et al., 2009; Leduc, 2013; Pluim & Jorgenson, 2012). Moreover, Canadian models concentrate predominantly on cultural and moral forms of GCE aimed at peacebuilding and the promotion of national social cohesion (Carr et al., 2014; Evans et al., 2009).

Nine of the articles in the cohort concerned Australia and New Zealand. The insights are reminiscent of those from the Canadian sample, differing mainly in the extent to which environmental forms of GCE were acknowledged as potential outcomes, and the degree to which environmental concerns served as antecedents. Mostly in Australia, environmental protection and awareness of humans' environmental impact were often conceptualised as both a desired outcome and key theme in GCE (Bradbery, 2013; Millei & Jones, 2014). Notably, this is the only country in which these issues were highlighted. In New Zealand, studies referred to global citizenship as one dimension of active citizenship (Wood, 2012; 2014), implying some sort of advocacy. Indeed, Wood (2014) showed that some schools and teachers (mainly those serving pupils of high socio-economic standing) enabled and encouraged pupils to actively engage in fighting global problems such as poverty and environmental issues.

In regional terms, the smallest groups in the cohort were South and Central America, which included four articles, and Africa, which included two. The South and Central American group included two articles concerning US-funded programs in Brazil (Bickel et al., 2013; Lima & Brown, 2007), one article comparing schools run by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) in Brazil and Canada (Shultz & Guimaraes-Iosif, 2012), and one surveying curricular reform in Argentina and Costa Rica (Suarez, 2008). These authors view the proximity of these countries to the US as the main rationales of GCE and consider the primary goals of GCE to be the strengthening of economic and cultural ties with the United States through learning English and engaging with Americans and American culture.

Of the two articles concerning Africa, one concentrated on GCE and citizenship education in post-conflict Liberia (Quaynor, 2015) and the other on international school partnerships (Edge & Khamsi, 2012) comparing the perceptions of pupils from UK and African schools. The authors of both these articles considered the main motivators for incorporating GCE in Africa to be the promotion of human rights and global responsibility, providing hope for impoverished pupils and allowing them to find their own voice.

The remaining seven could not be divided regionally, as they describe large-scale international studies (i.e., Bromley, 2009; Cha & Ham's, 2011) and those concerning supranational organisations such as International Baccalaureate Organisation (IBO) and UNESCO. Notably, the models of GCE promoted by UNESCO and the IBO vary substantially, in that UNESCO aims to promote advocacy forms of GCE (Harper & Dunkerly, 2013), while the IBO promotes political and economic cosmopolitan forms of GCE (Brunold-Conesa, 2010). Indeed, no common antecedents nor outcomes could be identified among these studies.

This regional analysis provides three important conclusions relating both to the contextual variations of GCE and to the classification of the empirical studies. First, while GCE clearly constitutes a global phenomenon, its implementation can differ vastly and is usually framed in terms of national rather than supranational needs. When GCE involves human rights or other cultures, such issues are commonly addressed with the quest of calling attention to similarities or common attributes between national-born citizens and immigrants. In general, in countries with high concentrations of immigrants or refugees, GCE is presented as a peace-building tool and as a potential framework for dialogue and the creation of a common identity.

Second, in the Global South, GCE is seen as a tool for the empowerment and creation of opportunities for pupils, although its meaning is sometimes reduced to knowledge of the English language that would enable pupils to exercise the opportunities for mobility offered by globalisation. Moreover, human rights often receive more attention in the Global South than in the Global North.

Finally, some highly nationalist countries that are considered central forces in the globalised world, particularly the US and China, seem to focus on serving national interests through GCE. This focus contrasts with the more cultural and moral foci highlighted in scholarly depictions, which address the responsibility of these nations to implement social-justice-oriented forms of GCE (Gaudelli, 2016; Gaudelli & Fernekes, 2004).

With respect to Oxley and Morris's model, most studies fell under the cosmopolitan mode of GCE. The particular categories of GCE within this mode varied slightly, with countries striving for social cohesion highlighting cultural and moral categories and countries seeking to maintain their status or preparing pupils for global competition focusing more on political and economic forms. The advocacy mode of GCE is nearly nonexistent in the empirical literature concerning GCE, pointing again to the possibility that in practice, GCE relates to the promotion of individual and national goals, rather than advocating for those who cannot speak for themselves and express their own interest or promoting action and criticality

Notably, the lack of examples of advocacy modes of GCE in the cohort could also be related to the fact that I concentrated on studies of primary and secondary education and excluded studies of higher education, where service programs are far more common and more prevalent in the literature. Perhaps countries aim to provide pupils with basic skills and an understanding of the world in primary and secondary education so as to be able to promote advocacy-based GCE later on.

Thematic Analysis

This part of the analysis involved excavating broader themes from the same 99 articles reviewed for the regional analysis but has not been previously published. I performed the analysis using Braun and Clarke's (2006) principles for thematic analysis, which involves familiarisation of data, initial coding, generating themes, ensuring validity and reliability of themes, defining and naming themes, and interpretation and reporting. The process was performed inductively, and I read the articles in full to allow themes to emerge. However, as I was familiar with the data (the

cohort of articles) and had also performed a deductive analysis of it by population and area of focus for the published portion of the review, I concede that I did not start the process without any preconceived notions.

I located three main themes through the thematic analysis: GCE and the national landscape; erasing differences, and tokenism. The analysis presented here extends beyond the results and conclusions of the individual studies to identify what can be learned from the cohort of 99 articles as a whole. Moreover, this analysis enabled me to identify and highlight underdeveloped areas in the empirical research surrounding GCE.

GCE and the national landscape

The first theme to emerge from this analysis concerns the delicate balance between the concepts of global and national citizenship, particularly in complex national situations, including those found in post-conflict areas or in countries experiencing significant social changes due to immigration. The analysis uncovers two main strategies that ostensibly developed in response to the difficulties in consolidating these (seemingly) contradictory concepts. The first strategy involves the articulation of GCE in terms of its benefits for the nation-state and its population – essentially dubbing GCE a means to an end goal of promoting national interests. The second strategy I discovered entails the development of multidimensional frameworks that allow policymakers and teachers to avoid discussing the interaction between the different types or levels of citizenship altogether, usually leading to the teaching of what Andreotti (2006) describes as 'soft' GCE and the shortcomings associated with it.

Strategy 1: GCE for the purpose of promoting national goals. Broadly stated, education has always been considered a means by which society promotes its needs; this is especially true with regard to citizenship education (Banks, 2008). Nearly all developed nations include citizenship education within their curriculum for the general purpose of instilling a national identity in pupils and making them aware of their rights and responsibilities as citizens (Ichilov, 2003). The first strategy my analysis revealed for dealing with potential tensions between global and local conceptions of citizenship involves the subordination of GCE within the citizenship curriculum, framing GCE in terms of its potential benefits for the nation-state and its citizens. Under this approach, GCE is considered a functional need brought on by globalisation, as well as a means for promoting national goals, particularly in two contexts: in developed countries experiencing social changes stemming from global phenomena such as the increasing influxes of immigration;

and in post-conflict or multi-cultural countries in which negotiating a national sense of identity comprises both a priority and a challenge.

An interesting case to examine in this context is Northern Ireland, a post-conflict nation with a diverse population and competing narratives of national identity. Gallagher's (2005) study of the integration of GCE into the Northern Irish curriculum found this initiative to be motivated by a need to help pupils transcend the problematic lack of a consensual definition for/of Northern Irish citizenship. However, at the school level, Reilly and Niens (2014) show in their study of teachers and pupils in Northern Ireland that teachers had adopted pragmatic and instrumental approaches to GCE in order to avoid sensitive issues. The authors claim that these approaches to GCE and the lack of critical reflection and engagement they offer inhibit the creation of a platform to negotiate a new model of national citizenship; hence, apparently, the original curricular goal of meeting national needs through the incorporation of GCE is not implemented in practice.

Law (2007) examined the multidimensional citizenship curriculum implemented in Shanghai's schools and analyzed teacher and pupil perceptions of the different dimensions it includes. His study directly ties GCE efforts to globalism's rising importance as reflected both in the curriculum and in teacher and pupil responses to Shanghai's aspirations to secure its status as a global city and to the changing demographics of the city's population following an influx of migrants. Similarly, Parmenter's (2011) study attributes differences in the extent and meaning of GCE within education policy in Japan and New Zealand to different local priorities. In Japan, where national allegiance is of primary concern, GCE goals are articulated in terms of enabling pupils to function and thrive as Japanese citizens in a global world; controversially, New Zealand's bicultural heritage and social diversity resulted in a policy that encourages pupils to look beyond national identity and relate to others on a higher plane.

Several studies of GCE in the US exposed a similar pattern in both curricular and policy documents (Rapoport, 2009) as well as teachers' conceptualisations of GCE (Myers, 2006). As discussed above, Rapoport (2009) reveals that although the curricula of only 15 US states mention globalisation or GCE, even where present, these terms' interpretations and the practical goals they are meant to promote are explained in economic terms. Similarly, Myers' (2006) analysis of interviews with teachers in two GCE programs finds the programs' goals to be articulated in terms of the practical skills necessary for pupils to excel in the contemporary era.

These studies attribute conservatism in curricular standards and in teachers' conceptions of GCE to a reluctance to challenge patriotic, nationalistic ideals. Similarly, Johnson, Boyer, and Brown (2011) assessed the effectiveness of a problem-based learning program that likewise stresses the importance of GCE in enabling the US to maintain its status as a global leader.

Strategy 2: Multidimensional citizenship frameworks as avoidance. The second strategy I identified for coping with the tensions that could potentially arise from GCE and its connotations involves the use of multidimensional frameworks presenting GCE as a separate construct, unrelated to national citizenship and usually devoid of any mentions of allegiance to or identification with a global community.

These multidimensional models of citizenship often present global issues such as environmental or social concerns from a non-critical standpoint, leaving pupils with only a vague understanding of how GCE ties into their everyday lives and experiences. Notably, much of the academic research concerning multidimensional models of citizenship may have been excluded from my cohort due to my initial screening of abstracts, as I focused on GCE as a term. However, empirical articles focusing particularly on GCE and its implications within multidimensional models of citizenship certainly were included in my cohort.

The multidimensional model of citizenship was found to be most dominant in China, which has a centralized and highly-controlled education system that strongly emphasises local identity and allegiance (Law, 2007). Pan (2011) examined Beijing pupils' perceptions of the relative importance of the various dimensions of citizenship articulated and used in the Chinese citizenship curriculum: self, local, national, and global. Findings reveal that pupils find the global dimension of citizenship to be rhetorical or vague, although they recognise its importance within the curriculum; interestingly, pupils experience more conflict or confusion between the local and national dimensions than between the national and global ones. The author interprets these results to show that the multidimensional and, in fact, multilevel, hierarchical model promoted in the Chinese curriculum enables pupils to maintain a national allegiance and identification while still learning *about* global citizenship and learning to participate in the globalised world as Chinese citizens. However, advocates of critical GCE could interpret the complete separation of these dimensions both in policy and in practice as a way to avoid any critical aspects of GCE, such as exploring the nation's own role in particular global issues or examining the topic of human rights in the particular national context. The lack of intersection

between the dimensions of the citizenship model, as well as their pre-determined hierarchy, could make GCE devoid of any substantive meaning for pupils.

An example of a different multidimensional model of citizenship that serves similar purposes is the EU model of national, European, and global citizenship. Although the EU does not have a central education system and each nation is free to develop its own curriculum, the EU does encourage its members to promote European as well as GCE within their schools. Ortloff's (2011) study of German social studies teachers' views and perception of global, European, and national citizenship education reveals their positions to be highly influenced by factors such as immigration and German history. Teachers in schools with a high percentage of immigrants were found more likely to favour GCE models of identity, claiming that their pupils are less likely to relate to national and European models. From a different perspective, moreover, some teachers also preferred to discuss European rather than German citizenship regardless of the pupil population in order to avoid discussions regarding the nation's controversial past. Thus, the multidimensional model of citizenship promoted by the EU enables educators and policymakers to choose which 'lens' is most appropriate for each setting, rather than combining various outlooks to present the complex reality. This pick-and-choose strategy is also evident in O'Connor and Faas's (2012) examination of the civics curricula in Ireland, England, and France discussed above. This showed that each country places greater emphasis on a different model of citizenship in conjunction with its own history, demographic makeup, and national goals. Notably, however, these articles – and likewise Pan's (2009) research regarding the Chinese multidimensional model of citizenship – do not engage with the implications of selectively highlighting one aspect or dimension of GCE over the others; nor do they discuss the potential benefits of combining the various dimensions of citizenship so as to allow pupils to critically engage with a wide variety of global topics through different lenses.

Erasing differences

The second theme I focus on here pertains to the fact that although many articles did address their context, the particularities of the study population were often ignored. Moreover, assumptions were made regarding the findings' applicability to broader populations both within the studied national context and beyond it.

'Flattening' the world - The English language as a prerequisite for GCE. The first category within my second theme identifies an inclination in many of the empirical studies to utilise

universalistic conceptions of GCE that often include post-colonial assumptions, such as regarding English as the universal language and the provision of English language instruction in countries whose official language is not English to comprise GCE in itself. One article that illustrates this approach is Bickel and colleagues' (2013) study, analyzing how English language training and contact with Americans affects Brazilian teens' self-identity, engagement in critical discourse, and design of community service projects. The study fails to address the underlying assumption of the program it evaluates: that knowledge of the English language is a key component of GCE and, in fact, a prerequisite for pupils to engage as global citizens.

Conversely, some articles focusing on English studies do engage with the association between post-colonialism and the growing adoption of English as a universal language. One prominent example of this approach is Cha and Ham's (2011) cross-national and historical analysis of the prevalence of English-language education in countries where English is not considered the primary language - as a symptom or example of the widespread and expanding nature of GCE. The authors highlight the neo-colonial view asserting that in many countries with a colonial past, the curriculum – including the teaching of English – is often inherited from the previously colonizing nations. Overall, their research shows that the adoption of English language education worldwide is no longer a post-colonial symptom but rather has become a response to globalisation and the emergence of the global market. Although Cha and Han provide a suitable framework for understanding the processes which have led to the adoption of GCE through English language classes, their study does not critically examine whether or not the English language is indeed a prerequisite for global citizenship in general or GCE in particular; an examination which is absent in most studies comprising this category.

Ignoring social background. As previously mentioned, most studies – especially those concerning pupils and teachers – concentrate on populations with unique characteristics, but seem to shy away from critically discussing implications of these characteristics for the possibility of applying their results to broader populations. This tendency is found mainly in studies of pupils and teachers in private or international schools (Allan & Charles, 2015; Harshman & Augustine, 2013; Schweisfurth, 2006) or of participants in GCE-oriented programs (Lima & Brown, 2007), as well as in studies concentrating on homogenous populations within diverse societies (Niens & Reilly, 2012). Studies of policy and curricula, as a result of their macro, state-level focus, tend to apply an underlying assumption that the same content can be

71

delivered in the same way to all pupils within a particular school, region, or nation and rarely address issues such as socio-economic background or diversity (Engel, 2014; Parmenter, 2011; Rapoport, 2009).

For example, Lima and Brown (2007) studied Brazilian youth participating in an online program aimed at developing global citizenship through English literacy at two private schools and one public school with internet connections (notably, the internet is only available at a relatively small percentage of Brazilian schools). The article's discussion and conclusions overlook the limited applicability of findings from these schools to the broader Brazilian population. Similarly, Allan and Charles' (2015) study of female pupils at private schools in England emphasises how travel experience and travel opportunities provided by their schools influences their perceptions of global citizenship. Although the authors understandably chose a study population that has opportunities for global mobility, since this was part of their definition of global citizenship, they fell short of engaging critically with the potential risk of excluding major parts of the population from the GCE landscape.

Moreover, the scholarship on GCE is heavily oriented towards western, developed countries. In fact, Parmenter (2011) found that of 199 academic publications mentioning global citizenship, approximately 80 per cent were written by scholars from the US, Canada, and several European countries. The western bias in the sources of knowledge regarding the concept of global citizenship, which supposedly is universally relevant, makes it seem as though GCE should or can be taught similarly and has the same meaning in most (if not all) contexts. These universalistic perceptions of GCE indeed blur the impact of social background and other differences at the school, regional, or national level.

Not surprisingly, the few studies in the cohort that did concentrate on the study population's socio-economic or cultural background (Wood, 2012; 2014) or discuss particular minority groups such as immigrants (Myers & Zaman, 2009) reveal the paramount importance of addressing these factors in any research involving education and particularly citizenship education. Wood (2012) examined perceptions and practices of education for active citizenship among teachers in New Zealand and found that those teaching pupils of high socio-economic status place greater emphasis on active citizenship in a global setting than do those teaching pupils from lower socio-economic backgrounds; the latter are less likely to promote active citizenship altogether and rarely emphasise active GCE. Myers and Zaman (2009) compared

perceptions and understandings of citizenship concepts among pupils belonging to the dominant culture and immigrants at an international school in the US and concluded that although the pupils were taught the same curriculum, they developed different levels of identification with the concept citizenship in general and with local citizenship in particular. The authors suggest that 'one-size-fits-all' civic education programs are not always suitable for diverse populations and do not enable all pupils to fully engage with the materials. They conclude that in a transnational world, more flexible models of citizenship are necessary – not only at international schools but also at any heterogeneous educational setting. The conclusions of both these studies suggest that the supposedly universal nature of GCE enables policymakers and researchers to ignore particularities of social groups.

Tokenism

The final issue to emerge from the thematic analysis of the full cohort of 99 articles represents one of the greatest methodological difficulties I encountered in performing any research concerning GCE. It concerns the substantial number of articles that mention the term 'global citizenship' only briefly without providing any discussion directly related to it. I found two discernable categories of such articles. The first includes articles that apply the term 'global citizenship' in reference to specific policies or programs bearing that term in their titles. The second category includes articles that mention global citizenship in the abstract and occasionally provide a short definition, but do not engage with the complexity of the concept and draw no directly related conclusions.

Policy-driven terminology. Many of the studies I reviewed that mention global citizenship in their abstract but not in the theoretical framework or conclusions originate from countries that had implemented policies and programs in which the term 'global citizenship' was a key component or goal. In many of these studies, the term's definition was taken for granted and thus omitted from the theoretical framework.

One example of policy or program-driven terminology can be found in the work of Niens and colleagues (2013), who studied the perspectives of teachers in Northern Ireland regarding the particularities of teaching civics in a divided society. The term 'global citizenship' is present in their research because their study population consisted of teachers participating in a program entitled 'Local and Global Citizenship'; however, the article's literature review and the study itself actually focuses on multicultural models of citizenship and the potential benefits of

multicultural education in divided societies. The same phenomenon can be observed in O'Connor's (2012) study of an informal education program in Northern Ireland which mentions global citizenship only in reference to the name of the local policy. Other studies in this category focus on countries that had chosen to articulate their policy with different terminology, such as that of De Oliveira Andreotti and colleagues (2014) on Finland and its policy of 'global-mindedness.' Such studies tend to address GCE as the policy framework, but their conclusions are not tied directly to GCE but rather to the particular term policymakers had chosen.

In fact, this tendency illustrates the complex relationship between conceptual scholarship, empirical studies, and policy – a relationship involving both substantial mutual influence and extensive differences. This claim is best exemplified in Rapoport's (2013) study of American social studies teachers. Although the teachers themselves attribute importance to the term 'global citizenship' and despite the term's appearance in the state social studies standards, in classroom observations, Rapoport found that teachers made no mention of the term. Seemingly, while scholars and policymakers are often quite comfortable discussing and addressing GCE, in practice, GCE is often omitted or replaced with less controversial terms and thereby softened and perhaps neutralised in the classroom. Additionally, in some countries and settings, policymakers also attempt to articulate policy in unobjectionable or less objectionable terms such as global mindedness, as is the case in Finland (De Oliveira Andreotti et al., 2014) and in parts of the US (Rapoport, 2009).

Global citizenship as a 'buzz word'. Global citizenship seems to be a trending term in the field of education research and is often woven into articles for the purpose of placing their subject matter within or as juxtaposed to a more substantial, globally recognised topic. Recently, this phenomenon has been enhanced by the introduction of the concept as part of the SDGs. Sixteen of the articles I reviewed used the term loosely, involved no analysis of the concept and drew no conclusions related to the notion. Indeed, some of these articles mention the term in their abstracts and return to it in their concluding remarks; absent is any engagement with its meaning throughout the text. While such use of the term is not necessarily an illegitimate practice, those performing research in the complex field of GCE or related areas should be cognisant of the connotations and assumptions weaved into the particular concepts associated with it and provide relevant theoretical or conceptual frameworks which explain their particular chosen definition of the concept.

With the absence of specific definitions and taxonomies, GCE term could simply become a token term arbitrarily chosen from a list of similar generic terms (i.e., cosmopolitanism, global mindedness, global consciousness, transnationalism, global competencies, global education etc.). I have chosen not to identify any particular examples within this final category, as my aim is to shed light on this phenomenon and encourage more in-depth critical thinking regarding conceptual choices in research throughout the field rather than admonish fellow scholars. The intricate differences between concepts related to GCE and particularly the underlying meanings associated with the word 'citizenship' make it imperative to properly consider whether or not GCE is the correct term in a particular research context. So as to better organise this highly disjointed field, and in light of the widespread trend towards adoption of GCE in developed countries, I suggest that scholars and policymakers alike should familiarise themselves with the intricate differences between GCE and other related terms.

In highlighting some overarching themes within the empirical research at the start of my PhD, I aim to show which topics were being addressed and which had been somewhat overlooked at the time. I suggest several gaps between theory and practice in this field that scholars performing theoretical and empirical research alike should more adequately address. One example of such a gap is researchers' seeming eagerness to discuss global citizenship, although policymakers and educators within schools seem to have reservations about the notion and tend to avoid the use of this particular term. Another gap involves the widespread call for more critical GCE expressed in theoretical research (Andreotti, 2006; Schattle, 2008), in contrast to its very low profile within empirical studies and actual policy.

2.2 Place, Identity and Social Inequality

The first part of the literature review (2.1) explored education's global turn, while focusing on the rise of GCE as a manifestation of globalisation of education and of efforts made by systems to internationalise in response to globalisation. In particular, the findings from the systematic literature review highlighted the shifting nature of GCE and foregrounded the importance of spatial and contextual factors in shaping it, which are often overlooked. Section 2.2 picks up on this theme (and the second main aspect of this thesis) and critically analyses the way spatial characteristics inform and shape pupils' educational environments and achievements, as well as their identities and imagined futures. I begin by introducing the spatial turn in comparative

75

education and in social research, which gave rise to a more in-depth approach to spatial aspects of educational environments - previously often portrayed as a backdrop or context. I then turn to literature that explores and conceptualises pupils' imagined futures and how these are tied to their spatial environments. This part of the literature review further illuminates the importance of exploring context in education from multiple perspectives, including pupils' own perceptions of their lived experiences and environment, as well as the way they and their teachers imagine their future trajectories.

2.2.1 The Spatial Turn in Education and Global/Local Dichotomies

Larsen and Beech (2014), criticise the dichotomy between conceptualisations of place and space, with place historically being viewed as a static, localised, construct and space being constructed in global and abstract terms. This changed to some extent with the 'spatial turn', which challenged this dichotomy and called attention to the dynamic relationship between the global and the local spheres. The spatial turn began in the twentieth century as a result of the rise of modernity, which challenged previous perceptions of time, place, and space and led to a reconsideration of the way space and time are theorised and taken into account (Warf & Arias, 2009). One side-effect of the spatial turn in education research has been the emergence of geographies of education and learning (Kong, 2013), which emphasize the role of spatiality in formal and informal learning environments and their potential effect on educational and life trajectories. Another product of the spatial turn is the attention paid to the ways in which spatiality facilitates the replication of various social gaps, divisions, and forms of inequality (Riley & Ettlinger, 2011; Tickamyer, 2000).

Lefebre (1991) as well as Soja (1996) both contributed significantly to the spatial turn, by calling upon scholars to understand that space is not merely a representation of the physical, static aspects of a concrete environment, but rather an intricate, socially constructed concept which reflects as well as shapes the ideologies, beliefs, and identities of those who occupy it. Soja (ibid) further developed a conceptual framework to accommodate the spatial turn in which space is broken down into three aspects: First, space, which includes the physical, material aspects of a given space; those which are reproducible. The second space is a more affect - centred analytical framework, the space in which emotions and feelings are assigned to a first space. Third space, as Soja defines it, is:

'[…] a knowable and unknowable, real and imagined lifeworld of experiences, emotional events, and political choices that is existentially shaped by the generative and problematic interplay between centres and peripheries, the abstract and concrete, the impassioned spaces of the conceptual and the lived, marked out materially and metaphorically in spatial praxis, the transformation of (spatial) knowledge into (spatial) action in the field of unevenly developed (spatial) power.' (Soja, ibid, p. 31).

In this thesis, the interview protocols will rely on Soja's framework in order to explore the power structures, emotions, ideas, stereotypes, and identities associated with each place and city of residence by each of the groups (pupils, teachers and parents) and assess how these relate to notions of GCE in each context.

Larsen and Beech (2014) emphasise the implications of globalisation for the spatial turn and for understandings of space and place in general. They call for the adoption of a relational notion of space, which takes into account nuanced understandings of the ways social relations shape and are shaped by space. The concepts of space and place can therefore no longer be dichotomized, particularly because of the way social relations are much less bound to the local sphere due to technological advances and economic globalisation. Additionally, the understanding embedded in a relational notion of space, that the global and local are heavily intertwined, challenges the static representation of place as well as the abstract notion of space. The global, rather than being an abstract concept referring to anything unrelated to one's local environment, is shaped, quite significantly by local context, for example, in education, global policy and discourses are grounded in the places from which they originated and take on different forms in whichever settings in which they are applied (Beech, 2009). Global cities are another concrete example of the inseparable nature of the global and local spheres. These cities share similar characteristics to one another, but the way they embody global forces and the way those forces shape them is dependent on local factors (Sassen, 2007; 2011).

In sum, the spatial turn in comparative education research has prompted an understanding that space is not a static backdrop or context to pupils' lives but rather a complex structure that can be theorised and understood in many ways, and must be taken into account when one is exploring the factors that shape pupil experiences and trajectories. This echoes some of the critiques of context introduced in Chapter 1 as part of the research approach, notably Sobe and

Kowalczyk (2012) call to 'explode [Bray and Thomas's] cube', and responds to the tendency to ignore context in GCE research which I addressed in section 2.1.4.

2.2.2 Geo-Identities and Imagined Futures

Pupils and youth, in general, are in a constant process of identity formation, which is shaped by many intersecting and independent factors and is crucial to the formation of the adults they will eventually become (Erikson, 1968). Pupils' place of residence is often an indicator of their social class but also has an independent role in shaping their self-perceptions and identities, as well as their aspirations and the opportunities afforded to them (Prince, 2014; Roscigno, Tomaskovic-Devey, & Crowley, 2006). This could be particularly true with regards to developing global identities and a self-conception of themselves as global citizens, as this thesis study aims to explore.

Roscigno, Tomaskovic-Devey, and Crowley (2006) use national US survey data to reveal the spatial stratification of education and resources in a way that puts pupils residing in inner-city and rural neighbourhoods at a disadvantage. Their findings suggest that these disparities affect pupils' achievements on national standardised tests but, more importantly, continue to impact trajectories long after they have finished school. Prince (2014) goes further and connects the concept of physical place directly to young people's identity formation and their imagined futures. According to Prince, pupils' identities embody the places they spend their time in and are shaped by physical attributes of these spaces as well as stigmas or social tags that might be associated with the places they inhabit. Furthermore, Rowe (2015) explores the educational choices of middle-class youth in Australia and introduces the concept of geo-identities as a way of consolidating class-identity and geographic positioning. Rowe suggests that identities are linked to geographic location no less than they are to social class, and that the role of physical space in relation to other spaces as well as changes to the composition of geographic locations should not be overlooked.

One aspect of young people's self-concept that could be tied to their geo-identities is imagined futures, used by Prince (2014) to denote the physical and non-physical aspects of young peoples' *proje*ctions of their future selves. This is one of the most interesting constructs addressed by studies that explore the ways in which educational context and social place shape pupils' trajectories in education and beyond (Ball, Macrae, & Maguire, 1999; Prince, 2014;

Thomson & Holland, 2002; Vigh, 2009). Ball and his colleagues found that pupils of different backgrounds imagined their futures differently and used their imagined futures to frame their choices with regard to their educational trajectories. Similarly, in their study of the motivations behind Australian pupils' choice of IB (international diploma) versus non-IB curriculums, Doherty, Mu, and Shield (2009) found that pupils' social class and imagined futures played a significant part in the pupils' choices; specifically, they found pupils of higher SES more likely to imagine a mobile future and choose to study the International Baccalaureate (IB) curriculum in order to enable this global imagined future to fulfil itself.

Pupils' nationality and national environment have also been shown to specifically shape the way pupils perceive their own positions in global society. Ross, Puzic, and Doolan (2017) used focus groups with adolescents aged 11-17 and examined the ways pupils from Croatia, which only formally joined the EU in 2013, constructed their identities with regards to the new levels of identification that had become available to them, and compared these to the findings of a larger scale study conducted across 28 European nations (Ross, 2015). They revealed differences between pupils in different countries that could be embedded in historical, cultural, and economic factors. Ross, Puzic and Doolan (2017) note that Croatian pupils developed complex multiple identities and place identifications. Pupils in this study were already beginning to envision how European membership could help them in the future and were already beginning to consider possibilities that hadn't been realistic before, but they were also hesitant to refer to themselves as Europeans outright. This suggests the possibility of kaleidoscopic identity models whose elements do not contradict but rather complement each other.

In sum, pupils' place of residence plays an important role in shaping their identity, both in terms of their immediate environment but also the way they perceive and understand the country they reside in. The physical and social aspects of an area of residence are difficult to change, but education could play a transformative role in enabling pupils to imagine different future trajectories for themselves than those dictated by their social class or place of residence; for example, school quality and neighbourhood characteristics have been shown, in a nationally representative sample of pupils in the US to be correlated with educational outcomes from an early age irrespective of socio-economic class and family-related variables (Aikens & Barbarin, 2008).

One way in which the local aspects of pupils' physical environment ties into constructed notions of GCE is through the extent to which pupils are exposed to global phenomena and factors within their physical environment. It has been suggested that pupils who reside in global cities, cities that house international companies, hold international cultural events, and have an effect on global processes in political, financial or cultural terms (Carter, 2005), could be more open to the themes associated with GCE and to imagine more global futures for themselves (Goren & Yemini, 2017c; Yemini & Maxwell, 2018; Maxwell & Aggleton, 2016). This does not mean that only pupils in global cities can develop mobile or global imaginaries for themselves; Hardgrove, Rootham and McDowell (2015), in a study of British young people's conceptions of their possible future selves, found that exposure to a variety of trajectories and paths contributed to the development of pupils' motivations to explore and enact similar trajectories - suggesting that an active policy of exposing pupils to a wide range of possibilities and opportunities can counteract the effects of their immediate settings.

Conversely, if schools and education system do not actively promote GCE and do not take advantage of this transformative potential, social inequality is reproduced not only at a local level but also at a global level by not providing pupils with GCE and leaving only pupils from privileged homes or from global cities to participate in the global arena fully and actively (Goren & Yemini, 2017b; c). This places the global city as an area of residence as somewhat of a mediating factor in the relationship between social factors and global citizenship by facilitating exposure to global influences to populations from different backgrounds, leading to this study's comparative focus on pupils from different socio-economic backgrounds residing in a global city as per Carter's (2005) definition: '…those cities where there is an accumulation of financial, economic, political and cultural headquarters of global importance (p.266)' versus pupils from a peripheral city where those characteristics do not apply.

2.3 Israel, its Education System, and its Patterns of Internationalisation

Israel, established in 1948, is a nation of nearly 9 million people, approximately 20 per cent of whom belong to the Arab-Palestinian population. The nation has been engaged in an intractable conflict with the Palestinians and with several countries in the Arab world since its establishment (Bar-Tal, 1998). These ongoing conflicts are a result of Israel annexing and occupying lands that had formerly belonged to Palestinians and expanding its borders unilaterally to include the Golan

Heights and East Jerusalem, which had been occupied by Syria, and Jordan until the Six-Day war of 1967 (although formal annexation did not occur until the early 1980s). These and other unilateral steps taken by Israel are justified by the government through explanations which draw on national security (Olesker, 2019), but they are heavily criticised by the international community, with many countries and international organisations refusing to recognise Israel's self-proclaimed borders (Ronen, 2014).

Moreover, Israeli society is highly divided; it is rampant with many internal struggles involving Jews of different religious sectors and origins, the Arab minority, and other groups (Agbaria et al., 2015; Ichilov 2003). Alongside the national conflict, these internal divisions have greatly affected the Israeli education system, which mirrors these conflicts and fluctuations; as different groups gain power, curricular goals and the national narrative promoted through schools change, as do official perceptions of the purpose of education itself (Agbaria 2016; Lemish 2003).

Israel, like most countries, is also experiencing the effects of globalisation, causing the education system to be somewhat torn between the nationalism invoked by the ongoing conflict and the expectations posed of a country attempting to participate in the global economy. One of the arguments I develop in this thesis is that Israel is an ideological semi-periphery. This definition of Israel has been used before (e.g Milner & Milner, 2020), but usually in economic terms, citing its dependence on core nations (USA) and its lack of natural resources and on the other hand its history of innovation and its active participation in the global economy. Here, I offer a more socially informed view of Israel's semi-peripherality, reflected in its ambiguity towards human rights and other values espoused by core nations, and the nature of its immigration laws, that negatively impact the movement of (non-Jewish) people from other countries to Israel.

2.3.1 Citizenship and Civic Education in Israel

Israeli citizenship is a contested issue, and as a result Israeli citizenship education is a highly researched topic, due to the delicate balance and perhaps the inherent paradox between the country's self-definition as a Jewish and democratic state (Agbaria 2016; Al-Haj 2005; Pedahzur 2001; Pinson 2007; Smooha 2002).This inherent paradox is highlighted by Smooha (2002), who asserts that Israel does not fall under the category of a Western liberal democracy,

as it is often perceived or presents itself, but rather, it embodies a model of ethnic democracy, in which the major ethnic or religious group uses state structures and resources in to maintain its own interests, sometimes at the expense of minority group rights. While in a democratic nation equality and freedom are valorised, in an ethnic democracy or a non-liberal democracy they are hindered by design (Pedahzur 2001). The tension between the Jewish and democratic definitions of the state is

often raised in the public discourse and comprises a particularly potent issue, and competing notions and conceptions of citizenship have been shown by Cohen (2017; 2019) to create ambivalence in Israeli classrooms.

Citizenship is a concept that is usually defined in reference to rights and responsibilities or obligations that reflect a legal mutual bond between people and states. Marshall (1950, pg.14) defined citizenship as 'a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community. All who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed. This definition and many others reflect one of the main ways in which the Israeli form of citizenship departs from the norm - particularly with regard to its Arab-Palestinian citizens but also the Orthodox Jewish citizens - both groups are exempt from military service, which is one of the duties bestowed unequally upon citizens in Israel. Another divergence between Israel and other modern democratic states is demonstrated through the process of becoming a citizen (known as naturalisation). In Israel, this process is significantly easier for Jews due to the law of return (enacted since 1950), which dictates that 'every Jew has the right to come to this country as an *oleh* (immigrant to Israel)' (Cohen, 2017). Although restrictions on naturalisation are not exclusive to Israel (Shachar, 1998), restrictions based solely on ethnicity or religious backgrounds are rare, and pose a challenge to the notion of equality in the eyes of the law and cements the hierarchy between Jewish and non-Jewish (particularly Arab-Palestinian) citizens. This is only one example of the interrelationship between religion/ethnicity and state that shapes the meaning and nature of democracy in Israel - thus impacting what citizenship means.

These issues, of course, also shape the education system and specifically citizenship education in Israel. The state has a divided education system as previously mentioned - but a core curriculum that is uniform throughout the system. This means Arab-Palestinian (and other minority) pupils and Jewish pupils study the same citizenship curriculum in secondary school, a curriculum which is often criticised for focusing heavily on the Jewish narrative and overlooking

the Arab-Palestinian population. One of the justifications given for the one-sidedness of the curriculum is that one of the goals of the education system is to encourage (Jewish) pupils to participate in the compulsory military service, a goal that could be undermined by a lack of focus on Jewish heritage or too much emphasis on the plight of the Arab-Palestinian population or their narrative regarding the expulsion or fleeing of about half of prewar Palestine's Arab population from their homes, during the 1948 Palestine war (Morris, 2004). This event is termed Al-Nakba (literally translated, the disaster or catastrophe), by the Arab-Palestinians, and it is not mentioned in the formal citizenship curriculum.

Yonah (2005) maintained that education and the curriculum comprise the main ways through which the Zionist narrative is disseminated in Israeli society. Additionally, as Firer (1998) explained, this narrative and the attempt to harmonise the ideas of the Zionist[4] nation with pupils' perceptions of themselves as individuals make it nearly impossible to include any progressive forms of civic education or human rights education in the curriculum. Resnik (1999) expressed similar concerns in her historical review of the Israeli curriculum, which showed that over the years, the particularistic principles of Jewish nationalism have expanded in the curriculum, pushing universalistic principles to the side-lines – a point echoed by Pedahzur (2001), who claimed that the civics curriculum had been subordinated to the ethnonational principles and decidedly non-liberal nature of the state. Pedahzur (ibid) asserts that Israel is a non-liberal democracy due to the fact that although the state holds democratic elections and allows minorities to participate freely in these elections, it also sacrifices some liberal values in order to maintain its ethnoreligious-nationalist nature.

These challenges and obstacles posed by competing national narratives and strong social division are not unique to Israel; as Hanna (2016) showed in her comparative study of the way differences are dealt with in the civics education of divided societies, Israel and Northern Ireland experience similar issues. Nevertheless, almost no research has focused explicitly on GCE in the

---

[4] Zionism is the general belief that the Jewish people are entitled to nationhood and self-determination in the state of Israel (Band, 2005). It is often portrayed critically as contradictory to the principals of democracy as it is used to justify the continued occupation of the West Bank and Palestinian territories and the conflation of religion (Judaism) and state in Israel.

Israeli context, and due to the expanding nature of GCE as a global phenomenon, more research is necessary.

2.3.2 Patterns of Selective Internationalisation and GCE in Israel

Most of the research concerning internationalisation of education in the Israeli context pertains to the higher education system, and identifies some neoliberal or globally oriented rationales that are widespread in the scholarship (such as gaining more international recognition to improve an institution's image thereby opening more opportunities for collaborations and employment) and others more closely related to Israel's distinct characteristics (Bamberger et al., 2019; Yemini et al., 2017). One example of the latter is presented in Bamberger and her colleagues' (2019) analysis of the patterns of internationalisation which emerged at Ariel University. Ariel University is highly contested as it is located in the occupied West Bank of Israel, and struggles to gain recognition and enact collaborations with other institutions in nations that oppose the occupation. As a result, in addition to specific actions by the institution and scholars that display patterns of internationalisation that veer away from the norm, the research reveals a way of using internationalisation for *domestic* purposes which had not been previously explored, specifically for the purpose of legitimising, expanding, and normalising the occupation – and by extension, government policy. Another example of the distinct characteristics of internationalisation of higher education in Israel is the focus on Jewish Diaspora as a target global audience, and the collaborations many universities enact with other Jewish institutions and diaspora organisations (Bamberger et al., 2020).

As a whole, the Israeli education system is open to internationalisation, as can be seen through the previous examples pertaining to higher education, its participation in projects led by the EU and other supranational organisations, and its widespread acceptance of international standardised testing through PISA and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) (Feniger, Livneh, & Yogev, 2012). However, this same openness does not necessarily apply to GCE or even a looser sense of globalisation or internationalisation of the curriculum, particularly at the primary and secondary school levels.

Research concerning the international contents of the history curricula as they are manifested in the final matriculation exam in this subject has painted quite a different picture. Yemini, Bar-Nissan and Shavit (2014) showed that over the last 20 years, the global contents on

the history matriculation exam have, in fact, been pushed aside in favour of more locally-focused issues. This too suggests that the Israeli education system applies a highly selective strategy as to which aspects of the system to internationalise and to what extent.

In a previous study (Goren & Yemini, 2017c), I reframed the data collected during the previous studies presented here by using deductive qualitative content analysis in order to observe the ways teachers saw the Israeli context as hindering or promoting GCE. The study concentrated mostly on the obstacles that the nationalist, particularistic, militarist nature often attributed to the Israeli education system posed to GCE, in the opinion of secular Jewish teachers. The study showed that the Israeli context presents a unique landscape for studying GCE due to historical, political, social, and geographic factors. These unique settings - and specifically the clash between the need to internationalise and the profound nationalism that dominates the education system - highlight the importance of understanding how different constructs of GCE are developed under these national conditions in differently constituted local contexts.

The examples provided thus far to demonstrate the absence of GCE in the Israeli education system have referred primarily to cosmopolitan (specifically political and moral) forms of GCE (as per Oxley & Morris's [2013] typology). However, as it relates to advocacy modes of GCE, the curriculum is also lacking (Pinson, 2020; Zaradez et al., 2020). Pinson (2020) critiques the most recent state-mandated curriculum and textbook for citizenship education and highlights the neo-national (Zionist) focus that pushes aside issues related to oppression, which Oxley and Morris regard as a social component of advocacy modes of GCE. Zaradez and colleagues show that environmental education, necessary for environmental components of GCE, is also greatly neglected by the Israeli curriculum and teacher education programmes. Both examples demonstrate that Israel's socio-political characteristics have oriented the education system inwards, neglecting the global sphere, and only providing pupils with abstract and scattered information about the world.

As of yet, GCE is not an officially recognised component of the citizenship education curriculum administered by the Ministry of Education (MOE), and only one third sector programme promotes GCE by name, offered by the Society for International Development in Israel[5] , is recognized by the MOE. The current, right-wing government and the policies enacted

---

[5] http://www.sid-israel.org/en/

by the past three Ministers of Education have clarified through funding and official documents that the education system is first and foremost concerned with the development of (Jewish) pupils' Jewish identities. However, some very recent developments, such as a document recently released by the MOE featuring future plans for 'glocal' education and 'future geared pedagogy'[6] (Dvir et al., 2019), coupled with a strong public discourse opposing the rise in religious contents in state-schools (Rozenfeld et al., 2020) could imply that a shift towards more globalised forms of education is imminent.

This chapter has provided several key points, which can be summarised in six points. First, GCE is a term that has been widely used in education policy and curricula over the past two decades. Its integration within UNESCO's SDGs is expected to make it even more relevant, thus raising the possibility that more studies and policies will adopt it without meaningful thought or critical engagement with adaptations or shortfalls of its integration. Second, there are myriad definitions for GCE, with distinct motives and antecedents, which can be attributed to national characteristics and goals. Third, previous empirical studies of GCE have been shown to ignore contexts and characteristics of populations within nations, thus making them overlook how the concept is applied to and understood by different groups. Fourth, one of the factors that can shape how educational concepts are understood and interpreted by different social groups is place of residence, which also impacts pupils' imagined futures and educational trajectories. Fifth, in Israel, the ethno-religious nature of the state and the ongoing intractable conflict profoundly impacts the meaning of citizenship and the education system. And finally, the nationalistic nature of the education system and civics education, in particular, could have unique implications for how the concept of GCE is enacted, manifested, and adapted for the Israeli context, and for how the concept of global citizenship is understood by different populations.

In this thesis, I integrate these points by focusing on the Israeli context and how it engenders GCE while also taking into account multiple perspectives of teachers belonging to different ethno-religious groups as well as teachers and pupils residing in different areas. I explore the extent to which bottom-up conceptions of GCE reflect different national goals and imagined futures of different groups while also comparing these conceptions to those presented throughout section 2.1 in this chapter, including those introduced by GEOs. In the next chapter, I

---

[6] http://edu.gov.il/minhalpedagogy/mop/pedagogy-disign/Pages/future-pedagogy.aspx

detail my methodology and methods, including methodological challenges I encountered throughout the study and limitations of the study, before turning to the findings.

Chapter 3: Methodology and Methods

In this chapter, I introduce the epistemological approaches and the paradigm from which they emanate while providing examples of how these shaped the study. Then, I detail the data collection methods for each findings chapter separately, highlighting how they answer the research questions. Following this, I explain how data for all of the findings chapters were analysed. This is followed by a reflexive account of the methodological challenges that arose during the study in various stages, how my positionality could have impacted these challenges, and how I dealt with them. I then turn to address ethical procedures and issues related to the different parts of the thesis and the actions I took to protect the data collected. Later I turn to the concept of trustworthiness and the steps taken to ensure it throughout the study. Finally, I outline some methodological limitations of the study and discuss the implications of bringing a foreign concept (GCE) to the field before concluding this chapter.

3.1 Epistemological Approach

This thesis is informed by an interpretivist and comparative approach, rooted in the constructivist paradigm. This paradigm itself, posits that knowledge is not external but rather constructed by the individual, and interpreted by the researcher (Guba & Lincoln, 1986). Knowledge is thus temporary, contextual, and personal, and the production of knowledge by the researcher needs to be done responsibly and reflexively, acknowledging the dynamic and unstable nature of reality and its interpretation and reconstruction (Krauss, 2005). Although I try to avoid generalisations within this study, I do highlight patterns - while acknowledging that these are neither representative of the study's context nor the particular forms of data I draw on, but rather, constructed and shaped by my own experiences, knowledge, positionality, and the social interactions that informed the study in the form of interviews and beyond (Fontana & Frey, 2005).

As noted earlier, within the constructivist paradigm, the study is informed by an interpretivist approach, best suited for qualitative research, which is described by Creswell (2003, p. 4) as:

> 'a means for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem. The process of research involves emerging questions and

procedures. Data [is] typically collected in the participant's setting, [and…] analysis inductively [builds] from particulars to general themes. [Finally, the process culminates with] the researcher making interpretations of the meaning of the data.'

The interpretivist approach, in line with the choice of qualitative methodology and within the assumptions of the nature of knowledge stemming from the constructivist paradigm, lead to a relativist ontology which can be demonstrated through Wilson's (1963. p.54) statement that there's 'no such thing as 'the' meaning of a word so there is no such thing as 'the' concept of a thing' (p. 54). This ontology guided me throughout the research, but will be particularly relevant in Chapter 6, in which I explore different interpretations of PISA's global competence measure by teachers and pupils from different backgrounds.

The paradigm and the interpretivist and comparative approaches that situate this study can be demonstrated through a few of the key choices made throughout this thesis, and they will also be highlighted where relevant. One example can be found in the broad and flexible description/portrayal of the many forms/features of GCE that I utilise, to avoid limiting its meaning to those meanings that have been ascribed to it by GEOs or scholars. This stance is most appropriate if we are to assume (as I am) that the meaning attributed to GCE education is not only nationally situated but is shaped at the individual level by many factors that influence perceptions and constructions of reality, making it individualised and impossible to generalise.

The multi-level approach to peripherality I pursue in this study (detailed in chapter 1), as a notion rather than merely a set geographic category, also aligns with these approaches. Schools were chosen based on the extent to which preliminary conversations with school principals and later teachers reflected notions of peripherality of the school, teachers, or pupils, and adequate space was given to accommodate these notions at the regional, personal, and national levels. This is established further by the rejection of methodological nationalism and the choice to concentrate on sub-national contexts (in addition to the national) as organising frameworks.

This approach to peripherality also highlights the comparative nature of the study. As many comparative education scholars have noted, contemporary comparative education research takes a broad approach to comparison (Manzon, 2018; Sobe & Kowalczyk, 2012) – focusing not only on differences between countries, but across various contexts and social groups within countries. Thus, the choice to compare notions of GCE across different groups and settings within Israel constitutes a comparative education endeavour. Furthermore, as GCE is a global

education phenomenon currently being promoted globally by leading GEOs, the pursuit of understanding its interpretations within a particular national (and sub-national) context is also aligned with the purposes of comparative education research.

3.2 Data Collection Methods and Participants

There are three main research questions at the core of this thesis, and three studies, each shedding light on different aspects of these questions. However, it is important to note (as will be discussed in depth within the findings chapters and the conclusion) that the studies do not each exclusively relate to one question. In this section, I describe the data collection methods for each findings chapter separately while providing details about the selection and number of participants and the procedures and tools employed for data collection. Within each section, I also relate the study to the research questions and show how the different forms of data collected in each of the studies shed light on the research questions.

Brewer (2000) suggests four requirements for social research which I utilised as guidelines when creating the interview and focus group protocols and when writing up the final thesis. These include the responsibility of the researcher to: ask people for their views, meanings, and constructions; ask people in such a way that they can tell them in their own words; ask them in-depth because these meanings are often complex, taken for granted and problematic; and address the social context which gives meaning and substance to their views and constructions. As addressed in the following sections, I made sure questions posed during interviews were not constricting and did not try to impose my own views and definitions, nor those presented in the scholarship, upon the participants. I also asked clarifying questions to make sure my understanding was representative of what participants meant. Finally, by combining the three studies, each using a different methodology and forms of data, as well as conducting the pilot study (my master's dissertation) and a pilot focus group, I was able to gain and provide readers with an in-depth analysis supported by rich and varied data that is not limited to a single source or setting.

In the following sections, I present the data collection methods and aspects related to the selection of settings and participants relevant to each of the three findings chapters (4, 5, and 6). Although each of these chapters is particularly relevant to a specific research question, I draw on

data from each of them to answer the research questions in Chapter 7. In order to maintain clarity, Table 2 includes the research questions, the most relevant findings chapter(s), the primary sources of data and the supplementary evidence used to answer each question.

Table 2: RQs, methods, and findings chapters

Research question	Most relevant findings chapter(s)	Primary sources of Data	Supplementary evidence
RQ1: How do pupils residing in different cities (global/peripheral) perceive GCE, their place in a global world, and their imagined futures? To what extent is this shaped by their place of residence?	5	Seven focus groups with 5-6 pupils aged 15-16 at two schools, in which students were also asked to review and comment on the PISA global competence questionnaire	Interviews with teachers (Chapter 5), Analysis of MOE course for pupils going abroad (Chapter 6)
RQ2: How do teachers of pupils residing in different cities construct meanings of GCE and perceive their role in preparing pupils for global society? How does place of residence/sector shape these constructed meanings and roles?	4, 5	Interviews with seven teachers from each of the three main sectors of the education system (secular-Jewish, Religious- Jewish, and Arab-Palestinian) (Chapter 4) Interviews with 11 teachers at two schools - periphery (7) and centre (4), in which teachers were also asked to review and comment on the PISA global competence questionnaire (Chapter 5)	Analysis of MOE course for pupils going abroad (Chapter 6) Comparison with pupil responses in focus groups (Chapter 5)
RQ3: How does Israel's position in the global arena engender manifestations and perceptions of GCE within and across the education system	6	Analysis of mandatory MOE and MFA course for pupils embarking on trips abroad (Chapter 6) Analysis of news excerpts in local papers and school websites regarding incoming and outgoing delegations of pupils (Chapter 6)	Analysis of how the Israeli context manifests and is understood to engender GCE through the education system by teachers and pupils – as well as how the Israeli context is manifested in their reactions to items in the PISA questionnaire (Chapters 4 and 5)

3.2.1 Findings Part 1 (Chapter 4): Perceptions of GCE by Teachers from the Arab-Palestinian, State-Religious, and State-Secular Sectors of the Israeli Education System

Before delving into the data collection and participant recruitment procedures, it is important to note a terminological issue that is pertinent to this part of the findings. I use the terms 'State-religious', and 'State-secular', which are part of the official terminology laid out by the MOE, while I use 'Arab-Palestinian', rather than 'Arab Sector', which is the corresponding MOE term. There are two reasons that underline this choice. First, the Arab sector of the education system encompasses several groups, including Druze, Circassians, Bedouins, and the group which forms the majority of this sector, who are simply called 'Arabs'. Pupils belonging to this group are mostly Muslim. As such, one reason to avoid classifying this sector in my study as 'Arab' is to minimise terminological confusion and accurately outline the population I engaged with. The choice to specifically use the Arab-Palestinian terminology stems from how the teachers I spoke to identify themselves, and a critique commonly raised by scholars belonging to this group is that not addressing the Palestinian identity is a form of oppression by the state of Israel and the education system (as per Jabareen, 2006). Some preliminary findings from this chapter have been previously published (Goren et al., 2019).

Data for this part of the thesis were collected between June and September 2018, through 21 semi-structured interviews with seven teachers from each of the three sectors that are the focus for this study. Participants were recruited using the snowball sampling method (Noy, 2008). I began by approaching teachers from the state-secular system in TLV whom I had previously interviewed for my master's dissertation. They referred me to colleagues at their schools and outside of their schools. I then used colleagues and research networks to approach potential interviewees in the other sectors, with which I was less familiar. It was more difficult to recruit participants from the sectors that I do not belong to (Ryan et al., 2011); the challenges related to recruitment are discussed later.

The interviewees' teaching experience ranged from 2-35 years, and their subject areas were varied. I conducted 16 of the interviews in person, while the remaining five were performed over Skype. Although there are shortcomings related to using video conferencing tools for interviews, which include less control or knowledge of the environment and atmosphere on the participants' side of the call, and a reduced ability to make a note of body language and other non-verbal cues (Janghorban et al., 2014), these interviewees (all from the Arab-Palestinian

sector) preferred this method. Reasons for this included difficulty arranging for a time and place to meet in person, as they resided in Arab villages and cities that are far from TLV where I was based at the time. Although I was open to travelling as far as necessary, I accepted their preferences. Since the interviews were conducted during the summer break, the interviews that were not conducted over Skype were conducted in public parks and coffee - shops in TLV and two other cities in Israel, in accordance with the suggestions and preferences of the participants. I ensured to the best of my ability that the settings were as quiet as possible, to facilitate the recording of the sessions and try to minimise distractions.

All interviews began with the presentation and signing of a letter of consent (Appendix 6) approved by the Israeli MOE Chief Scientist (Permit number 10439) (Appendix 5), which detailed the voluntary nature of participation in the study and the ways in which data and anonymity would be protected. Participants also gave their approval for the audio - recording of each interview. The interviews lasted between 40 minutes and one hour, and, as I explain later in the methodological challenges section, in six cases I performed follow-up interviews over the phone to gain further insights relevant to the thesis. The interviews were transcribed in Hebrew, and relevant quotes were translated in a double translation method to ensure reliability (this is further discussed in the trustworthiness section of this chapter). The subject areas that teachers taught were not limited in this study to history or citizenship education, as is often done in empirical studies of GCE (Rappaport, 2010; Reilly & Niens, 2014); this is because the study pertains to teachers' general perceptions of the concept and how it relates to pupils in their sector, rather than how they themselves would implement it in their classroom. Additionally, it should be noted that in order to receive a representative view of the teachers' own understandings of global citizenship and GCE, they were not provided with any definition in the interviews and answered all questions according to their own definition/understanding of the concept.

I used semi-structured interviews (Merriam, 2009) as the data collection method in this study. Merriam (ibid) defines semi-structured interviews as interviews that consist of open-ended questions aimed at facilitating a focused discussion that is led by the researcher but flexible and open enough to enable them to capture a wide range of participants' worldviews and opinions. The protocol (Appendix 1) for the interviews (the list of questions I presented) was adapted with minor changes from the one created for my master's dissertation and included 19 open-ended

questions divided into four parts: general questions; questions related to GCE and the sector/school population; questions related to the teacher's perception of the MOEs position on GCE and finally questions related to challenges and obstacles to GCE in the Israeli context and the sector the teacher belongs to. Some of these questions emerged from my previous studies (Goren & Yemini, 2015; 2017a).

The structure of the interviews is important and was constructed through a reflective process, in which I took into account the order of questions and how they might shape responses. For example, I was aware of how questions related to obstacles could affect answers to questions related to the sector if introduced earlier, so I put them at the end. Of course, because the process of semi-structured interviews is a constructive and flexible interaction, participants sometimes answered questions before I had a chance to ask them explicitly, and some questions were added during each interview to gain a better or more accurate understanding of issues and subjects raised by the participants. Furthermore, between interviews, I often made small changes to the interview protocols to account for issues and challenges that I encountered in earlier interviews. For example, in the first few interviews, I asked participants 'how would you define global citizenship', and they seemed intimidated by this question and had trouble answering it. I later refined this question to say, 'there is a term that has recently been incorporated into some education systems, global citizenship education; it has a lot of definitions, but I want to hear from you what sorts of things come to mind when you hear that term, what do you think the purpose of GCE might be and what kinds of contents would it be related to.' Then, in the following section of the interview I would ask if there were aspects of meanings of the term that they think might be more relevant or fit for their sector.

The main limitation of this study is a self-selection bias among the participants. The participants from all three sectors were open to being interviewed by a secular female researcher regarding issues related to globalisation and identity - as they were told prior to the interview. Several of the participants from the Arab and the Religious sector noted that they did not think most teachers from their sector would agree to participate and assisted me in locating more interviewees who were more open to having this discussion. This means that although my participants displayed a wide array of opinions and perceptions, they cannot be said to be representative of their sectors, but furthermore, their views may be different than those of teachers in the same schools who chose not to be interviewed.

These interviews of the teachers specifically addressed RQ2: How do teachers of pupils residing in different cities or belonging to different sectors of the Israeli society construct meanings of GCE and perceive their role in preparing pupils for global society? How does place of residence/sector shape these constructed meanings and roles? As the only participants in this part of the study were teachers, and the comparative angle focused on the differences between the meanings ascribed to GCE in each of the sectors. However, some of the findings also shed light on areas related to RQ1, which concerns how pupils might see themselves in relation to the world within each of the sectors, and on RQ3, because teachers from the different sectors expressed different views on the extent to which Israel is (or should be) considered part of global society, and thus their answers reflect ways that the Israeli position in the global arena engenders manifestations and perceptions of GCE within and across the education system.

3.2.2 Findings Part 2 (Chapter 5): Perceptions of GCE by Pupils and Teachers in a Central and a Peripheral City

This part of the study relies on two forms of data, gathered through interviews with teachers and focus groups with pupils at a school in each city I chose for the study. The challenges and particularities of recruitment and choice of settings are described in detail in the methodological challenges section of this chapter, and the description of each school and setting I eventually chose appear later in this section. Data were collected at both schools throughout 2019 and the beginning of 2020. I conducted between 4-7 interviews with teachers at each school and 3-4 focus groups with pupils. The pupils were recruited by their homeroom teacher, who also participated as an interviewee (but was not present in the focus group). All interviews and focus groups were conducted at the school, during school hours, in the library or sometimes outdoors.

This part of the thesis specifically addresses RQ1, which relates to the way teachers of pupils in different regional settings in Israel construct meanings of GCE and perceive their role in preparing pupils for global society; and RQ2: How do pupils residing in different cities (global/peripheral) perceive GCE, their place in a global world, and their imagined futures? To what extent is this shaped by their place of residence? As with the previous section, some responses of teachers also related to or shed light on responses provided directly by pupils. The comparative angle in this part of the thesis focuses on the differences between the meanings ascribed to GCE in each of the schools, but also on the way pupils and teachers in the same

setting sometimes contradicted each other. Some of the findings also relate to RQ3, as the responses in both settings reflected different understandings and constructions of the place of Israel in global society, thus shedding light on how they perceived the Israeli context to engender manifestations or conceptions of GCE.

Research sites chosen

The Periphery: Valley City (VC) - pseudonym

The city chosen as the 'peripheral' case is relatively large (approximately 100,000 residents), but is characterized by a lack of industry, high paying jobs, limited public transportation within and outside the city, a large percentage of first and second-generation Olim, and a mix of old and new buildings and residents. Located about 40 kilometres from Tel-Aviv, and about a 45-minute drive, some of the city's residents commute to the centre via train, bus, or car on a daily basis.

This city is not a development town; it was established during the first aliya (late 1800s) by eastern European Jews, and was declared a city shortly after the establishment of the Israeli state (early 1950s). There are over 50 schools in the city, catering to nearly 20,000 pupils, and the city has been growing steadily over the past two decades. The school at the centre of this study is located near the centre of the city, and includes approximately 1,500 pupils between 7th and 12th grade.

As I mentioned earlier, in sociological terms, this city is considered a semi-periphery, as it feeds workers to the centre, and serves as a remote - centre for those in the 'true' periphery but lacks its own resources. It also does not benefit from the incentives given to the periphery detailed earlier. However, in the public discourse, it is quite often referred to as a peripheral city. For the purpose of this study, it was important for me to select a relatively large city, with a broad range of populations (in terms of SES) of various professions, that is not considered wholly impoverished or disadvantaged, as I aim to show that differences in perceptions of GCE are shaped by spatial and geographic factors beyond family income. It is also aligned with the epistemological approach of the thesis, which assumed the lived experiences of the participants determine reality, and the participants in my study absolutely saw themselves as residents of the periphery.

I recognise this introduces a limitation to the study, as any finding regarding 'the periphery' would need to be qualified with a disclaimer; however, this study concerns notions of

peripherality, and I argue that these exist independently of, or at least not explicitly within, geographic locations.

The Centre: Tel Aviv (TLV)

The city representing the centre in this study, is the most obvious choice - TLV. It is one of the largest cities in Israel, and the most cosmopolitan city in the country (Kipnis, 2004). TLV was founded in 1909, and has nearly 500,000 residents, of which over 50,000 are pupils spread across nearly 200 schools. There is wide variability in the socioeconomic status of the city's residents, as is the case in many metropolitans.

Indeed, TLV's schools cater to different socio-economic groups, including Jewish and non-Jewish immigrants, children of refugees, and pupils of varying religious backgrounds (Oplatka, 2002). In TLV, as in other cosmopolitan cities, immigrants often reside in clusters (Pamuk, 2004) and attend schools that cater to lower - and middle-class populations, while schools catering to pupils of high SES remain largely homogenous. This phenomenon is a result of the homogeneity within different neighbourhoods that characterizes TLV and other cosmopolitan cities (Mehmedbegovic, 2007; Yemini, 2014). TLV is the global financial and cultural centre of Israel, and it is home to the majority of the embassies other countries hold in the state. This is due to the disputed nature of Jerusalem, which was only recognised by the United States as the capital of Israel in 2018, and remains unrecognised by many other nations (Dumper, 2019). The school chosen to represent the case of TLV caters to mid-SES populations and is in the centre of the city.

I chose this school to correspond with the school in the periphery, as its population is not unique, as opposed to some schools in the city that cater to a disproportionate population of immigrants or Arab pupils (in comparison to the city's population). The school has approximately 700 pupils, ranging from 13-18 years of age, and the pupils who participated in the study were between the ages of 15-16. Teachers interviewed also taught in the corresponding classes.

Interviews

I conducted 11 interviews with teachers who had not participated in my previous studies, seven from the school in VC and five in TLV. In each case, I asked the school headmasters to approach as many teachers as possible with the interview request and then give me the contact information for those who responded positively. Difficulties and limitations of the recruitment process are

discussed in the methodological challenges section of this chapter. The interview protocol can be read in full in appendix 2. Similar to the interview protocol I adapted for the first findings section, the protocol was divided into four main sections, but the questions that comprised each section were different. The sections included questions about global influences teachers recognised in and around the school; the extent to which they felt their pupils were exposed to global influences (and types of influences); their interpretation of GCE and global competencies; and the extent to which they felt the Israeli education system in Israel incorporates global dimensions into pupils' education - as well as the extent to which they felt it should do so. I also asked some comparative questions within each section, to encourage them to think of their pupils and city compared to pupils in other cities in Israel, as well as in other settings such as London, Beijing, and rural towns or developing nations.

The interview protocol made use of Inductive Probing, a method in which the researcher asks open-ended questions which connect the interviewee's own answers to the research at hand and its theoretical backdrop (Guest et al., 2011). In each interview, the order of the questions and phrasing slightly changed in response to the dynamics of the conversation, and questions were added based on the interviewees' responses. This allowed me to gain larger insight into the participants' full range of experiences and perceptions, and gather a wider array of information regarding their own construction of the term GCE and its relevance for their pupils, and get information about what they perceived to be global within the school and its environment, before asking more specifically about global influences identified in my review of the literature.

Each interview began with the teacher signing a letter of consent indicating the voluntary nature of the study and the measures taken to protect their anonymity and the data (appendix 6). Interviews were conducted at the teachers' schools, mostly in private offices (their own or those of their colleagues), although three interviews were held in teachers' lounges. The different settings did not seem to affect teachers' earnestness or willingness to cooperate. Interviews lasted between 45 mins to one hour. All interviews were conducted in Hebrew, with the exception of one interview with an English teacher, conducted in English. The interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed in Hebrew, omitting personal details and redacting mentions of school names. Quotes included in this study were translated to English and back into Hebrew to ensure their validity, as is elaborated upon in the trustworthiness section of this chapter.

In addition, I presented teachers with a translation I created of the PISA global competence questionnaire, which consists of 15 constructs (groups of items) (appendix 9) at the end of each interview, and asked them to review each question and tell me how they thought their pupils would rank, which terms might be difficult to understand or translate, and how they thought their pupils' answers might differ from those of pupils in other places, whether in Israel or abroad. In two cases, there was not enough time for the final part of the interview (the global competence measure), and this part was then conducted over the phone while the teachers reviewed the test on their computers.

Focus Groups

Overall, six focus groups were conducted, with 5-6 pupils in each. The pupils were all in the 9th grade, and their ages ranged between 15 and 16. I chose this age group because PISA is distributed to 15-year-old pupils, and I wanted to present the GC measure to the appropriate audience. The focus group protocol was similar to the teacher interview protocol but asked questions referring directly to pupils and was adapted to correspond with their age and verbal abilities (See appendix 3). In the last part of each focus group, I presented pupils with the translated PISA global competence measure as I did with teachers. To do this, I showed the translated questionnaire to the homeroom teacher prior to the focus groups, to allow her to examine the translation and give comments or notes about unclear phrasing. None of the homeroom teachers commented on the translation.

Each focus group lasted 40 minutes (the duration of a classsession), and they were held at the library or the schoolyard during the school day, at the time of the pupils' homeroom class with the participating teacher. I asked teachers to select the pupils and diversify the groups in terms of gender and SES as much as possible - I presented the request in terms of parental professions. (as per Wardel et al., 2002). I also asked teachers to try and recruit pupils who come from immigrant (Olim) descent for each group, and they did. Each group had between one and three pupils who had one or both parents born abroad. All participating pupils were secular, Jewish, citizens of Israel (there were no religious participants in this part of the study due to the choice of schools from the state-secular system, which has very few religious pupils). More information regarding the focus groups is provided in the methodological challenges and ethics sections of this chapter (3.4, 3.5).

3.2.3 Findings Part 3 (Chapter 6): Analysis of the MOE and MFA Mandated Course for Pupils Attending Trips Abroad

This part of the thesis study draws on two types of data, collected in July-August 2019: (1) the course materials and tests that comprise the online program produced by the Ministry of Education (MOE) in partnership with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) in 2013 and mandated by the MOE for every pupil embarking on a school-based trip overseas to pass; (2) publicly available local newspaper and school website excerpts featuring testimonials and quotes from participating pupils and staff or administrative officials.

This part of the study is distinct from the others, as it does not draw on actual interactions with participants but rather a secondary analysis of texts and documents produced either by local media outlets or the ministries involved in the course. It also does not concentrate on GCE as its central point of inquiry but rather with a single phenomenon that is often tied to GCE in the literature (e.g., student trips abroad). I was referred to the course through one of my interviewees at VC, who presented it as one example of the way the MOE intervenes or shapes pupil's interactions with the world by mandating them to follow the guidelines presented in the course when they go abroad as part of school activities.

I gained access to the course by registering for it through the MOE site, but did not need to state my status or obstruct my identity in any way. The videos analysed in this section are publicly available on YouTube, while the questions that comprise the tests I sometimes refer to are embedded in the MOE's website, where the course is completed by pupils. The news excerpts were found through Google searches in Hebrew for a variety of terms such as 'student delegation', 'sister-cities', 'students visited/travelled to'. I term these texts excerpts rather than articles because they were generally short and appeared in local (town or area-wide) news outlets or in news sections of school websites. I limited my search to excerpts published between 2015 and 2019 (when data was collected) and only chose texts that included quotes from school officials, pupils, or other related stakeholders (such as mayors), while excluding those that were only descriptive. I also excluded any results that dealt with higher education, as these would not be helpful in triangulating the discourse I explored in the course that is the centre of the analysis. Overall, 32 news excerpts from various sources were used for this process of triangulation.

The data from both sources (the course materials, including videos, tests, and texts; and the news excerpts) were analysed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), which

provides a flexible method for integrating information and data from different types of sources, while taking into account multiple theoretical perspectives. First, all data was read inductively to locate key actors, representations, silences, and broad recurring themes. Next, a more deductive process was performed to examine the appearances of these categories across the different sources (e.g. instances of mentioning people from other countries, references to Israeli innovation, references to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, etc.). Finally, three major themes emerged that encompassed enough of the data to allow for a detailed framework through which the findings were presented. The process of analysis is described at length in the thematic analysis section of this chapter (3.3).

This part of the findings is best situated within the frame of RQ3: How does Israel's position in the global arena engender manifestations and perceptions of GCE within and across the education system? As it is highly reflective of the high value placed on nationalism in the education system and of how pupil interactions abroad and their relationships with people outside of Israel are 'nationalised' (in that they are presented first and foremost as national assets). This has extensive implications for what GCE means in the Israeli context, as these global experiences are discursively disconnected from global competence, and show one way in which the notion of semi-peripherality manifests and is then reflected by the MOE to pupils of all sectors and in all schools. Thus, this section also highlights some issues related to RQ1 and RQ2, as it is emblematic of the system as a whole, and the way it shapes the way pupils and teachers make sense of GCE and their place in global society.

3.3 Thematic Analysis

All data for the parts of this thesis were analysed using thematic analysis as per Braun and Clarke's (2006) procedures. In this process, I used both theoretical and inductive approaches. Thematic analysis can accommodate a variety of data sources and collection methods, theoretical orientations, and is useful in identifying commonalities across data without obstructing the unique facets of individual cases (Braun & Clarke, 2006), and thus it was deemed most appropriate for this thesis. The process of analysis was somewhat similar to the grounded theory approach that may also be appropriate in this type of research, and one step (Theoretical coding) was borrowed and adapted from Charmaz's (2006) guidelines – however, practical considerations I detail in the next paragraph precluded me from using grounded theory in its

purest sense. The main divergence in this research from grounded theory is that since I had conducted extensive previous research in this field before embarking on this thesis, and was familiar with the existing literature and its caveats, I started with a specific focus (i.e., comparing GCE perceptions in the periphery and centre, and among teachers from different sectors comparatively to explore how context shaped these perceptions). This means that this thesis will contribute to fine-tuning existing approaches to studying GCE as well as understanding the way peripherality shapes manifestations of other phenomena.

I used the six phases of thematic analysis proposed by Braun & Clarke (2013), separately for each findings chapter. *First*, I familiarized myself with the data, by listening to the recordings while transcribing and reading each transcription in full (this applies to the interviews, focus groups, and videos of the lessons that comprise the online course). *Second*, I reviewed each unit of data again while coding for patterns as well as outliers. *Third*, I reviewed the codes while searching for themes and patterns across the different interviews, focus groups, and lessons and within each of them. *Fourth*, I reviewed and refined these themes by consulting with my advisors and colleagues, re-reading the full transcriptions, and exploring additional supporting information sources. When I was content with the themes, I performed the *fifth* stage in which I defined and named them, and finally, in the *sixth* phase, I produced the written analysis. The production of the analysis happened in stages as well. Each chapter of the findings has been presented at a conference or seminar and received feedback and advice.

Between the fourth stage of reviewing the themes, and the fifth stage of naming the themes, I borrowed a step from Thornberg and Charmaz's (2014) steps for grounded theory analysis - theoretical coding, where I reviewed previous research surrounding GCE and other relevant topics to further refine and illuminate my themes, while comparing the data with the literature. Braun and Clarke's guidelines encourage contextualizing the themes according to the existing literature in the final stage while writing up; however, I feel this approach could lead to themes becoming too rigid and inflexible in the authors' mind, causing the analysis to be too ad-hoc rather than informed. In relating my findings to the literature (or finding contradictions) before naming and defining the themes fully, I was able to look at them through an additional, external lens, without going so far as to make the analysis purely deductive or category-driven.

The other steps of the analysis were also quite similar to Thornberg and Charmaz's (2014) grounded theory guidelines that include open and focused coding (similar to Braun and

Clarke's second, third, and fourth steps); the main departure from grounded theory in this thesis is, as mentioned earlier, that I was already aware of the existing literature and its caveats, and did not enter the coding process as a blank slate; as a result, the whole process was 'tainted' by my previous knowledge. A transcribed, translated, and coded interview with a teacher from the Arab-Palestinian sector can be found in Appendix 10, and it reflects the way coding was conducted across the different sources of data.

The units of analysis throughout the stages of analysis of the interviews and focus group data were not only based on place of residence (periphery versus centre). The teachers and pupils themselves as individuals, with varying experiences and worldviews, and the location of the schools and their environment were also units of analysis. The data was also reviewed with the national context in mind as another unit of analysis. The units of analysis evolved throughout the stages described here, as suggested by Gibton (2016). The analysis moved from textual, line-by-line analysis, which aimed to discern and observe the particularities of each individual response, to a discursive analysis focused on whole episodes of text and examples brought up by the participants, and finally, a broader narrative analysis that concentrated on the full story told by each participant, unit, or source of data.

3.4 A Reflexive Account of Methodological Challenges

Reflexivity is of utmost importance in qualitative analyses, particularly those guided by interpretivist approaches that require acute awareness by the researcher to their positionality, biases, and the relative manner in which the data is shaped and transformed through the researchers' own experience (Angrosino, 2007). In the following section I will detail the methodological challenges I encountered throughout the study, while providing a narrative and reflective account not only of the way I dealt with the challenges, but also how I shaped them and how they, in turn, shaped the research endeavour.

Several methodological challenges arose throughout the conception, data collection, analysis, and writing up stages of this thesis. Originally, my thesis was planned as a multiple case study, building on my previous work in the field of GCE. As mentioned in Chapter 1, I had written my master's dissertation at Tel Aviv University based on a study of teacher perceptions of GCE at different schools in Tel Aviv. This study was designed to explore differences based on pupils' socioeconomic status and the way their teachers imagined the pupils' futures, but also

differences that seemed to stem from Tel Aviv's characteristics as a global city and the different neighbourhoods and areas that pupils came from. This led me to want to explore space and locality in a more focused manner, and I wanted to do this through interviews with teachers and focus groups with pupils in a city in the (geographic) periphery and in Tel Aviv (Chapter 5). My MA dissertation also piqued my interest in how conceptions of GCE could differ among teachers in the different sectors of the Israeli education system (Chapter 4).

Chapter 4 presents the first part of the study, and it was accompanied by various challenges, mostly related to my positionality as a secular Jewish woman – and thus an outsider for the religious-Jewish and Palestinian-Arab teachers I wanted to interview. It was difficult to locate participants who would be willing to speak with me from these sectors, and I used personal connections to find teachers who obliged. Throughout this part of the study, particularly when speaking with teachers from the sectors I am not part of, I often felt I lacked the knowledge or experience to truly understand and relate to my interviewees - however, this led me to ask many questions for clarification, to ensure that I could adequately reflect their views, and eventually strengthened my findings. It was very important for me, particularly in relation to the Palestinian-Arab participants, to make sure I used terms they felt comfortable with. I achieved this by consulting with a Palestinian acquaintance prior to the interviews to see if any changes should be made to the interview protocol, and by maintaining awareness of the participants' body language throughout the interviews. I told participants in all three sectors that if they are uncomfortable with any of the questions or feel they might be irrelevant or poorly phrased, they should feel comfortable telling me, so that I can adjust them for the following interviews – but I received no comments on the questions or their phrasing.

For the part of the study detailed in Chapter 5, I had originally planned on using a multiple case study approach that would consist of several schools serving different SES populations in the geographic periphery and centre of the country. However, as I read more about periphery and centre both in Israel and in other contexts, I realised that beyond being a geographic spatial categorisation, periphery and peripherality could also be understood as social categories - this made me look more closely at the parameters I had originally set for choosing my peripheral city, and pursue a more open approach that does not fully depend on physical distance from the centre. Although this was a challenge, looking back on the study I think it makes the findings more significant.

I ultimately chose a city that is only 40 km from Tel Aviv, but because of the small area of the country and the historical distribution of the population, is still considered peripheral. Cities that are peripheral in Israel in classic geographic terms have many characteristics that make them different from Tel Aviv, other than their residents' perceptions of themselves as living in the periphery, and the way they are portrayed in the news and media. For example, they (by definition) live near the borders and as a result, experience the conflict between Israel and its neighbouring Arab nations much more intensely; they live much farther away from the only international airport in Israel at the time (another was constructed in the south recently), and thus tend to travel less often; in addition, they have much less access to modes of public transportation in general, and tend to perceive their cities' borders as more metaphorically concrete. Furthermore, these cities are often much smaller and less densely populated than the city I eventually chose.

As I explain in the choice of settings section, where the considerations of my choices are detailed further, many of the insights from this part of the study related to comparative perceptions voiced by pupils and teachers as to the global opportunities and nature of the opposing context - whereas further away in the geographic periphery, TLV may not even be a point of reference. This more nuanced and complex understanding of periphery also led to my next challenge (or opportunity).

It was very difficult for me to recruit participants for the study as I had originally intended to perform it (with several schools in each city, creating a complex matrix of socio-economic status and periphery/centre). This was, in part, due to my own background. Since I do not have a background in teaching, I am perceived as an outsider by headmasters and teachers alike and needed to use personal connections to try and recruit participants; however, since I had already exhausted my connections in Tel Aviv during my masters' study, the headmasters I contacted seemed to feel they had already given me enough help, and I soon realized asking to come into the school and interact with pupils was also perceived as much more invasive and demanding than merely asking for permission to contact teachers.

I encountered a similar problem of distrust or unwillingness to help in the peripheral city I had chosen (although there was also a process of elimination through which I made a list of potential cities and realised I had very few contacts who could help in most of them). In the peripheral city, I felt some of the principals I contacted seemed reluctant to help, not only

because of the fact I was not an insider in the sense that I did not have teaching experience, but also perhaps because of my own positionality, as a member of two groups that are considered privileged in Israel, an Ashkenazi Jew (while many of the principals I spoke to were of Mizrachi[7] background) and a resident of Tel Aviv, coming from the outside and asking to study a school in the periphery. Furthermore, I needed to mention I was performing the study as part of my doctoral thesis at a British university, which may have raised its own issues of class and privilege.

I tried to minimise the effects of my positionality by highlighting my secondary advisor, Miri Yemini, a Professor at Tel Aviv University, avoiding mentioning where I lived unless asked, and of course, avoiding referring to the cities the schools were situated in as peripheral, instead simply saying I was studying pupil and teacher perceptions of globalisation (this is how I simplified my study) and was looking for a school that had a heterogeneous population (which characterised most of the schools I approached). Looking back, and based on my findings, I see that there is a disconnect between pupil background (for example, whether or not there are a lot of pupils who are second or third generation Olim), and globalisation, particularly in the city I chose (I cannot speak for a broader context), which may have increased their unwillingness to cooperate. Another factor I should mention that applies to both settings where I eventually succeeded in recruiting participants is my own traits disposition. I have several traits that could have impacted willingness to cooperate by the principals and teachers I approached, including the fact that I sound very young and hesitant on the phone, I am shy and anxious in ways that are difficult to cloak, and these traits could have negatively affected cooperation.

Eventually, I decided to focus the study on one school in each setting, which served a mid-SES population (which was more restrictive in TLV than in VC, where most schools are classified mid-SES), and I exhausted all my connections and was persistent until I was granted access by principals to a list of teachers who were willing to cooperate. For this part of my study, I interviewed between five and seven teachers at each school, at least one of whom was a homeroom teacher who agreed to contact pupil parents on my behalf, to gain their approval, and these homeroom teachers arranged the participants for my focus groups. The teachers I

---

[7] Mizrachi (literally translated to Eastern) is a term referring to Sephardic Jews of Arab/North African descent, whereas Ashkenazi denotes Jews of European descent.

interviewed for this study were English, History, Sociology, and Geography teachers, who were likely more predisposed to accept an invitation to take part in a study concerning globalisation (as it was presented to them). This, of course, introduces a selection bias that I will discuss in the following section.

Gaining access to the pupils through their homeroom teachers at both schools and performing the focus groups in the school during the time allotted to the teachers (with their consent and encouragement), made this part of the process quite simple. However, there were some methodological challenges associated with the focus groups, particularly in terms of mediating the discussions, calming the atmosphere when debates became heated, making sure everyone's voices were heard, and getting the pupils to respond to my questions, which I dealt with using the help of suggestions from colleagues with teaching experience who helped me go over the questions before I started the focus groups, conducting a pilot focus group with pupils from a friend's niece's class (that are not used in the findings), and a few articles and chapters I read to prepare. I also made a conscious effort to avoid referencing my positionality unless pupils explicitly asked.

Chapter 6 was written while I was already collecting data for my study of the two cities. One of my interviewees mentioned that there was a course developed by the MFA and MOE that each pupil going abroad needed to take, and I was fascinated. I looked at the course and immediately started to analyse it, and noticed how well it clarified some of the arguments I was trying to make, by providing specific, focused examples of the goals and discourse produced and expressed by the ministries that created it, which speak to the broader atmosphere of the system in which pupils and teachers were operating. I wrote and published a paper about it (Goren, 2020), and at the same time adapted it for my thesis by changing the literature review, reorganising, and expanding the findings, and writing the conclusion in accordance with the conceptual approach that I detail in the next paragraph.

This process of performing three separate studies as part of my thesis introduced another challenge, as I did not have a clear view of how they could come together under the same headline. I tried to avoid this issue for a long time, until I began to write up the thesis in early 2020, and was confronted with the thought that I did not have a unified conceptual framework. Then a conversation with a colleague about how I was going to define periphery (specifically with relation to the regional periphery in this study), she noted that I should look beyond

scholarship on Israel at other conceptions of the term, such as Wallerstein's (1974) world-systems analysis. It was after reading about semi-peripheries that I went back to exploring social conceptions of periphery that had informed the earlier stages of my study, and realised this was my organising concept. The notion of semi-peripherality opened my eyes to the fact that I was actually examining how notions of peripherality at these different levels could shape or explain the different manifestations and perceptions of GCE, as they arise from my various studies and sources of data.

I reread all of my data in order to explore what other relationships and connections I could make (beyond simply categorizing each study as a reflection of one form of periphery), and the concluding remarks of each chapter as well as the overarching argument and conclusions of the thesis reflect the results of this process.

3.5 Ethics

Ethics are a crucial construct in qualitative research, particularly in studies involving data collection through interviews or focus groups, due to issues of representation as well as anonymity, and even more so when there are power relations between the participants as is the case with a study involving pupils and their teachers (Nespor, 2000; Walford, 2005). The researcher in these studies is committed to an accurate representation of participants' views and maintenance of complete anonymity of the study population (both between subjects and among colleagues and peers).

In this study, despite the seemingly non-controversial nature of its subject (GCE), Gibton's (2016) timeline of ethical deliberations was used to ensure that at every stage of the research, all relevant ethical issues were addressed. First, during the planning stage of the study, the participant list was not discussed other than with my advisors. Additionally, during the planning stage the research proposal was reviewed and approved by the Chief Scientist at the Ministry of Education (appendix 4), and the UCL ethics committee (Appendix 5) who gave approval to approach school principals and teachers and conduct interviews with teachers and focus groups with pupils. The approval of the study also included approval of the consent forms, which were signed by teachers and pupils at the beginning of each encounter, and forwarded by teachers to pupils' parents prior to the encounters to gain their oral approval for their child's participation (appendix 8).

In the stage of initial contact, when approaching headmasters and teachers, I did not mention other schools and teachers who had participated in the study, even when prompted to do so. Clear boundaries and obligations were set upon initial contact by explaining the voluntary nature of the study and the strategies through which anonymity will be maintained and established (Moosa, 2013). During the interviews and focus groups, which were held in a safe environment chosen by the participants (within the school grounds), these obligations to the privacy and anonymity of participants were repeated and it was further explained that interview recordings would only be accessible by me and that the interview will be transcribed without identifying details of neither the school nor the individual teachers or pupils (Seidman, 2006). Participants all signed consent forms (Appendix 7) that highlighted the measures put in place to protect their anonymity, the voluntary nature of the study, and in the case of pupils, clarified that they were able to leave at any time with no repercussions and that their teacher would not be informed of any information regarding their responses. Pupils were assured that the only response teachers would receive from me if they inquired as to the nature of the meeting would be 'it went well'. Furthermore, my contact information was provided to pupils in the event that they would wish to review or omit any of their responses (as per Grover, 2004). Pupils were also advised to seek the help of their school counselor in the event that the interview brought on thoughts they find confusing or unsettling.

When preparing for the focus groups I made sure to maintain awareness that the identities of young people are constructs in a constant state of development, and any discussion of them should be performed in a sensitive manner while maintaining awareness of power relations between the researcher and the participants of the study (Bagnoli & Clark, 2010; Hartas, 2010). In line with this issue, prior to commencing the actual data collection from pupils, I performed a pilot focus group, accompanied by a friend, with a group of 15–16-year-old pupils from her niece's class. These pupils who are all familiar with the friend who attended the pilot group, advised me about sensitive issues touched upon in the focus group protocols that I had overlooked, such as refraining from asking pupils directly about their parents' occupations, but rather asking more generally and not probing by going around the group and asking each one to respond in turn.

During snowball sampling of teachers, all approached individuals were told that they were recommended by the school principal or one of their colleagues, without mentioning names

when colleagues were involved. In the data analysis phase, the data were triangulated and reviewed by my secondary advisor, and interpretations were debated until an agreement was reached in order to ensure a proper representation and understanding of the participants' own views without imposing unreliable personal interpretations.

When writing the final product of the research, pseudonyms were provided to all teachers, and pupils were not identified by the specific group they took part in for the discussion nor by names. The city that serves as the case study for the periphery was also given a pseudonym, Valley City, any quotes that provided information that could be used specifically to identify the city or any of the schools referenced in the sections of the study that pertain to pupils and teachers were redacted. Quotes are used throughout the analysis sections, to provide a more accurate account and representation of teachers' and pupils' own perceptions. These same stages were repeated for publication and will be maintained in the aftermath of this study.

3.6 Data Management and Privacy Concerns

In addition to the safeguards detailed in the previous section, additional measures were implemented with regard to maintaining the anonymity of participants. These include the removal of all names and identifying features from the transcripts before they were saved to the encrypted personal drive on which the data was kept, and saving the interview recordings only for a limited amount of time on the UCL research data management cloud, which is encrypted and requires two-step authentication for use. The cloud also enables knowledge of each time the data is accessed and any changes made to it. I am the only one with access to the raw data in both recording and text form. Participants were asked directly at the end of each session if they would like any additional, specific information removed from the interview transcripts.

3.7 Trustworthiness

Scholars in the qualitative research paradigm have debated for decades whether the quantitative terms of reliability and validity can or should be applied to research carried out using qualitative methods. In recent decades, there has been a rise in the use of the term 'trustworthiness' to address issues of 'quality assurance' in qualitative research (Morse et al., 2000). This term is thought to be more dynamic and versatile and therefore favourable to various attempts which have been made over the years to create checklists associated with validity and reliability for

qualitative methods, which some claim could be counter-productive and harmful for qualitative research (Healy & Perry, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 2000; Stenbacka, 2001).

Trustworthiness in qualitative research is considered a term that encompasses both reliability and validity, and it is achieved mostly through the triangulation of data and interpretations (Healy & Perry, 2000). To ensure trustworthiness, data is collected from enough participants to enable the researcher to make sure that the evidence introduced to support arguments is framed in a way that enables readers to understand the extent to which it is representative of the relevant group of participants and the data is cross-compared across interviewees; Second, the data is read, re-read, and interpreted simultaneously by the researcher and by other scholars. Disagreements regarding the interpretation of the data are then debated until a consensus is reached (Morse et al., 2000). In the current study this method of ensuring trustworthiness was applied through discussing the data, interpretations and findings with my advisor, peers, and fellow scholars, particularly during academic conferences and tutorials led by both my primary supervisor with his former and current students at UCL (which I attended in person six times prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, and five times remotely since travel bans were imposed) and with my secondary advisor and her current students at Tel Aviv University (these were all remote as she was a visiting professor in Germany for most of the time prior to the pandemic). I presented parts of the research at every opportunity I had, no feedback was left unaddressed in this process and the findings were constantly refined in order to make them more trustworthy in addition to improving clarity and coherence.

Another important aspect of trustworthiness, particularly as it relates to studies in which data from different languages are collected and translated in the processes of analysis and writing up, is the reliability of the translations. This also relates to ethical and epistemological issues of accurate representation. To ensure trustworthiness in this regard, I employed a double translation method whereby text is translated from the source language to the output language, and then back to the source language to ensure that meanings remain stable (Eremenco et al., 2005). Furthermore, when I encountered difficulties in translation, I consulted my secondary advisor who is also fluent in both languages relevant to the study (Hebrew and English), and colleagues - while maintaining anonymity of the participants in cases where the quotes in question were collected from teachers and pupils. Finally, words that I could not find an accurate translation for, but are a pertinent part of the evidence I use in the analysis, are written phonetically in

English, and italicised, followed by a footnote or explanation within the text of the closest meaning that also sheds light on the cultural significance or literal meaning of the term (when relevant), to facilitate an accurate understanding for non-native Hebrew speakers.

Another concept that is commonly employed to evaluate or qualify quantitative research is generalisability, which is less appropriate when discussing small cases approached interpretively through qualitative modes of inquiry (Krefting, 1991, 216). Krefting suggests that in addition to discussing the research in terms of trustworthiness rather than reliability or validity, 'applicability' is better suited for qualitative research than generalisability. There are two main approaches to applicability that Krefting draws on; the first is outlined by Sandelowski (1986), who emphasises that generalisation is an illusion due to the interpretive nature of qualitative research, particularly when we consider the epistemological stance relevant to the current research, that knowledge is constructed through the researcher and their participants, and thus no 'finding' can be seen as representative beyond the specific conditions through which it was reached. As such, Sandelowski does not only reject generalisation but also applicability, as the explanatory purpose of qualitative research lies only in the particular case with which it is concerned.

The second approach to applicability is that presented by Guba (1981), and is more open to applying this concept to qualitative research. Guba suggests that fittingness and transferability are criteria that qualitative researchers can use to evaluate and qualify their research. Furthermore, Lincoln and Guba (1985) note that transferability is an issue that needs to be addressed when applying a framework developed in another context to a new context, by determining the extent of similarity and acknowledging difference between the context, while the original research is only tasked with providing sufficient data to allow others to know the limits and characteristics of the context in which the research was conducted. Through this, applicability is addressed.

In this thesis, I rely on the second approach (Guba, 1981; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). First, although I identify many approaches and frameworks for GCE in the literature review, I try to acknowledge the characteristics of where they were developed and do not conform to a single framework that is 'most fitting' for the setting of my study. Then, in terms of my own data, each findings section begins with a detailed introduction in which I present specific aspects and characteristics of Israeli society that are relevant for the findings presented in the subsequent

113

chapter. I also note how common particular reactions and patterns were among participants where relevant, and qualify the findings in each section by acknowledging more formal limitations such as selection bias which greatly shape the applicability of the findings.

3.8 Methodological Limitations

This study has several limitations, the first of which stems from the self-selection of teachers who chose to participate, and the placement of the responsibility for pupil selection and recruitment on their homeroom teacher. As I briefly mentioned earlier in this chapter, it was difficult to recruit teachers and I was not at liberty to pick and choose them based on a range of number of years of experience or subject matter, simply because there was not a surplus of volunteers. As such, most of the teachers were quite young, with less than ten years of experience, and from subject areas that are seemingly more concerned with globalisation such as history, English, geography, and sociology.

Furthermore, I asked teachers whose pupils I interviewed to try and provide groups of 5-6 pupils who were relatively outgoing, while making the groups balanced in terms of gender, trying to make sure pupils came from similar backgrounds in economic terms while still accounting for diversity. This could have affected the sample of pupils I was able to talk to in each focus group. A similar limitation of self-selection relates to the part of the study in which I interviewed teachers from the different sectors of the education system, particularly with relation to the Arab-Palestinian and state-religious sector participants. These participants tended to be between 30 and 40 years old, and perhaps somewhat liberal compared to their counterparts who chose not to participate in the study. Although males and females were included from each sector, male participants may have felt less atease to speak with me as a secular-Jewish female doctoral candidate from a UK university, and their responses could have been impacted by my background.

I have tried to overcome these limitations mostly through triangulation of the data from different interviews and coding for similarities to avoid presenting outlier responses as representative. In addition, I have been mindful to present the findings in a qualified manner, avoiding overarching sweeping statements and generalisations regarding any group participants based on one or two responses, instead identifying and highlighting patterns, and acknowledging the extent to which similar statements appeared (or did not appear).

114

A broader limitation of the comparative approach I employ here relates to cultural insensitivity that can affect comparative analyses. Steiner-Khamsi (2009) calls on scholars to beware of displaying or perpetuating cultural insensitivity in comparative research, particularly through what she terms 'contrastive analyses' (p. 1147). Although this critique was developed particularly with cross-national comparisons in mind, I took it into account throughout this research, and have tried to respond to it particularly in the analysis and writing up stages of the research, but also when creating the interview and focus group protocols. In the protocols, I asked teachers from the different sectors and the different cities to consider how the experiences of their pupils might be different than those in other settings, but asked them to also think of similarities, so as to not make the research purely contrastive. In the analysis and writing up phases I made sure to emphasise both sides of these responses where relevant, and quotes have been included to support each argument I present throughout the thesis, to allow readers to reach conclusions regarding the extent to which the arguments are supported, or, alternatively, products of my own interpretation, limited by my positionality.

3.9 Implications of Bringing Foreign Concepts into the Field

Researching the way GCE in a context to which it has not yet been officially introduced in terms of curriculum, policy, or the public discourse can be challenging and often frustrating, but also fruitful and fascinating. The exploration of how any new educational concept is perceived by practitioners and the main audience to whom it is addressed (pupils) can be quite helpful in the process of making policy decisions, drafting curricular goals, and understanding the contextually specific nuances that would need to be taken into consideration if and when the concept is introduced.

With regards to GCE, my previous studies on Israeli teacher perceptions of the concept enabled me to see the risks they associated with it and how the semantic value they placed on the word citizenship often caused an aversion to it. This indicates that it is possible that under a different name, GCE could be easier to 'sell' to practitioners and to the public. However, the choice to use this term as a guiding concept was not arbitrary. GCE is an educational trend that is gaining recognition around the world, particularly in western countries. The recent inclusion of GCE in UNESCO's SDG 4.7 further establishes that the term is not going to disappear in the near future, and it is possible that UNESCO member states will be rewarded for its inclusion in

the curriculum - rendering it more likely for Israel to incorporate GCE into its own education system, raising the value of exploratory studies on the possible obstacles and objections that might surface. Similarly, the introduction of global competencies into PISA's set of tested skills (OECD, 2018) is also bound to impact the local educational arena in Israel, which places high importance on international rankings.

There are methodological implications for using a term without providing participants with a single clear explanation of its meaning, but this is also necessary for getting participants' own constructions of the term. These implications, however, will not go ignored in this study nor were they ignored in my previous studies. Specifically, in my previous studies and in the studies included in this thesis, I use categorical models of GCE to formulate interview protocols. This enabled me to collect data that can concretely be analysed with reference to the existing literature even without explaining the term itself.

Throughout this chapter, I outlined methodological approaches, procedures, challenges, and limitations that shaped this thesis as a whole, as well as each of the questions introduced in the following three chapters. I briefly revisit some methodological aspects related to each chapter where relevant but have tried to limit this practice to maintain a coherent structure. In the discussion and conclusions chapter (7), I will elaborate on some of the limitations that are not strictly methodological and elaborate on some ways that the choices and challenges presented here shaped the final product in a broader sense.

Chapter 4: GCE Across Sectors of the Education System

As indicated above, the first part of my study consisted of interviews with 21 teachers (seven from each of the largest sectors of the Israeli school system: state-secular, state-religious, and Arab-Palestinian). The purpose is to delineate differences and similarities in perceptions of GCE across these sectors, and, more broadly, to examine how perceptions of GCE are shaped by socio-political, ethnic, and cultural factors. Some initial findings of this study were published (see Goren et al., 2019).

4.1. Introduction

This chapter addresses how conceptions of GCEmanifest and differ between teachers belonging to the three largest sectors of the Israeli education system, and relates most clearly to RQ1 (see Table 2 in Chapter 3). I explore how teachers' belonging to these different sectors and the groups that comprise them engendered their conceptions of GC, the values and challenges they associated with the concept, as well as the extent to which they thought the Israeli MOE would be likely to incorporate GCE in their sector or throughout the system, and to what ends. I begin by elaborating on key issues which were briefly noted in the literature review and introducing others that are specific to this part of the study. Through this brief and focused literature review I provide relevant background for framing the findings. Then, I analyse the findings through two separate but related themes: the way religion was reflected in teachers' responses from the various sectors as a platform or an obstacle to GC, and the specific meanings attributed to the concept, as they relate to the social positioning of each group of teachers. In the concluding section I highlight some of the main implications of this part of the research, including how it relates to the conceptual framework of peripherality, marginalisation, and liminality.

4.1.1 Global Citizenship, Social Periphery, and Belonging

Several of the conceptions of GCE presented in the literature review were developed with reference to marginalised populations, such as minorities and immigrants, and recognize/position GCE as a way to introduce broader notions of citizenship, for nations that are becoming more diverse or experiencing difficulties integrating non-native/minority populations. In this sense,

GCE could be seen as a way to bring the social periphery closer to the core by expanding the boundaries of who belongs to society.

Belonging is a term that encompasses both geographic and social elements (Antonisch, 2010; Trudeau, 2006) that deals with distinguishing who belongs and who doesn't and exposes social mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion that work in the social and physical landscapes. The sense of belonging has social and cultural components, it is necessary for meaningful lives, and its absence can have many adverse social effects (Moore & Barker, 2012). However, while belonging is a feeling that is perceived to be natural and relates to attachment and a feeling of security, the politics of belonging deal with the construction of belonging to specific groups, usually discussed in terms of citizenship, diaspora and inclusion in a discourse related to rights (Yuval-Davies, 2006).

Yuval-Davies (ibid) refers to the politics of belonging as one of the ways that social control is enacted over space. Similar to peripheralisation, belonging is not constructed as a place or a situation but a constant process of being and making that combines actions, reactions, and ideas. Belonging could be seen as a performative act built on practices (Fenster, 2004); As such, GCE could be seen as a way to aid the social periphery in developing stronger feelings of belonging. This rationale is similar to that which underscores GCE policies incorporated in different contexts, that are often justified in terms of aiding in the creation of a more inclusive form of citizenship as a result of a large influx of immigrants (Bondy & Johnson, 2018; Dyrness, 2021; Engel, 2014) – however, there is an underlying assumption in these contexts that the immigrants are formally citizens of somewhere else, that they or their families were born elsewhere, and that the nation they are residing in wants to integrate them and they want to feel like an integrated part of it – which is not necessarily the case among the Palestinian population in Israel.

4.1.2 The Divided Nature of the Israeli Education System

As noted in chapter 2.3, Israeli society is highly divided along ethnic and religious lines. These divisions stem first from the ongoing Palestinian-Israeli conflict that began prior to the nation's establishment in 1948, and escalated further following Israel's declaration of independence. The declaration of independence was immediately followed by the 1948 Arab Israeli war that led to the displacement of a large portion of the Arab population. Palestinian

Arabs who remained in Israel were awarded citizenship, and are referred to as Arab citizens of Israel. This term further distinguishes them from the Jewish majority and the Palestinians residing in Gaza and West Bank (Agbaria et al., 2015; Ichilov, 2003; Peled, 1992). A further source of division in Israeli society is the level of orthodoxy within the Jewish population. Israeli law protects the Ultra-Orthodox Haredi sector's autonomy in matters related to education and other social services. The law, therefore, reinforces a systematic separation in the education system and across other aspects of life between secular and religious Jews. All schools – across the various sectors are financed by the Israeli Ministry of Education (MOE), but levels of recognition and control differ, and the Ultra-Orthodox sector does not follow the national curriculum.

While the majority of pupils attend the public education system in Israel, potentially ensuring most pupils are exposed to the same curriculum, this is not the case in practice (Benavot & Resh, 2003; Sabbagh & Resh, 2014). The public education system is divided into a number of sectors: the Jewish sector, which teaches 73.9%[8] of the total population and is further divided into the state-secular (61.2% of Jewish population), state-religious (21.4%) and Ultra-Orthodox sectors (17.4%). The remaining 26% of pupils study in the Arab sector, which is comprised of Arab (18.7% of total population), Druze (2%), Bedouin (5.4%) and Circassian (0.03%) pupils. These sectors each hold a certain level of autonomy, but are also monitored by the MOE. This study concentrates on the three largest sub-sectors: The secular-Jewish, religious-Jewish, and Palestinian-Arab sectors.

4.1.3 Religion and GCE

Most scholarly discussions of religion and GCE address them as non-mutually exclusive worldviews, in that one does not need to give up their religion in order to be a global citizen - but also in that GCE includes, by definition, an acknowledgement of the legitimacy of and an appreciation for all religions and cultures (Davis, 2008; Gaudelli, 2016). Empirical studies, on the other hand, often suggest otherwise, stating that in educational settings, in particular, religion can negatively impact the ability to introduce certain universal values or collide in other ways

---

[8] All statistical data was taken from the annual CBS [Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics] report, 2016

with principles associated with GC. For example, in a large-scale quantitative series of studies, Katzarska-Miller, Barnsly & Reysen (2014) did not find a significant correlation between religiosity and global identity - but did find that prejudice and exclusionary values were significantly correlated with religiosity, whereas GCE identification was found to positively correlate with inclusionary and prosocial values. In this part of my thesis, evidence supporting both claims arose from the analysis - as well as a view of religion itself *as* a form of GC.

4.1.4 Citizenship in a Fragmented Nation

Historically, as different groups have gained differential levels of power, curricular goals, and the national narratives of belonging and inclusion promoted through schools have changed, as have official perceptions of the purpose of education itself (Agbaria, 2016; Lemish, 2003). Pinson (2007) showed how the three main sectors vary greatly in their adherence to the official curriculum, as well as in the extent to which they are autonomous, and the proportion of resources allocated to them.

As demands for autonomy have increased over the years, Sabbagh and Resh (2014) argue that the sectors developed what they term a 'community-specific identity' (pg. 40), which, as their study shows, shapes pupils' understandings and conceptions of citizenship. Sabbagh and Resh (2014) claim, among other things, that junior-high pupils in the Palestinian Arab and secular-Jewish sectors tend to hold more liberal orientations of citizenship than pupils in the religious sector. Religious Jewish pupils, on the other hand, were more likely to embrace an ethno-republican orientation which highlights the superiority of the country's Jewish nature over its democratic principles.

The differences in citizenship orientation discussed here are not surprising. Until 1994, Arab-Israeli pupils studied a different citizenship curriculum than that studied by the Jewish population (Ichilov, 2003) but since 1994, after arriving at the conclusion that citizenship education could bridge gaps in Israeli society rather than widen them, both Jewish and Palestinian Arab pupils have essentially studied the same curriculum (Pinson, 2007; 2020). However, the unified curriculum has been heavily criticised for the emphasis it puts on a Jewish narrative shaped by the state while delegitimising the Palestinian claims to nationhood (Agbaria et al., 2015; Al-Haj, 2005; Pinson, 2020).

It is therefore probable that teachers from the Palestinian Arab and Jewish (both religious and secular) sectors would hold quite different conceptions of GCE, because of their diverging conceptions of national citizenship (Agbaria, 2016; Muff & Bekerman, 2019; Sheps, 2019). These conceptions have also arguably been shaped by the differential goals of the education system within each sector. One instance of this relates to expectations regarding military service. Military service is compulsory only for the (non-Orthodox) Jewish population in Israel, and the education system, through citizenship education, in particular, plays a significant role in preparing Jewish pupils for this service (Muff & Bekerman, 2019). Meanwhile, Palestinian-Arab pupils, while being exposed to the same nationalist, militarised curriculum, are not expected to serve in the army, and therefore the teaching around this aspect will likely be quite different.

This chapter sheds light on the notion of social periphery and draws on a qualitative analysis of semi-structured interviews with seven teachers from each of the main sectors of the Israeli education system. The analysis reveals that the identity of the teachers, their dispositions towards GCE, and the background of the pupils all shape teachers' understanding of the term and their inclination to bring it into their classrooms. These factors, therefore, determine the form and pedagogical approaches taken in relation to GCE, and open up or close down possibilities for Israeli pupils to engage with the concept and future imaginaries it could facilitate. I argue that notions of social peripherality (and centrality) come into play in shaping these perceptions of GCE.

4.2 Findings and Discussion

My analysis of the interviews revealed that GCE is constructed and understood by teachers from different social, ethnic, and religious groups very differently. This section details the main distinctions between the sectors in perceptions of GCE, and relates these differences to the unique placement of each group with regard to the social centre/periphery.

4.2.1 Religion and Global Citizenship: Obstacle or Opportunity

I start by presenting two themes that emerged from the interviews across all three sectors, and demonstrate how religion was represented by teachers to be either (or simultaneously in some cases) a foundation for GCE or a barrier that limits or challenges it.

Islam and Judaism were each expressly referred to by teachers in the Arab and Religious Jewish sectors, respectively, as a unifying force and an existing infrastructure for some form of GC. Some Arab teachers described global Islamic extremism as somewhat of a threat to liberal values associated with GC, but also stressed that the Quran itself includes many passages that encourage respect to other religions and cultures and promotes an idealistic unity between all peoples of the world.

The conception of GCE which rests upon the common ground created by mutual religious affiliations was stated by Ahmed, a Palestinian-Arab teacher, to be universal and obvious:

> The Jews of the world feel like they belong to the Jews and to Judaism more than they belong to their own country… so what is global? Every Jewish person in the world is your brother, right? Just like every Muslim person in the world is my brother. So even though we live in the same country, you might feel more connected to a Jewish person living in Argentina just like I feel closer to a Muslim person in Indonesia or Malaysia more than I feel close or related to you. So, this is the idea of GCE as I see it - it transcends nationality and geography.

This statement is particularly interesting because it was one of the only viewpoints that repeated itself in four of the seven interviews in the Arab sector, which inferred information about the feelings of the Jewish population. In general, the participants were quite reluctant to make any claims regarding their counterparts from the other sectors, citing a lack of knowledge and exposure to the other groups. Another Arab teacher, Omar, suspected that the Jewish population in Israel would be more open to GCE:

> I think that if we look at Israeli society as a whole, the Jewish population would be more open to this concept [of GCE]. At least it could be, because of its origins and the different people who make up the population. They [the Jewish population] came from a lot of different diasporas in Europe, in the United States - all sorts of places - and they brought these sorts of ideas with them and they conserved their ties to some extent with their communities there.

According to Omar, the Arab society in Israel is more traditional and conservative due to its homogeneity - and its ties and customs are more closely related to those practised in other Arab countries than to those which he perceives as common to western countries.

Jewish religious teachers also spoke of the religious foundation in their view of GCE and global citizenship only in relation to the Jewish population, and even more precisely - the religious and orthodox Jewish populations, excluding the secular and reformed Jews. Religious pupils were seen by their teachers as part of a global Jewish citizenry, which manifests itself in missionary organisations such as Chabad, which does extensive work to connect the Jews of the world to their heritage and spread the importance of Israel and Jewish unity in general. All seven of the religious teachers mentioned ties to Jewish diaspora as a form of GCE that they endorse, promote, and feel is necessary - particularly in the globalized world today. As David explained:

'Today, my pupils and I can go almost anywhere in the world, anywhere! In the world! Without having to give up any of our customs. We can find kosher food, even glat-kosher [a higher level of authorization of kosherness]. We can have Shabbat dinner in Beit Chabad (the colloquial name for the Chabad community centres around the world), find a minyan (the minimum number of people required for certain Jewish prayers) - so this is our GC - I can feel at home anywhere without compromise. '

David went on to explain, however, that although secular Jews are also known to seek out these Jewish centres when travelling, particularly in the far east, whether to maintain or strengthen their spiritual connection to Judaism or just to get a free meal - they enjoy both worlds: 'Secular Jews can feel at home anywhere in the world because they don't feel like they are compromising by eating food that is not kosher, they are truly global citizens.' This sentiment was echoed, in a more critical tone, by most of the religious teachers when asked about the other groups in Israeli society in relation to GCE; they were reluctant to comment about the Arab population but did not spare their criticism of the secular Jews, who they see as belonging to a world culture rather than the Jewish collective (e.g. Yadgar, 2011). One example of this came from Yoav, who (when asked about GCE in other sectors of the education system) noted:

'I don't know about the Arabs, but I know *chilonim* (secular Jews) who talk proudly about how they could easily live in Berlin or in America – but to me, it means they don't have roots. They are more global, but this means they are less Jewish, and they have fewer values and are more hollow than full.'

123

This was a notion commonly alluded to by the religious teachers, who saw the ability (of secular Jews) to assimilate in other countries, and not within Jewish communities in these countries, as something that reflected a lack of values and portrayed those who emigrated or had thought of emigrating as people with a shallow sense of morality and values.

The secular Jewish teachers themselves did not speak of religion as a platform for GCE, but did refer critically to the way that a narrative of global Judaism was being promoted by the state, particularly through programs that aim to bring young Jewish people to Israel. One example came from an interview with Yael who mentioned Birthright Israel (*Taglit*), a programme aimed at promoting *Aliyah* and maintaining connections between Diasporic Jewish communities and Israel, funded largely by Jewish philanthropists, diaspora organisations, and the Israeli government):

> 'I think we can see how GCE might have a specific Jewish context if we think about pupils and teenagers who are coming here by the thousands through Taglit, as opposed to semesters abroad or things like that that might be less Jewish-ness oriented - they are coming because they have been offered to join this trip because of their religion. Some of them might not see that as part of their identity, at least before the trip and I think maybe also after, but it is supposed to make them feel like they are part of a bigger community that is here, and then support it when they are older and wealthy - even if they don't choose to live here. I think this takes away from what GCE *could* be and puts it into a box.'

This quote demonstrates a difference between the potential of GCE and the way it is limited through a religious focus - however, I chose to include it in this theme because it still speaks to a way in which GCE could be constructed within/from the platform of religion.

Another quote that demonstrates the way religion was seen to limit global citizenship came from an interview with another secular teacher, Tamar:

> 'I think it is important to separate global - global citizenship from maybe a more Jewish global citizenship when I think about what this term means and how it appears in Israel. For example, if I have a pupil who comes from Russia and speaks Russian, he is more of a global citizen than my pupil born here who only speaks Hebrew, but he only came here because he is Jewish. And when he's here then that is the main part of his identity and what makes him part of this country… but if I had a pupil whose parents were not Jewish

and came here for another reason, he would be more of a global citizen, because he has a different homeland and yet he lives here.'

This quote is similar to views raised by three of the secular teachers, who spoke about the way *Olim* (Jewish migrants) could not be considered global citizens in the fullest sense of the term because they are part of the Jewish collective.

Oxley and Morris (2013) mention that many global organisations that promote GCE are rooted in major world religions - but the ideals they promote are not aligned with those of liberal democracies because their aim is to promote a theocratic system of governance over secular models. In fact, the exclusive form of GCE described by the Jewish religious teachers corresponds more with the discourse employed by counter-movements to GCE such as Haines' (2012) discussion of Muslim cosmopolitanism.

Religion as a barrier to GCE.

Some statements made by teachers in all three sectors referred to religion as a factor that would in fact inhibit the development of GCE among pupils, at least in relation to the types of GCE outlined in the literature review. In the state-secular and Arab sector, this was described as a setback or hindrance, whereas in the religious Jewish sector it was seen to provide protection, and establish a hierarchy. Netanel, a teacher from a religious Jewish school in Tel-Aviv, was particularly candid about the way he felt GCE could be utilised in his sector:

> If [the Jewish religious sector] would embrace anything related to GCE, it would be for the sake of being able to communicate to other people - 'we are the children of the light, *the chosen ones*, come learn from us'. And then we would be able to spread this light to more places. It would also open [the Jewish religion and the importance of Israel] up to a much wider audience - so if I [as a pupil] know English now then that's great! I'll talk to Jewish folks from the US and tell them how important it is to make *Aliyah* (migration of Jewish diaspora to Israel) and how important the holy land is and tell them to come join the military.

This quote was quite representative of the majority of religious teachers in the sample, and could be said to embody the sort of missionary, neocolonial, westernized discourse that is often embodied in nationalistic adaptations of GCE, particularly in developed countries (Goren & Yemini, 2017a). An underlying (or in this case, blatant) assumption that one's values are superior to others and that GCE can facilitate the supposed 'spreading of the light'. This

sentiment was expressed by five of the religious Jewish teachers to different degrees, and three teachers referred to the Jewish people as 'Or Lagoyim' - a source of light for the non-Jews (See Fishman, 2014; Ilani, 2015). The Jewish religious teachers all stressed the point that it was important to preserve the differences between the Jewish people and others, to avoid assimilation or secularisation. These sectarian fears are not unfounded, as national-level steps towards liberalisation, such as GCE, has been shown to limit the control of the religious education sector in Israel and impede their mechanisms for self-preservation (Maussen & Bader, 2015; Maussen & Vermeulen, 2017; Scheunpflug, 2015).

The sense of superiority of the Jewish people over others and the fear of compromising the Jewish identity was also expressed by Netanel, another religious Jewish teacher:

> If GCE […] and clearly part of GCE would be trying to say 'ok, let's take down all the barriers and ignore all our differences and mix with each other in the most open of ways because we're all the same and why not?' then this is not ok with me - I certainly see a need to differentiate the Jewish people and the Jewish nation from other nations in this sense because we need to preserve our Jewish identity, which of course means avoiding inter-religious marriages.

Netanel's quote is reflective of five of the seven teachers from the religious sector perceptions of GC. There was general agreement amongst the teachers from the Jewish Religious sector that GCE aimed at everyone accepting each-other's beliefs and customs and promoting some universal values that are in line with Judaism is fine, particularly in cases where it benefits Jewish communities around the world. However, any insinuation that people are fundamentally the same (which many definitions of GCE rely on), is dangerous and unacceptable in this view.

The Arab teachers in this study, in contrast to the religious Jewish teachers, made less mentions of the potential use of GCE for missionary purposes and were not fearful of a loss of identity. These teachers spoke of the Muslim religion as one aspect of their identity and their pupils' identity which could co-exist with GCE and in fact be supplemented by it; for example, pupils' lack of awareness of a universal set of values was lamented by several of the Arab teachers, particularly those teaching in schools with very underprivileged pupils and high levels of crime or violence. As Said put it:

> I think we really need solutions to a lot of problems and issues that we have today in the Arab sector. We have crime, violence, and other problems that our social and religious

sets of values don't really solve. So, I think we should start adopting models that really could help, and I think that GCE can be one of these models that we can try to use to start to solve these issues.

This is not to say that Said or other Arab teachers perceive Islam as violent in any way or oppose its values - but rather to point to certain problems - in their opinion, which their religion (or any religion) does not fully condone nor condemn. Said suggests that schools should provide pupils with a clear set of universal values to guide them, and sees GCE as one way to achieve this.

Another Arab teacher, Mahmud, claimed that globalisation in general and online social networks specifically were causing pupils to sometimes be exposed to 'the wrong ideas' about Islamic principles and values:

You need to separate between the school and the adults in the community, and the pupils, in their private lives. These pupils are already global; they are already exposed - but there is no filter. They can connect with Muslims like them living all over the world - some of this exposure will make them want better lives, have aspirations. Some of it will take them in dangerous directions, give them wrong ideas.

Mahmud and three other teachers in this sector feel that the implementation of GCE is imperative in these global times to regulate, mediate and manage pupils' understanding and exposure to the world and make them less susceptible to extremist propaganda. This directly echoes the UNESCO goals for sustainable development with regards to GCE: 'supporting countries seeking to deliver education programmes that build young people's resilience to violent extremist messaging and foster a positive sense of identity and belonging [through GCE]'. However, constructing the role of the teacher as a mediator in GCE, as part of his agency, is quite novel. This involves a recognition that some forms of GCE are passive and that pupils can become global citizens simply through exposure facilitated by the internet and other technological advancements, alongside recognition of good and bad forms of global citizenship. This is of particular interest given Khatib's (2003) exploration of the global citizenship discourse adopted and utilized by Islamic fundamentalist groups.

Five of the seven secular Jewish participants in the sample were adamant about the way the Jewish religion and its values contradict the values they attached to GC. One major factor in this clash between Judaism and GC in the eyes of the secular Jewish teachers was the idea of marrying or procreating with people from other religions which is forbidden by Jewish customs.

The derogatory term for this phenomenon is called *Hitbolelut*, which literally refers to the dilution of ones' relationship to the Jewish religion and to Israeli culture [when referring to Jewish Israelis] through marriage to non-Jews. In some extremist groups, this is considered a form of treason, and the religious establishment in Israel does not sanction or recognise these marriages unless the non-Jewish member undergoes a rigorous process of converting to Judaism (*Giur*).

Prior to my conducting the interviews in the secular sector, the Minister of Education at the time, Naftali Bennet, had removed a novel detailing a romantic relationship formed between a Jewish women and a Muslim-Arab man from the approved literature curriculum, causing a public debate on the topic. Dan and two other participants from the secular sector specifically connected this censorship incident to the Israeli aversion to inter-religious marriages:

> As more people see themselves as citizens of the world and try to blur their unique Jewish nationality… that [act] threatens certain groups here. The Minister of Education has openly declared that he is not interested in the 'other' but in empowering [Jewish] identity. So of course [GCE] is a threat. Some people see it as a bad thing—'we need to be nationalist Zionist Jews'…and anything that isn't along those lines is threatening— and that's something that is said outright, not inferred or hinted at. Look at that book that was censored…it's terrible, the head of the pedagogic office in the MOE said in an interview that she wouldn't want her children to read a book about someone falling in love with an Arab. This was said very violently and bluntly, and I think it is just terrible.

This example shows that the fear of inter-group marriages and assimilation - is embedded in Israeli society and in the education system, posing a built-in opposition to any attempts at GCE.

The two remaining, relatively conservative teachers from the secular sector expressed their own fear of assimilation and emigration from Israel because of pupils becoming more open to the world, citing the fact that even secular pupils in their classroom today are not well enough acquainted with Jewish customs - which they felt should be prioritised over GCE. As noted by Tamar when asked whether she thought the MOE should incorporate GCE into the curriculum:

> 'Overall, I think it depends on how you define this GC - because if it means that pupils will know more about the world and be able to have intelligent conversations and maybe work for global companies more easily, then I think it is good. But if it comes at the expense of what they learn about Israel, if we are teaching them to be a part of the world

128

before we teach them to be a part of this country - before they know about our battles, our history, our tradition – then no, I don't think we can afford to do it because we don't want to lose them or not make them feel connected to here'.

The distinction between Jewish Culture and global citizenship, which two secular teachers and all of the religious teachers presented as opposite sides of a spectrum, rather than as concepts that could be taught alongside one another, could be an obstacle to GCE.

4.2.2 Meanings Attributed to GCE: Belonging, Economic Advancement, and Threats

As noted in the methodology chapter, I did not present teachers with a specific definition of GCE during the interviews to gain insights into what values and practices they associated with the term. In the coding process, I was then able to explore differences and similarities across and within the three groups, which reflect stark differences in how it was perceived.

**Palestinian -Arab Sector- new ways of belonging for a discriminated minority in an ethnic democracy**

The most striking similarity among the Arab Teachers' interviews was their association of GCE with belonging to a global community, as a substitute for the void they recognise with regards to identification with the Israeli national narrative. The teachers in this sector spoke of different levels of belonging, particularly, they said they and their pupils held strong ties to their family, local community, Palestinian nationality, and to the Muslim community- but Israeli citizenship was described as a set of rules they need to follow rather than an identity model. Racism and lack of opportunities to thrive were mentioned by most of the Arab teachers in this study as factors that would increase their pupils' affinity for alternative identity models such as global citizneship. As Mahmud put it:

> In the 90s I visited Switzerland, and in Zurich I met a French citizen who lived there, very close to France. I asked him where he felt he belonged, who he felt were his fellow citizens - and he explained that he felt closer to a German national living in Zurich than to a French national living in Paris. He said, 'The French-man and I may share the same language, but he does not share my life or experience - as opposed to the German in Zurich'. So, he felt like the people in Zurich wanted him there and Switzerland was the country that provided his needs, and he was living well with a high quality of life… So, to me this shows that belonging depends on who satisfies your basic needs, lets you feel

129

appreciated and fulfilled and wanted. If I felt that all my needs were being filled by whatever state I lived in with whichever borders it may have, and the definition of the place where I live included me and provided me with self-definition then I wouldn't care about sharing it with other people [Jewish, in this case]. But if the place where I live doesn't provide these needs and I don't feel I belong, then I will look outside of it to belong, and this is GC.

This quote articulates what many Arab teachers communicated in their interviews, with regards to the potential benefits of GCE for their pupils and what GCE could do for them. It also echoes several previous works which examined Palestinian-Israeli identity models and perceptions of citizenship (Agbaria et al., 2015; Cohen, 2019; Pinson, 2007; Pinson & Agbaria, 2021; Rabinowitz, 2001). Mahmud's use of an example from outside of the Israeli context is particularly interesting, as it removes the issue of the intractable conflict completely and assumes that a sense of belonging and fulfilment is crucial to constructing one's civic identity - a point which could apply to minorities, immigrants or people excluded from the national narrative in any context (Yuval-Davis, 2006).

Another Arab teacher, Nahad, expressed a similar yet more critical and elaborate view of the antecedents that make GCE attractive to Israel's Arab pupils, connecting it to the frustration Arabs feel about not having rights to their land, the general neglect of the Arab sector and its schools by the Israeli government, and structured discrimination in Israel which makes it more difficult for Arabs to gain access to higher education and other opportunities:

So, because of [the aforementioned reasons], a lot of [my pupils] just leave. Sometimes they leave to get their education, they go to Jordan, they go to Bulgaria, they get licensed as pharmacologists and doctors. They are global citizens - when they come back, sometimes it is just to pack their suitcases … there is some criticism, when we need them here, but we want what is best for them... and there is a general despair here [in Israel] that is hard to ignore.

Interestingly, and in stark contrast with the Jewish religious and secular teachers, emigration - which was broadly discussed by most of the Arab Interviewees - was not described as a threat or phenomenon that needed to be mitigated. As a result, GCE was seen as a helpful tool that could promote pupils' ability to navigate and thrive in global society, rather than a threat to the national cohesion (whether in terms of the Israeli or Palestinian nationality). In Arab teachers' eyes, GCE

130

may be particularly important in their sector, because for Arab young people to flourish given the intractable political situation – they must develop aspirations of mobility and develop skills to move to other parts of the world. It is possible that because currently there is no official Palestinian state, this aspect of Arab Israelis' identity is not bound to their geographic location, but rather constitutes an imagined community (Gupta & Ferguson, 1992) that is not under threat, enabling members to move about freely.

Diasporas and minorities are often referred to as members of imagined communities (Suh, An, & Forest, 2015), although the case of the Arabs in Israel is less common, as they are an indigenous, trapped minority (as per Rabinowitz, 2001). This term is reserved for groups who are excluded from national narratives and power structures to different extents, despite feeling connected to the land and having claims to it. As Nahad mentions, the circumstances for Arabs in Israel makes emigration seem like a legitimate solution for those who wish to succeed, whether they return to their village with the skills they acquired elsewhere or not.

Regarding the possibility that the Israeli MOE would adopt GCE and incorporate it as policy, Arab teachers were somewhat optimistic – several of them thought that GCE would be more suitable and more likely to be added to the Arab sectors' citizenship curriculum, because while GCE could pose a threat to the Jewish Israeli national identity, the MOE should not have objections to Arab pupils developing global sentiments As Samir said, half-jokingly '[the MOE] could think - maybe [GCE] will make [the Arabs] leave'.

Only two of the seven Arab teachers spoke about the potential for peacebuilding within the nation through GCE, and particularly the development of a common set of values that would begin to bridge over gaps. This could be because the word 'global' caused them to think outside the state - but it can also be explained by a general disbelief that Israelis and Palestinians could be part of the same imagined global community or even agree upon a universal set of values. The Arab teachers in this study chose their words carefully and did not seem to feel comfortable voicing any harsh critiques they may have; however, one teacher, Faruq, did mention a paradox stemming from the relationship between human rights and GCE, which he claimed embodied the hypocrisy of any talk of GCE on the Jewish Israeli side:

> If we say this GCE means that we all agree about some values, basic rights - This already exists, human rights - but [the Israeli] government sometimes forgets, and the world needs to be reminded of it. I don't know if the ministry [of education] wants more Arab

or Jewish classrooms to be talking about human rights because of vulnerabilities. Of course, I teach my pupils human rights and I give examples when I can, but the ministry does not tell me to do this - what if [the pupils] start to demand things. Better to be vague. '

In sum, although Arab teachers see GCE as a valuable tool for their pupils, they are doubtful the MOE will be inclined to insert it into policy and the curriculum, because there are some inherent paradoxes between the values associated with GCE and the policies enacted by the state of Israel with regards to the Palestinian population. Supporting this view, studies of Israeli curricula in civics and history have found that the treatment of issues related to human rights is often lacking (Firer, 1998; Hanna, 2016).

To Said and Mahmoud however, who were quoted previously in this chapter stating the dangers of a passive GCE facilitated by remote engagement with extremist groups, it is very clear that GCE should be value-laden, and that those values should be those associated with moral imperatives that the education system currently does not introduce to pupils. In Said's opinion, which was echoed in other teachers' responses, there are universal values that anyone who wants to be a part of the global imaginary should embrace:

I think we really need solutions to a lot of problems and issues that we have today in the Arab sector. We have crime, violence, and other problems that our social and religious sets of values don't really solve. So, I think we should start adopting models that really could help, and I think that GCE can be one of these models that we can try to use to start to solve these issues.

While the situation faced by Palestinian Arabs in Israel is arguably among the most extreme examples of the exclusionary nature of national citizenship models today (see Agbaria 2018; Cohen 2017), the promotion of GCE as a way to productively generate an affective sense of belonging could be applied to many other minority groups, immigrant populations, and other marginalised groups in the social peripheries, who are often excluded from the national narratives of citizenship (Banks, 2017; Myers & Zaman, 2009; Shirazi, 2018; Worden & Smith, 2017).

Religious-Jewish Sector - Sectarian fears of an encroaching global world

The teachers from the Jewish religious sector raised the most objections to GCE. Although four of the seven teachers from this sector felt some universal values were acceptable and could be

132

taught, especially if it also meant that their values would gain more respect (as demonstrated in the religion as a platform for global citizenship section), this was countered by all seven of the teachers expressing various fears of assimilation or other consequences they felt could be brought on by GCE. They feared the term could lead to a widespread rejection of specific Jewish customs that are not universally endorsed (such as the methods of kosher slaughtering of animals for consumption), and expressed general concerns about the facilitation of assimilation abroad through GCE, the loss of national allegiance, and the normalisation of phenomena that are not acceptable in their opinion, such as equal marriage rights. One example of these fears came from Netanel:

> 'I have no problem with people in other countries learning GCE if it means less prejudice, antisemitism and things like this, but I think here for us it is more complicated. We are the only Jewish nation, we have been persecuted, we have been killed – we can't have our pupils thinking they are first part of the world and then part of Israel. They need to know that we have our own values, our own traditions, and why these are important to maintain. I don't want the MOE to start teaching this and very soon after there will be a lot of arguments about our religious laws – why can't gay people get married, why don't we let everyone into the country - it is about tradition, and tradition is not something global'.

This quote is the most robust example of the fears expressed by all of the religious teachers, because it demonstrates a complexity that most teachers did not touch upon in their interviews. GCE should be a one-way street, according to Netanel - it should be taught in other countries, but not in Israel, because Israel is unique, and needs to stay that way. Thus, while the fears Netanel expresses were widespread in the sample, the more detailed reasoning as to why GCE is appropriate and even necessary in other settings, was only brought up by three others.

One anecdote that came up in several of the interviews with religious Jewish teachers, referred to a media campaign at the time interviews were conducted (June-September 2017) by the Ministry of Education. The campaign aimed to raise awareness and motivation among primary and secondary school pupils to study advanced English courses and focus on spoken English (as opposed to the previous focus on grammatical rules). The teachers who brought up this campaign all referred to it as offensive to some extent and threatening for Israeli society. Abraham was particularly passionate in his objection:

I think the MOE is definitely encouraging and going in the direction of GCE…and I think it not only needs to stop promoting it, but it should actively fight against it. I heard the 'Spoken English' campaign on the radio, and it said that they are going to emphasise spoken English. So, they want pupils to know not just how to read and write so they can read articles and be smarter - but to be able to have a common language and make it easier for them to conduct business, on a skills - technical level - and on a deeper level, to feel like they are pretty much the same as any American or European. They're saying - let's cancel our pupils' uniqueness and turn them into global kids who happen to live in Israel.

In another reference to this campaign, Reut, another religious Jewish teacher, also expressed her dissatisfaction with the goals underlying this program:

If I have to think of how GCE is already in our schools, then it would be through English classes. And I don't know if you've heard, but now they are working more on spoken English than grammar - so, they aren't just saying, this world is global, and we need to be able to communicate for business - [the MOE] is saying, I want to give pupils the feeling that they can go anywhere, fit it, assimilate - I don't understand why there isn't more of an outrage.

The religious Jewish teachers all conceded that due to globalisation, exposure to the world is inevitable, and preparing pupils for this world is necessary and beneficial to some extent. However, most drew the line at giving pupils skills and knowledge that may make them leave the country for relocation - another term that repeated itself in the interviews with this group. Softer aspects of GCE were perceived by the religious teachers to be more negotiable. For example, environmental issues were not perceived to be controversial and seemed to religious teachers like a harmless way to make it seem as though pupils are being taught to be global citizens. This could be equated to soft GCE as per Andreotti's (2006) typology, a form of learning about the world without engaging with issues of critical thinking and identity construction. Another form of GCE these teachers accepted was the need to teach pupils how to act abroad so that they would not cast a negative image on the entire Jewish population.

Secular Jewish Sector - A majority seeking further opportunities

All the secular Jewish teachers, to some extent, connected GCE to globalisation, mobility, and work opportunities - before relating it to universal values, human rights, or sustainability and

environmental issues. This is contradictory to the Palestinian Arab sector's teachers' concentration on belonging and universal values and the religious sector's negative definition of GCE as a global-liberal trend, aimed at erasing inter-personal and inter-religious differences and imposing a universal set of values. Four secular teachers referred to the inherent paradox between Israel's global ambitions and its intent to maintain pupils' Jewish identity, and the ways this paradox could be overcome. Yuval explained:

> I think [the MOE] is teaching GCE - not in the purest form - not by saying the actual words but by doing things like promoting STEM subjects, which are universal. So, on the one hand, the education system works hard at promoting pupils' national identity, but it is also trying to introduce more than that through this back door - it wants to raise children who will grow up to be innovative and work in a dynamic reality in a global world, and this will help them. The system is *doing* GCE without *saying the words.*

This quote demonstrates several points. First, secular teachers perceive STEM as a form of GCE, indicating a skills-based approach (Engel & Siczek, 2018); furthermore, this form of GCE is perceived as a less controversial form because it does not collide with concepts like citizenship that are related to identity development. This focus on the way GCE can benefit pupils and allow them to thrive in global society was present to some extent in all of the secular teachers' responses. Itay, like two other secular teachers, mentioned Israel's status as a 'start-up nation', a point of national pride that the education system aims to promote. GCE was described as one way to facilitate the development of the start-up nation, though as Itay cautions, there are also drawbacks:

> 'The start-up nation needs the international connections…but once you enable and promote these connections, people find out that they can also live [abroad] […] the system and the minister of education are saying…we need entrepreneurial kids who will open start-up companies, but what does an entrepreneur who starts a company do? He moves his company to San Francisco. Or he sells it and buys another company abroad. So economically [the system is] looking outward, but socially [the system is] closing itself and the pupils in, by [promoting their devotion and identification with the Jewish and Israeli struggles].

This dual positioning – of GCE in Israel as something positive but also with consequences has been discussed elsewhere (Goren & Yemini, 2017c). But the data generated in this study allows

135

me to contrast how different groups in Israel conceptualise the potential benefits and drawbacks. Similar to the religious Jewish teachers, secular Jewish teachers felt that the MOE would likely perceive GCE as a threat to Israeli nationality, and would therefore need to contain its potential impact by promoting nationalistic curricular contents to attempt to mitigate the 'brain-drain' and broader, global processes of assimilation. This points to a delicate balance which they perceive as needing to be achieved in order to accommodate these somewhat conflicting national interests. The secular Jewish teachers perceived GCE to be a tool for economic advancement - whether at the national or individual level, and they did not discuss GCE as a way to facilitate a sense of global belonging. This utilitarian, skills-based approach to GCE is quite salient, particularly in post-conflict or diverse nations, in which issues of identity can be disputed. In such contexts, educators are often left to concentrate mostly on enforcing pragmatic conceptions of GCE that are less controversial and not directly associated with identity per se (Reilly & Niens, 2014).

The avoidance of the actual term by the MOE was also a recurring theme in the secular Jewish teachers' interviews. Teachers felt that the term GCE itself was contradictory to the national narrative promoted by the education system and explained that this narrative dictates a localized concentration on the Israeli context or the Jewish context, not leaving much room for pupils to identify with any broader community. As a result, any attempts at GCE would have to be done 'through the back door', as Yuval's quote suggests - through the acquisition of skills in STEM rather than delving into issues of identity. As Anat explained:

> The pupils don't learn at all about any of the horrors happening in other places in the world. Except for natural disasters - because that's no ones' [responsibility], and it might even deter them from going anywhere - we don't do anything that addresses the world, not on universal Human Rights Day, not on international Holocaust Remembrance Day - the focus is only on *us* - look what *they* did to *us* - this is how Israel protects itself from *hitbolelut* [assimilation in a negative sense of identity loss] - by creating this differentiation… there is a price to this, and we must decide how we feel about it.

Anat's observation about the nationalistic tendencies of the Israeli education system has been the focus of many studies, some concentrating on the particularistic aspects of the way the Holocaust is taught (Gross, 2010; Resnik, 2003) and others on the localised nature of the history curriculum, which focuses almost completely on Jewish and Israeli history (Firer, 1998; Goren & Yemini, 2016). However, the second sentence in Anat's quote echoes what two other religious

136

teachers said about the acceptability of environmental issues and sustainability as being the focus of GCE. These issues seem to be perceived by teachers as neutral, 'belonging to no one' (meaning they are not to be blamed on any state in particular). Though, many would dispute such a claim, considering the large contribution of developed countries to greenhouse gas emissions, which in turn are seen as the driving force for global warming, the effects of which are often disproportionately felt by developing countries (Mendelsohn et al., 2006). Finally, as opposed to the religious teachers, The Secular Jewish teachers did not speak of religion as a platform for GCE, and seemed to orient themselves to GCE as part of their modern engagement with technology, travel, mobility, and employment opportunities, above all else.

4.3 Concluding Remarks

This chapter examined the way GCE is perceived by teachers from schools belonging to the different sectors of the Israeli education system. The findings indicate that religious affiliation and or perceived status within a country can yield very different perceptions of the notion of GCE, as well as shape the extent to which GCE is perceived as a threat or an opportunity to national schooling systems. Ultimately, three rationales for GCE can be observed in the findings: GCE for the promotion of individual as well as national interests; GCE as an alternative to national belonging (which is regarded by the Palestinian Arab sector as an opportunity, and in the religious Jewish sector as a threat); and religion as a platform for GCE.

I found that teachers from each sector held very different views of GCE, which are usually based on the way they see the needs of pupils and their futures. Accordingly, six of the Jewish religious teachers developed a depiction of GCE as a threat because they feel their collective identity needs to be protected, particularly to counter processes of perceived increasing globalisation. Meanwhile, the Palestinian Arab teachers associated the term mostly with making available to their marginalised pupils a sense of belonging and opportunities for greater social and geographic mobility, usually through moving abroad. Finally, the secular Jewish teachers saw the development of GCE provision as a positive, necessary extension to the curriculum to further their pupils' ability to navigate global society and promote Israel's start-up nation reputation, as well as create global workers.

Some have argued that GCE can be a part of a national political project of belonging (as per Yuval-Davis' terminology 2006) aimed at creating a form of citizenship that does not rely on

social characteristics like place of birth or religion to build bonds between people across society, but rather embeds connections between them through an agreed set of values and the promotion of mutual respect (Pashby, 2018; Tarozzi & Torres, 2016). Yet my study suggests that some teachers can see GCE as potentially successful in creating a more internationally or transnationally located project of belonging, which is perhaps especially critical for those people who are marginalised within their national borders (Çayır, 2015; Eliassi, 2016; Nordberg, 2006; Yuval-Davis et al., 2005). Banks (2017) termed situations in which marginalised groups do not identify with the values or other aspects of the nation-state as 'failed citizenship' and called upon schools and states to develop a model of multicultural citizenship. However, this is predicated on an underlying assumption that states aim to provide all their citizens with the opportunity to truly identify with the national collective. This is not necessarily the case in Israel (Cohen 2017), and should also be critically examined and problematised in other contexts that pertain to marginalised groups.

The relationships between religion and GCE point to a complex and multi-dimensional understanding of GCE, particularly among the religious Jewish teachers I interviewed. Scholarly discussions of religion and GCE address them as world views that are not mutually exclusive (Levitt, 2008), in that one does not need to give up one's religion in order to be a global citizen, but also in that GCE includes, by definition, an acknowledgement of the legitimacy of and an appreciation for all religions and cultures (Gaudelli, 2016). Empirical studies, on the other hand, often suggest otherwise, stating that in educational settings in particular, religion can negatively impact the ability to introduce certain universal values or collide in other ways with principles associated with GCE (Fontana, 2016; Katzarska-Miller et al., 2014).

These findings support those of previous studies, which showed that religious education settings can lead to sectarianism and prejudiced views of the religious other; however, they also reveal a prevalent view of religion itself *as* a form of GC. On the one hand, the religious teachers I interviewed perceived GCE as a threat to the very existence of Israel and to Jewish traditions through its supposed promotion of universal human rights and values that do not align with the Jewish religious mandates (such as gay marriage). These assumptions underlying GCE are, in the eyes of religious teachers, incompatible with Jewish values, which, as previously mentioned, place the Jewish People on a pedestal. These findings are in line with those highlighted by Fontana (2016) in her study of religious education reforms in Lebanon, Northern Ireland, and

Macedonia after identity-based conflicts. Her findings indicate that religious education could have a divisive effect, reinforcing social rifts between ethnic and national groups.

Nevertheless, teachers who opposed the universal aspects of GCE in this study also described religion itself as a platform for GC - a point raised mostly by the Jewish religious teachers. They felt that if their sector was to embrace any notions of GCE, they would be tied directly to belonging to a transnational Jewish community, engaging with Jews in Diaspora, encouraging Jews to migrate to Israel, and for broader missionary purposes - spreading the Jewish religion further. Such a view of religion as a platform for GCE does not constitute spiritual GCE, which Oxley and Morris (2013) referred to in their typology of models of GCE. The definition of spiritual GCE relies on religious, moral imperatives and values that emphasise humanism, respect for others and a holistic view of humanity; one might, in fact, argue that the Jewish teachers' religion-based conception of GCE is not a form of GCE at all, because it excludes anyone who is not Jewish or open to becoming Jewish.

This part of my thesis calls into question the potential for promoting peace and social cohesion through GCE, considering the stark differences in the way the term is interpreted and articulated within different contexts in a divided society. Although this is an idea which has emerged in other research conducted through case studies, theoretical explorations, and reviews, this study has provided a more detailed account of the manifestations of these different interpretations through the cross-sector comparison of different populations - dominant-culture, religious, and marginalised - allowing a more complete understanding of how these differences manifest themselves and how they shape conceptual understandings. Finally, the extent to which states are willing to or aim to be truly inclusive should always be critically examined when discussing GCE, as it is often in the interest of the state to maintain the status-quo between various groups, which puts the potential for GCE to deliver on its intended purpose at risk.

The findings presented here form the rationale for the next section, in that they point to remarkably different understandings of GCE across sectors, and emphasise how notions of social peripherality shape these understandings. This, alongside issues of positionality and access that I presented in Chapter Three, prompted me to concentrate the next section of my study on the largest sector of the Israeli school system, the Secular Jewish sector, as the teachers in this sector perceived GCE and its purposes most similar to the way that it is articulated in the scholarship and in the definitions brought forward by GEOs, thus providing a better ground for comparison.

139

In addition, this part of the study reinforced the need to directly explore pupils' perceptions and understandings of GCE and global influences in their lives, rather than rely on teachers' speculations.

Chapter 5: Differences in Perceptions of GCE Among Teachers and Pupils in a Peripheral and Global city

This chapter details findings from the fieldwork I conducted at two secondary schools in Israel, which included interviews with teachers and focus groups with pupils. I show how teachers at each school constructed widely different understandings of GCE and its relevance for their pupils based on the pupils' backgrounds and the school's vision and missions - as they interpreted them. I also detail the types of global influences pupils identified in their schools and their cities, the way they imagined their futures with regard to mobility and GC, and their divergent understandings of the constructs that comprise PISAs global competence measure. As part of the discussion, I also incorporate insights from the full report on the results of PISA's global competence measure (released in November 2020), to show how the unique makeup of the test given to Israeli pupils corresponds with my findings.

5.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses how perceptions of GCE manifest and differ between pupils from a city regarded as peripheral, and in a global, central city, TLV. In my master's dissertation, submitted to TLV University, I explored how teachers in TLV perceived GCE and to what extent they saw it as relevant or important for their pupils based on their socio-economic background. In that study, I saw that teachers felt TLV was not a single unified space but rather a combination of different spaces, some more global than others, and some with different global characteristics than others. In this part of the thesis, I further examined these spatial and geographic characteristics by incorporating two additional comparative angles - the spatial-geographic angle of the locations of the schools and the addition of focus groups with pupils to the initial methodological design (which had only included teachers).

The chapter begins by elaborating on the way geographic and social periphery and centre have historically been constructed and intertwined in Israel, and presents some evidence as to how areas of residence have been shown to affect educational achievement and trajectories. I then present an in-depth review of the current literature related to the PISA framework and questionnaire for assessing global competence, which played an integral part in this part of the study. The findings are presented in three parts, the first two of which demonstrate themes that

arose from the semi-structured interviews with teachers and focus groups with pupils. The third part of the findings is prefaced by a short introduction in which I elaborate on some of the background issues concerning the PISA GC framework and scholarly critiques of it; in this introductory section I also outline the differences between the Israeli questionnaire and the one distributed in the majority of participating countries. I then introduce the part of the analysis that specifically relates to the PISA GC questionnaire which I introduced to participants during the data collection process. The chapter ends with concluding remarks that connect the findings to the conceptual framework, as well as highlight some methodological implications.

5.1.1 Geographic Periphery and Centre in Israel

The centre-periphery dichotomy in Israel is historically constructed, and nearly absolute. From the establishment of the state, settlers were sent to the outskirts of the country, then known as 'sfar' (frontier), to secure the borders by building towns and villages. The towns built for the purpose of becoming satellite areas for the smaller villages on the borders were called development towns, a term that has remained salient in the Israeli public and policy discourses. Olim who came from (Western) Europe were generally sent to the larger, more central cities and centres of population, and those who came later, from African and Arab nations, as well as Eastern European Jews who arrived in the 1900s, were often sent to the development towns - leading to deeply entrenched ethnic differences, as well as neglect, stereotypes, and disadvantage (Tzfadia, 2006; Yiftachel & Tzfadia, 2004). Today, these towns are what comes to most peoples' minds when thinking of the Israeli periphery; they are characterised by lower socioeconomic status (although many national economic programmes are in place to incentivise people to live and work there as well as build factories and other employment centres). (Tzfadia, 2006; Yiftachel, 2000).

The development towns formed in Israel in the first years after its establishment were designed as communities formed to quickly absorb Jewish immigrants and as part of a policy of population dissemination (Yiftachel, 2000). Other social and economic considerations also contributed to their establishment and locations. Most of these villages are characterised by geographic marginality and by social marginality, although their developmental trajectories differ (Peled, 1990). Historically and to this day, the population in these areas is part of the lower strata of Israeli society socially, economically, and professionally. As a result of social-cultural

142

segregation and separation, as well as dependency on the political and bureaucratic centre have formed (Tzfadia, 2006; Yiftachel & Tzfadia, 2004).

In the relationship between geographic centre and periphery we can often see two opposing phenomena. The state wants to stir people from the centre to the periphery, to better distribute the population and promote development of areas outside the centre. This is done through loans, tax breaks and grants awarded to those interested in or willing to build their homes there. This is an attempt to create a power attraction outside of the centre (centrifugal force). On the other hand, citizens often express their will to leave the periphery and go to the centre in a centripetal force (Shefer & Frenkel, 2013).

In Israel, it could also be said that there is a geographic semi-periphery, that shares many of the characteristics of the periphery (e.g., fewer opportunities than in the centre), but provides residents with more opportunities for mobility, such as working in the centre (Razin, 1990). Because Israel is a small country, the geographic distance between the centre and what constitutes the periphery is small, and between the centre and semi-periphery, even smaller. Cities and towns as close as 30 kilometres distance from a central city of employment, culture, and population can be considered part of the semi-periphery.

5.1.2 Educational Achievement and Attainment Gaps Based on Area of Residence in Israel

One of the ways in which the geographic centre-periphery dichotomy profoundly impacts pupils is through their educational achievements and trajectories, mediated by the opportunities available to them (Ayalon et al., 2008). This situation is not unique to Israel, as many countries have disparities in resource allocations and experience difficulties recruiting teachers for schools in low-income areas; however, due to Israel's small size and the historical placement of different ethnic groups in specific areas, these differences are particularly apparent (Lewin-Epstein & Semyonov, 2000).

According to the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) in Israel,40 per cent of the population lives in peripheral areas, which are classified as the northern and southern districts of the six districts in the country (CBS, 2019). The CBS ranks local authorities on a 1-10 scale based on socio-economic and demographic factors, with 1 denoting the lowest ranking and 10 indicating the highest. Most local authorities in the northern and southern districts of the country were ranked in the three lowest clusters according to the CBS scale, indicating that the peripheral

143

areas are also economically-disadvantaged (Soen & Davidovich, 2004). This is particularly important because it ties into other known factors which influence pupils' educational achievement, such as parental involvement and expectations (Castro et al., 2015; Seginer & Vermulst, 2002) - both of which tend to be higher in families with stronger socio-economic backgrounds, who more commonly reside in the central regions of Israel.

Ayalon and her colleagues (2008) found that attending high school in the Israeli periphery was significantly and negatively linked to the type of higher education attained by pupils as well as their achievements. In the US sample of the same study, attending high school in rural areas also predicted lower educational achievements than urban areas; this and other studies (Arnold et al., 2005; Young, 1998) contribute to the notion that the differences in higher education attainment and achievements are to some extent shaped by additional factors such as teacher and parental expectations from pupils and pupils' ambitions and self-efficacy (Fan & Chen, 1999).

5.1.3 Background: PISA GC Framework

The institutionalisation of GCE by UNESCO and the OECD detailed in chapter 2.1 led to the largest attempt to assess and compare GC levels of pupils through PISA. The measure developed by PISA, as explained previously, was based on the following definition of global competence (OECD, 2018, pg. 5):

> 'a multidimensional capacity…. [through which] globally competent individuals can examine local, global, and intercultural issues, understand and appreciate different perspectives and world views, interact successfully and respectfully with others, and take responsible action toward sustainability and collective well-being'.

The measure breaks global competence down to four dimensions or abilities (OECD, 2020, pg. 60): examine issues of local, global, and cultural significance; understand and appreciate the perspectives and worldviews of others; engage in open appropriate and effective interactions across cultures; take action for collective well-being and sustainable development. Each of these dimensions, according to the OECD, consists of four key areas: values, attitudes, skills, and knowledge.

Two instruments were developed for the assessment:

'• a *cognitive* test focused on the cognitive aspects, including knowledge and cognitive skills of three dimensions of global competence: examining issues of local, global and cultural significance; understanding and appreciating the perspectives and worldviews of others; and taking action for collective well-being and sustainable development

• a set of questionnaire items collecting self-reported information on students' awareness of global issues and cultures, skills (both cognitive and social) and attitudes, plus information from schools, teachers, and parents on activities to promote global competence. The student questionnaire covered all four dimensions of global competence.' (OECD, 2020, pg. 66).

It is important to note that the report for the test states that the cognitive test measures cognitive skills and knowledge, and the questionnaire measured knowledge, cognitive skills, and social skills and attitudes - while values, the fourth area, is said to be beyond the scope of the assessment. 27 countries participated in the cognitive part of the test, and 64 participated in the questionnaire.

The cognitive part of the test included short reading sections, after which pupils were asked to provide written answers to a few questions. 'The framework specified four major knowledge domains that were deemed relevant to pupils regardless of their specific socio-cultural background. The scenarios were developed to cover one of those domains with the objective of achieving the widest coverage across the test units. The major knowledge domains were 1) culture and intercultural relations; 2) socio-economic development and interdependence; 3) environmental sustainability; and 4) institutions, conflicts and human rights (OECD, 2020, pg. 67)'. The cognitive part of the test is beyond the scope of this thesis, but it is important to note the disconnect created in the framework between these 'knowledge domains' and values, and perhaps even more so between the knowledge domains and pupils' socio-cultural background. This critique will be elaborated upon in the next section.

The student questionnaire, which many more countries opted in for, was distributed (with some changes) to school principals, parents, teachers, and pupils - but here I will only focus on the parts distributed to pupils. The pupil questionnaire included 15 sets of questions, three of which included only a single item or were aimed at collecting background information (i.e., how many languages do you speak at home and with whom; how many foreign languages are offered at your school; and do you have contact with people from other countries and where). The

remaining 12 included multi-item constructs, some of which asked pupils to report the extent to which they identify or agree with various statements or feel they are able to explain global phenomena, some asked pupils to select relevant answers (for example, do you learn about the following items at your school), and others asked for positive or negative responses (do you engage in the following activities). Once again, there is an issue as to whether questions asking pupils regarding the extent to which they agree or disagree with statements concerning immigration or cultural rights of minorities can be disconnected from their socio-cultural backgrounds or from values (deemed 'beyond the scope' of the test), but it will be elaborated in the following section and in the relevant findings chapter.

5.2 Findings and Discussion

The findings and discussion in this section are organised according to the themes developed through the thematic analysis. The themes are as follows: exposure and engagement - identifying what is global; imagined futures and the relevance of global society; and finally, grounding PISA - contextualising understandings of the global competence measure.

The first two themes and their categories were coded inductively and represent the most salient patterns identified in the data. The final theme is different, as it only concerns the final part of the interviews and focus groups I conducted, where participants were presented with the questions from the PISA global competence measure. In this sense, it is deductive.

5.2.1 Differences in Opportunities for Exposure and Engagement

The interviews with teachers and focus groups with pupils revealed profound differences in the reported manifestations of globalisation at each school and city, and in the way these manifestations were understood to impact pupils' own GC or outlook.

What is global?

Generally, in the periphery, the majority of teachers and pupils referred to some school subjects (primarily English language classes and some geography), and occasionally trips abroad with family or as part of school delegations - as the main global factors. Outside the school setting, references were often made to global platforms and trends with which pupils engage - but upon closer examination and prodding, it appears that within these platforms and trends, pupils tended to seek out the local contents, people, and trend-adopters. One notable exception

was with regard to online multi-player games, within which a few pupils in VC expressed they occasionally had some interaction with 'people from other places'- some of these people were in different parts of the world, but interestingly, some were merely in other places in Israel. Both teachers and pupils also referred to films and other artefacts of pop culture that pupils engaged with.

In TLV, on the other hand, examples of global engagement and opportunities for it were much more diverse and plentiful. Notably, many of the participants in each of the focus groups referred to the city itself and to global events held locally; tourists; languages heard at school and outside of it; immigrants and refugees in the city; and global companies with offices in TLV. With regard to school subjects, English and geography classes were also often mentioned in this context, but in addition to various elective computer coding or entrepreneurship classes offered by the school, and international collaborations that the school took part in. Like in the periphery, pupils often mentioned online games and platforms - but their reflections included more meaningful engagement such as learning people's stories and telling them about Israel (within the platforms), and they were less centred around Israeli content and creators. Furthermore, global environmental causes that pupils identified with and took part in promoting were also a strong global component in responses provided by TLV participants.

Comparative perceptions of the other context

The way teachers and pupils responded to questions about the other context (how they thought global characteristics and phenomena manifested in the centre versus the periphery) was most enlightening. Peripheral participants had a somewhat accurate but also somewhat romanticised and standardised perception of the opportunities for global engagement offered to pupils in TLV. Pupils in VC assumed that pupils in TLV likely have many interactions with tourists, with the phrase 'I've never seen a tourist in [our city]' being repeated in different ways in each of the focus group discussions at VC. Pupils in TLV did mention tourists as one of the global components of their environment but did not feel they were a very meaningful part of their own global experiences. Furthermore, while they did have opportunities to travel as part of their school experience (competitions, sister cities, student exchanges), they made a point of mentioning that not all schools offer the same international opportunities and that many of these activities (competitions especially) are open to all pupils, and they had met pupils from the periphery in these trips, on occasion.

Indeed, the picture painted by the teachers at schools serving different populations is strikingly different, with different socio-economic groups being exposed to completely different global phenomena. This echoes the differences between the two schools at the centre of this part of my study, suggesting that notions of peripherality are not bound by city lines, and the term is mostly relational and socially constructed.

When asked about the global opportunities afforded to pupils in the periphery, pupils in TLV assumed that travel experience would be similar (recreational family tourism, not school trips), as would the use of online content platforms and exposure to popular culture. One pupil said:

> 'I know people from Netanya (30 km from TLV), like my cousins, they travel just as much as me. We've even gone together! I don't think it's so different for them to travel, they live in the same way I do.'

Another pupil explained:

> 'I imagine they [pupils in the periphery] have similar access to everything, but in some ways it can be harder. Like, yes they can go online and listen to the same music that we listen to - but the scene, like the emo-scene at the centre, or the goth scene, they have to take a bus, maybe they can't go on a school night, maybe they don't listen to the music in the first place because they didn't meet someone who has an older brother that plays in a band that plays this type of music.'

This relates to another point - whereby pupils in TLV noted that pupils in the periphery had a disadvantage, in that they do not live in a global city, and thus, might be less exposed to global phenomena. One pupil noted: 'even going to TLV would be global for them '.

Like the peripheral pupils, Teachers in VC assumed that pupils in TLV likely had more opportunities to travel through their schools and their families, consistently engaged with people from other cultures and other countries, and were more open to the world in general. When asked how pupils' place of residence might impact their opportunities to engage with the world, a teacher in VC said:

> 'my pupils live in a small world. On the weekend, they stay here. Maybe they go to one of the beaches of [bordering towns], but usually, they are here. I can count on ten fingers the number of times I've heard them talk about something they did somewhere else, like a concert in TLV, but also even travelling the country with their families. If we are

talking only about what they encounter that is global in their city - then there is nothing. Unless we count their grandparents' caregivers who can be from India or the Philippines or Thailand. They just got a movie theatre here this year! This year!'

This statement expresses three arguments made by several teachers in VC, and echoes many of the pupils' responses. First, that doing anything outside the city moves the pupils closer to global exposure, particularly in TLV. Second, that encounters with international populations occur mostly with caregivers of their grandparents and can be assumed not to be particularly meaningful; and third, that a movie theatre is considered a place of global exposure, because it allows pupils to see something that pupils all over the world are seeing, as well as (usually) a portrayal of another country or place.

Going back to the issue of TLV as a global city as opposed to VC whose pupils would need to leave their area to experience anything global -a teacher in TLV said:

'the world is here. For better or worse, these pupils are exposed every day, and I think living here is not so different from living in New York or in London or wherever - but this can make them less thirsty to experience these other places. Maybe it will make them interested in experiencing rural areas in other countries, but I don't think so, I think they want to travel and see places, but I don't know how interested they are in the world.'

In addition to promoting a claim that pupils in TLV are innately more global because they live in a global city, this quote raises another sentiment that appeared in a few of the interviews with teachers in TLV- the possibility of overexposure to the world in TLV coming in the way of pupils' thirst for experiencing other places - or lead them to only want to experience other large cities.

This aspect of the phenomenon also appeared in the study I conducted for my master's dissertation concerning teachers in TLV. In that study, I focused on teachers of pupils from different socioeconomic backgrounds. When asked about the cosmopolitan characteristics of TLV in relation to GCE and GC, teachers of high SES pupils spoke of the opportunities TLV offers for exposure to global culture through museum exhibitions and musical concerts. However, they also noted that most pupils who take advantage of these opportunities come from privileged backgrounds. Teachers at low SES schools confirmed these views but also referred to other aspects of cosmopolitanism in TLV (such as the presence of immigrants and African refugees) as factors that expose children to global phenomena. These teachers said that while

their pupils often do not feel connected to the city of TLV as a whole and are largely defined by their neighbourhoods, meeting refugees and immigrants within their schools and neighbourhoods does provide them with some exposure to processes related to globalisation.

The issue of the different types of global exposure available to residents (and pupils in particular) in what might be considered a global city as opposed to one that doesn't fall under this category, and particularly within different areas of global cities, remains to be adequately explored. It is often assumed in scholarship that global cities develop distinct educational environments as a result of the multiple languages spoken within them (Mehmedbegovic, 2017) and the multicultural exposure they provide (Warf, 2015). However, critical research suggests these global environments do not necessarily amount to the idealised cosmopolitan 'eduscapes' one might imagine where pupils develop tolerance, cultural appreciation, and a stronger global consciousness. Rather, it has been suggested that education in these cities is geared towards the need to educate pupils for a multicultural workforce, in a way that delimits cosmopolitanism to national and neoliberal interests (Baildon & Alviar-Martin, 2020).

Passive GC through global culture and online platforms

The opening of the movie theatre mentioned by the VC teacher above, was brought up by two other teachers as a new global aspect of VC. In the other interviews, it was mentioned alongside global exposure through online platforms and games. One teacher explained:

> 'I think that if a kid has a phone or a computer, a connection to the internet, a movie theatre nearby - and we just got one! - then they are global. They can be just as globally exposed as anyone living anywhere with these conditions. And so, I think that yes, my pupils are part of the world because they are part of international networks, because they like things that kids everywhere like. I'll tell you even more - as a kid growing up in a much more peripheral city than this, I also was global, as global as I could have been, because I watched TV shows and MTV, I knew what was cool outside of Israel, I had internet as soon as it was a thing, and I could go into chat rooms and talk to people all over the place.'
>
> Me: and did you?
>
> Teacher: sometimes, not very often probably because my English wasn't so good but also, I don't think I wanted to
>
> Me: And do your pupils?

Teacher: yes, I think I can say that they do much more than I did. I mean, they won't talk to someone from somewhere else because they want to know what their life is like there, but they won't not talk to them during a game for example because they are from another country. So, I think yes, they have more opportunities, and they can be global without really doing anything today.'

This teacher and several others (at both schools) expressed a notion akin to passive GCE, a concept addressed by Bourn (2010), which he equates with Andreotti's (2006) 'soft' GCE. This teacher, however, is referring to an even more extreme form of passive GCE- whereby simply living their lives, and without explicitly or purposefully being presented with information or knowledge about the world by anyone, pupils *are* global citizens. She elaborated this argument saying that anyone keeping up with popular culture, such as herself in the 1980s and 1990s, is a global citizen. Interestingly, arguments such as this, that equate global environments with GCE, are commonly explored in the literature concerning international schools (Hughes, 2020; Dvir et al., 2019) and elite schools that draw a wide range of international pupils (Howard & Maxwell, 2020) - however, the extent to which this type of GCE truly shapes pupil identities and subjectivities is often called into question in these works.

The different reports from teachers and pupils regarding the nature of online engagement was perhaps the strongest divergence in the responses of teachers and pupils; while teachers across both contexts appeared to think that by being online pupils were necessarily enacting a form of 'digital' global citizenship, most of the pupils in VC and a few of the pupils in TLV rejected these claims, emphasizing that while some activities on online platforms might involve people from other countries or content generated in other countries, the majority of *their* activities on these platforms do not. One pupil in VC said:

'I look for content in Hebrew, first of all. Even if I'm playing a game in English and I want a tutorial and I know there are more, and they might even be better in English - I want it in Hebrew because it's easier for me to find and to understand. If I'm listening to music, it's not that I don't listen to music in English, of course, I do, but if I actively search I do it in Hebrew. News - obviously, the same. If I am playing a multiplayer game, and I need to collaborate with someone, then it's the same if they're from here or somewhere else. I talk to them in English, but I don't ask them about their day.'

This pupils' description led to agreement from the other members of the focus group. It echoes the response of the teacher from VC who said that the pupils' engagement with international peers online would be utilitarian in nature rather than deep and descriptive, but it also contradicts her statement. The contradiction lies in how teachers perceive pupils' online activities versus pupils' accounts of their activities. If pupils have access and are using a platform that is global, teachers expect that they will be passively exposed to the world and engage with the world in a way that embodies or promotes GC. However, pupils, particularly in VC, seemed reluctant to think of their online activities as inherently global, and highlighted the locally produced content they use these platforms to consume. This contradiction highlights the importance of directly engaging pupils in research concerning their experiences and attitudes, as opposed to relying on teachers' accounts, which can often be partial or misleading (Yazzie-Mintz & McCormick, 2012).

5.2.2 Imagined Futures and Relevance of Global Society

Beyond the different opportunities for global exposure and engagement that pupils and teachers identified in each city, there were also distinctive characteristics to the way pupils delineated their imagined futures and the extent to which they considered themselves part of global society. Teachers' responses also reflected these differences, occasionally more starkly than the pupils'.

Pupils' imagined global futures

When I asked pupils if they had ever considered or given any thought to living or studying abroad, there was a clear distinction between TLV and VC. This is not to say that pupils in TLV responded positively and pupils in VC responded negatively, although these were the tendencies of the responses. What can be said was that pupils in TLV had clearer understandings of what they would need to do in order to live abroad and what they would do there, than pupils in VC. Teachers in the centre were also more likely to envision their pupils studying and working abroad, while teachers in the periphery said they did not think their pupils would be interested in such future paths.

Most of the VC pupils knew someone currently living abroad, and the stories pupils shared with me ranged from green-card marriages to business ownership, to ownership of foreign passports and simply working abroad. The places pupils mentioned included the US, UK, Canada, Greece, Cyprus, Belgium, and Italy. In VC, pupils appeared to model their own

imagined futures (with regard to living abroad) after those they had heard of from these acquaintances, who were usually family members or family friends. So, if a pupil said that they had a cousin with a business in Germany, they would likely say they had thought of living and working in Germany.

In TLV, five of the six participants in each focus group knew at least one family member or friend living abroad, with several referring to former pupils from their class who had emigrated with their families. In addition, at least one pupil in each focus group had a foreign passport, and had a provisional plan to use that passport to emigrate in the future. These passports were referred to as 'exit tickets' in case the political or financial circumstances in Israel were to deteriorate. Pupils who did not hold foreign passports expressed jealousy in response to hearing about them. The single-citizenship pupils in TLV, however, still expressed more well-developed global trajectories than their counterparts in VC. Specifically, they knew which institutions they might want to attend abroad to study the field they are passionate about, they knew what tests they might have to complete to get accepted to those institutions as foreign pupils (for example, several referenced TOFEL), and they explained that knowledge of the English language is highly important in facilitating these plans, and thus they invested time and effort in developing their skills in this area.

Pupils in VC, however, took more time to think of the question regarding their own plans to live or study abroad, and it appeared most had not thought of this and were developing their visions as they spoke (perhaps leading them to model their imagined global trajectory on those of people they knew personally). One pupil, who had told the group about a cousin who had married an American and now lived and owned a small business in Florida said:

> 'I guess I could work in Miami with my cousin, after the army obviously, but I don't
> know if it would be legal. Maybe his wife has a sister she could set me up with [laughs],
> but there's time anyway; it's not happening tomorrow.'

Another pupil responded to this, asking if the wife was Jewish, to which the first pupil responded affirmatively, adding 'that's the most important thing'. This exchange led to a discussion about how the 'supply' of Jewish (women) abroad is lower, and this could impede their opportunities to marry foreigners with European or American citizenship.

In terms of imagining the future in general it should be noted that in Israel, most Jewish citizens are required by law to enlist in the military after secondary school and before continuing

to higher education or beginning professional training or careers. However, pupils in TLV told me of their plans and ideas for futures abroad after the military, while pupils in the peripheral school more often said that they rarely thought in detail about what they will do after their service.

The differences in the level of development of the pupils' imagined futures with regard to the possibility of living abroad could be attributed to the concept of motivation, as is suggested by Hardgrove, Rootham and McDowell (2015); in a study of British young people's conceptions of their possible future selves, they found that exposure to a variety of trajectories and paths contributed to the development of pupils' motivations to explore and enact similar trajectories, thus linking the abstract possible imaginaries of the future to concrete steps in the present. Another aspect that might have contributed to these differences between the pupils in the two settings is that while many of the pupils' parents had similar professions - accountants, lawyers, teachers - several of the pupils in TLV mentioned that their parents work or had worked for international companies or had previous experience working and living abroad. This could also provide a clearer model for pupils of what such a trajectory might entail.

Another obstacle pupils from VC mentioned with regard to developing and imagining global futures was anti-Israeli and anti-Semitic sentiments abroad, often conflated into the same issue under the title of antisemitism. Interestingly, although these issues were occasionally addressed in TLV, they were not seen as a deciding factor or a hurdle that could not be overcome, perhaps because of pupils' stronger personal connections to Israelis and Jews abroad. Pupils in TLV most often cited their ties to Israel as the main factor that would impede their willingness to leave (families, friends, pets, etc.).This is particularly interesting when looked at through the lens of Israel as a semi-periphery, which will be elaborated on later on, as it suggests that the status of Israel and criticisms against it weigh more heavily on pupils residing in the geographic periphery - creating an intersectionality of peripheries, or a double peripherality. The concept of double peripherality was first developed by House (1980) in reference to geographic areas located near the border of a particular nation, where residents also experienced economic, social and political peripherality that manifested in their economic status or power. In the case of the pupils in VC, the double peripherality relates to their own geographic and social peripherality but also extends to their embodiment or perception of the national semi-peripherality of Israel, which is excluded from the global consensus.

Teacher perceptions of their role in preparing pupils for global society

Although teachers were asked whether they thought pupils had any plans or thoughts of living abroad, teachers rarely had a lot to say on the matter, and the interviews with them were more focused on how they imagined their pupils' occupational/academic futures, and how this affected contents and ideas they presented in the classroom. The differences between VC and TLV were quite stark in this regard - with teachers in TLV discussing individualised trajectories for pupils (not by name) and teachers in VC speaking more broadly and referring to the military as the final point of the pupils' futures that they had considered. This of course was not completely dichotomous, but when teachers at VC strayed from these general descriptions, they framed these particular references (to pupils whose futures they had considered beyond the military) as outliers. These differences could lead to disparities in the motivation and inclination of teachers to address global future trajectories as possibilities in classroom discussions.

Teachers in TLV seemed aware of the opportunities and imagined futures of their pupils, and showed confidence in their pupils' ability to materialise/operationalise them. This was also reflected in the extent to which they reportedly felt it was their responsibility to prepare pupils for global society. Teachers in TLV all responded positively when asked if they do anything for this purpose, and each gave different examples ranging from contents and examples given in class to pedagogies aimed at preparing pupils for the global workforce. One homeroom teacher in TLV, when asked what she did to prepare pupils for global society, said:

> 'I think everything I do prepares them. Everything that isn't just the curriculum and the tests-because I also teach them literature - but when we talk about social issues in our education class [homeroom], I give them examples from different places in the world, I try to introduce them to the practical elements of the things we talk about. And I think it's easier because they have the base for it - if I talk about something that has to do with a different culture, they have something to tie it back to. Like if I talk about Black Lives Matter, they can connect it to marginalised groups here in Israel and in TLV specifically. If I talk about refugees, they feel very connected because of all the controversy about the rights of the children of refugees and foreign workers here […] I think it is different here than outside of TLV for sure because of this.'

Pupils in TLV also reported higher awareness of global issues and expressed more interest in and knowledge about world events. Specifically, they were much more verbal and engaged when speaking about environmental issues than pupils in the VC. Pupils in the periphery were aware, for example, of Gretta Thunberg, only because they had heard about her in class, and they thought she was strange. Pupils in TLV saw her as a hero, spoke about her actions motivating them to become educated about environmental issues and participate in protests and activities. One exchange in the first focus group in TLV sheds light on this issue:

> Me: Do you learn about global issues at school?
>
> Pupil 1: do you mean like history?
>
> Me: for example, yeah, anything else?
>
> Pupil 2: we learn a little about things like global warming, environmental stuff
>
> Pupil 3: not enough!
>
> Me: what do you mean?
>
> Pupil 3: I mean things are happening around the world, there are protests now with pupils our age and even younger that are striking and not going to school because this is more important.
>
> Pupil 2: but maybe that's also why they don't teach us enough about it, they don't want us to go and protest.
>
> Me: did you hear about these protests in school? Do you learn about climate change?
>
> Pupil 1: We have talked about climate change in geography class sometimes, maybe also science. But not about the protests, and not enough practical information, just technical knowledge like how the greenhouse effect happens.
>
> Pupils all nod in agreement
>
> Me: and are you concerned?
>
> Pupil 2: I'm terrified
>
> Pupil 4: yes, it's definitely something I think about, and I want to take action, but it's disconnected from what we learn in school. It's on my mind because I read about it online and I see stories and videos on Facebook, not because of what I'm told at school - and I don't even know if my teachers know or care enough about it to teach us.

Pupil 3: yes, and I think that it might be more relevant for us even than for pupils in some places in Israel because this is where the pollution happens (TLV), and also Haifa maybe - but this is where change can come from. Change starts in Tel Aviv, I think.

This could reflect one way in which the periphery-centre divide is most salient and which echoes the way pupils in TLV described the pupils in the periphery. TLV is seen as part of the world, and as such, global environmental issues are directly relevant to the pupils there. The peripheral city is part of Israel, and global environmental issues may be important at the national level but not their local sphere.

Another example of a similar phenomenon comes from discussions at each school about global consumerism and child labour in the Global South. Consumption patterns, or at least the availability of global clothing brands, are quite similar between the cities. There are at least two large shopping centres in VC that have major brands, and when I asked pupils at both schools whether they owned clothes from global brands they all responded affirmatively. However, when I asked pupils what their thoughts on patterns of exploitation were, pupils in TLV had more developed views on the matter than pupils in VC. Pupils in VC, when prompted, did express awareness of some of the problems that stem from consumerism and capitalism with relation to these brands; however, as opposed to pupils in TLV, they neither took responsibility nor acknowledged their own part in sustaining these patterns by supporting the brands. One discussion surrounding this issue in a focus group at VC was particularly enlightening; the discussion came after I had asked pupils about global aspects of their everyday lives and one of them mentioned global brands of clothing:

Me: Where are the clothes made?

Pupil 1: China, India, some in Turkey maybe?

Pupil 2: In the east mostly.

Me: why?

Pupil 2: Because it's cheaper, the workers can be paid less because it doesn't cost much to live there

Me: and what do you think about that?

Pupil 1: I think it's a problem, but I won't stop buying because of it. It's a part of globalisation - that's what they do in global society, and we do other things.

Me: what do we do?

157

Pupil 3: we invent things, maybe, like Waze?

Pupil 1: we also export fruits and vegetables to some places I think, but we have people from the East working in the fields here too.

Me: and what do you think about that?

Pupil 1: they're paid better than in their countries, that's why they come here.

Despite my prodding throughout the discussion, pupils seemed to express relatively uncritical views of these issues, as opposed to far more empathy and concern in TLV. Although pupils in TLV did not report acts such as boycotting brands - at least one pupil in each group reported they have thought about limiting their consumption and engaging in more sustainable activities such as shopping at secondhand stores, which led to other pupils echoing the same message. This did not happen in VC.   It is difficult to connect these findings to existing literature, as research concerning attitudes towards sustainability or global consciousness is usually carried out on a national rather than a regional scale (e.g. Mayerl & Best, 2018), and even if regional data is collected it is rarely the focus of the study (e.g. Fielding & Head, 2012; Nelms et al., 2017). The greater environmental awareness reported by pupils in TLV could be attributed to city-wide environmental initiatives such as the availability of bicycles, and scooters residents (and visitors) can rent to avoid travelling by car, as well as occasional protests in the city about a variety of global issues including pollution and climate change - whereas these factors do not exist in VC. Regarding the ethical aspects of participating in global consumerism and awareness of patterns of exploitation associated with the production of global goods, it could be assumed that the differences between VC and TLV stem from a stronger tendency of value signalling in the predominantly liberal and progressive city (and particularly the northern/central part of the city) as opposed to the periphery which tends to be more conservative (Cohen & Margalit, 2015).

5.2.3 Grounding PISA - Contextualizing Understandings of the Global Competence Measure

Before delving into the findings related to the PISA global competence measure and the way it was understood and interpreted by teachers and pupils, I provide some background concerning the measure itself, starting with scholarly critiques, followed by an overview of particular characteristics of the questionnaire presented to Israeli pupils. These supplement the general background which can be referred to in Chapter 2.2 and in the introduction of this chapter.

Critiques of the measure

Although the results of the PISA GC assessment were only released in October 2020, several in-depth critiques have already been published, each focusing on a different aspect of the framework and test. These critiques are based on the framework presented in 2018, which also included the questionnaire items. Auld and Morris (2019) present a broad critique of the framework focusing on its implications for internationalisation and questioning its ability to act as a yardstick for these processes. They show through an analysis of policy documents related to the framework as well as the framework itself, how the conception of global competence by the OECD evolved over time, from a broad and abstract economically oriented term, to one that is presented using a humanitarian discourse while still informed by the economic underlying motives. They argue that this evolution was strongly influenced by the OECD's wish to position itself as the most fitting agency to monitor progress on the SDGs. As part of this process of changing conceptions, UNESCO's vision of GCE needed to be reduced to what could be operationalised and quantitatively measured. One example Auld and Morris (2019) provide that will be discussed at length later in this findings chapter, is that of a set of items related to pupils' attitudes towards immigrants. They call the validity of these items into question by distinguishing the lived experiences 'pupils who live in multicultural urban societies currently seeking to integrate large influxes of immigrants and refugees (e.g., Italy and Germany), [whose] responses will be influenced by their lived experiences, including the coverage of that topic in the domestic media and by local politicians. [As opposed to] other pupils, who live in relatively homogeneous societies (e.g., Japan) or where the media is centrally controlled (e.g., China), [whose] answers will be essentially hypothetical and rooted in a very different set of experiences (pg. 690).'

Engel, Rutkowski, and Thompson (2019) present a similar argument to that made by Auld and Morris, focusing more broadly on the OECD's historical role and objectives and the discrepancies between these and the SDGs in general, and the framework produced for PISA. Specifically, they problematise the underlying and explicit assumptions presented in the framework that 'there is 'global consensus' on global competence, implying the OECD's position is to simply meet this demand and supply a product to countries so that they can measure a universally agreed-upon concept. (pg. 128)', pointing to conflicting rationales and definitions both within the framework and in scholarship. They also call attention to the global

inequalities, largely ignored in the measure, which seems to include an inherent assumption that the opportunity to become globally competent is afforded to everyone, and the only question is whether they have adopted the appropriate dispositions. Finally, they critique the Western liberal bias in the framework, which is often attributed to PISA and the OECD but is perhaps even more relevant or obvious in the case of soft skills and specifically GC.

Grotluschen (2018), focuses specifically on the last point addressed by Engel and her colleagues. Tracing the discourse of GC within the OECD over time through a variety of sources culminating in the final framework, Grotluschen reveals a process through which the voices and perspectives of the Global South (i.e., religious, emotional, and bodily aspects of GC), were present at the early stages, and gradually eliminated from the discourse as a result of being deemed 'not scientific'. This critique and those presented earlier all echo those of Ledger and her colleagues (2020), who outline in detail the social and political ideologies it favours and embedded in the framework.

Simpson and Dervin (2019) present a slightly different argument; they posit that while the OECD claims to be measuring 'global competence', what the framework actually concentrates on is intercultural competence, a term that has long been the centre of theory and practice. They argue that the way the goals of the assessment are framed, and the way questions are worded, ignores much of the criticism lodged against intercultural education - namely, that phrases like 'other cultures' or 'other backgrounds' scattered within the framework and the test itself, discursively promote an 'ideology of difference and exclusiveness which can lead to a differentialist bias' (pg.674). The approach they identify as exclusive and differentialist, neglects and negates the importance of intercultural appreciation and dialogue and reduces the other to a single dimension that emphasises difference rather than similarities. This, they warn, can exacerbate stereotypes and discriminatory attitudes.

All of the critiques I have presented so far are based on documentary analysis done by scholars whose key focus is policy. However, one recently published study was performed in a similar manner to the study I will present in this chapter - and focused on the way pupils perceive and understand the questions and items of the PISA questionnaire. Chandir (2020) used a methodology of survey encounters in Australia, which includes group discussions and interviews with individual pupils, to gain grounded insights regarding the articulation of the constructs and items. Her research shows that beyond the values that are clearly understood by pupils to be

160

preferred by the test, pupils identified ambiguity in questions such as those which asked them to assess how well they would be able to deal with 'unusual situations' (aimed at assessing adaptability). Furthermore, pupils pointed to assumptions inscribed in the test regarding the tools and resources at their disposal for solving world problems or doing something to help people suffering from poor conditions. Chandir argues that these differences in how the test is interpreted by pupils can have severe implications of the evidence produced through the test. This is an argument that I will also elaborate on.

The questionnaire in practice

As mentioned previously, the PISA global competence test includes two main parts, a cognitive test comprised of texts that pupils were required to answer questions about and a questionnaire. This section of my findings only concerns the questionnaire, as it was the only part available to the public while data were being collected. Furthermore, as I will discuss in greater detail later in this chapter, in practice, Israeli pupils were only exposed to six of the ten constructs that comprise the full questionnaire. Pupils in all 64 participating countries answered the following constructs:

- Knowledge of global issues (e.g., how easy do you think it would be for you to perform the following tasks **on your own**: explain how carbon dioxide emissions affect global climate change)

- Perspective-taking (e.g., how well does each statement describe you: I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision)

- Adaptability (e.g., how well does each statement describe you: I can deal with unusual situations)

- Intercultural communication (e.g., imagine you are talking in your native language to people whose native language is different: to what extent do you agree with the following: I give concrete examples to explain my ideas)

- Interest in other cultures (e.g., to what extent do the following statements define you: I want to learn how people live in other countries)

- Activities at school (e.g., do you learn the following at school: I learn about different cultures)

While the division of the Israeli MoE charged with making adaptations to the test opted out of the remaining four (as did the UAE):

161

- Attitudes towards migrants (e.g., how much do you agree with the following statements about immigrants: immigrant children should have the same opportunities for education that other children in the country have) - In addition to Israel and the UAE, France, Malaysia, Peru, and Singapore also opted out of this construct.

- Agency regarding global issues (e.g. to what extent do you agree with the following statements: I believe my behaviour can impact people in other countries)

- Respect for people from other cultures (e.g. how well do these statements describe you: I respect people from other cultures as equal human beings)

- Capacity to take action (e.g., are you involved in the following activities: I participate in activities in favour of environmental protection)

The information regarding the differences between the test administered in Israel and that in other countries was not readily available and could only be found by looking at the final translated version of the questionnaire, and contrasting it with the full version shown to pupils in the majority of participating countries. By delving into the full report of the results released by the OECD, I was also able to see that data were also missing for the United Arab Emirates in most of the constructs that Israel opted out of.

I approached the governmental agency charged with modifying and distributing the test in Israel, the Israeli National Authority for Measurement and Evaluation in Education (INAMEE) by email, to gain insights as to how decisions were made regarding the omitted parts of the questionnaire. The head of the INAMEE explained that questions were removed from the questionnaire at the advice of legal advisors, who claimed these questions go against Israeli privacy laws. I then inquired further to find out what this meant and received the following response:

> Any questions that [are perceived to] ask about political views or private feelings that might endanger personal privacy and were not asked in an educational context were removed by the legal advisors.

This response demonstrates that although values are claimed by the OECD to be 'beyond the scope' of the PISA GC framework, some questions were indeed deemed political (meaning value-laden) in the Israel context. While I assume this was also the reason the same parts of the questionnaire were removed in the United Arab Emirates, I was unable to corroborate this. Another aspect of the PISA test in Israel that is important to mention is that Haredi (Orthodox-

162

Jewish) pupils, who comprise 10% of the public education system, are not sampled - this is noted in a footnote throughout the PISA report, to indicate that the findings in Israel are not representative. Israel is the only nation for which this is noted explicitly, although claims have been raised by others as to the extent to which data from other nations (i.e., China) can be considered representative. The reason the INAMEE provided for Haredi pupils not participating in the GC cognitive test was also quite telling, they claimed this part of the test (which consists of reading excerpts regarding human rights, environmental issues, and refugees) did not include enough items that aligned with this sector's values or worldviews. This also speaks to the contextual and dynamic meaning of 'values', and undermines the OECD's claim that the test simply did not address them.

In my focus groups and interviews, I presented pupils and teachers with a translated version of the questionnaire. They were given a printed version to look through for ten minutes, and then I went through each set of questions with them to get their impressions. This provides insights on the rationales behind the Israeli decision to opt-out of the parts that pupils were not exposed to. This part of the findings sub-chapter is divided into five sections, each concentrating not necessarily on a specific construct from the test (although the first section does focus on one construct that measures attitudes towards immigrants), but rather a different theme that arises from an aggregation of items from different constructs.

Immigration

Immigration has unique meanings in the Israeli context, which shapes the way it is perceived in different areas based on the 'types' of immigrants pupils encounter and the contexts of these encounters. As previously mentioned, most migrants to Israel are those of Jewish descent, who arrive as part of the Law of Return - a law which enables every person deemed to have Jewish roots to immigrate to Israel, and upon their arrival gain citizenship as well as different benefits including financial assistance and classes that help them acclimate both culturally and in terms of language. In addition to these migrants - who are termed 'Olim' (a word with a positive connotation that means to ascend - in this case to Israel), a minority of immigrants in Israel are foreign workers of international companies and organisations; some are foreign caretakers and agricultural or other blue-collar workers from the Far East and Eastern Europe; a few are international pupils without Jewish roots, and others are refugees from several countries in Africa (mostly Sudan and Eritrea) (Raijman, 2010). These immigrants are each different in terms

163

of their legal status and the rights they are awarded, but of course, the most prominent difference is between the Jewish Olim who are naturalised upon arrival and the remaining groups (Elias & Kemp, 2010).

The dispersion of these different types of immigrants (including Olim from different regions of the world) is also quite varied, with some areas or cities serving as major hubs for one type or another - while in other areas, some types may seldom appear; for example, out of 72,000 French Olim who came to Israel between 1989 and 2018, over 40% are almost equally dispersed between the cities of Netanya and Jerusalem, and an additional 35% are in seven other large cities[9]. This leaves just 18,000 French Olim who reside in the entire rest of the country. Another example is that the vast majority of the 53,646 Sudanese and Eritrean refugees who came to Israel in 2013 resided in the south of TLV (Müller, 2018).

When presented with questions from the 11th construct of the PISA questionnaire (see appendix 9) that deals with attitudes towards immigrants, pupils and teachers at both schools inquired as to 'what type of immigrants' should be taken into account when answering items concerning the rights immigrants and their children should have, and the extent to which they should be 'allowed' to maintain their cultural practices. A short discussion in one of the focus groups in VC demonstrates this:

Me: How much do you agree with the following statements about immigrants - Immigrant children should have the same opportunities for education that other children in the country have.

Pupil 1: immigrants like anyone who came from somewhere else?

Pupil 2: Olim don't count I think

Pupil1: yeah that's why I'm asking, but also, I think it's different from the refugees/workers whatever you want to call them

Pupil 3: infiltrators

Pupil 1: whatever, but I don't think their kids can even go to school here, I don't think they bring them

Pupil 2: ok but if they do then do you think they should?

Pupil 1: I don't care, they can take my place

---

[9] Fohorils, Ynet, 2018 https://www.ynet.co.il/articles/0,7340,L-5297264,00.html [Hebrew]

Pupil 3: not mine

This exchange has several layers. First, the distinction between Olim, who are naturalised soon after entering the country and gain citizenship and full rights, and immigrants who are not of Jewish descent is quite telling. Second, the exchange shows a lack of awareness of immigrants who come for purposes outside of work and are not refugees and a lack of knowledge of the fact that there are in fact immigrant children at some schools. The comment made by pupil 3 - who referred to refugees/migrant workers as infiltrators (*mistanenim*), also reveals the negative views attributed to this group. This line of discussion arose each time this question was reached in the interviews with teachers and pupils, within each of the schools. Eventually, most respondents opined that children of immigrants should go to school like other pupils and have the same rights, outside of the right to vote. As one pupil from TLV noted:

> 'I don't understand this question, but I don't think it's because there aren't immigrants here, I know there are immigrants - but how can we let them vote? I think it's like a trick question because you come off as racist but also, legally, where does this exist? I mean the rest of them [in the construct] are fine, yes, they should do whatever they want, yes, I don't care if they're not Jewish, but I don't want them to decide what we do here. I don't think anyone, anywhere, would say something different, we have citizenship for a reason.'

In the peripheral school (VC), pupils were especially adamant that in coming to live in Israel (as opposed to coming to work here), people should make an effort to assimilate culturally, because they came to become Israelis. This is of course relevant mostly to Olim, who become citizens upon arriving in Israel, and thus, the issue of rights is less relevant for them. Even pupils who were second-generation migrants (2/6 in each of the focus groups) agreed that assimilation was important, but noted that there are cultural practices at their homes that their fellow pupils may not be aware of.

In the TLV school, there were fewer second generation Olim, but the pupils and teachers seemed more resistant to support full cultural assimilation. They stressed how holidays of different cultures are celebrated and discussed at the school, pupils are encouraged to share stories about their cultural practices from home and feel comfortable doing so. There was also more awareness among pupils in TLV to the existence of non-Jewish migrants - whether employees of international companies, refugees from African countries, carers from the

165

Philippines, Thailand, and India, and more. Pupils in TLV were not only more aware, but were quicker to identify the immigrants in their city as global influences. Several pupils in the TLV focus groups discussed the cultural practices of the Philippine workers who tend to their grandparents, community efforts and protests to support and promote the rights of refugees as well as work-migrants and their children. In VC, only teachers mentioned foreigners as global influences, and their 'influence' on pupils' everyday lives was called into question and seemed limited. The teachers in TLV conceded that their views and experiences involving migrant populations are probably not representative of the city - and that in the south of TLV, where there are many more refugees and work-migrants, experiences (as well as political views and stances) may be highly different.

The diverging understanding of what immigration means in the context of the test versus in the context of Israel or of pupils' everyday lives echoes the argument made by Auld and Morris (2019): '…that the OECD's conception of global competencies is an ahistorical and depoliticised entity, focusing on the cognitive domain through the measurement of pupils' understanding' (page 681). The wording of the questions themselves is, as Auld and Morris state, depoliticised and ahistorical - but the lived experiences are not - making these questions difficult to grasp and understand. Furthermore, if pupils were given the questions not as a base for discussion but simply a test, they would each have answered in accordance with their own understanding and perspectives, producing data that would be essentially worthless in actually reflecting their overall views towards immigrants or immigration.

Diversity and multiculturalism

Diversity and multiculturalism are two additional concepts that are scattered throughout the global competence measure and are arguably harder to define. While immigration has legal implications and a legal definition (which in Israel is distinct from other OECD member states and the EU states specifically), diversity and multiculturalism are abstract terms that are much more likely to be shaped by contextual factors and have vastly different meanings even in different communities within the same national, regional, and municipal context (Ahmed, 2006). In the PISA questionnaire, pupils are asked about their tolerance and views towards people from other cultures and about the diversity of their schools. When presented with these questions as part of my focus groups and interviews, pupils and teachers alike expressed uncertainty regarding the *types* of diversity the questions are referring to and what counts as 'other' cultures.

Before asking teachers and pupils the PISA questions, I asked broadly in the interviews/focus groups what was global about the school - to see if pupil diversity was perceived as a global element. Responses usually concerned specific classes such as foreign languages (English in VC and English and French in TLV, but not Arabic - which is taught at both), geography, participation in international 'twin cities' initiatives and school delegations to Poland[10].

Only teachers in TLV mentioned diversity in the pupil body without me prompting the issue, but mostly in reference to the few pupils who were not Jewish or not born in Israel (these were only present in TLV, to my knowledge). Furthermore, direct descendants of Jewish migrants (second generation Olim) from the Former Soviet Union and Ethiopia (the largest groups of Olim) were not considered a global element at either school. Similarly, in VC, when asked about the pupil population, both teachers and pupils said that it was homogenous (referring to all pupils being Jewish and having been born in Israel), even though a large portion of the population were second and third-generation Olim. This is even more interesting if we consider that Israel is a young nation, meaning most of its citizens' families have had some history of immigration since its establishment. Within the Jewish population, there is a widely spoken and debated distinction between Jews from Ashkenazi (European) and Mizrachi (Eastern/Arab) backgrounds, which, although it has become blurred over the years as a result of inter-group marriages and assimilationist ideologies and policies, is still very much part of the discourse and consciousness of society. This division was not brought up in any of the interviews or focus groups until the final part that dealt with the PISA questionnaire - neither as an indicator of globalness nor heterogeneity of the student body, in spite of the fact that there are many pupils from either group within each of the schools.

When we moved on to the PISA questionnaire, answers became more complex, and a divergence occurred in the responses of pupils and teachers in VC and in TLV. When presented with the set of questions that deal with activities at the school related to GC, and specifically the item 'I participate in events celebrating cultural diversity throughout the school year' (construct 14) in TLV, teachers and pupils cited school efforts to be inclusive of all cultures and make room

---

[10] The Israeli MOE sponsors and arranges annual secondary school delegations to sites of Nazi death camps in Poland across the system (but mostly in the Jewish sector), as part of its Holocaust remembrance policy.

for pupils to learn about other cultures through celebrations of holidays such as Ethiopian Sigd, or Russian Novy God. In VC, where there are many more children of Olim, no such efforts were mentioned.

Based on the VC participants' lack of mention of these multicultural efforts, it would appear that children of immigrants, who are often portrayed in the literature as a distinct social category even if they are born citizens of the country they reside in, are assimilated into the core group in the Israeli (Jewish) context. On a national level, this could stem from the solidarity that has developed as a result of the intractable conflict in Israel, which could reduce the functional necessity of 'us' vs 'them' dynamics within the Jewish population. However, as I mentioned, a different picture emerged in TLV. The fact that these multicultural efforts to forefront holidays and practices were only mentioned in TLV as elements of diversity and multiculturalism is interesting, and I would argue that it could be attributed to the individualism and liberalism that are more characteristic of progressive TLV than the periphery.

The issue of cultural diversity in Israel becomes more complex when the different ethnicities within Israeli Jewish society are addressed. In response to items such as 'I am interested in finding out about the traditions of other cultures' (construct 7) and 'I learn about different cultures [at my school]' (construct 14) teachers from VC inquired whether the Mizrachi Ashkenazi distinction was relevant to the question, while pupils at both schools and most teachers in TLV did not address it. This difference might stem from the historic composition of the periphery in Israel and the feelings of marginalisation and neglect that are often attributed to the Mizrachi Jews in the periphery, who suffer from a double or intersectional marginalisation, leading this issue to be more evident there (Tzfadia, 2006; Yiftachel & Tzfadia, 2004).

Two constructs in the questionnaire address multiculturalism (constructs 7 and 9). The first (7) measures interest in learning about other cultures, and the second (9) measures respect for people from other cultural backgrounds. Initially, questions from both of these constructs elicited similar responses and queries among teachers and pupils at both schools, regarding the Arab-Palestinian population. While in many nations multiculturalism can refer to the cultures of immigrant groups, in Israel, the multiculturalism is (also) embedded within the nation's citizens - mostly associated with 'Arab-Palestinian' and 'Jewish' cultural traditions, but also within each of these contexts as I mentioned previously.

When I presented pupils and teachers with these constructs concerning 'other cultures' multicultural encounters were understood as interactions the [Jewish] pupils had with Palestinian Arabs; multicultural appreciation was reduced to whether or not they enjoyed hummus, where they ate it, and if they themselves descended from Arab countries. When I asked them to think more broadly, teachers usually turned to the main cultural groups within the Jewish population - Mizrachi and Ashkenazi Jews, while pupils more often turned to either religious sects (Haredi, Leumi-Dati, Secular) or cultures of Olim. This was true both in the centre and the periphery and could reflect a generational difference regarding which groups are considered part of the social core, and which are peripheral to it. However, stark differences also occasionally arose between the settings (VC and TLV), and within the schools. One teacher in VC, referring to the item 'I give space for people from other cultures to express themselves' (construct 9), said:

> 'What do they mean? If my pupil sees these questions I don't know if he'll think of Arabs in Israel, World cultures, the Ethiopian or Russian pupils in his class or his grandmother's caretaker from the Philippines - and the response about each of these other cultures would be different.'

Whereas another teacher from the same school reacted quite differently to the same item:

> 'It's kind of a theoretical question, isn't it? There are some schools probably in Tel Aviv, where there are immigrants, and then they actually know if they give people from other cultures the opportunities to express themselves, but I don't think we have that here because all the pupils are Israeli.'

This demonstrates an issue that could appear in different settings across different national and local settings and among different people in the same setting– that 'other cultures' is a highly contextualised term that can be understood in a myriad of ways. The first teacher at the VC school stated that there are too many cultures at her school to assess which one pupils would think of first, whereas the second teacher from the same school had a completely different understanding of what 'other' means. To the latter, all of her pupils are Jewish Israelis, regardless of where their parents or grandparents were born, and thus questions about how pupils might treat people from other cultures were perceived to be theoretical.

Moreover, a response from a pupil in VC which was more representative of the common connotation reflects the other side of this which I already noted. He asked: 'do they mean Arabs [by people from other cultures]? I don't respect the opinions of people who don't respect me'.

169

Thus, the findings reveal that pupils and teachers alike had different cultures in mind when encountering these items, and this could shape their responses greatly.

__Social desirability of responses and semantics__

One overarching issue with the PISA measure was the social desirability that was reflected in some of the questions, which both teachers and pupils commented on. This was particularly evident in the questions regarding the cultural rights of immigrants (i.e., Immigrants should have the opportunity to continue their own customs and lifestyles), but pupils especially expressed that they knew what the 'right' answer was, even if it was not what they would naturally respond. One pupil in the first focus group in TLV, in response to the item 'looking after the global environment, is important to me' (construct 10) stated: 'I can say I agree with this one, especially since the last one is so heavy', meaning the answer she would mark could have little correlation with her opinion or her willingness to act on it. The previous item this pupil referred to states 'I can do something about the problems of the world' - and this item was found by the majority of pupils at both schools to elicit feelings of helplessness or being overwhelmed. An exchange in the first VC group surrounding an item about the importance of the global environment sheds further light on this issue:

> Pupil 1: I don't know who would answer no to this question. I mean, I don't even know if I care about the environment, but I don't mind saying I do. Especially if I just went through ten questions about how I treat and respect and want to know everything about people from other cultures, and maybe even especially if I answered those truthfully and said sometimes I don't really care. Because then I get to this question and I think if I say yes then I'm a good person.
>
> Pupil 2: but everyone said yes to the ones before
>
> Pupil 1: ok, and what does that mean? What do you know about other cultures, seriously, not about computer games culture or music culture? What do you do to learn about them?
>
> Pupil 2: but that's why the questions say do I want to learn, am I interested…
>
> Pupil 3: no, I understand what she's [pupil 1] saying. If I said, or if I thought, that other cultures aren't interesting and I don't want to learn what people are celebrating or doing in other places, or if I was racist and I honestly thought people from other cultures are worth less than me, then I could feel like these questions are provoking me. I would still

know what the 'right answer' is, but maybe I wouldn't put it down with a full heart, and then if I see this question then I would think yes, fine, I don't hate the environment.

Pupil 1: exactly!

These pupils are referring to constructs 7 and 9 which address respect for and knowledge of other cultures. Similar discussions occurred in each of the focus groups at one time or another during the part of the discussion focused on the questionnaire. The social desirability aspects of the items were also explored by Chandir (2020), who employed a similar methodology of 'survey encounters' by asking pupils to discuss items from the test in small groups and observing their discussions, in addition to personal interviews. Her research with Australian pupils also illuminates some of the ambiguous terms and assumptions that arise from the way questions are phrased and presented, suggesting that these aspects of the questionnaire (such as socially desirable responses) could be present across cultures and contexts.

One response in the third VC focus group to an item in the construct that deals with attitudes towards immigrants (construct 11), reflects a similar aspect of social desirability, particularly as it relates to the 'real world' constraints that pupils felt the questionnaire ignored. The item asks pupils to assess the degree to which they agree with the statement 'immigrants who live in a country for several years should have the opportunity to vote in elections. The pupil reacted to this item:

'I know they want me to say yes, sure, why not let everyone vote - and that might be what I would put down, but I don't think any country just lets people who live in it vote. I don't think my grandfather's Indian caretaker should decide who will be the prime minister [of Israel]'.

This response was met with agreement from the other five pupils in the group, who also felt the question was phrased in a way that does not account for legal implications. The response also shows that in spite of these implications, the pupil felt she still might respond positively, but this would not reflect her true feelings.

Another issue, more specific to the Israeli context, was the semantic meaning attached to some of the terms used in certain items. As I have demonstrated - multiculturalism, immigration, and diversity, have distinct meanings across contexts. However, even terms with more stable or agreed-upon definitions can hold various semantic meanings. This came across most strongly

when pupils were confronted with words such as conflict and boycott - which they had strong feelings about because of the Israeli context.

A question about conflict appears in the second set of questions on the questionnaire as part of a construct aimed at assessing pupil's knowledge regarding global issues (construct 2). Pupils are asked to report how informed they are about a list of topics, one of which is international conflicts. When presented with this item, pupils and teachers alike at both schools asked if 'our' conflict 'counts'- referring to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. When I asked if they thought it did, responses were mixed but generally there was agreement that they would place themselves (or, in the case of teachers, they would place their pupils) high on the scale related to this question, but they often qualified this by mentioning that this doesn't mean they know anything about other conflicts in the world, so they are not sure if it is a good item to measure GC through. This was usually reflected in the low scores they said they might have assigned to the extent to which they felt informed about other topics on the list such as hunger or malnutrition in different parts of the world, causes of poverty, global health (i.e., pandemics, prior to Covid-19), and climate change.

Another example of a term that has strong implications in the Israeli context is 'boycott', which appears twice in the questionnaire. First, pupils are asked to assess the extent to which they agree with a list of items which includes 'It is right to boycott companies that are known to provide poor workplace conditions for their employees' (construct 10), and, in another section (construct 6), they are asked whether they participate in a list of activities that includes 'I boycott products or companies for political, ethical or environmental reasons'. Interestingly, teachers and pupils at both schools noted that these items could come across as controversial and elicit emotionally driven (negative) responses from pupils in Israel - despite only the second item referring to a political boycott. These items made them think of the Boycott Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement to boycott Israeli goods, academics, and more, as well as other initiatives aimed at marking items produced in settlements in the occupied territories.

One quote that demonstrates the sentiment echoed by the majority of participants surrounding this item, came from a female pupil in the second focus group in VC who noted: 'I think the answer to this question has a different meaning in Israel, because we know they're referring to us'. Although both pupils and teachers in TLV seemed to hold more left-wing political views, with some stating they agree with these boycotts, all participants noted that these

items have a specific connotation in the Israeli context that could make them less suitable for assessing GC.

Interestingly, this item also affected how pupils in particular said they might respond to the following questions in the construct, that are less 'controversial' or hold less of a political connotation. In two of the focus groups in TLV and one in VC, pupils noted that they might be more likely to respond positively to the remaining questions in the construct, as a way of mitigating a cognitive dissonance, or virtue signalling after they felt they were unable to provide the desired answer to the boycott item. One pupil in TLV noted: 'if I answered no to the last one - because I can't answer yes, I might answer yes to the next ones because it doesn't cost me anything to say I care about the environment even if I don't.' This statement highlights how the placement of items in the questionnaire can impact the responses they produce, almost independently of their actual phrasing or content.

The final concept that appeared to elicit contextually driven emotional responses was human rights. Human rights only appear once in the questionnaire, within a construct aimed at assessing pupils' capacity to take action regarding global issues (construct 6). The item is phrased as follows: I regularly read websites on international social issues (e.g., poverty, human rights). This item did not elicit any particularly interesting responses in my data collection. However, in a set of questions addressing agency regarding global issues (construct 10), the following item appeared: 'When I see the poor conditions that some people live under, I feel a responsibility to do something about it'. This item was flagged by pupils and teachers at both schools, perhaps because it appears in the same set of questions that addresses whether it is right to boycott products (though in this case for employing workers under poor conditions and not political reasons), thus priming participants in Israel to think about their own position. The discussion and responses surrounding this item became quite political in the pupil focus groups, and in all three of the VC focus groups and one of the TLV ones, I found myself struggling to move the discussion onwards to the next item. At VC, a heated argument between three of the participants in the second focus group arose, as is demonstrated in the following excerpt:

Pupil 1: I think it's hypocritical to say we strongly agree

Pupil 2: Why?

Pupil 1: because of Gaza - we have people living in poor conditions and we can help them

Pupil 3: how can we help them?

Pupil 1: I don't know, like when we collect coats for poor people in Israel, we could send them things

Pupil 2: but then we wouldn't be able to give to the people here, do you understand what you're saying? They're our enemy

Pupil 1: no one is my enemy except terrorists. Some of them are just people, just like any homeless person in [nearby city].

Pupil 3: I think so too, but I still think we can say we feel a responsibility - when we can vote then we can vote based on who we think will help them

Pupil 2: I can't believe how *smolanim* (a term for left-wing political ideologists, often used as a derogatory term) you're being - bleeding hearts! Don't we have a responsibility for [Israeli, Jewish] people hurt by Palestinian attacks first?

Pupil 3: it's a theoretical question!

Pupil 2: I also don't think it's a choice we need to make between these poor people and those poor people, it's about what you think is right.

Me: so, what do you think about the question - can it measure global competence?

Pupil 1: yes, because I also want to help people in Africa or in Syria

Pupil 3: yes

Pupil 2: if being left-wing is global competence then yes. And I think it is [GC is left-wing ideology], so yes.

This argument points to several interesting points raised to some extent in each of the focus groups as well as the interviews, not always around this particular item. First, equating left-wing political views and ideologies with global competence, which also arose surrounding the issue of boycotting goods and respect for world religions and cultures; second, the sensitive nature of the topic of human rights in a country that is involved in an ongoing occupation and war; third, the role of context in shaping how questions are perceived, understood, and ultimately answered. The social and political ideologies endorsed, favoured and promoted by the test have been explored and critiqued in several recent studies (Auld & Morris, 2020; Grotlüschen, 2018; Ledger et al., 2019). However, these concentrated on critical readings of the questions by scholars, rather than the direct understandings of pupils.

5.3 Concluding Remarks

Taken together, the findings of this section illuminate the ways that notions of peripherality at the national and regional level can compound and interact in ways that can deeply affect pupils' opportunities to engage with global society, their attitudes towards and perceptions of GC, and where they place themselves in relation to the world. This also sheds light on the problematic nature of measuring GC using supposedly universal measures and constructs, as these measures inevitably encapsulate values, cultural assumptions, and terms with different semantic meanings across contexts - even within the same nation.

At the regional level, the findings show that perceptions of GCE and global citizenship are greatly shaped by the existence and types of manifestations of factors like diversity, cultural centres and venues, and industries - in addition to other socioeconomic factors, levels of income and parental occupations. Pupils in TLV expressed more environmental consciousness and awareness, perceived their city to be part of a global society and economy, sought out and engaged with more global contents online, and expressed more consolidated plans for their imagined global future trajectories. Their teachers, consequently, reported acting as facilitators and saw it as part of their role to expose them to global issues and contents and broadly prepare them for GC.

On the other hand, pupils in the periphery felt twice removed from the global collective, and thus experienced more difficulty identifying global factors in their everyday lives and planning or even imagining global mobility and trajectories; they felt they would first need to experience and connect with the central part of Israel before engaging with anything beyond the national borders. Perhaps the best example of this is the way global environmental issues were perceived by pupils in the periphery as something that did not immediately concern them, but did concern residents in the larger cities - which are part of the global collective. This limited their interest as well as their agency regarding their capacity to act on issues related to pollution or climate change. The teachers in the periphery also did not seem to perceive their pupils as global subjects beyond very broad definitions of engagement with online platforms and global popular culture, and thus did not feel it was their role to prepare them for any sort of global future. The findings also challenge the view of online platforms and media as inherently global, at least in terms of patterns of usage among people in different settings and of different backgrounds. It is worth noting that this chapter did not include data from schools in the religious sector of the

175

education system, and it is possible to infer that their responses would be more conservative. As part of a socially peripheral or liminal group, they may also internalise and express a double-peripherality similar to that presented by the students from the geographic periphery.

Furthermore, at the national level, the findings shed some light on obstacles facing GCE in the Israeli (Jewish) context, including those related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Teachers and pupils in both schools - although especially in VC - perceived Israel to be outside of the global consensus as a result of the conflict, thus limiting opportunities for global engagement and particularly mobility and global imagined futures. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict also shaped the extent to which some pupils felt they could define themselves as globally competent, as they felt this clashed with their belonging to a nation that occupies and controls the Palestinian people. The national semi-peripherality of Israel was also manifested, according to pupils and teachers, in the unique patterns of (incoming) immigration that is mostly limited to Jews - another factor that, particularly in the periphery, was perceived to limit the extent to which Israel could be considered part of the global polity. The perception of Jewish people as part of a single collective also seemed to blur the extent to which participants recognised the diversity in their environment, and thus the extent to which they felt their environment was global.

Finally, methodologically, the findings illuminate the importance of directly interviewing pupils about their views, experiences and perceptions of global society and education in general to gain detailed and in-depth understandings, rather than merely subjecting them to teachers' assumptions and ideas of what their lives might entail. More broadly, these notions of peripherality correspond with literature related to the special turn in comparative education that calls on scholars to explore space in a more nuanced and comprehensive manner, by highlighting the effect of eduscapes on pupils' imagined futures. Furthermore, the findings correlate with critiques of methodological nationalism (Wimmer & Glick Schiller, 2002), because using the nation as the main unit of analysis would cause these immense differences between contexts within the nation to be overlooked.

Chapter 6: Uncoupling Student Trips Abroad and Global Competence

This final findings chapter consists of a different approach than that presented in the previous chapters in three major ways: (1) It is based on the analysis of texts and videos as opposed to interviews and focus groups. (2) it zeroes in on one phenomenon that is often associated with global citizenship (student trips abroad), and uses this phenomenon as a case that demonstrates one way in which the Israeli MOE drives a form of internationalisation that is uniquely tailored to the Israeli context with its goals and obstacles. Due to the divergence of this chapter from the overarching literature review presented in chapter 2, it includes a more robust/extended introductory section, that focuses on the relevant literature that ties it into the broader issues I have previously outlined.

Following this introduction, I focus on two types of data: (1) the course materials and tests that comprise the online program produced by the MOE in partnership with the MFA in 2013, mandated by the MOE for every pupil embarking on a school-based trip to pass[11]; (2) publicly available local newspaper and school website excerpts, featuring testimonials and quotes from participating pupils and staff or administrative officials. The data from both sources were analyzed using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006, described at length in chapter 3), which provides a flexible method for integrating information and data from different types of sources while taking into account multiple theoretical perspectives.

Throughout this chapter, I explore the characteristics of the state-focused (and state produced) discourse used to describe, explain, and legitimise pupil trips abroad, highlighting how pupils are marginalized through this discourse which reduces them to reflections and ambassadors of the state. Furthermore, I demonstrate an alternative model for articulating the goals of student trips abroad, that does not align with the aims and anticipated outcomes delineated in comparative education scholarship. The explicit manner in which these goals are articulated in Israel is not surprising, in light of the education system's nationalistic nature, but political science scholarship suggests that the goals themselves are not unique to the Israeli context, and operate in other contexts and settings, though in a more subtle manner (e.g. Turkey [Uğuz, & Saygili, 2018]; China [Yun & Vibber, 2012])

---

[11]Israeli Ministry of Education (2013) Online Hasbara Course for Students Taking Part in Delegations [Hebrew]. Retrieved from: http://bit.ly/3o9RGgb

6.1 Introduction

The findings presented thus far have shown how notions of social and geographic peripherality shape the meanings attributed by different actors (pupils and teachers) to global citizenship and the way they perceive themselves in relation to the world. In this chapter, the notion of semi-peripherality in relation to the world is explored. My argument here is two-fold: first, that Israel is a semi-periphery, not necessarily in the economic sense (which is beyond the scope of this thesis), but ideologically, in terms of the values it embodies and the ambiguity it presents in relation to the Western nations that comprise the core. Second, I show that this semi-peripherality is reflected in its approach to student trips abroad, as can be seen through official documents and artefacts produced by the state. This notion of semi-peripherality causes Israel to break away from the common conception of student trips abroad as ways of promoting global competence and GCE, and leads it to nationalise the goals of these trips.

In this chapter, I explore the Israeli case and demonstrate that secondary school student trips abroad are based on aims that are unrelated to global competencies or intercultural skills. I thus argue that student trips would act as a false signifier in the measurement for these constructs. I also suggest that a more comprehensive framework informed by the field of political science is useful in examining student trips abroad more comprehensively, allowing scholars to take into account a wider array of underlying motives, including mechanisms of soft power and public diplomacy preserved and strengthened through these trips.

6.2 Background: Student Trips Abroad

Programs that include student trips abroad are not a new phenomenon, and the scholarly interest in them has grown steadily since the early 1900s, with peaks in the post Second World War and Cold War eras as well as in recent years, in line with the global trend of internationalisation. Research surrounding these can be divided into two main strands - one that views student trips abroad and study abroad as mechanisms of soft power and diplomacy, and another which concentrates on the outcomes of these programs on a student or institutional level, usually addressing the potential for personal growth, improved adaptability or employability of students, the development of intercultural skills, or institutional reputation and branding (Knight, 2012; Zemach-Bersin, 2009; 2012).

The strands of research that promote each of these narratives are, for the most part, separate. Literature that relates these programs to student development and internationalisation of education systems is often grounded in the realms of education and psychology, whereas literature that concentrates on the power relations and diplomacy efforts they embody is more common in the field of political science. Two prominent exceptions to this categorization are Lomer's (2017) work, which integrates the two perspectives to some extent, showing that while UK higher education policy treats incoming international students as potential ambassadors and student trips as a tool for soft power, this view is somewhat antiquated, and students are far more interested in their own personal development; and Wilson's (2014) book in which he explores the political influence often attributed to international education programs and demonstrates the plethora of state and private interests that can form the base of such programs. It should be noted that both of these works concentrate mainly on incoming international students in British higher education, whereas the current study addresses short term trips in secondary education.

6.2.1 Student Trips Abroad for Personal Development and GC: The Educational Perspective

Student exchange programs and trips abroad are primarily depicted as a key strategy for schools and higher education institutions to promote students' global competence and intercultural skills through exposure to international experiences. Although the efficacy of these programs has been questioned and critiqued from many angles, their goals are consistently linked to the personal development of students and their employability (Brooks et al., 2012; Di Pietro, 2015). In the 2018 round of PISA (OECD, 2018), one of the measures of GC, in a section that assesses opportunities for multicultural/intercultural practices in schools, refers to the operation of student exchange programs in students' schools, suggesting an assumed correlation. Studies that use other measures of global competence (e.g., global citizenship, intercultural mindedness) similarly assume the benefits of travel experience and participation in educational programs abroad for the personal development of students (e.g., Perry et al., 2013; Salisbury et al., 2013; Tarrant, 2010; Tarrant et al., 2014). These assumptions are also evident in the justifications used by institutions when developing and marketing study abroad programs and short-term student trips, which are framed in student-centred terms that emphasise the personal development of students' intercultural skills through the multicultural experiences offered (Zemach-Bersin, 2012). One example of this appears in the American Field Service (AFS) website, which is one

of the world-leading organisations that offers and promotes opportunities for study abroad and student exchange. They offer a 'global competence certificate' through an online module that students can complete prior to and during their stay, regardless of the purpose of the trip. This module is aimed to help students 'improve their global competence skills' to improve their 'results in terms of intercultural development', as one professor quoted on the website claims.[12] This example is representative of the common discourse surrounding these trips in marketing materials.

In the fields of comparative and international education research, student trips abroad have long been considered a way to provide students with intercultural and international exposure and encounters that they would otherwise be unlikely to experience (e.g. Mendelsohn & Orenstein, 1955). Scholars have developed many tools and used them to assess changes in participants' global competence (Deardorff, 2006; Kehl & Morris, 2008), world/global mindedness (Poole & Davis, 2006), global citizenship (Linsdey-Parsons, 2010), intercultural competence (Deardorff, 2006; Deardorff & Van Gaalen, 2012), among others, based on the assumed correlation between international experiences and these skills. While in the past it was common for an encounter with a foreign culture as part of such programs to be considered sufficient for fostering global mindedness or competence and developing intercultural skills, over the past two decades, more attention has been given to specific activities and environmental factors that are necessary for the fostering of meaningful engagement, without which many programs are deemed ineffective (Byram & Feng, 2006; Cushner & Chang, 2015; Lokkesmoe et al., 2016; Wolff & Borzikowsky, 2018). Some attention has also begun to be called to the manifestations, goals, and outcomes of these programs in different settings, particularly in developing or conflict-ridden versus western contexts (e.g. Selvaratnam, 1985).

This change in perception has been the result of a broader shift in recent years to a more critical standpoint that questions the efficacy of the programmes, rather than normatively describing them. However, most studies in the field of international education still begin with an assumption that personal development and intercultural skills are always the central if not only goals. For example, even when critical scholars such as Cuchner & Chang (2015) call on readers to 'check their assumptions' regarding the development of intercultural competence through

---

[12] AFS global competence certificate for study abroad: https://afs.org/certificate/gcc-study-abroad/#afs-nav-events

overseas student teaching, they frame the problem as the 'immersion assumption'. This assumption manifests when scholars and policymakers assume that immersion by itself can lead to change - rather than engage with the possibility that more meaningful interactions would be required to truly promote intercultural competence.

6.2.2 Student Trips Abroad as Public Diplomacy: The Political Science Perspective

Two concepts that are central to understanding the state-centred discourse that is prevalent in discussions of student trips abroad within the field of political science are soft power and public diplomacy. Soft power is a term used to describe non-violent efforts to strengthen a nation or group's image [usually in the international arena] and relationships (Nye, 2004). As such, soft power is a way of influencing others and attracting them without force and covers a wide multitude of activities.

Programs involving student trips abroad have long been associated with these purposes within the realm of political science - with one notable example being the Cold War, during which both the Americans and the Soviets made extensive use of student organisations and youth movements in spreading their values and agendas (Kotek, 2003). The same example is appropriate in explaining the concepts of public and cultural diplomacy, which stood at the centre of the World Youth Festival held in Berlin in 1951. This event targeted mostly foreign youth, and through it the Soviet Union attempted to sway public opinion in the home nations of the attendees, who participated in cultural events, parades, concerts and more. The events were not targeted at foreign diplomats or leaders, but at the general [foreign] public (i.e., public diplomacy). Although public diplomacy can be utilized and executed directly by state powers, informal actors can play a role in their execution, directly or indirectly (Ayhan, 2018; Kotek, 2003)

Today, public diplomacy is on the rise and its definitions are evolving and becoming more flexible in order to accommodate some of its new manifestations. Ayhan (2018) reviews 160 academic articles regarding public diplomacy and provides a taxonomy that is quite useful in unpacking its different forms. He suggests that state and non-state types of public diplomacy certainly are being utilized today, and he calls for clearer boundaries to be set attempting to bring order to this evolving phenomenon and avoid overlooking types of PD that may not have traditional manifestations. Ayhan's taxonomy delineates five perspectives: (1) the state-centric

perspective posits that PD is performed by official state powers, and any action by non-state powers needs to be directed by the state in order to qualify as PD; (2) neo-statist perspectives to PD legitimise some (mainly transnational) activities by non-state actors while differentiating them under names such as grassroots or social diplomacy, not requiring any direct involvement by the state; (3) the nontraditional perspectives of PD, similarly to neo-statist perspectives, recognise some activities initiated and performed by non-state actors as PD, but requires these actors to adhere to certain criteria and capabilities and engage, to some extent, with state actors; (4) society-centric perspectives look to non-state actors as the *primary* executors of PD in the global public sphere, and finally, (5) accommodative perspectives that acknowledge some activities and capabilities of non-state actors as PD, but require these actions to be legitimized by the state and aligned with its interests, and meet other criteria in terms of their main goals and target audiences. Government-directed use of individuals - and more specifically, minors - as agents of PD is difficult to categorise through this framework, which only acknowledges individuals in key positions, disregarding the role individual, ordinary citizens (whether domestic, as is displayed in the Israeli case or foreign, as can be gleaned from Lomer's work) might play in executing state-centred PD.

One recent example of efforts at public diplomacy specifically targeting youth can be found in Eksi's (2016) detailed examination of Turkey's strategies for exerting soft power in the Balkan region through a variety of activities and initiatives led by state-sponsored and governmental agencies. Notably, these include the sponsorship and organization of student trips to Turkey, which are 'intended to provide the youth of the Balkans with sufficient knowledge about Turkey and with [a] chance to establish communication and interaction with the Turkish society' (page 206). These trips, fully funded by the Turkish Cooperation and Coordination Agency, would qualify as state-centric PD under Ayhan's taxonomy, as it is executed directly by state actors; however, more radical perspectives may view the various actors that students engage with during these trips as relevant individual (or collective) agents of PD; broadening the scope of activities and encounters that need to be taken into account when discussing manifestations of PD.

Although a political science framework on its own is insufficient for gaining a comprehensive understanding of phenomena that occur in the realm of formal or informal education, these concepts could prove useful in deciphering some aspects of modern-day

programs involving student trips abroad, which seem to consistently be judged against similar metrics of student personal development and fall short in exploring more subliminal motives or functions.

6.2.3 Student Trips Abroad in the Israeli Context

In Israel, the development of global competencies is nearly absent from the way student trips abroad are presented in the scholarly literature, particularly in secondary education. These trips, almost exclusively referred to as 'delegations' in the Israeli context, are overwhelmingly presented in state-centred rather than student-centred terms, and as a result, the development of global competence is not part of the agenda from the outset, and the literature concerning these practices in Israel better relates to the PD perspective I have outlined above. Most student trips in the Israeli secondary school system are aimed at strengthening students' Zionist sentiments through Holocaust memorial delegations to sites of extermination camps in Poland (See Gross, 2020); others aim to strengthen and maintain relationships with communities in the Jewish diaspora and some have goals that pertain to countering negative portrayals of Israel in foreign media and delegitimising calls to boycott Israeli companies and goods (Cohen & Liebman, 2000). Finally, some are part of bilateral sister city or sister-school agreements and other initiatives with broadly defined goals.

Two key factors rooted in the sociopolitical and historical context shape the character and purpose of student trips abroad in secondary education. Since its establishment in 1948, Israel has been experiencing heavy, growing criticism from other nations for its continued occupation of Palestinian Territories and the continued violent conflict with Palestine/Gaza (Fishman, 2012). This criticism fueled the establishment of the Boycott Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement in 2005, which calls for nations as well as private organizations and entities to boycott Israel economically, academically, and in other areas (Fishman, 2012; Joseph & Phillips, 2015). The Israeli response to this has involved portraying the BDS as an anti-Semitic movement and national security threat (Olesker, 2019), deflecting attention from Israel with regard to human rights violations and conflicts in the surrounding Arab nations, and tasking various government agencies, including the MOE, with lobbying to delegitimise the BDS around the world, particularly in Europe (Aouragh, 2016; Olesker, 2019). These and other characteristics of Israel which stem from the intractable conflict have led to the development of unique strategies of

internationalisation, which also manifest in the way funding is acquired by institutes of higher education (e.g. Bamberger et al., 2019), the selective internationalisation of the secondary school curriculum (e.g. Goren & Yemini, 2017; Yemini, Bar-Nissan, & Shavit, 2014). These were presented in Chapter 2.3.

The second factor rooted in the sociopolitical context that shapes student trips abroad is the relationship between Israel as the Jewish State and the Jewish diaspora (Sheffer, 2002). Many of the efforts to maintain ties with diaspora are focused on encouraging *Aliyah* (Jewish migration to Israel, literally translated to coming up or rising to Israel) (Harris, 2015) and discouraging assimilation of Jews abroad within non-Jewish communities (Aiken-Klar, 2009). Other efforts frame these ties as a source of power for political lobbying abroad (Guerlain, 2011), as well as a means of securing funding by strengthening the connection that Jews abroad feel to Israel and the extent to which they identify with and support Israel's policy (Haklai, 2008; Sheffer, 2012). Additionally, beyond a general disagreement with some of Israel's policies and behaviours within the conflict, diaspora communities have been offended by some of Israel's policies related directly to recognition of reform Jews and those converted through the reformist stream of Judaism prevalent in the United States in particular (Sheffer, 2012). These processes have led to a sharp decline in the support and funding provided by these communities to Israel, and the state and other organizations have been operating several programs and employing several strategies to counter these negative sentiments and restore the flow of money and support (Cohen & Liebman, 2000; Haklai, 2008).

One key term that is important to understanding the Israeli strategy for dealing with international criticism is *Hasbara* (literally translated to 'explaining'). Hasbara is a widely used term that refers to a wide range of diplomacy practices, programs, and efforts that are aimed at explaining Israeli policy pertaining to the Gaza strip and the Palestinian population in general. Some of these efforts are enacted through PD, while others are institutional and are carried out directly by the state when corresponding directly with representatives of other states. Israel's efforts to secure support for its policies abroad are performed through two main channels: government agencies such as the MFA, the Ministry of Diaspora Relations, and the Office of Strategic Affairs; and other organisations such as the Jewish Agency. Each of these channels has some contact with the MOE and uses student trips abroad to promote its goals, whether regarding

the Jewish community or regarding public and political perception outside the context of diaspora relations.

Most Israeli secondary student trips abroad, which are referred to as delegations, as previously noted, are holocaust memorial trips to Nazi Internment camps in Poland (Feldman, 2008). These trips, which started in the late 1980s have been described as state mechanisms of eliciting Zionist patriotic sentiments in pupils through intense experiences (Feldman, 2008; Gross, 2020). These delegations, while the most common, will not be included in the current study, because the policy and preparation for these trips is different from the one analysed in this paper (the students embarking on them do not take the MOE and MFA course I analyse). ,

Although student trips are not a new phenomenon in Israel, in 2013, Naftali Bennet (former Minister of Education) institutionalised and more heavily regulated them by instating a new policy[13]. This requires that every pupil (including Palestinian-Arab pupils with Israeli citizenship) participating in any sort of trip or delegation abroad through the education system pass an online course to prepare them for any encounters they may have abroad. This includes pupils travelling for various athletic competitions or extra-curricular activities, those going on trips to meet Jewish communities through the Jewish Agency programs and similar bodies, pupils travelling to sister cities around the world, and spans across all sectors of the education system, including the Arab sector. The contents of this course (The Preparatory Course for Students Participating in Delegations Abroad) will be the main focal point of the analysis I will present here. The analysis will also draw on news excerpts, as detailed in Chapter 3, which appeared in small local newspapers and school websites between 2015-2020, to triangulate and strengthen the findings.

6.3 Findings and Discussion

Three major themes were derived from the analysis: *pupils as reflections of the state* - which details the various ways in which pupils were reduced to representatives of the state; *the commodification of international relationships* - which explores both the discursive avoidance of the word friendships and the ways in which contacts made by pupils were described as being of

---

[13] MOE guidelines for student trips abroad [Hebrew]. Retrieved from: https://edu.gov.il/sites/Shaar/Institutes/security/Pages/overseas-delegations.aspx

national value, as well as examples in which pupils were supposedly encouraged to learn about their host nations, but only for the purpose of effectively finding the right angle for diplomacy; and *explaining a nation*: *deflect and refocus,* which encompasses examples of the practical aspects of how pupils were told to defend and promote Israeli policies and actions.

6.3.1 Pupils as Reflections of the State

Throughout the course and the news excerpts, pupils are often equated with the state itself, not only tasked with discursively defending it or deflecting criticisms but also passively portrayed as reflections of it. For example, in one of the lessons of the online course (Lesson 2), Hasbara (the practices of public diplomacy aimed at explaining Israeli policy pertaining to the Gaza strip and the Palestinian population in general) is presented as analogous to a first date. In the video, pupils are presented with two ways to conduct themselves on a first date. In the first way, a pupil might choose to:

> Talk about yourself, a lot, and you can even start by telling the other person about all your disadvantages. […] [you] can even go further and tell him about a conflict [you're] having with my cousin and that he's really annoying and he started it and since we were young he's always been pestering me and doing stuff to me so that eventually I won't have any other choice than to slap him. [you] can tell them about that. I can tell you, that if you do that, it's unlikely you'll get a second date.[14]

> This analogy puts pupils in the place of the state itself, while the Palestinians are

portrayed as the annoying cousin. The other, more favourable strategy pupils are presented with after this first strategy is to be good listeners, to show interest in the other person, ask a lot of questions to find common grounds for discussions - before engaging in Hasbara:

> That's one way of doing it [focusing on the negative], another way of going about it is by showing interest in the other person, seeing what they're interested in... finding common interest… if you show interest in the other side you will find something in common and then a relationship will develop, and you can continue to grow this relationship based on common interests. And what does this have to do with hasbara? It's the same as doing hasbara abroad. You'll be meeting youth from other countries, even online, I would

---

[14] Lesson 2 video: https://bit.ly/2M1lCho

recommend not immediately starting off defensively. Who will want to follow you on social media if you only post negative things?

This excerpt builds on a representation of people that pupils will encounter abroad as simply lacking in knowledge regarding all of Israel's great achievements. In this instance and in other instances in the course and in the news excerpts, foreigners, particularly in Europe, are very often naïve, ignorant, or misinformed rather than inherently anti-Israeli or antisemitic. This echoes Eksi's (2016) depiction of Turkey's rationale for funding Balkan student trips for the sake of dispelling false information and images they may have been exposed to in their home countries. The use of pupils (both incoming and outgoing) as ambassadors is not a new phenomenon nor a distinctly Israeli one, although Israel provides an explicit modern-day example of it. In the first lesson of the course, Naftali Bennet (the creator of the course and policy) provides the following background:

One of the most important things about hasbara is framing, it's called framing, so the way we frame the story is dramatic [in its influence]. Now, the story that they like to tell in the world today is that there's a huge country called Israel, and by the way, most of the world thinks Israel is a huge powerful country because they hear about it in the news all the time so it's probably really really big. Do you know that Israel is about the size of New Jersey? (Shows map) here there is a tiny, tiny country called Israel, its surrounded by about a billion Muslims (there are actually about 350,000,000 Muslims in the Middle East). The Arab nations don't want this tiny Jewish democratic state to survive. There is currently a historic fight between radical extreme Islam and the free world where the Islamic world basically want to ensnare Khalifates all over the world, the Muslim kingdom, so we need to explain to those people living maybe in London or Belgium or the United States: guys, what you're reading about in the newspaper, we are the ones defending you, we are the fortified wall standing in front of this wave and we are protecting you. We are in the frontiers of the global war against radical Islam. They say, Jews came here 70 years ago, and you sent away the Arabs and you took their lands. The actual reality is, 3000 years ago there was a Jewish kingdom here, with King David etc. then it was destroyed, the Jews went to all over the world and then came back to build a new state around 70 AD and that lasted until… so this is actually the third time that Jews

187

have had a Nation on this land and this time its forever [children running around with Israel flag in the video]. So, in conclusion, when you go abroad, you are Israel.[15]

This excerpt is revealing, particularly because of its ending which leaves little room for interpretation about what is expected of them. In another part of the video, Bennet says 'when you are abroad, you are ambassadors of Israel, whether you like it or not'. Pupils are also told here to talk about Israel as 'we'', and highlight that *we* are defending the people of London, Belgium, and the USA from the 'Muslim Kingdom'. This is a tactic for making pupils not only feel that they are part of this effort, but also making their audience feel grateful to the pupil relaying the information, and as a result, to Israel.

In the school website and news excerpts, pupils embarking on trips are also portrayed as ambassadors of Israel, with nearly every article specifically commending local pupils for the Zionism they exhibit by serving as ambassadors for the nation[16] as well as for their schools and regions[17]. Moreover, pupils do not even need to be actively engaging in Hasbara in order to fulfil this imposed duty; for example, in an excerpt about a school's ballet group which had performed in an event in Belgium, the wife of the Israeli ambassador to Belgium is quoted saying to the group after their performance:

Well done! Even 50 years of diplomacy won't do what you do with this modest connection through dance. While you danced, you proved to everyone that we [Israelis] are people of culture, that we are not animals like they [the Belgians] tend to describe us as. This is Zionism of the highest order and a great contribution to the state and society of Israel. You have moved me to tears.[18]

This quote brings together Zionism, diplomacy, and a reference to the supposedly negative views that pupils are charged with dispelling, whether willingly or unwillingly.

---

[15] Lesson 1 Video: https://bit.ly/3acGI4P

[16] Rehovot Municipal Website (2019, May 29th). From Rehovot to Bulgaria [Hebrew]. Retrieved from: http://bit.ly/2MlBwmw

[17] Eilat Municipal Website (2016, November 22nd). Youth delegation exchange as part of sister cities initiative [Hebrew]. Retrieved from: http://bit.ly/2Ya4bxP

[18] Ironi Alef School Website (Publication date unknown), Dance Student Delegation to Belgium [Hebrew]. Retrieved from [page has been deleted]: http://www.schooly.co.il/ironi_alef_dance/page.asp?page_parent=102670

Such strong depictions of pupils as ambassadors have not, to my knowledge, been exhibited in scholarship emanating elsewhere. Lomer (2017) makes a strong argument for the goals and expected outcomes of bringing international students to the UK as part of its soft power strategy - but acknowledges that the path to transforming these students into effective ambassadors for the UK is vague. Lomer reveals that international students are represented in policy texts as potential ambassadors for British values and culture in their home nations and are brought into the UK based on the assumption that many of them will rise to positions of power and retain their fondness for their former hosts. Wilson (2015) provides a detailed analysis of several UK scholarship programs with similar ends - though he calls on scholars to be mindful of the fact that while these programs can have political or diplomatic benefits, they were not necessarily originally developed with the state's interests in mind. This 'benefit of the doubt' cannot be applied to the Israeli case, as the course examined here was developed directly by state agencies. Here, the path is clear, detailed, and placed at the centre of the activities.

6.3.2 Commodification of International Relationships

In what could be considered an extension of the pupils-as-ambassadors narrative, throughout the course and the news excerpts, pupils are encouraged to develop connections (rarely referred to as friendships) with foreigners abroad, largely in order to promote national interests. The pupils' relationships with pupils and others abroad are framed as assets that are valued only through their benefits for the state. One way in which commodification manifests is that fostering relations with people from foreign nations is presented in the course as a way to gain support for Israeli policy in the UN and in foreign political arenas (e.g., to counter BDS activity) and to promote Israel's economic ties with these countries. One of the videos in the online course explains:

> You are going to make contacts that in the future could serve as a bridge [between the state of Israel and the] youth, the grown-ups and the other countries… beyond the personal level where you are making friends from other countries, it can also serve us as a nation in the future in our relationships with countries from all over the world.[19]

---

[19] MOOC in the Education System [Channel, Hebrew]. (2018, June 19th). *Being a young ambassador- Hagai Gross* [Video file]. Retrieved from https://bit.ly/3o9UKJd

189

This point is further demonstrated by a news excerpt in which a pupil who had returned from a trip to the Netherlands explains why he and his fellow classmates made sure to 'befriend' the people they met abroad on Facebook:

> 'everything today happens on social media. As soon as each of us has a few friends from each country on Facebook, our whole activity for Israel becomes viral. This is our biggest achievement; it's how we win. And because of this, we make sure to maintain these relationships consistently.'[20]

This quote shows that pupils are not oblivious to the purpose of their contacts abroad, and happily accept the responsibility bestowed on them, which gives them a sense of national importance. I found no quotes or excerpts that explicitly mentioned friendships or meaningful relationships pupils had developed while abroad – interactions were consistently reduced to creating a network of contacts that could be useful in the future, on a national level.

The involvement of the MFA in the development and execution of the online course and through its participation in the funding of trips even when they are initiated by school leadership is also of interest. One school website excerpt details the preparations and rationales for a pupil trip to Albania involving three schools, one of which is from the Arab sector. The school principal comments:

> 'The delegation is particularly important to the MFA, which is working to strengthen our relationship with Balkan states like Albania and Macedonia for several reasons: Political, cultural, economic and more. The proof of the value placed by the MFA on this initiative is in its assistance with funding the trip through donations which lowers the cost for pupils.[21]'

This excerpt demonstrates the focus on value and what can be gained by the state through the pupils' visit to these nations, while the entire piece omits any discussion of pupil-centred gains.

A more explicitly economically oriented version of this commodification can also be found in the news excepts; In one striking case, incoming pupils were commodified and

---

[20] Ynet (June 20th, 2017). We are creating change with students our own age [Hebrew]. Retrieved from: shorturl.at/sALN1

[21] Beer Tuvia School Website (2019, March 4th). *Pioneering delegation of Jewish and Arab students to Albania and Macedonia* [Hebrew]. Retrieved from: https://bit.ly/3c1gYL7

described in a reductionist way that only addressed what could be gained from their visits, financially or politically. The principal of a school which hosted an incoming delegation of Chinese pupils proclaimed:

> 'We explained to our pupils that behind every Chinese pupil is a family, and not just a family but a mother or father of the family who might run businesses with hundreds or maybe thousands of employees. And indeed, later on we discovered that some of the incoming pupils are children of high-ranking government officials in China.[22]'

This statement, particularly because it was not accompanied by any discussion of Chinese culture or history is quite telling. The need to justify to the pupils why it was important to be welcoming, kind, and open to the Chinese visitors by highlighting their potential economic value is indicative of the lack of subtlety in the discourse surrounding these delegations.

The contribution of the trips for pupils is not limited to these financial ties and diplomatic relationships - some of them are also internal, and aimed at increasing pupils' loyalty to the state. One local newspaper article regarding a group of 20 Israeli pupils who participated in a trip to the Vatican and Italy included information provided by the organizers of the trip which indicates the trip would focus on: 'Israeli-Italian relations, the rising anti-Semitism in Italy and its Jewish population, and the strategic efforts Israel needs to make in light of [Italy's] relationships with Arab states and the de-legitimization of the state of Israel'[23]. These focal points would likely take precedence over and come at the expense of any contents or experiences that are not in line with them, such as getting to know Italian history, culture, people, and more.

Another article about an outgoing delegation to China explains that the trip itself shapes and strengthens pupils' Israeli nationalism, with the school principal stating 'one of the main purposes of the trip was for the pupils to realise that we have a great country that is strong and advanced, and we have a lot to be proud of'[24], suggesting that the intercultural engagement and exposure serve as a backdrop for a comparison that is flattering for the state of Israel. This is

---

[22] Ort Tivon School Facebook Page (2018, February 18th). *Visit-summary- Chinese students' visit*. Retrieved from: http://bit.ly/2McpMmt /

[23] Kol Ashdod (November 5th, 2017). From Ashdod to Rome with love: Students from Makif Vav and Zain are ambassadors [Hebrew]. Retrieved from: http://bit.ly/3qKzcob

[24] Merkaz Hainianim (2019, May 1st). Delegation of 46 students from Ort Alon visited China. [Hebrew]. Retrieved from: https://bit.ly/2NwKsX5

somewhat reminiscent of the discourse that often characterizes Israeli student delegations to concentration camps in Poland, in that it depicts the main expected outcome as a stronger sense of loyalty and patriotism towards the state despite the vastly different circumstances (Feldman, 2008; Hoffman, 2016).

In several instances throughout the online course and the news excerpts, pupils seemed to be encouraged to learn about their host country, as might be expected before attending any international activity. However, this encouragement was framed very narrowly. One example of what pupils should learn about their prospective host countries appears in another lesson:

> For example, if you're going to a country like France or the US, we expect you to be familiar with the different aspects (of that place) that are relevant to your trip. Starting with knowing the characteristics of the population, is it similar to Israel, is it different? Is it critical of Israel? Does it have good relations with Israel? Is there any status quo about things related to Israel? And in these contexts, we suggest that you prepare yourselves.[25]

This furthers the point made through the 'first date' analogy, in saying that knowledge of the other is important mostly (if not only) so that pupils can better convey their own message (which is that of the state) and know which angle to approach them from. These statements produce a reductionist representation of the other, suggesting that pupils should focus their efforts on getting to know the ways in which their foreign peers are similar to them, to create a platform for informal diplomacy, rather than being free to explore the cultures on their own terms, for the sake of their own personal enrichment.

A further example of this comes from a news excerpt about a delegation to Madrid that a group of pupils took part in. The excerpt features a quote from a pupil who says:

> 'Our advantage [as pupils] is that we come meet these teens exactly at the critical age […] they get to know us while they're still in high school, before they go off to the colleges and universities that fill them with hate [towards Israel]. It's easier for them to relate to us at this stage and to listen to us than to adult politicians.'

The same excerpt goes on to state: 'the relationships they [the pupils] create abroad will help them to spread the truth about Israel in social media, and thus help in the fight against the

---

[25] The Educational Catalogue [Channel, Hebrew]. (2016, November 28th). *Online ambassadors* [Video file]. Retrieved from: https://bit.ly/3sPAwrD

delegitimisation brought on by the boycott movements in the world'. [26] These quotes show that pupils are clear on their role and the advantages they have when speaking to their peers in other countries; they are abroad for a specific purpose, and take pride not in building friendships or making connections for their own sake, but in fulfilling their national duties.

This highlights the main point of divergence between the Israeli case and the majority of the scholarship surrounding student trips abroad. The delimiting of what pupils should aim to learn about individuals they meet abroad and their host countries to Israel's advantages over the host countries, the host countries' stances towards Israel, and information that could be useful in advocating on Israel's behalf are quite contrary to the frequent arguments calling for deeper and more meaningful engagement (see Byram & Feng, 2006; Cuschner & Chang, 2015; Wolff & Borzikowsky, 2018). Thus, these findings suggest that the Israeli youth delegations are more likely to be considered state-centric endeavours of public diplomacy (Ayhan, 2018) than transformative educational sojourns as they are depicted in education scholarship (Choi et al., 2012; Strange & Gibson, 2017).

The process of commodification illustrated here could likewise, and perhaps more easily be identified across many settings beyond Israel. The pupil-centred discourse surrounding student trips abroad is often articulated through economic, neoliberal justifications that take pupil personal development to a more utilitarian rather than cultural-enrichment-based direction. This includes articulating the goals of student trips abroad as making pupils more well-rounded candidates for the global workforce or otherwise improving their opportunities for employment (Brooks et al., 2012; Di Pietro, 2015). However, in the Israeli context, the international connections pupils make are nationalized before they are considered on a more personal level, and their commodification is quite explicit.

6.3.3 Explaining the Nation: Deflect and Refocus

The commodification of international interactions and relationships is not only aimed at what foreign relationships can do for Israel or for Israeli pupils; it extends to countering criticisms by deflecting and refocusing on what Israel can do for the world. One example of this from a video

---

[26] Ynet (June 20th, 2017). We are creating change with students our own age [Hebrew]. Retrieved from: shorturl.at/sALN1

in the course features an MFA employee who explains what pupils should do to counter the negative representations of Israel in the foreign press - by distracting the others and shifting the narrative. The course shows pupils how Israel is represented in foreign media in a biased and antagonized manner. Thus, pupils are being sent to counter this, with an underlying message that tells them the negative things are already being presented by the media, so they should be the ones to counter that image and 'blur the lines':

> If you're looking at Israel from a foreigner's perspective you would be seeing it negatively, and I must say that it's true, a lot of them are watching a lot of media and what do they see in the media? Things like this picture where we see a tank and a little boy, and in this picture we see the tank as ourselves and we're trying to protect ourselves, with the military and this child who is lifting a stone is actually attacking us! But the people abroad they don't see it like this they see us as the attacker, the person in the tank is the attacker. So, what we try to do is explain this picture and in a sense what we're doing is what we call *'unhasbarable'* ok? Something that can't be explained. [so, we highlight other aspects] […] we can [emphasize] the whole issue of our innovation and high tech and the fact we have a lot of startups. We can talk a about our culture which is very diverse with east and west and it's very modern... it's possible that they will still show a [negative] photo […] on the news but if they have more associations and more things they will remember about Israel then there's a chance this image will become blurrier. We can talk to them about our inventions […] cherry tomatoes […] disk on key […].

This excerpt is perhaps the only one in the course that acknowledges that certain Israeli actions and policies are difficult or impossible to explain, and it calls on pupils to basically change the subject and deflect, to shift the conversation to more favourable subjects.

This blurring of the lines by highlighting Israeli inventions and developments is a shift from the narrative of Israel as the country for the Jewish people that is often used by national agencies, as it focuses on Israel's benefits for the world. The same message is echoed in course materials that include messages from famous Israeli actors, models, and musicians - who are also commodified as assets of the state. Furthermore, the course requires pupils to internalise specific talking points using questions phrased in leading terns such as 'what can be said about [Jerusalem]' to which the proposed answers are: (a) the city is only important to Jews; (b) in

culinary terms, the city combines east and west; (c) people of all religions live together in Jerusalem [Jews, Muslims, and Christians]; (d) Israel's governmental and national centres are in Jerusalem. Pupils need to tick the last three options to receive full credit for the question.

Another example of this is displayed in a question that asks: 'what framework was presented in the course for examining the conflict between Israel and its neighbours'. The proposed answers (only one of which is correct according to the test) are (a) a localized framework that only examines Israel's relationship with its immediate neighbouring countries; (b) a wide framework that examines all of the events happening in the Middle East, with the [Israeli-Palestinian] conflict being only part of them; (c) there is no reason to focus on the conflict, it is in the past and Israel has other problems today; (d) the conflict needs to be understood within a framework that recognizes that all Arab states are resentful of Israel and do not acknowledge its existence. The only correct answer to this question is (b). Thus, in this case, as well, pupils are requested to internalise a framework that deflects any responsibility or focus from Israeli policy, instead pointing to the wider region. In one of the news excerpts, a pupil who had attended a delegation to Madrid explains:

> 'I came back from Madrid feeling we had made a huge impact - we tried to talk less about politics and focus on being with them, talking, showing them that Israelis are just like them. Even if just one of them is affected by this and they tell other people they have a friend from Israel, and suddenly it doesn't sound as bad as the media there portrays it. [27],

This demonstrates an internalisation by pupils of the goals outlined by the course; they are to avoid politics, deflect if the subject arises, and focus on representing themselves as similar to their peers abroad to gain trust. It also further sheds light on the supposedly negative portrayal of Israel in foreign media and higher education institutions, which amplifies pupils' feeling of marginalisation in the global arena. This leads them to believe that there is national urgency and importance to their trips abroad.

Another example of the way pupils are told to deflect and refocus conversations if critiques of Israel or Israeli policy arise appears in the course, where Naftali Bennet outlines

---

[27] Ynet (June 20th, 2017). We are creating change with students our own age [Hebrew]. Retrieved from: shorturl.at/sALN1

another strategy for pupils, in which they are asked to first talk about their fears to show weakness, and then move on to Israeli innovation:

> The best way to tell the Israeli story is through your own aspirations and worries [about war and security]. Then fast shift to - Israel is the land of entrepreneurship. We use innovation to do good things for millions of people around the world. Examples. Saving lives. I like to ask people how would the world look without Israel's technological innovations? How would you wake up - actually you wouldn't wake up because the alarm clock wouldn't work because the cellular chip is produced in Israel. Then you would try to go to work, you'd take longer because Waze is made in Israel. Once you got to work you wouldn't have a computer because intel makes its thing in Israel. So, you open your computer to start working but your computer has been hacked because cyber security companies are based in Israel. No cucumbers in your sandwich because they are imported from Israel. Israel is a leading power of doing good for the world through technology.

Taken together, the examples presented in this theme show the practical behaviours and talking points that pupils are encouraged to adopt in any interactions they have abroad - detailing what can and should be said, as well as which topics to avoid. Students who do not pass the examination at the end of the course are barred from travelling, but they are able to retake the test up to three times.

6.4 Concluding Remarks

These findings undercut the core assumptions that are integral to the modern understandings and portrayals of intercultural and international experiences as inherently connected to the development of dispositions and attitudes related to global citizenship. I demonstrated that Israel presents an alternative model for articulating the goals of student trips abroad, that does not align with the goals and anticipated outcomes delineated in international education scholarship, and also extends the scope of current definitions of public diplomacy. While this model is very explicit in the Israeli case, some of its characteristics may be more subtly embedded in other national or institutional initiatives.

With the exception of the somewhat scarce literature at the nexus of education and political science, which centres around higher education (Lomer, 2017; Wilson, 2014; 2015), the

roles of education policy and pupils in serving national interests appear to be beyond the scope of current discussions surrounding student trips abroad, student exchange, and other phenomena addressed in comparative education scholarship. This suggests that the initiatives developed by the Israeli government, in which public diplomacy directed by the state is carried out by pupils who act as surrogates, are pushing the boundaries of how student trips abroad are currently rationalized and understood. Israel's strategy is defined by Attias (2012) as peer-to-peer diplomacy, but this concept has not yet become salient in the literature. Thus, a framework that combines the agency attributed to individuals in international education scholarship and the new forms of diplomacy now gaining recognition in the field of political science (Ayhan, 2018), could prove useful in gaining a wider understanding of the myriad of goals that could be met through programs involving student trips abroad.

As GEOs and agencies such as PISA and Erasmus continue to implicitly and explicitly promote these trips and observe them as indicators of a certain mindset characterized by cultural curiosity and opportunities for global engagement, the critical examination of the goals and outcomes of these programs becomes of paramount importance. Furthermore, the rise in anti-globalist sentiments and far right-wing regimes in different areas of the world is reshaping education policy and manifestations of student trips abroad; as such, this study is timely and may serve as a preliminary blueprint for identifying the language and rationales that may increasingly characterise these trips. As such, this part of the thesis calls for a change in focus - from questioning why and to what extent student trips abroad are or are not adequately fostering GCE, to a more critical examination of the programs' explicit and implicit purposes and associated practices. If this pattern of instrumentalism continues to permeate the phenomenon of study abroad programs and student trips abroad, their potential efficacy with regards to developing the skills, attitudes, and dispositions associated with GC would be compromised.

In terms of the notions of peripherality that underscore this part of the thesis, the examples shown here all tie in into an understanding of Israel as a semi-periphery, as this status is the rationale for the public diplomacy advocated and enacted through the course, and it also underscores the coverage in the news excepts. The fact that Israel is portrayed as being outside of the global (liberal, progressive) consensus and pupils are tasked with representing it in a way that would contribute to bring it closer or make it seem like part of it, is reminiscent of the actions taken by other nations often presented in the literature as semi-peripheries, such as China

(Hornborg, 1998), Russia (Robinson, 2013), and the Balkan states (Blagojevic, 2009; 2010). Marina Blagojević (2009) points most accurately to the challenge or paradox that semi-peripheral nations (referring specifically to Eastern European nations) face. She highlights that they are characterised and shaped both by efforts 'to catch up with the core', and to 'resist the integration into the core, so as to not lose [their] cultural characteristics' (pg. 34). This dual process is demonstrated throughout this chapter and will be discussed in more detail in the concluding chapter of this thesis.

Chapter 7: Discussion and Conclusions

I conclude by tying together the findings and literature and addressing the implications of my research from different angles. First, I revisit the aims of this research, present each of the research questions and address the ways in which the research I conducted addresses and answers them. Then, I demonstrate how the research contributes to contemporary conceptual and theoretical debates, as well as what can be inferred from the findings in relation to policy and practice. Next, I address the limitations of this research and outline further research that could shed light on the patterns I have demonstrated. This leads to the final section, in which I provide some concluding remarks.

7.1 Summary of the Purpose/ RQs and Previous Chapters in Relation to the RQs

At the start of this thesis, I presented my overarching question as follows: *How does sociopolitical context shape the meanings attributed to global citizenship education and the skills associated with global competencies?* Through the exploration of this question, I aimed to challenge the dichotomous separation between the global and local often expressed in the literature by examining the extent to which perceptions of the global are shaped by local socio-spatial factors. This was achieved through three distinct but intertwined lines of inquiry, the first of which pertained to pupils and their imagined futures as well as how they perceived their place in global society; the second focused on teachers and their perceptions of GCE and their role in relation to it; and the third tied these conceptions into the Israeli context, and specifically to the semi-peripherality of Israel in the global (Western) context.

Through these lines of inquiry, in addition to a broad literature review (Chapter 2), I also fulfilled additional aims, such as critically examining institutional forms of GCE by comparing them to bottom-up conceptions of the term by different actors (pupils, teachers, and policymakers), and demonstrating how manifestations and understandings of GCE in Israel reflect national goals as well as cultural, political, and historical factors.

RQ1: How Do Pupils Residing in Different Cities (Central/Peripheral) Perceive GCE, Their Place in a Global World, and Their Imagined Futures? To What Extent are These Perceptions Shaped by Their Place of Residence?

On the surface, it might seem as though only the second findings chapter, which drew on data from focus groups with pupils, would be relevant to answering this question. However, I will now show how each of the findings chapters sheds light on it. First, to plainly answer the question based on the findings, pupils' perceptions of GCE and their place in a global world are deeply shaped by their place of residence. Chapter 5 shows that pupils in TLV felt they were to a strong extent inherently global citizens, were highly concerned with global environmental issues, and displayed both neoliberal and social/environmental forms of GCE in response to the questions I posed. Accordingly, their imagined futures were often articulated as mobile and global, as they constructed them based on people they know living abroad or on previous experiences of their parents as global professionals (Beech et al., 2021). They also displayed developed understandings of the steps required to achieve the futures they imagined for themselves, through different forms of personal development, meeting bureaucratic requirements, and using their second nationality as a form of material cosmopolitan capital (termed citizenship capital by Harpaz, 2019).

Pupils in VC, chosen in this part of my thesis to represent a peripheral place of residence, perceived themselves as external to global society; they displayed less interest in global issues than pupils in TLV, argued against forms of 'passive global citizenship' that are often assumed to be byproducts of living in a globalised era, and felt ill-equipped to partake in global society. These pupils' imagined futures were also less developed - meaning they had thought little about their futures after their compulsory military service, and when probed on the matter of the possibility of living abroad they seemed to give more spontaneous responses, based either on people they knew or Israeli celebrities, without any formulated step-by-step plans. Furthermore, pupils in VC perceived themselves as doubly peripheral, in that they seemed to internalise both the semi-peripheral status of Israel and their own place of residence, and perceived these as factors that would preclude them from actively performing global citizenship and participating in global society.

These findings that emanate directly from pupils are further illuminated and strengthened by the findings reached through interviews with teachers at their schools in the different sectors

of the Israeli education system (chapter 3). The teachers in TLV reported practices they adopted to prepare their pupils for global futures, thus exposing pupils to more opportunities for global engagement, teaching them about environmental issues, and helping them formulate their global mobile futures. The teachers in VC showed much less inclination towards these sorts of activities, arguing that their pupils would neither be interested nor deem them relevant. This points to a form of self-fulfilling prophesy, for which it is difficult and futile to pinpoint the starting point. It also goes against the transformative ideals often linked to education, which posit that education should introduce children to new worlds and take them beyond their current circumstances (e.g., Donnell, 2007).

When thinking about the pupils' place of residence and how it shapes their perceptions of GC, it is also important to note other aspects of their social positioning as secular Jewish pupils. This means that, unlike Palestinian-Arab pupils, they are constantly reassured that Israel is their homeland, and their main aim should be to serve the nation - a point that was raised more often in VC than in TLV but should nonetheless be taken into account when examining the other cities and settings I explored. The study of teachers from the different sectors shows this broader angle that focuses on belonging and religion as key parts of how teachers perceive their pupils' lives, and thus could be assumed to also shape their educational experiences.

Finally, the findings presented in chapter 5 from the analysis of the MOE and MFA course for pupils going abroad further illuminates this line of inquiry, in that it reflects the broader expectations of the education system and the national setting. Many of the quotes presented in this chapter echo the responses of pupils in both the periphery and the centre to the questions I presented them with as well as their responses to the items from the PISA questionnaire. For example, the course I analysed demonstrates how the BDS movement is constructed by the state as a hostile organisation, in a way that could have shaped pupils' perceptions of questions directed at international boycotts in the PISA questionnaire. The course also promotes the perception that other countries question or disagree with many Israeli policies related to the conflict and the occupation and that these stances could cause hostility towards Israelis abroad; this perception was echoed particularly in VC, bolstering my argument that notions of peripherality can be complex and intertwined, thus explaining some of the differences in pupils' perceptions of GCE and global citizenship I have outlined in this section.

RQ2: How Do Teachers of Pupils Residing in Different Cities and Sectors Construct Meanings of GCE and Perceive Their Role in Preparing Pupils for Global Society? How Does Place of Residence/Sector Shape These Constructed Meanings and Roles?

The second research question specifically addresses teachers and their views of GCE and global citizenship as well as their perceived roles in terms of preparing their pupils to be global citizens. As with the first question, although the data collected directly from teachers in Chapters 4 and 5 provide the majority of relevant findings, these can be further illuminated through comparison to the findings of chapter 6, as well as the pupils' responses in chapter 4. I have demonstrated throughout that teachers of pupils in the three main sectors of the Israeli education system and in the periphery and centre of Israel have very different notions of the meaning of GCE as well as the extent to which they believe it is relevant for their pupils. As a result, teachers view their role in preparing pupils for global society accordingly. These notions are shaped socially by the sector of the education system teachers teach in and their own religious or ethnic identities, and spatially with reference to (mostly) the particular city they and their pupils reside in, but also the geographic placement of Israel.

In Chapter 4, I discussed the differences in perceptions of GCE by teachers from the three main sectors of the Israeli education system and outlined the role of religion and religiosity as well as how religion is perceived as a key aspect in shaping these perceptions. I showed that, depending on these factors, teachers viewed GCE as either compatible or incompatible with their religion, and this in turn shaped whether they felt religion could serve as a platform for GCE or a challenge to it. I also highlighted specific characteristics of each of the sectors I studied that led to three widely different understandings of the concept itself: the marginalisation experienced by the Arab-Palestinian teachers that led them to connect GCE to a notion of belonging that could fill the void left by the exclusionary nature of Israeli citizenship and civic education in particular; the duality attributed to the education system and the MOE by teachers in the main, secular state sector, who expressed utilitarian notions of GCE as a means for promoting the opportunities afforded to pupils in the global workforce; and, finally the sectarian fears expressed by teachers from the state-religious sector, who felt that GCE could provide a platform for promoting their religion, or pose a threat to the Jewish nature of the education system and the state. This chapter showed that a single definition of GCE could not be applied across the Israeli education system,

and if presented with the definitions devised by GEOs, each sector would likely react quite differently.

Each of these notions of GCE also has different implications for how teachers perceive their role in preparing pupils for global society. In the Arab-Palestinian sector, teachers reported feeling they needed to mediate the knowledge pupils might be exposed to through online platforms, to make sure they do not develop extremist views that could lead them down dangerous paths. They also recognised their pupils' best chances for employment, high-quality higher education, and quality of life may be outside of Israel, and thus felt obligated to support them in whichever trajectory they chose. In the state-religious sector, teachers felt their role and the role of the education system were similar to that expressed by the Arab-Palestinian teachers in terms of mediating global influences, but the reasoning for this was different. These teachers described themselves as gatekeepers, whose purpose was to maintain and promote pupils' Jewishness above all else. Although they spoke of religion as a potential platform for GCE, the audience for this idea was mostly international, meaning they felt Jews in the diaspora could use a narrow form of GCE to feel connected to the state and Jewish people of Israel, but its impact on their own role perception was less discernable. Finally, teachers in the secular state sector saw themselves as key actors in preparing pupils to take part in global society, but described the education system as a constraining factor, because, while it does want to promote pupils who will raise the nation's status by being innovative entrepreneurs, it also heavily focuses on promoting nationalism. Thus, their role as mediators was mostly centred around balancing these contradictory national aims. Chapter 5 further illuminates these issues, particularly with regard to the state-secular sector in which the study was conducted.

The TLV and VC teachers interviewed for the comparative study presented in Chapter 5 were presented with slightly different questions than those that comprised the interview protocol for the sectoral comparison (see chapter 3). Specifically, I asked them to think about their pupils (and their role) in comparison to pupils (and teachers) in global cities in different settings (i.e., London, New York, Shanghai, and TLV for VC) and in comparison with rural areas or peripheral cities in Israel (in TLV), and in developed and developing nations. This led to more elaborate answers, that gave many insights beyond those that could be gained from the comparison across the sectors.

Teachers from TLV discussed a variety of forms of GCE relevant for their pupils, that touched on political, economic, social, and environmental aspects of the concept. As I noted in the previous section with relation to RQ1, they saw their pupils as inherently global subjects, and thus perceived their own role as facilitators and knowledge brokers who aim to help their pupils develop themselves as global citizens. This was supported by practices such as introducing global social and environmental issues in the classroom even if they were not specified in the curriculum; allotting time for pupils to discuss their experiences travelling abroad; celebrating diversity in the classroom rather than minimising or ignoring it; and encouraging critical thinking while specifically drawing on global events and relating them to the Israeli context. The teachers acknowledged that this was easier to do with pupils in TLV than they believed it would be in peripheral settings, some even saying that pupils in the periphery were 'farther away' from global issues, because they might first need to connect to the centre of their own context before being able to look outwards.

Furthermore, teachers in TLV found it much easier to identify global influences in their school and their city than teachers in VC, including acknowledging the diversity of the pupil body in spite of the overwhelming majority of pupils being Jewish and having been born in Israel. In Chapter 5, I also outlined some shortcomings teachers associated with the TLV setting, particularly that the sense of global community that the city offers could adversely affect pupils' willingness to look beyond the city's (and the nation's) borders; or that it could make them more eager to travel to and explore only similar global metropolitan cities, but these downsides were theoretical, and teachers did not provide examples.

Teachers from VC expressed difficulty identifying global aspects of the school and its environment other than some school subjects and factors such as the global brands and culture pupils were familiar with and the online platforms with which pupils engaged, despite the fact that a large proportion of the pupil body was comprised of second or third generation Olim. This reported lack of global influences in the school also played into the way these teachers constructed GCE in very abstract terms, speaking broadly of globalisation and pupils needing to be prepared for a global world.

Like in TLV, VC teachers saw their pupils as inherently global subjects, but only in the sense that they assumed a passive notion of global citizenship, meaning anyone who engaged with global contents, platforms, or cultures, could fall under this definition. As such, they did not

seem to feel they had any particular role in preparing pupils for global society other than providing them with very practical tools that are important at the local setting as well as a global one, such as teaching the English language or providing a basic knowledge of world events. In stark contrast with the TLV teachers, when I prompted them to speak about multiculturalism in the school, VC teachers acknowledged that there are pupils from various backgrounds, but they as teachers felt it was their duty to try and create cohesion rather than distinction, and it seemed this might have been part of a wider school policy, whether explicit or implicit. When I asked them to think comparatively about the global influences and opportunities for engagement afforded to their pupils as opposed to the other settings I presented, including TLV, they acknowledged that pupils in TLV were likely much better positioned for global engagement, and would likely be more open to global contents as well. They likened their pupils to those in rural or peripheral areas in other developed nations, claiming their lives were likely shaped by globalisation to a broader extent than those of pupils in developing countries, but not to the extent of meaningful engagement supposedly available to pupils in global cities.

Finally, similar to the way the examples detailed in the third findings chapter speak to the atmosphere of the education system, which in turn shapes pupils' views of GCE and their place in a global world, they are also relevant to understanding how teachers construct notions of GCE and understand their role in relation to it, but the particularities of this will be introduced in the next section as they speak more to the third research question.

RQ3: How Does Israel's Position in The Global Arena Engender Manifestations and Perceptions of GCE Within and Across the Education System?

This question, although it is the least complex in phrasing, is the broadest of the three, because it not only encompasses the former two, but also connects to the overarching position of the education system and the nation itself. As I have shown throughout the findings chapters, the Israeli context engenders manifestations and perceptions of GCE that are shaped by a tension between two goals: the first is Israel's wish to be part of a global community, its participation in global organisations, and the value it places on the success of Israeli and Jewish individuals in the international sphere. The second goal is maintaining the nation's status as the Jewish State, by rejecting international (Western) criticisms, maintaining a strong connection between religion and state structures, and promoting nationalism within the education system (which is indistinct

205

from religion in this regard). The promotion of nationalism in the education system is also tied to Israel's wish to maintain its military power, as one of the goals of the education system is to encourage pupils to comply with the mandatory military service, and volunteer for combat duty when possible (Cohen, 2017; Lemish, 2003).

These competing goals of engaging with the global while keeping the local intact are clearly manifested in the education system. They limit the extent to which teachers and pupils feel global citizenship is relevant to them while disconnecting phenomena commonly associated with GCE (student trips abroad) from the purpose they are *assumed* to serve in other national settings. This effect is not uniform, as I have shown, and manifests in distinct ways across populations throughout the Israeli context in relation to different factors. The nationalism in the education system was addressed in the literature review, where I suggested how it might impact GCE based on how it has previously been shown to shape processes of internationalisation. However, in this section, I address the manifestations of this local/global tension in each of my finding chapters with relation to teacher and pupil perceptions of GCE and the MOE and MFA course for pupils embarking on trips abroad.

Chapter 6 sheds the most light on the tensions I have identified as emblematic of the Israeli context. By examining the course designed to prepare pupils intending to visit abroad produced by the MOE and MFA as a specific case, I have been able to directly examine how the global/local tension is displayed and dealt with by these state ministries. The analysis of the course is supplemented by news excerpts that echo the messages promoted through the course to show that although the tension emanates from the government, it is widely disseminated through other spheres as well. The analysis of the course and the news excerpts not only provides examples of the way the national overshadows the global - thus disconnecting student trips abroad from GC - but also speaks to a broader process through which the global and the individual are both subsumed by the national in Israel. As such, I further argue that the Israeli context produces manifestations of GCE (at the institutional/policy/curricular levels) that align with national goals, while rejecting manifestations that could undermine those goals.

One example of this is that the mandatory course constructs pupils as representatives and ambassadors of the state, thus ignoring any opinions, dispositions, and views they may hold that do not align with those of the state. It also nationalises any international relationships pupils may have or create, by calling on pupils to view people outside of Israel through a narrow prism of

what these relationships mean on the national level, and how they can be used to further the national goals and narratives. As a result of these processes, pupils are discouraged from being critical towards the state, and encouraged to learn about other cultures only to the extent that is relevant in representing/promoting Israel.

The course and the news excerpts include many assumptions regarding negative portrayals of Israel in foreign countries by the media and by organisations that oppose Israeli policy as it relates to the occupation. As I demonstrated, this reflects some pupils' and teachers' views of Israel's status in relation to the world. Most forms of GCE have an inherent assumption that the world is interconnected and there are some universal values that can be attributed to global citizens (Davies, 2006), but the course reflects a separatist view that disconnects Israel from this global polity.

As I have noted, the course I analysed was chosen as a single case that reflects a broader discourse through which the national subsumes both the global and the individual - but the effects of this discourse are not uniform throughout the nation, as is shown in the focus groups with pupils, for example. As noted earlier, the disconnect of Israel from the global polity by highlighting critiques against it and by conflating anti-Semitism with critiques against Israeli policy, was echoed much more often by pupils in VC, who felt 'farther away' from the global and seemed to internalise this discourse in a more meaningful manner than pupils in TLV. Pupils in TLV, perhaps as a result of their teachers' and families' political stances as well as their residence in a global city and exposure to global influences, did not align themselves completely with the state. Furthermore, they were more discerning when speaking about Israeli policies or critiques against it, in that they were less likely to use 'we' or 'us' in reference to Israel or all Israelis.

The teachers I interviewed from the different sectors and the different cities all worked within this supposedly unified system that is in constant tension between nationalism and globalisation, and shows tendencies of subsuming the global and individual to the national. However, the Israeli context shaped different perceptions and practices associated with GCE across the different groups of teachers as it did with pupils. These differences can be attributed to where teachers positioned themselves and their pupils within the Israeli context.

Teachers from the Arab-Palestinian sector felt excluded by the national curriculum and the Jewish narrative it promotes - as a result, they felt GCE could be a good alternative to the

model of citizenship currently instilled, but realistically they recognised that it would go against the national system's goals of maintaining their subordination (Abu-Saad, 2004). As such, they did not address the tensions between the national and global in the education system but instead saw the education system as an obstacle between themselves, their pupils and the global. These teachers spoke of a careful balance in the classroom where they felt they had to mediate both their pupils' global exposure through online platforms and the education system's requirements that often seemed irrelevant.

Teachers from the state-religious sector conflated nationalism with Judaism, and expressed the tension in the Israeli context in a manner that is somewhat similar to the way I described it earlier in this section - with the national being perceived as much more important. However, their view of the global had two aspects - the Jewish diaspora, viewed positively, and the rest of the world and its influences, viewed mostly negatively. Some teachers in this sector acknowledged the need for the English language to be learned in schools for example, but all opposed anything they felt could negatively impact pupils' strong connection to Israel and consequently, Judaism. In this sector, specific examples from the MFA and MOE course that relate more to the global sphere (such as points of discussion for representing the nation abroad and counterarguments for critiques against Israel), could seem irrelevant or even problematic if presented to teachers. These teachers feel pupils should not be encouraged to highlight how they are similar to others, but rather emphasise and enforce their difference, and in some cases even their superiority as some of the interviewees suggested. This suggests that this sector engenders a very limited notion of GCE, that is more relevant to those outside Israel - both Jewish (who should view themselves as part of a Jewish community and aspire to immigrate to Israel) and non-Jewish (who should be taught to be tolerant and respectful of Judaism specifically).

Finally, teachers from the secular state sector, both in the sectorial comparison and the regional one, expressed more varied approaches. Some, particularly in VC, acknowledged the tensions but felt comfortable with the nationalist nature of the system, which prepares their pupils for military service, the final point of pupils' lives that most teachers seemed to think about. They acknowledged that Israel is part of a global economy, and internalised the notion that Israelis and their pupils specifically may be barred from engaging with 'the global' because of the controversial way the state is portrayed in foreign countries, anti-Semitism, and other reasons. As such, they did not feel it is widely important for them to prepare pupils for global

futures, and the forms of GCE they acknowledged were limited formal school subjects necessary for participating in a local but globalised environment.

Conversely, teachers in TLV and others in central cities, while aware of the tensions, seemed more inclined to see their pupils and themselves as global subjects that the education system was constricting, somewhat similar to the Arab Palestinians. They acknowledged (although some rejected) the nationalism promoted by the education system and described conscious efforts to navigate the competing aims it embodies. The teachers in TLV especially seemed to prefer to highlight similarities between their city and other global cities, and this can be demonstrated through their practices of discussing global issues with their pupils while relating them to issues within Israel.

Pupils in VC and in TLV did not address the nationalistic tendencies of the education system directly; however, their comments regarding the PISA global competence items demonstrate how these tendencies effectively shape how they perceive their place in relation to global society, particularly in the periphery – as noted in response to RQ1.

7.2 Contributions to the Literature, Theory, Practice and Policy

As outlined in the introductory chapter, this thesis contributes to our knowledge of GCE and several ongoing debates in the fields it touches on, by illuminating a broad variety of factors that shape how GCE is manifested, perceived, and enacted in different settings, that have not previously been explored. With regard to the literature, I have demonstrated notable departures between how GCE is understood and manifested in the Israeli context, and the 'ideal types' I presented throughout the literature review, thus highlighting the importance of adopting more complex typologies, or understanding typologies as fluid, incomplete, and evolving, while rejecting the universality of definitions suggested by GEOs (as I did in Chapter 6).

My data departs from some of the main categorisation of GCE most often cited in the literature, and presents some lacunas that cannot be addressed using them. For example, dichotomous categorisations of GCE such as that suggested by Dill (2013) who referred to global consciousness and global competence, fail to capture many of the nuances expressed in my thesis. Teachers in VC and TLV for example all spoke mostly about skills that would be associated with global competence, but had a different understanding of what those skills were and for what type of future (mobile or globalised-local) they were preparing pupils. A similar

issue could arise if I were to use Andreotti's (2006) soft versus critical approach to GCE. Andreotti equated soft GCE with learning about the world and critical GCE with learning to identify and engage with inequalities, power structures, and biases; however, the reasons expressed by Arab-Palestinian teachers for wanting to provide their pupils with an alternative model of belonging cannot be captured by this model.

Oxley and Morris's (2013) model is more complex and thus can be useful in explaining more of the different approaches to GCE detailed in this thesis. For example, on the one hand, the notions of GCE that teachers and pupils from the centre expressed correspond with most of the categories suggested by their model (ibid); cosmopolitan (political, moral, economic and cultural) and advocacy modes (social, environmental, and critical) could be identified in the data. On the other hand, in VC, only cosmopolitan types were demonstrated, particularly economic and cultural. In the interviews with teachers from the state-religious and Arab-Palestinian sectors, notions were more connected to the religious category of advocacy-based GCE, as teachers I spoke with expressed notions that suggested a common religious background could act as a platform for GCE. The MOE and MFA course for pupils reflected only cosmopolitan types of GC, specifically political, economic, and cultural. However, while this model is clearly able to identify more of the manifestations of GCE than the previous models I mentioned, it does not (nor does it presume to) provide an explanatory framework for the characteristics of the population nor the setting that each of these forms is a product of. This also relates to the meta-review produced by Pashby and her colleagues (2020) which was introduced in Chapter 2. As noted there, although they integrated the nine most used typologies of GCE to highlight patterns, conflated terms, and absences, the overarching cartography they produced was neither meant to be prescriptive, nor did it delve into the settings in which each typology was produced. As such, although similarities could be drawn between the types of GCE that emerged in my study and those identified by Pashby and her colleagues, the integrated model/cartography they produced does not explain *why* certain types of GCE are absent or abundant in the different contexts I explored.

As such, the main novelty of the thesis lies in suggesting peripherality/centrality as a framework/perspective that can contribute to a better understanding of differential perceptions of GCE, while taking into account both the settings from which they emerged and the goals they aim to achieve. I have shown throughout the thesis that empirical literature shows a tendency to

over-simplify context, particularly as it relates to GCE (Chapters 1 and 2); that notions of peripherality/centrality at both the social and geographic levels can shed light on some different notions of GCE and their aims (Chapters 4 and 5); that some of Israel's features such as the controversial nature of its policies related to the conflict and the occupation and its efforts to get closer to the West while maintaining its national identity are characteristic of a semi-periphery (Chapters 1 and 6); and that in turn, this semi-peripherality engenders a particularistic type of GCE that is subsumed to the national goals so as to not threaten the nation (Chapters 6 and 7).

This contribution relates to theory as well as policy first and foremost in relation to GCE but also beyond this concept. Examining notions or policy manifestations of GCE while taking into account national and sub-national notions of peripherality, centrality, and semi-peripherality will enable scholars to take into account a wider variety of factors when defining the focus of their study; this can contribute to better understanding the applicability of findings, as well as gain clearer understandings of how manifestations, perceptions and purposes of GCE are shaped by the way nations and communities within them perceive themselves in relation to the world. This is also relevant for GCE policy initiatives; as I have shown, definitions of GCE proposed by GEOs have inherent assumptions that may preclude some nations from taking part in certain initiatives. However, national policymakers are better placed to adapt these definitions and initiatives to localnational and sub-national settings. I argue that notions of peripherality could play a role in identifying the factors that would need to be adapted and the ways to adapt them for different settings.

In broader terms this layered approach to peripherality also ties into critiques of methodological nationalism that call on scholars, particularly in the field of comparative education, to look both beyond the nation, rather than looking at the nation as the main unit of analysis (Beck, 2000; Dale & Robertson, 2008). The concept of national semi-periphery has not yet been examined comparatively with respect to education, and I argue that it could play a role in identifying characteristics that may distinguish education systems and phenomena in semi-peripheries from other nations, and that the global North/South and East/West dichotomous models often adopted, could cause these characteristics to be overlooked. As mentioned in chapter 1, critiques of methodological nationalism also prompt scholars to look inward, and although differences related to educational environments and opportunities afforded to pupils

have been explored both in terms of social and geographic periphery, the intersection between these and the national semi-periphery have neither been adequately addressed nor explored.

As it relates to policy, both on a global, national, and sub-national scale, inadequate attention to distinct national and sub-national characteristics, has been the focus of many critiques related to processes of policy borrowing and transfer (e.g., Burdett & O'Donnell, 2016; Mohammed & Morris, 2019; Lingard, 2010). These critiques usually address national differences in terms of education, structure, funding, or culture. The unified framework of peripherality I am suggesting could potentially be useful in identifying intersections or clashes between the global, national, and local spheres that may be crucial in the adaptation of policies for different populations.

Finally, one of my aims throughout this thesis has been to contribute to the development of more contextually informed understandings of what GCE means to different populations and how globalisation manifests and shapes pupils' lives differently. I sought to explore differences in how pupils from different backgrounds relate to GCE and the types of opportunities and means for engagement they are exposed to in different places of residence. This aim has been achieved through the findings I presented and the framework I suggested for improving these understandings. However, while I have shown the different opportunities and means for global engagement, the contribution of this study to practice lies in highlighting the implications of these discrepancies by bringing them to the attention of practitioners and teacher education programmes.

As demonstrated in Chapter 4, I identified differences between pupils' reported experiences and those imagined by their teachers. Specifically, teachers assumed that pupils were meaningfully engaged with 'the global' through social media and online platforms, whereas pupils dismissed this notion. I also identified differences between how teachers in the periphery and in the centre perceived their pupils imagined futures, and showed that while in the centre teachers appeared to have elaborate thoughts about what these futures might entail and these thoughts shaped their practices, this was much less common in the periphery, where teachers were more inclined to only consider pupils' immediate future after graduation (military service).

These discrepancies both between centre and periphery and between pupils' actual experiences and what their teachers imagine, could deepen social inequalities if left unaddressed - as a result of the effect of teacher expectations on pupil performance (Rubie-Davies, 2006;

Sorhagen, 2013). As such, I suggest teacher education programmes should promote teachers' awareness to their pupils' futures, and emphasise teachers' transformative powers and agency in influencing as well as empowering pupils, in relation to global citizenship and beyond.

Over the last two years I have developed and taught a course entitled 'Local Manifestations of Global Education Phenomena' as part of a teacher education programme at Seminar Hakibbutzim College in Israel; in this course I highlight some of these findings and discuss their implications with my students. I have found that teachers are highly receptive to hearing about issues that demonstrate the effect they can have on pupils' futures and feel empowered by being told that by making conscious efforts to expose pupils to the world, even if it does not seem immediately relevant to their everyday lives, they can encourage them to think beyond their immediate environment.

Finally, my thesis has implications for the endeavour of standardising and measuring GCE using global competence as a supposedly uniform, quantifiable and operationalised construct. The implications pertaining specifically to the PISA measures were discussed at length in Chapter 5, and can be summarised through two main points: (1) although the OECD claimed that values were beyond the scope of the measurement, this would be impossible to achieve, as different terms and concepts can be considered value-laden or politically sensitive in different settings. This leads to the second implication, (2) that the GC measure included many constructs that have different meanings not only in different national contexts, but also within these contexts, in different areas, schools, and among pupils belonging to different populations. These points undermine the validity of the measure itself. However, the implications are broader if we consider how these points could apply to the measurement of any 'soft skills' or factors related to well-being and school climate across different settings.

Different expectations of and by pupils, cultural characteristics, socio-political aspects and the population of schools could all shape the semantic meaning associated with terms that have been or are currently being measured by PISA (i.e., well-being, life-meaning, creativity, financial literacy and others), and those the OECD plans on measuring in the future (i.e., 21st-century skills in 2022). My grounded critique of the GC measure calls all of these constructs into question, as it shows that the data produced through questions that are interpreted differently by pupils in various settings is unreliable at best. The test, which was developed by core OECD

213

nations, clearly does not incorporate the realities in the semi-peripheral state of Israel, but it also neglects to account for differences in the lived experiences of students within these core nations.

7.3 Limitations

Some limitations related and inherent to this thesis pertaining to its scope, applicability and selection of data sources and participants were outlined in Chapter 3. Here I address broader limitations that pertain to the questions the research is unable to answer, as well as issues of positionality that arose during the final stages of the thesis.

Throughout the thesis, I have tried to recognise my positionality in a reflexive manner, both as an insider in Israeli society, and as an outsider to some of the sectors and settings I collected data in. However, beyond my formal status as a female Ashkenazi Jewish secular citizen of Israel studying in a UK university, throughout the data collection and analysis, I developed an acute awareness of the fact that there are experiential aspects related to positionality that I neglected to properly take into account, when acknowledging the methodological limitations of the research.

These are particularly embedded in the fact that I am not a product of the Israeli education system, because I studied in the US for most of my secondary schooling. This means that while my formal positional attributes shaped the access I was able to acquire to participants (either facilitating or making recruitment more difficult), my experiences preclude me from capturing or fully understanding some aspects of the data. What I mean by this, is that some aspects of my background preclude me from fully understanding some of the data I collected, even within the setting in which I am considered 'an insider' (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009; Merriam et al., 2001). For example, there are longstanding effects of experiences by Israelis, including secondary PTSD from the second Intifada (Palestinian uprising) (Ben-Zur et al., 2012) which happened between 1987-1993, while I was abroad. Furthermore, I do not personally know anyone who has died in a terrorist attack or Israeli war, and have had no first-hand experiences of anti-Semitism abroad. The lack of these experiences is a privilege, but it is important to acknowledge that many of the formative collective memories and experiences that are assumed to unite many Israeli Jews are not part of my own identity, and thus could preclude me from fully capturing some meaning, while making me overly critical of parts of the discourse I analyse in this thesis.

Furthermore, it is important to note that the framework of compounding notions of peripherality I have laid out here is quite preliminary and by no means provides a causal explanation for the findings. It is a combination of concepts that I came across during the research process, which I found helpful in organising and illuminating some aspects of the data. While I do suggest it might be helpful to others embarking on research in the field to take this prismatic view of peripherality into account, it should be applied carefully, with respect to cultural, historical, and political characteristics of each setting.

Finally, there are several notable questions that this thesis cannot answer, and I do not presume to be able to answer. I do not know how GCE can or should be adapted to better fit a wide range of populations within a divided society, as the scope of my thesis is small, and its aim was to point to issues that prevent a unified framework from being appropriate. Furthermore, in this thesis, while drawing on some interviews with Arab-Palestinian teachers and addressing the lack of belonging they describe, I neither make concrete suggestions nor offer social-justice based transformative or emancipatory models for GCE that could be relevant for this population. These policy suggestions are beyond the scope of the thesis and are also beyond my scope as a researcher. I feel that while my position enables me to identify and highlight these issues, it would not be appropriate for me to presume that I have gained a deep enough understanding of the struggle and constraints to properly identify what should be done.

Another limitation is that I neither spoke to policymakers directly nor did I look for manifestations of concepts related to GCE throughout the education system, and as a result, cannot analyse how the concept is constructed by these actors or in curricula. Instead, I chose to focus on a single phenomenon that is often associated with GCE in scholarship and use it to demonstrate how the socio-political context shapes it, and infer how it might shape other associated phenomena and concepts as well. This means that other concepts related to GCE could be elaborately addressed in ways that transcend the socio-political factors I have pointed to, but my literature review suggests this is unlikely. Lastly, I asked teachers how they perceive the MOEs approach or position towards GCE, but these accounts cannot be taken as representative of the Ministry, and need to be framed as secondary interpretations by particular teachers, each within their own position and limited knowledge.

7.4 Future Research Trajectories

In this thesis, I explored in depth how GCE is constructed and interpreted by different actors in diverse settings within the Israeli education system - but I believe there is much more to be said about this issue within and beyond the Israeli context. As GEOs continue to promote GCE as a central concept/policy/curricular component, particularly throughout the remaining term of the SDGs (2030), it will be interesting to examine the way different nations contend with this framework, what adaptations they make, and how these can be explained by socio-political factors in different contexts across and within nations.

In a similar vein, the OECD's framework for assessing 21st Century Skills will be presented to pupils in 2022, inviting scholars to explore how pupils and other actors understand this tool, what assumptions it encases, and what changes will be made to adapt it for different national settings. Another interesting side of this would be which nations opt-in and out of this measurement, and whether these decisions speak more to those nations or to the OECD's hegemonic role. A comparison between the frameworks for defining and measuring GCE and 21st-century skills could also be telling, because they could flesh out similarities and differences in the balance between humanitarian and neoliberal discourses adopted for the GC framework.

The framework of compounding notions of peripherality I have outlined throughout this thesis and in this final chapter suggests many trajectories for future research as well – which will also be dependent on different contexts. For example, an exploration of the characteristics of education systems in semi-peripheries, in search of commonalities and differences could prove fascinating, as could any research that looks comparatively at how global education concepts are perceived by audiences with different intersectionalities of periphery and centre.

7.5 Concluding Remarks: Avoiding a Nihilistic Ending

Although it inevitably sometimes reads as such. this thesis should not be read as an obituary for the ideals of global citizenship, or a dismissal of the role education can and should play in preparing pupils for the challenges faced by global society (many of which are also evident and relevant in local societies), or for opportunities for mobility, employment, and education presented by globalisation. I recognise that these challenges have been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, which led to the erection and closing of borders and a rise in xenophobia and racism – which can be addressed and mitigated through some types of GCE. In the light of my findings, I would call upon scholars, policymakers and practitioners to reject narrow, static

definitions of these concepts that limit them to practices and themes with which they are most often associated. Instead, I have contributed to an understanding of the distinct ways globalisation impacts and interacts with people and pupils in particular in their everyday lives, and to a recognition of these interactions and practices as their own forms of global citizenship. As such, although I am rejecting efforts to delimit GCE for the sake of measurement, assessment and ease of comparison, I feel the need to clarify that I am in favour of human rights and object to industry induced environmental damages and the expansion of inequalities. However, I strongly believe that those holding different understandings or definitions of what these mean should neither be excluded from the global collective nor penalised by GEOs. Throughout this thesis, I have made a case for showing more awareness of the diversity of perspectives and experiences that should be taken into consideration, which I see as a step towards better policies and more nuanced goals that I hope can contribute to addressing these issues in a less divisive and exclusive manner.

References

Adams, R. J. (2003) Response to 'Cautions on OECD's recent educational survey (PISA)'. *Oxford Review of Education, 29*(3), 377–389.

Addey, C., Sellar, S., Steiner-Khamsi, G., Lingard, B., & Verger, A. (2017). The rise of international large-scale assessments and rationales for participation. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *47*(3), 434-452.

Agbaria A.K. (2016) Ethno-national politics of citizenship education in Israel and the counter-knowledge of Palestinian teachers. In J. A. Banks, M. Suárez-Orozco, & M. Ben-Peretz (Eds.), *Global migration, diversity, and civic education: Improving policy and practice* (pp.156–176). Columbia University Teachers College Press.

Agbaria, A. K., Mustafa, M., & Jabareen, Y. T. (2015). 'In your face' democracy: education for belonging and its challenges in Israel. *British Educational Research Journal*, *41*(1), 143-175.

Ahmed, S. (2006). Doing diversity work in higher education in Australia. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *38*(6), 745-768.

Aiken-Klar, E. J. (2009). The fear factor: Assimilation, antisemitism and the relationship between Zionism and Jewish diasporic identity. *Vis-à-vis: Explorations in Anthropology*, *9*(1).

Aikens, N. L., & Barbarin, O. (2008). Socioeconomic differences in reading trajectories: The contribution of family, neighborhood, and school contexts. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *100*(2), 235.

Albrow, M. (1997). *The Global Age*. Polity.

Al-Haj, M. (2005). National ethos, multicultural education, and the new history textbooks in Israel. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *35*(1), 47-71.

Allan, A., & Charles, C. (2015). Preparing for life in the global village: Producing global citizen subjects in UK schools. *Research Papers in Education*, *30*, 25–43.

Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Development Education Policy and Practice*, *3,* 83-98

Angrosino, M. (2007). *Doing ethnographic and observational research*. Sage.

Antonsich, M. (2010). Searching for belonging–an analytical framework. *Geography Compass*, *4*(6), 644-659.

Aouragh, M. (2016). Hasbara 2.0: Israel's public diplomacy in the digital age. *Middle East Critique*, *25*(3), 271-297.

Arnold, M. L., Newman, J. H., Gaddy, B. B., & Dean, C. B. (2005). A look at the condition of rural education research: Setting a direction for future research. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, *20*(6), 1-25.

Attias, S. (2012). Israel's new peer-to-peer diplomacy. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, *7*(4), 473-482.

Auld, E., & Morris, P. (2014). Comparative education, the 'New Paradigm' and policy borrowing: Constructing knowledge for educational reform. *Comparative Education*, *50*(2), 129-155.

Auld, E., & Morris, P. (2016). PISA, policy and persuasion: Translating complex conditions into education 'best practice'. *Comparative Education*, *52*(2), 202-229.

Auld, E., & Morris, P. (2019). Science by streetlight and the OECD's measure of global competence: A new yardstick for internationalisation?. *Policy Futures in Education*, *17*(6), 677-698.

Auld, E., Rappleye, J., & Morris, P. (2019). PISA for Development: how the OECD and World Bank shaped education governance post-2015. *Comparative Education*, *55*(2), 197-219.

Ayalon, H., Grodsky, E., Gamoran, A., & Yogev, A. (2008). Diversification and inequality in higher education: a comparison of Israel and the United States. *Sociology of Education*, *81*(3), 211-241.

Ayhan, K. J. (2018). The boundaries of public diplomacy and nonstate actors: A taxonomy of perspectives. *International Studies Perspectives*, *20*(1), 63-83.

Bagnoli, A., & Clark, A. (2010). Focus groups with young people: A participatory approach to research planning. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *13*(1), 101-119.

Baildon, M., & Alviar-Martin, T. (2020). Taming cosmopolitanism: The limits of national and neoliberal civic education in two global cities. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *40*(1), 98-111.

Balarin, M. (2014). The changing governance of education: A comparative political economy perspective on hybridity. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *58*(11), 1446-1463.

Ball, S. J., Macrae, S., & Maguire, M. E. G. (1999). Young lives, diverse choices and imagined futures in an education and training market. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *3*(3), 195-224.

Bamber, P., Bullivant, A., Clark, A., & Lundie, D. (2018). Educating Global Britain: Perils and possibilities promoting 'national' values through critical global citizenship education. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *66*(4), 433-453.

Bamberger, A., Bronshtein, Y., & Yemini, M. (2020). Marketing universities and targeting international students: a comparative analysis of social media data trails. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *25*(4), 476-492.

Bamberger, A., Morris, P., Weinreb, Y., & Yemini, M. (2019). Hyperpoliticised internationalisation in a pariah university: An Israeli institution in the occupied West Bank. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *66*, 119-128.

Band, M. (2005). *Religiosity, coping and suicidality within the religious Zionist community of Israel*. London University.

Banks, J.A. (2004). Teaching for social justice diversity, and citizenship in a global world. *The Educational Forum*, *68*(4): 295–305.

Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity and citizenship education in global times. In J. Arthur, I. Davies, & C. Hahn (Eds.), *Sage handbook of education for citizenship and democracy* (pp. 80-91). Sage.

Banks, J. A. (2017). Failed citizenship and transformative civic education. *Educational Researcher*, *46*(7), 366-377.

Bar-Tal, D. (1998). Societal beliefs in times of intractable conflict: The Israeli case. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 9*(1), 22-50.

Bartelson, J. (2000). Three concepts of globalization. *International Sociology*, *15*(2), 180-196.

Beck, U. (2007). The cosmopolitan condition: Why methodological nationalism fails. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *24*(7-8), 286-290.

Beck, U., & Lau, C. (2005). Second modernity as a research agenda: Theoretical and empirical explorations in the 'meta-change' of modern society. *The British Journal of Sociology*, *56*(4), 525-557.

Beck, U. (2002). Zombie categories: Interview with Ulrich Beck. In U. Beck & E. Beck-Gernsheim (Eds.), *Individualisation*. Sage.

Beech, J. (2009). Policy spaces, mobile discourses, and the definition of educated identities. *Comparative Education 45*(1), 347–65.

Beech, J., Koh, A., Maxwell, C., Yemini, M., Tucker, K., & Barrenechea, I. (2021). 'Cosmopolitan start-up' capital: mobility and school choices of global middle-class parents. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, (ahead of print).

Bekerman, Z., & Zembylas, M. (2016). Identity negotiations in conflict-ridden societies: historical and anthropological perspectives. *Paedagogica Historica*, *52*(1-2), 201-218.

Benavot, A., & Resh, N. (2003). Educational governance, school autonomy, and curriculum implementation: A comparative study of Arab and Jewish schools in Israel. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *35*(2), 171-196.

Ben-Zur, H., Gil, S., & Shamshins, Y. (2012). The relationship between exposure to terror through the media, coping strategies and resources, and distress and secondary traumatization. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *19*(2), 132.

Bickel, B., Shin, J. K., Taylor, J., Faust, H., & Penniston, T. (2013). Learning English internationally while engaging communities locally: Online EFL supporting community learning for young leaders. *TESOL Journal*, *4*, 439–462.

Blagojevich, M. (2009). *Knowledge production at the semiperiphery: A gender perspective*. Institute of Criminological and Sociological Research.

Blagojevich, M. (2010). Non- "White" whites, non-European Europeans, and gendered noncitizens: On a possible epistemic strategy from the semiperiphery of Europe. In B. Young & C. Scherrer (Eds.), Gender knowledge and knowledge networks in international political economy (pp. 183–198). Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.

Bogardus, E. S. (1960). Trends in social distance in American life. *Social Science*, *35*(1), 10-16.

Bok, S. (2002). *Common values*. University of Missouri Press.

Bondy, J. & Johnson, A. (2018). Race, national exclusions, and the implications for global citizenship. In I. Davies, L. C. Ho, D. Kiwan, C. Peck, A. Peterson, E. Sant, & Y. Waghid (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of global citizenship and education* (pp. 393-407). Palgrave Macmillan.

Bosio, E., & Torres, C. A. (2019). Global citizenship education: An educational theory of the common good? A conversation with Carlos Alberto Torres. *Policy Futures in Education*, *17*(6), 745-760.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In A. Coulon, & J. G. Richardson (Eds.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). Greenwood.

Bourn, D. (2005). Education for sustainable development and global citizenship—The UK perspective. *Applied Environmental Education and Communication*, *4*(3), 233-237.

Bourn, D. (2010). Students as global citizens. In E. Jones (Ed.), *Internationalization and the student voice* (pp. 18–29). Routledge

Bourn, D. (2020). The emergence of global education as a distinctive pedagogical field. In Douglas Bourn (Ed.), *Bloomsbury handbook for global education and learning* (pp. 11–23). UK: Bloomsbury

Bourn, D., Hunt, F. & Bamber, P. (2017). *A review of education for sustainable development and global citizenship education in teacher education*. UNESCO.

Bowden, B. (2003). The perils of global citizenship. *Citizenship Studies* 7(3), 349-362.

Bradbery, D. (2013). Bridges to global citizenship: Ecologically sustainable futures utilising children's literature in teacher education. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, *29*(2), 221-237.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Braun, V., & V. Clarke. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. Sage.

Bray, M. (2017). Schooling and its supplements: Changing global patterns and implications for comparative education. *Comparative Education Review*, *61*(3), 469-491.

Bray, M., & Thomas, R. M. (1995). Levels of comparison in educational studies: Different insights from different literatures and the value of multilevel analyses. *Harvard Educational Review*, *65*, 472–490.

Bray, M., Adamson, B. & Mason, M. (2007). *Comparative education research: Approaches and methods.* Comparative Education Research Centre (CERC).

Brenner, N. (2003). *New state spaces: Urban governance and the rescaling of the state*. Oxford University Press.

Brewer, J. D. (2000). *Ethnography*. Open UP.

Bromley, P. (2009). Cosmopolitanism in civic education: Exploring cross-national trends, 1970-2008. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, *12*, 33–44.

Brooks, R., Waters, J., & Pimlott-Wilson, H. (2012). International education and the employability of UK students. *British Educational Research Journal*, *38*(2), 281-298.

Brooks, R. M., & Waters, J. L. (2015). The hidden internationalism of elite English schools. *Sociology, 49*, 212–228.

Brown, P., & Tannock, S. (2009). Education, meritocracy and the global war for talent. *Journal of Education Policy*, *24*(4), 377-392.

Brunold-Conesa, C. (2010). International education: The International Baccalaureate, Montessori and global citizenship. *Journal of Research in International Education, 9*, 259-272.

Burdett, N., & O'Donnell, S. (2016). Lost in translation? The challenges of educational policy borrowing. *Educational Research*, *58*(2), 113–120

Byram, M., & Feng, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Living and studying abroad: Research and practice*. Multilingual Matters

Caldeira, T. (1999). Fortified enclaves: The new urban segregation. In J. Holston (Ed.), *Cities and citizenship* (pp 114-138). Duke University Press

Carmody, P. (2002). Between globalisation and (post) apartheid: The political economy of restructuring in South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, *28*(2), 255-275.

Carr, P. R., Pluim, G., & Howard, L. (2014). Linking global citizenship education and education for democracy through social justice: What can we learn from the perspectives of teacher-education candidates. *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education*, *4*, 1–21.

Carter, T. (2005). The influence of immigration on global city housing markets: The Canadian perspective. *Urban Policy and Research*, *23*(3), 265-286.

Caruana, V. (2014). Re-thinking global citizenship in higher education: From cosmopolitanism and international mobility to cosmopolitanisation, resilience and resilient thinking. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *68*(1), 85-104.

Castells, M. (2010). Globalisation, networking, urbanisation: Reflections on the spatial dynamics of the information age. *Urban Studies*, *47*(13), 2737-2745.

Castro, M., Exposito-Casas, E., Lopez-Martin, E., Lizasoain, L., Navarro-Asencio, E., & Luis Gaviria, J. (2015). Parental involvement on student academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, *14*, 33–46.

Çayır, K. (2015). Citizenship, nationality and minorities in Turkey's textbooks: from politics of non-recognition to 'difference multiculturalism'. *Comparative Education*, *51*(4), 519-536.

Cha, Y. K., & Ham, S. H. (2011). Educating supranational citizens: The incorporation of English language education into curriculum policies. *American Journal of Education*, *117*, 183–209.

Chandir, H. (2020). Student responses on the survey of global competence in PISA 2018. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 1-17.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative research*. Sage.

Chirot, D., & Hall, T. D. (1982). World-system theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *8*(1), 81-106.

Cho, H. S., & Mosselson, J. (2018). Neoliberal practices amidst social justice orientations: global citizenship education in South Korea. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *48*(6), 861-878.

Choi, S., Slaubaugh, M., & Kim, A. S. (2012). International exchange as a transformative learning experience: A case study. *International Journal of Educational Reform, 21*(3), 160-172.

Choi, Y., & Kim, Y. (2020). Deconstructing neoliberalism in global citizenship discourses: An analysis of Korean social studies textbooks. *Critical Studies in Education*, *61*(4), 464-479.

Chung, B. G., & Park, I. (2016). A review of the differences between ESD and GCED in SDGs: Focusing on the concepts of global citizenship education. *Journal of international Cooperation in Education*, *18*(2), 17-35.

Cohen, A. (2017). Between teachers' perceptions and civic conceptions: Lessons from three Israeli civics teachers. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *49*(4), 542-560.

Cohen, A. (2019). From ideological tensions to pedagogical solutions: Narratives of Israeli Arab-Palestinian civics teachers. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *68*, 96-104.

Cohen, A. (2019b). Israel's civic education wars: A review of the literature and theoretical implications. *Educational Review*, *71*(3), 287-305.

Cohen, N., & Margalit, T. (2015). 'There are really two cities here': Fragmented urban citizenship in Tel Aviv. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *39*(4), 666-686.

Cohen, S. M., & Liebman, C. S. (2000). Israel and American Jewry in the twenty-first century. In A. Gal & A. Gottschalk (Eds.), *Beyond survival and philanthropy: American Jewry and Israel* (pp. 3-24). HUC Press.

Cowen, R. (2014). Comparative education: stones, silences, and siren songs. *Comparative Education*, *50*(1), 3-14.

Cowen, R., & Kazamias, A. M. (Eds.). (2009). *International handbook of comparative education* (Vol. 22). Springer Science & Business Media.

Creswell, J.W. (2003) *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd edition). Sage.

Crossley, M. (2009). Rethinking context in comparative education. In R. Cowen, & K. Kazamias (Eds.), *International handbook of comparative education.* Springer.

Cushner, K., & Chang, S. C. (2015). Developing intercultural competence through overseas student teaching: Checking our assumptions. *Intercultural Education, 26*(3), 165-178.

Dale, I. R. (2003). Globalisation and the rescaling of educational governance: A case of sociological ectopia. In C. A. Torres & A. Teodoro (Eds.) *Critique and utopia: New developments in the sociology of education in the twenty-first century* (pp. 25-42). Rowman and Littlefield.

Davies, I., Evans, M., & Reid, A. (2005). Globalising citizenship education? A critique of 'global education' and 'citizenship education'. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *53*(1), 66-89.

Davies, I., Li-Ching, H., Dina Kiwan, C. L., Peck, A. P., Sant, E., & Waghid, Y. (Eds.) (2018). *The Palgrave handbook of global citizenship and education.* Palgrave MacMillan.

Davies, L. (2006). Global citizenship: Abstraction or framework for action? *Educational Review, 58*(1), 5–25.

Davies, L. (2008) Interruptive democracy in education. In: J. Zajda, L. Davies, & S. Majhanovich (Eds.), *Comparative and global pedagogies: Globalization, comparative education and policy research* (pp. 15-31). Springer.

De Oliveira Andreotti, V., Biesta, G., & Ahenakew, C. (2014). Between the nation and the globe: Education for global mindedness in Finland. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *13*(2), 246-259.

De Oliviera-Andreotti, V., & de Souza, L. M. (2012). *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education*. London: Routledge

De Wit, H. (2011). Globalisation and internationalisation of higher education. *Rusc*, *8*(2), 241–247.

de Wit, H., & Hunter, F. (2015). The future of internationalization of higher education in Europe. *International Higher Education*, *83*, 2–3.

Deardorff, D.K. (2006). Assessing intercultural competence in study abroad students. In M. Bryam & A. Feng (Eds*.), Living and studying abroad: Research and practice* (pp. 232–256). Multilingual Matters.

Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10,* 241-266.

Deardorff, D. K., & van Gaalen, A. (2012). Outcomes assessment in the internationalization of higher education. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.)*, The Sage handbook of international higher education* (pp. 167-187). Sage.

Di Pietro, G. (2015). Do study abroad programs enhance the employability of graduates? *Education Finance and Policy*, *10*(2), 223-243.

Dill, J. S. (2013). *The longings and limits of global citizenship education: The moral pedagogy of schooling in a cosmopolitan age*. Routledge.

Dobson, A. (2003). *Citizenship and the environment*. Oxford University Press.

Doherty, C., Mu, L., & Shield, P. (2009). Planning mobile futures: the border artistry of International Baccalaureate Diploma choosers. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *30*(6), 757-771.

Dohn, N. B. (2007). Knowledge and skills for PISA—Assessing the assessment. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *41*(1), 1-16.

Donnell, K. (2007). Getting to we: Developing a transformative urban teaching practice. *Urban Education*, *42*(3), 223-249.

Dower, N. (2003) An introduction to global citizenship. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Dumper, M. (2019). The US embassy move to Jerusalem: Mixed messages and mixed blessings for Israel?. *Review of Middle East Studies*, *53*(1), 34-45.

Dvir, Y., Maxwell, C., & Yemini, M. (2019). "Glocalisation" doctrine in the Israeli Public Education System: A contextual analysis of a policy-making process. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *27*(24), 1-24.

Dwyer, S. C., & Buckle, J. L. (2009). The space between: On being an insider-outsider in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *8*(1), 54-63.

Dyrness, A. (2021). Rethinking global citizenship education with/for transnational youth. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, (Ahead of Print).

Edge, K., & Khamsi, K. (2012). International school partnerships as a vehicle for global education: Student perspectives. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *32*, 455-472.

Ee Loh, C. (2013). Singaporean boys constructing global literate selves through their reading practices in and out of school. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *44*(1), 38-57.

Ekşi, M. (2016). *The rise and fall of soft power in Turkish foreign policy during JDP*. Lambert Academic Publishing.

Ekşi, M. (2017). Turkey's cultural diplomacy and soft power policy towards the balkans. *Karadeniz* Araştırmaları, 55, 189-208.

Elfert, M. (2015). UNESCO, the Faure report, the Delors report, and the political utopia of lifelong learning. *European Journal of Education*, *50*(1), 88-100.

Elfert, M. (2019). Lifelong learning in Sustainable Development Goal 4: What does it mean for UNESCO's rights-based approach to adult learning and education? *International Review of Education*, *65*(4), 537-556.

Elfert, M. (2021). The power struggle over education in developing countries: The case of the UNESCO-World Bank Co-operative program, 1964-1989. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *81*, 102336.

Elias, N., & Kemp, A. (2010). The new second generation: Non-Jewish Olim, Black Jews and children of migrant workers in Israel. *Israel Studies*, *15*(1), 73-94.

Eliassi, B. (2016). Conceiving citizenship and statelessness in the Middle East and Sweden: The experiences of Kurdish migrants in Sweden. In N. Stokes-DuPass & R. Fruja (Eds.), *Citizenship, belonging, and nation-states in the twenty-first century* (pp. 85-110). Palgrave Macmillan

Engel, L. C. (2014). Global citizenship and national (re) formations: Analysis of citizenship education reform in Spain. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 9(3), 239-254.

Engel, L. C., & Frizzell, M. O. (2015). Competitive comparison and PISA bragging rights: sub-national uses of the OECD's PISA in Canada and the USA. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 36(5), 665-682.

Engel, L. C., & Gibson, H. (2020). Elite making and increasing access to cosmopolitan capital: DC youth experiences in education abroad. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 1-18.

Engel, L. C., & Siczek, M. M. (2018). A cross-national comparison of international strategies: Global citizenship and the advancement of national competitiveness. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 48(5), 749-767.

Engel, L. C., Rutkowski, D., & Thompson, G. (2019). Toward an international measure of global competence? A critical look at the PISA 2018 framework. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 17(2), 117-131.

Epstein, E. H. (2008). Setting the normative boundaries: Crucial epistemological benchmarks in comparative education. *Comparative Education*, 44(4), 373-386.

Eremenco, S. L., Cella, D. & Arnold, B.J. (2005). A comprehensive method for the translation and cross-cultural validation of health status questionnaires. *Evaluation Health Professionals, 28*(2), 212–232.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Youth and crisis*. W. W. Norton & Company

Eštok, G., & Bzdilová, R. (2011). Globalization–an old or a new phenomenon?. In P. Mácha & T. Drobík (Eds.), *The scale of globalization. think globally, act locally, change individually in the 21st Century* (pp. 43-48). University of Ostrava press.

Evans, M., Ingram, L. A., MacDonald, A., & Weber, N. (2009). Mapping the "global dimension" of citizenship education in Canada: The complex interplay of theory, practice and context. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 5, 17–34.

Fan. X., & Chen. M. (1999). Academic achievement of rural school students: A multi-year comparison with their peers in suburban and urban schools. *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 15*(3), 1-46.

Feldman, J. (2008) *Above the death pits, beneath the flag: Youth voyages to Poland and the performance of Israeli national identity*. Berghahn.

Feniger, Y., Livneh, I., & Yogev, A. (2012). Globalisation and the politics of international tests: the case of Israel. *Comparative Education*, 48(3), 323-335.

Fenster, T. (2004). Belonging, memory and the politics of planning in Israel. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *4*(3), 403–417.

Ferraro, V. (2008), Dependency theory: An introduction, in G. Secondi (Ed.), *The development economics reader* (pp. 58-64). Routledge.

Fielding, K. S., & Head, B. W. (2012). Determinants of young Australians' environmental actions: The role of responsibility attributions, locus of control, knowledge and attitudes. *Environmental Education Research*, *18*(2), 171-186.

Finch, H., & Lewis, J. (2003). Focus groups. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 170–198). Sage.

Firer, R. (1998). Human rights in history and civics textbooks: The case of Israel. *Curriculum Inquiry, 28*(2), 195-208.

Fischman, G. E., Topper, A. M., Silova, I., Goebel, J., & Holloway, J. L. (2019). Examining the influence of international large-scale assessments on national education policies. *Journal of Education Policy*, *34*(4), 470-499.

Fishman, J. S. (2012). The BDS message of anti-Zionism, anti-Semitism, and incitement to discrimination. *Israel Affairs, 18*(3), 412-425.

Fishman, S. (2014). Generational and cultural constructions of Jewish peoplehood. In E. Ben-Rafael, J. Bokser-Liwerant, & J. Gorny (Eds.), *Reconsidering Israel diaspora relations* (pp. 250–271). Brill.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J.H. (2005). The interview: From neutral stance to political involvment. In N. K. Denzin, & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 695-728). Sage.

Fontana, G. (2016). Religious education after conflicts: Promoting social cohesion or entrenching existing cleavages? *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *46*(5), 811-831.

Franch, S. (2020). Global citizenship education: A new 'moral pedagogy' for the 21st century? *European Educational Research Journal*, *19*(6), 506-524.

Fraser, S. (1964). *Jullien's plan for comparative education, 1816-1817*. Teachers' College, Columbia University

Freitas, P., Nunes, L. C., Balcão Reis, A., Seabra, C., & Ferro, A. (2016). Correcting for sample problems in PISA and the improvement in Portuguese students' performance. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, *23*(4), 456-472.

Gallagher, T. (2005). Balancing difference and the common good: Lessons from a post-conflict society. *Compare: a Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *35*, 429–442.

Gardner-McTaggart, A. (2016). International elite, or global citizens? Equity, distinction and power: The International Baccalaureate and the rise of the South. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *14*(1), 1-29.

Gaudelli, W., & Fernekes, W. R. (2004). Teaching about global human rights for global citizenship. *The Social Studies*, *95*(1), 16-26.

Gaudelli, W. (2016). *Global citizenship education: Everyday transcendence*. Routledge

Gibton, D. (2016). *Researching education policy, public policy, and policymakers: Qualitative methods and ethical issues*. Routledge.

Giddens, A. (2003). *Runaway world: How globalization is reshaping our lives*. Routledge.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Polity.

Gilbertson, A. (2016). Cosmopolitan learning, making merit, and reproducing privilege in Indian schools. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *47*(3), 297-313.

Gisolo, G., & Stanlick, S. E. (2012). Promoting global citizenship outside the classroom: Undergraduate-refugee service learning at Lehigh University. *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education*, *2*(2), 98-122.

Goren, H. & Yemini, M. (2015). Global Citizenship Education in context: Teacher perceptions at an international school and a local Israeli school. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *46*(5), 832-853.

Goren, H. (2020). Students in service of the state: Uncoupling student trips abroad and global competence. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *77*, 102226.

Goren, H., & Yemini, M. (2017a). The global citizenship education gap: Teacher perceptions of the relationship between global citizenship education and students' socio-economic status. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *67*, 9-22.

Goren, H., & Yemini, M. (2017b). Citizenship education redefined–A systematic review of empirical studies on global citizenship education. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *82*, 170-183.

Goren, H., & Yemini, M. (2018a). Obstacles and opportunities for global citizenship education under intractable conflict: The case of Israel. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *48*(3), 397-413.

Goren, H., Maxwell, C., & Yemini, M. (2019). Israeli teachers make sense of global citizenship education in a divided society-religion, marginalisation and economic globalisation. *Comparative Education*, *55*(2), 243-263.

Goren, H., Yemini, M., Maxwell, C., & Blumenfeld-Lieberthal, E. (2020). Terminological "communities": A conceptual mapping of scholarship identified with education's "global turn". *Review of Research in Education*, *44*(1), 36-63.

Green, B. & Letts, W. (2007) Space, equity and rural education: A 'trialectical' account, in K. N. Gulson & C. Symes (Eds.), *Spatial theories of education: policy and geography matters*. Routledge.

Grey, S., & Morris, P. (2018). PISA: Multiple 'truths' and mediatised global governance. *Comparative Education*, *54*(2), 109-131.

Gross, Z. (2020). Holocaust memory and cultural trauma: Israeli adolescents' poetry and heritage journeys to Poland. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *41*(1), 57-69.

Gross, Z. (2010). Holocaust education in Jewish schools in Israel: Goals, dilemmas, challenges. *Prospects*, *40*(1), 93-113.

Grotlüschen, A. (2018). Global competence–Does the new OECD competence domain ignore the global South? *Studies in the Education of Adults*, *50*(2), 185-202.

Grover, S. (2004). Why won't they listen to us? On giving power and voice to children participating in social research. *Childhood*, *11*(1), 81-93.

Guba, E. G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal, 29*(2), 75-91.

Guerlain, P. (2011). The Israel lobby, American democracy and foreign perceptions of the USA. *Journal of Public Affairs*, *11*(4), 372-381.

Guest, G., Namey, E. E., & Mitchell, M. L. (2013). *Collecting qualitative data: A field manual for applied research*. Sage.

Guest, G., MacQueen, K. M., & Namey, E. E. (2011). *Applied thematic analysis*. Sage.

Gupta, A., & Ferguson, J. (1992). Beyond "culture": Space, identity, and the politics of difference. *Cultural anthropology*, *7*(1), 6-23.

Haines, C. (2015). Being Muslim, being cosmopolitan: Transgressing the liberal global. *Journal of International & Global Studies*, *7*(1).

Haklai, O. (2008). Helping the enemy? Why transnational Jewish philanthropic foundations donate to Palestinian NGOs in Israel. *Nations and Nationalism*, *14*(3), 581-599.

Handler, R. (2013). Disciplinary adaptation and undergraduate desire: Anthropology and global development studies in the liberal arts curriculum. *Cultural Anthropology*, *28*(2), 181-203.

Hanna, H. (2017). Dealing with difference in the divided educational context: Balancing freedom of expression and non-discrimination in Northern Ireland and Israel. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *47*(1), 17-31.

Hardgrove, A., McDowell, L., & Rootham, E. (2015). Precarious lives, precarious labour: family support and young men's transitions to work in the UK. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *18*(8), 1057-1076.

Harpaz, Y. (2019). *Citizenship 2.0: Dual nationality as a global asset*. Princeton University Press

Harper, H., & Dunkerly, J. (2013). Educating the world: Teachers and their work as defined by the united nations educational, scientific and cultural organization (UNESCO). In Y. He´bert & A. Abdi (Eds.), *Critical perspectives in international education* (pp. 279-291). Sense Publishers.

Harris, B. D. (2015). Beyond guilt and stigma: Changing attitudes among Israeli migrants in Canada. *International Migration*, *53*(6), 41-56.

Harshman, J. R., & Augustine, T. A. (2013). Fostering global citizenship education for teachers through online research. *The Educational Forum, 77*, 450–463.

Hartas, D. (2010). *Educational research and inquiry: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*, London, UK: Continuum.

Healy, M. & Perry, C. (2000). Comprehensive criteria to judge validity and reliability of qualitative research within the realism paradigm. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal* 3(3), 118-126.

Held, D. (ed.) (2000). *A globalizing world? culture, economics and politics*. Routledge.

Ho, L. C., Alviar-Martin, T., Sim, J. B. Y., & Yap, P. S. (2011). Civic disparities: Exploring students' perceptions of citizenship within Singapore's academic tracks. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *39*(2), 203-237.

Hoffman, T. (2016). Today a student tomorrow a soldier: Delegations to Poland as pre-induction educational arena. In N. Gazit & Y. Levy (Eds.), *An army educates a nation: The role of the military in the Israeli school system* (pp. 117–156). Open University of Israel. (Hebrew)

Hornborg, A. (1998). Towards an ecological theory of unequal exchange: articulating world system theory and ecological economics. *Ecological Economics*, *25*(1), 127-136.

House, J. (1980). The frontier zone: A conceptual problem for policy makers. *International Political Science Review*, *1*(4), 456–477.

Howard, A., & Freeman, K. (2020). Teaching difference: Global citizenship education within an elite single-sex context. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, *29*(3), 204-223.

Howard, A., & Maxwell, C. (2018). From conscientization to imagining redistributive strategies: social justice collaborations in elite schools. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *16*(4), 526-540.

Howard, A., & Maxwell, C. (2020). Conferred cosmopolitanism: class-making strategies of elite schools across the world. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, (ahead of print).

Hughes, C. (2020). International schools and global citizenship education. In *Global citizenship education* (pp. 177-190). Springer.

Ichilov, O. (2002) Differentiated civics curriculum and patterns of citizenship education: vocational and academic programs in Israel. In D. Scott & H. Lawson (Eds.), *Citizenship education and the curriculum* (pp.88-107). Ablex.

Ichilov, O. (2003). Teaching civics in a divided society: The case of Israel. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, *13*(3), 219-242.

Igarashi, H., & Saito, H. (2014). Cosmopolitanism as cultural capital: Exploring the intersection of globalization, education and stratification. *Cultural Sociology*, *8*(3), 222-239.

Ilani, O. (2015). The Jews as educators of humanity: a Christian philosemitic grand narrative of Jewish modernity?. in S. E. Aschheim & V. Liska (Eds.), *The German-Jewish experience revisited* (pp. 1-14). De Gruyter.

Janghorban, R., Roudsari, R. L., & Taghipour, A. (2014). Skype interviewing: The new generation of online synchronous interview in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-Being*, *9*(1), 24152.

Johnson, P. R., Boyer, M. A., & Brown, S. W. (2011). Vital interests: Cultivating global competence in the international studies classroom. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *9*, 503–519.

Joseph, E. Y., & Phillips, J. (2015). The BDS Campaign against Israel: Lessons from South Africa. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *48*(2), 306-310.

Jung, J.-K. (2014). Community through the eyes of children: Blending child-centered research and qualitative geovisualization. *Children's Geographies*, *13*(6), 722–740.

Kamens, D. H. (2013). Globalization and the emergence of an audit culture: PISA and the search for 'best practices' and magic bullets. In H. Meyer, & A. Benavot (Eds.), *PISA, power, and policy: The emergence of global educational governance* (pp. 117–139). Symposium Books.

Katzarska-Miller, I., Barnsley, C. A., & Reysen, S. (2014). Global citizenship identification and religiosity. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion*, *36*(3), 344-367.

Katzarska-Miller, I., Reysen, S., Kamble, S. V., & Vithoji, N. (2012). Cross-national differences in global citizenship: Comparison of Bulgaria, India, and the United States. *Journal of Globalization Studies*, *3*, 166–183.

Kehl, K., & Morris, J. (2008). Differences in global-mindedness between short-term and semester-long study abroad participants at selected private universities. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *15*, 67-79.

Kenway, J., & Fahey, J. (2014). Staying ahead of the game: The globalising practices of elite schools. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *12*(2), 177-195.

Kerkhoff, S. N. (2017). Designing global futures: A mixed methods study to develop and validate the teaching for global readiness scale. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *65*, 91-106.

Khatib, L. (2003). Communicating Islamic fundamentalism as global citizenship. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, *27*(4), 389-409.

Kipnis, B.A. (2004). Tel Aviv, Israel–A world city in evolution: Urban development at a dead end of the global economy." *Dela, 21*, 183-193.

Knight, J. (2003). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 33, 2–3.

Knight, J. (2012). Concepts, rationales, and interpretive frameworks in the internationalization of higher education. In D. Deardoff, H. de Wit, J. Heyl and T. Adams (Eds.), *Handbook for international higher education* (Chapter 2). Sage.

Knight, J. (2008). *Higher education in turmoil: The changing world of internationalization*. Sense.

Kong, L. (2013). Balancing spirituality and secularism, globalism and nationalism: The geographies of identity, integration and citizenship in schools. *Journal of Cultural Geography*, *30*(3), 276-307.

Kotek, J. (2003). Youth organizations as a battlefield in the Cold War. *Intelligence and National Security*, *18*(2), 168-191.

Krauss, S. E. (2005). Research paradigms and meaning making: A primer. *The Qualitative Report*, *10*(4), 758-770.

Krefting, L. (1991). Rigor in qualitative research: The assessment of trustworthiness. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, *45*, 214–222.

Kühn, M. (2015). Peripheralization: Theoretical concepts explaining socio-spatial inequalities. *European Planning Studies*, *23*(2), 367-378.

Larsen, M. A., & Beech, J. (2014). Spatial theorizing in comparative and international education research. *Comparative Education Review*, *58*(2), 191-214.

Latour, B. (2004). Why has critique run out of steam? From matters of fact to matters of concern. *Critical Inquiry*, *30*(2), 225-248.

Law, W. (2007). Globalisation, city development and citizenship education in China's Shanghai. *International Journal of Educational Development, 27*, 18–38.

Law, W. (2010). The state, citizenship education, and international events in a global age: The 2008 Beijing Olympic games. *Comparative Education Review, 54*, 343–367.

Ledger, S., Thier, M., Bailey, L., & Pitts, C. (2019). OECD's approach to measuring global competency: Powerful voices shaping education. *Teachers College Record*, *121*(8), 1-40.

Leduc, R. (2013). Global citizenship instruction through active participation: What is being learned about global citizenship? *The Educational Forum, 77*, 394-406.

Lee, R. E. (2010). Critiques and developments in world systems analysis: an introduction to the special collection. *Journal of Philosophical Economics*, *4*(1), 5-18.

Lefebre, H. (1991*) The production of space*. Blackwell.

Lemish, P. (2003). Civic and citizenship education in Israel. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *33*(1), 53-72.

Levinson, M. (2010). The civic empowerment gap: Defining the problem and locating Solutions. In L. Sherrod, J. Torney-Purta, & C. A. Flanagan (Eds.), *Handbook of research in civic engagement and youth* (pp.331-361). Wiley.

Levitt, P. (2008). Religion as a path to civic engagement. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *31*(4), 766-791.

Lewin-Epstein, N., & Semyonov, M. (2000). Migration, ethnicity, and inequality: homeownership in Israel. *Social Problems*, *47*(3), 425-444.

Li, Y., & Nicholson Jr, H. L. (2021). When "model minorities" become "yellow peril"—Othering and the racialization of Asian Americans in the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sociology Compass*, *15*(2), e12849.

Li, X. & Auld, E. (2020). A historical perspective on the OECD's 'humanitarian turn': PISA for Development and the Learning Framework 2030. *Comparative Education*, *56*(4), 503-521.

Lima, C. O., & Brown, S. W. (2007). ICT for development: Are Brazilian students well prepared to become global citizens? *Educational Media International, 44*, 141–153.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1986). But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation. *New Directions for Program Evaluation*, *1986*(30), 73-84.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 163–188). Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1995). *Naturalist inquiry.* Sage.

Lindsey Parsons, R. (2010). The effects of an internationalized university experience on domestic students in the United States and Australia. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 14*(4), 313-334.

Lingard, B. (2010). Policy borrowing, policy learning: Testing times in Australian schooling. *Critical studies in education*, *51*(2), 129-147.

Literat, I. (2013). Participatory mapping with urban youth: The visual elicitation of socio-spatial research data. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *38*(2), 198-216.

Loh, C. E. (2016). Elite schoolboys becoming global citizens: Examining the practice of habitus. In A. Koh & J. Kenway (Eds.), Elite schools: Multiple geographies of privilege (pp. 70–86). Routledge.

Lokkesmoe, K. J., Kuchinke, K. P., & Ardichvili, A. (2016). Developing cross-cultural awareness through foreign immersion programs: Implications of university study abroad research for global competency development. *European Journal of Training and Development*, *40*(3), 155-170.

Lomer, S. (2017). Soft power as a policy rationale for international education in the UK: a critical analysis. *Higher Education, 74*(4), 581-598.

Lyengar, R. (2020). Education as the path to a sustainable recovery from COVID-19. *Prospects*, *49*(1), 77-80.

Mannion, G., Biesta, G., Priestley, M., & Ross, H. (2011). The global dimension in education and education for global citizenship: Genealogy and critique. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *9*(3-4), 443-456.

Manzon, M. (2011). *Comparative education*: *The construction of a field.* Springer.

Manzon, M. (2018). Origins and traditions in comparative education: Challenging some assumptions. *Comparative Education, 54*(1), 1–9.

Marshall, H. (2009). Educating the European citizen in the global age: Engaging with the post-national and identifying a research agenda. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *41*(2), 247-267.

Marshall, H. (2011). Instrumentalism, ideals and imaginaries: Theorising the contested space of global citizenship education in schools. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *9*(3-4), 411-426.

Marshall, T. H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class.* Cambridge University Press.

Maussen, M., & Bader, V. (2015). Non-governmental religious schools in Europe: Institutional opportunities, associational freedoms, and contemporary challenges. *Comparative Education*, *51*(1), 1-21.

Maussen, M., & Vermeulen, F. (2015). Liberal equality and toleration for conservative religious minorities. Decreasing opportunities for religious schools in the Netherlands?. *Comparative Education*, *51*(1), 87-104.

Maxwell, C., & Aggleton, P. (2016). Creating cosmopolitan subjects: The role of families and private schools in England. *Sociology*, *50*(4), 780-795.

Mayerl, J., & Best, H. (2018). Two worlds of environmentalism?: Empirical analyses on the complex relationship between postmaterialism, national wealth, and environmental concern. *Nature and Culture*, *13*(2), 208-231.

Mehmedbegovic, D. (2007). 'Miss, who needs the languages of immigrants?' London's multilingual schools. In T., Brighthouse & L. Fullick (Eds.), *Education in a global city: Essays from London*. IoE Press.

Mendelsohn, H., & Orenstein, F. E. (1955). A survey of Fulbright award recipients: Cross-cultural education and its impacts. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *19*(4), 401-407.

Mendelsohn, R., Dinar, A., & Williams, L. (2006). The distributional impact of climate change on rich and poor countries. *Environment and Development Economics*, *11*, 159-178.

Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B., Johnson-Bailey, J., Lee, M. Y., Kee, Y., Ntseane, G., & Muhamad, M. (2001). Power and positionality: Negotiating insider/outsider status within and across cultures. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *20*(5), 405-416.

Meyer, J. W., & Ramirez, F. O. (2000). The world institutionalization of education. In J, Schriewer (Ed.), *Discourse formation in comparative education* (pp. 111–132). Peter Lang.

Millei, Z., & Jones, A. (2014). The Australian early childhood curriculum and a cosmopolitan imaginary. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, *46*(1), 63-79.

Milner, A., & Milner, J. B. (2020). Anthropocene Fiction and World-Systems Analysis. *Journal of World-Systems Research*, *26*(2), 350-371.

Mohamed, M., & Morris, P. (2019). Buying, selling and outsourcing educational reform: the Global Education Industry and 'policy borrowing' in the Gulf. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, (ahead of print).

Moore, A. M., & Barker, G. G. (2012). Confused or multicultural: Third culture individuals' cultural identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *36*(4), 553-562.

Moosa, D. (2013). Challenges to anonymity and representation in educational qualitative research in a small community: a reflection on my research journey. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *43*(4), 483-495.

Morris, B. (2004) *The birth of the Palestinian refugee problem revisited*. Cambridge University Press.

Morris, P., Cogan, J. J. & Liu, M. H. (2002). A comparative overview: Civic education across the six societies. In: J. J. Cogan, P. Morris & M. Print (Eds.), *Civic education in the Asia-Pacific region: case studies across six societies* (pp. 167-188). Routledge Falmer.

Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 1*(2), 13-22.

Muff, A., & Bekerman, Z. (2019). Agents of the nation-state or transformative intellectuals? Exploring the conflicting roles of civics teachers in Israel. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *14*(1), 22-39.

Müller, T. R. (2018). Realising rights within the Israeli asylum regime: a case study among Eritrean refugees in Tel Aviv. *African Geographical Review*, *37*(2), 134-145.

Mundy, K. (2007). Global governance, educational change. *Comparative Education*, *43*(3), 339-357.

Mundy, K., & Verger, A. (2016). The World Bank and the global governance of education in a changing world order. In K., Mundy, A., Green, Lingard, B., & A., Verger (Eds.), *The handbook of global education policy* (pp. 335-356). Wiley.

Myers, J. P. (2006). Rethinking the social studies curriculum in the context of globalization: Education for global citizenship in the US. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *34*, 370–394.

Myers, J. P. (2016). Charting a democratic course for global citizenship education: Research directions and current challenges. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24, 1–19.

Myers, J., & Zaman, H. (2009). Negotiating the global and national: Immigrant and dominant-culture adolescents' vocabularies of citizenship in a transnational world. *Teachers College Record*, *111*, 2589–2625.

Nelms, C., Allen, M. W., Craig, C. A., & Riggs, S. (2017). Who is the adolescent environmentalist? Environmental attitudes, identity, media usage and communication orientation. *Environmental Communication*, *11*(4), 537-553.

Nespor, J. (2000). Anonymity and place in qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *6*(4), 546-569.

Niens, U., & Reilly, J. (2012). Education for global citizenship in a divided society? Young people's views and experiences. *Comparative Education*, *48*, 103–118.

Niens, U., O'Connor, U., & Smith, A. (2013). Citizenship education in divided societies: Teachers' perspectives in Northern Ireland. *Citizenship Studies*, *17*, 128–141.

Noah, H., & Eckstein, M. (1969). *Toward a science of comparative education*. Macmillan.

Noddings, N. (2005). Global citizenship: Promises and problems. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 1-21). Teachers College Press.

Nordberg, C. (2006). Claiming citizenship: Marginalised voices on identity and belonging. *Citizenship Studies*, *10*(5), 523-539.

Noy, C. (2008). Sampling knowledge: The hermeneutics of snowball sampling in qualitative research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *11*(4), 327-344.

Nussbaum, M.C. (2002). Education for citizenship in an era of global connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 21*, 289–303.

Nye, J., (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. Public Affairs.

O'Connor, L., & Faas, D. (2012). The impact of migration on national identity in a globalized world: A comparison of civic education curricula in England, France and Ireland. *Irish Educational Studies*, *31*, 51–66.

OECD, (2019). PISA 2018 global competence framework, in *PISA 2018 Assessment and Analytical Framework*. OECD.

OECD. (2018). *Preparing our youth for an inclusive and sustainable world. The OECD PISA global competence framework*. OECD.

OECD. (2020). *PISA 2018 results (volume VI) are students ready to thrive in an interconnected world*. OECD.

Olesker, R. (2019). Delegitimization as a national security threat: Israel and BDS. *Israel Studies Review*, *1*, 1-22.

Oplatka, I. (2002). The emergence of educational marketing: Lessons from the experiences of Israeli principals. *Comparative Education Review, 46*(2), 211-233.

Ortloff, D. H. (2011). Moving the borders: Multiculturalism and global citizenship in the German social studies classroom. *Educational Research*, *53*, 137–149.

Oxley, L., & Morris, P. (2013). Global citizenship: A typology for distinguishing its multiple conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *61*, 301–325.

Pais, A., & Costa, M. (2020). An ideology critique of global citizenship education. *Critical Studies in Education*, *61*(1), 1-16.

Pak, S. Y., & Lee, M. (2018). 'Hit the ground running': Delineating the problems and potentials in State-led Global Citizenship Education (GCE) through teacher practices in South Korea. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *66*(4), 515-535.

Pamuk, A. (2004). Geography of immigrant clusters in global cities: a case study of San Francisco. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 28*(2), 287-307.

Pan, S. (2011). Multileveled citizenship and citizenship education: Experiences of students in China's Beijing. *Citizenship Studies, 15*, 283–30.

Parekh, B. (2003). Cosmopolitanism and global citizenship. *Review of International Studies, 29*, 3-17.

Parekh, B. (2008). *A new politics of identity: Political principles for an interdependent world*. Basingstoke: Palgrave

Park, R. E. (1950). Culture and civilization. in E.C. Hughes, C. S. Johnson, J. Masuoka, R. Redfield & L. Wirth (Eds.), *Race and culture* (pp. 15–23). Free Press.

Parmenter, L. (2011). Power and place in the discourse of global citizenship education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *9*(3-4), 367-380.

Pashby, K. (2015). Conflations, possibilities, and foreclosures: Global citizenship education in a multicultural context. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *45*(4), 345-366.

Pashby, K. (2018). Identity, belonging and diversity in education for global citizenship: Multipying intersecting, transforming, and engaging lived realities. In I. Davies, L. Ho, D. Kiwan, C. Peck, A. Peterson, E. Sant, & Y. Waghid (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of global citizenship and education* (pp. 277–293). Palgrave Macmillan.

Pashby, K., & Sund, L. (2019). Critical GCE in the era of SDG 4.7: Discussing HEADSUP with secondary teachers in England, Finland, and Sweden. In Douglas Bourn (Ed.), *Bloomsbury handbook for global education and learning* (pp. 314–326). Bloomsbury.

Pashby, K., & Sund, L. (2020). Decolonial options and foreclosures for global citizenship education and education for sustainable development. *Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education (NJCIE)*, *4*(1), 66-83.

Pashby, K., da Costa, M., Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. (2020). A meta-review of typologies of global citizenship education. *Comparative Education*, *56*(2), 144-164.

Pedahzur, A. (2001). The paradox of civic education in non-liberal democracies: The case of Israel. *Journal of Education Policy*, *16*(5), 413-430.

Peled, Y. (1990). Ethnic exclusionism in the periphery: The case of Oriental Jews in Israel's development towns. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *13*(3), 345-367.

Peled, Y. (1992). Ethnic democracy and the legal construction of citizenship: Arab citizens of the Jewish state. *The American Political Science Review*, 432-443.

Perry, L., Stoner, K. R., Stoner, L., Wadsworth, D., Page, R., & Tarrant, M. A. (2013). The importance of global citizenship to higher education: The role of short-term study abroad. *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioral Science*, 3(2), 184-194.

Peterson, A. (2020). Global citizenship education: Meanings and (mis) intentions. In *Global citizenship education in Australian schools* (pp. 19-49). Palgrave Pivot.

Pike, G. (2008). Reconstructing the legend: Educating for global citizenship. In A. Abdi & L. Shultz (Eds.), *Educating for human rights and global citizenship* (pp. 223–237). State University of New York Press.

Pinson, H. (2020). The new civics curriculum for high schools in Israel: The discursive construction of Palestinian identity and narratives. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *15*(1), 22-34.

Pinson, H. (2007). Inclusive curriculum? Challenges to the role of civic education in a Jewish and democratic state. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *37*(4), 351-382.

Pinson, H., & Agbaria, A. K. (2021). Ethno-nationalism in citizenship education in Israel: an analysis of the official civics textbook. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, (ahead of print).

Pluim, G. W., & Jorgenson, S. R. (2012). A reflection on the broader, systemic impacts of youth volunteer abroad programmes: A Canadian perspective. *Intercultural Education, 23*, 25-38.

Poole, D. L., & Davis, T. S. (2006). Concept mapping to measure outcomes in study abroad programs. *Social Work Education, 25*(1), 61-77.

Powell, K. (2010). Making sense of place: Mapping as a multisensory research method. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *16*(7), 539-555.

Prais, S. J. (2003). Cautions on OECD's recent educational survey (PISA). *Oxford Review of Education*, *29*(2), 139-163.

Prebisch, R. (1950). *The economic development of Latin America and its principal problems.* United Nations.

Prince, D. (2014). What about place? Considering the role of physical environment on youth imagining of future possible selves. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *17*(6), 697-716.

Quaynor, L. (2015). 'I do not have the means to speak': Educating youth for citizenship in post-conflict Liberia. *Journal of Peace Education, 12*, 15-36.

Rabinowitz, D. (2001). The Palestinian citizens of Israel, the concept of trapped minority and the discourse of transnationalism in anthropology. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *24*(1), 64-85.

Raijman, R. (2010). Citizenship status, ethno-national origin and entitlement to rights: Majority attitudes towards minorities and immigrants in Israel. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *36*(1), 87-106.

Rapoport, A. (2009). A forgotten concept: Global citizenship education and state social studies standards. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, *33*, 91–112.

Rapoport, A. (2010). We cannot teach what we don't know: Indiana teachers talk about global citizenship education. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 5*(3), 179–190.

Rapoport, A. (2013). Global citizenship themes in the social studies classroom: Teaching devices and teachers' attitudes. *The Educational Forum, 77*, 407–420.

Rappleye, J. (2015). Revisiting the metaphor of the island: challenging 'world culture' from an island misunderstood. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *13*(1), 58-87.

Razin, E. (1990). Urban economic development in a period of local initiative: competition among towns in Israel's southern coastal plain. *Urban Studies*, *27*(5), 685-703.

Reilly, J., & Niens, U. (2014). Global citizenship as education for peacebuilding in a divided society: structural and contextual constraints on the development of critical dialogic discourse in schools. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *44*(1), 53-76.

Resnik, J. (1999). Particularistic vs. universalistic content in the Israeli education system. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *29*(4), 485-511.

Resnik, J. (2003). 'Sites of memory' of the Holocaust: shaping national memory in the education system in Israel. *Nations and nationalism*, *9*(2), 297-317.

Reysen, S., & Katzarska-Miller, I. (2013). A model of global citizenship: Antecedents and outcomes. *International Journal of Psychology*, *48*(5), 858-870.

Riley, C., & Ettlinger, N. (2011). Interpreting racial formation and multiculturalism in a high school: Towards a constructive deployment of two approaches to critical race theory. *Antipode*, *43*(4), 1250-1280.

Robertson, S. L., & Dale, R. (2015). Towards a 'critical cultural political economy' account of the globalising of education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *13*(1), 149-170.

Robertson, S.L, & Dale, R. (2008). Researching education in a globalising era. In J. Resnik (Ed.), *The production of educational knowledge in the global era* (pp. 19-32). Sense Publishers.

Robinson, N. (2013). *The political economy of Russia*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Roman, L. G. (2003). Education and the contested meanings of 'global citizenship'. *Journal of Educational Change*, *4*(3), 269-293.

Ronen, Y. (2014). Israel, Palestine and the ICC—territory uncharted but not unknown. *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, *12*(1), 7-25.

Roscigno, V. J., Tomaskovic-Devey, D., & Crowley, M. (2006). Education and the inequalities of place. *Social Forces*, *84*(4), 2121-2145.

Ross, A. (2018). *Finding political identities: Young people in a changing Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Ross, A., Puzić, S., & Doolan, K. (2017). Balkan and European? Place identifications of young people in Croatia. *Revija za sociologiju*, *47*(2), 125-150.

Rowe, E. (2015). Theorising geo-identity and David Harvey's space: School choices of the geographically bound middle-class. *Critical Studies in Education*, *56*(3), 285-300.

Rozenfeld, I., Yemini, M., & Engel, L. C. (2020). Walking between the raindrops: the role of religion in globalised schooling. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, (ahead of print).

Rubenson, K. (2006). Constructing the lifelong learning paradigm: Competing visions from the OECD and UNESCO. In S. Ellers (Ed.), *Milestones in adult education* (pp. 63–78). Danish University Press.

Rubie-Davies, C. M. (2006). Teacher expectations and student self-perceptions: Exploring relationships. *Psychology in the Schools*, *43*(5), 537-552.

Russell S.G. & Suárez, D. (2017). Symbol and substance: Human rights education as an emergent global institution (pp. 18-42). In M., Bajaj (Ed.), *Human rights education: Theory, research, praxis*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Ryan, L., Kofman, E., & Aaron, P. (2011). Insiders and outsiders: working with peer researchers in researching Muslim communities. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *14*(1), 49-60.

Sabbagh, C., & Resh, N. (2014). Citizenship orientations in a divided society: A comparison of three groups of Israeli junior-high students—secular Jews, religious Jews, and Israeli Arabs. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *9*(1), 34-54.

Salisbury, M. H., An, B. P., & Pascarella, E. T. (2013). The effect of study abroad on intercultural competence among undergraduate college students. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice, 50*(1), 1-20.

Sandelowski, M. (1986). The problem of rigor in qualitative research. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 8(3), 27–37.

Sant, E., Davies, I., Pashby, K., & Shultz, L. (2018). *Global citizenship education: A critical introduction to key concepts and debates.* Bloomsbury Publishing.

Sassen, S. (2007). *A sociology of globalization*. New York, NY: Norton.

Sassen, S. (2011). *Cities in a World Economy*. 4th ed. Sage.

Schattle, H. (2008). Education for global citizenship: Illustrations of ideological pluralism and adaptation. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, *13*(1), 73-94.

Schattle, H. (2009). Global citizenship in theory and practice. In R. Lewin (Ed.), *The handbook of practice and research in study abroad: Higher education and the quest for global citizenship* (pp. 3-18). Routledge.

Scheunpflug, A. (2015). Non-governmental religious schools in Germany–increasing demand by decreasing religiosity? *Comparative Education*, *51*(1), 38-56.

Schweisfurth, M. (2006). Education for global citizenship: Teacher agency and curricular structure in Ontario schools. *Educational Review*, *58*, 41–50.

Seginer, R., & Vermulst, A. D. (2002). Family environment, educational aspirations, and academic achievement in two cultural settings. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *33*(6), 540-558.

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research*. Teachers College Press.

Sellar, S., & Lingard, B. (2013). Looking East: Shanghai, PISA 2009 and the reconstitution of reference societies in the global education policy field. *Comparative Education*, *49*(4), 464-485.

Sellar, S., & Lingard, B. (2013). The OECD and global governance in education. *Journal of Education Policy*, *28*(5), 710-725.

Selvaratnam, V. (1985). The international flow of scholars and students: A vehicle for cross-cultural understanding, international co-operation and global development? *International Journal of Educational Development, 5*(4), 307-323.

Shachar, A. (1998). Reshaping the map of Israel: A new national planning doctrine. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *555*(1), 209-218.

Shefer, D. and Frenkel, A. (2013). The center-periphery dilemma: Spatial inequality and regional development. In Carmon, N. & Fainstein, S.S. (Eds.). *Policy, planning, and people: Promoting justice in urban development* (pp. 183-202). University of Pennsylvania Press,

Sheffer, G. (2002). A nation and its diaspora: A re-examination of Israeli—Jewish Diaspora relations. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, *11*(3), 331-358.

Sheffer, G. (2012). Loyalty and criticism in the relations between world Jewry and Israel. *Israel Atudies*, *17*(2), 77-85.

Sheps, S. W. (2019). History and civics education in Israel: Reflections from Israeli teachers. *Critical Studies in Education*, *60*(3), 358-374.

Shirazi, R. (2018). Between hosts and guests: Conditional hospitality and citizenship in an American suburban school. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *48*(1), 95-114.

Shultz, L., & Guimaraes-Iosif, R. (2012). Citizenship education and the promise of democracy: A study of UNESCO associated schools in Brazil and Canada. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 7*, 241-254.

Simmel, G. (1971 [1908]) 'The stranger', in D. N. Levine (Ed.), *Georg Simmel: On individuality and social forms: Selected writings* (pp.143-149). University of Chicago Press.

Simpson, A., & Dervin, F. (2019). Global and intercultural competences for whom? By whom? For what purpose?: An example from the Asia Society and the OECD. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*.

Singer, H. W. (1975). The distribution of gains from trade and investment-revisited. *The Journal of Development Studies*, *11*(4), 376-382.

Smooha, S. (2002). The model of ethnic democracy: Israel as a Jewish and democratic state. *Nations and nationalism*, *8*(4), 475-503.

Sobe, N. W., & Kowalczyk, J. A. (2013). Exploding the cube: Revisioning "context" in the field of comparative education. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, *16*(1), 6-12.

Soen, D., & Davidovitch, N. (2004). Centre and periphery in higher education: The case of Israel. *International Education Journal*, *5*(4), 439-457.

Soja, E. W. (1996) *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places*. Blackwell.

Sorhagen, N. S. (2013). Early teacher expectations disproportionately affect poor children's high school performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *105*(2), 465-477.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Sage.

Stein, S. (2017). The persistent challenges of addressing epistemic dominance in higher education: Considering the case of curriculum internationalization. *Comparative Education Review*, *61*(1), 25-50.

Stein, S., Andreotti, V. D. O., & Suša, R. (2019). 'Beyond 2015', within the modern/colonial global imaginary? Global development and higher education. *Critical Studies in Education*, *60*(3), 281-301.

Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2009). Comparison: Quo vadis? In R. Cowen, A. M. Kazamias, & E. Unterhalter (Eds.), *International handbook of comparative education – part 2 (*pp.1143–58). Springer.

Stenbacka, C. (2001). Qualitative research requires quality concepts of its own. *Management Decision, 39*(7), 551-555

Strange, H., & Gibson, H. J. (2017). An investigation of experiential and transformative learning in study abroad programs. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, *29*(1), 85-100.

Suh, Y., An, S., & Forest, D. (2015). Immigration, imagined communities, and collective memories of Asian American experiences: A content analysis of Asian American experiences in Virginia US history textbooks. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, *39*(1), 39-51.

Tarozzi, M., & Torres, C. A. (2016). *Global citizenship education and the crises of multiculturalism: Comparative perspectives*. Bloomsbury.

Tarrant, M. A. (2010). A conceptual framework for exploring the role of studies abroad in nurturing global citizenship. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 14(5),* 433-451.

Tarrant, M. A., Rubin, D. L., & Stoner, L. (2014). The added value of study abroad: Fostering a global citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *18*(2), 141-161.

Thomson, R., & Holland, J. (2002). Imagined adulthood: Resources, plans and contradictions. *Gender and Education*, *14*(4), 337-350.

Thornberg, R. & Charmaz, C. (2014). Grounded theory and theoretical coding. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 153-169). Sage.

Tickamyer, A. R. (2000). Space matters! Spatial inequality in future sociology. *Contemporary Sociology*, *29*(6), 805-813.

Torres, C. A., & Bosio, E. (2020). Global citizenship education at the crossroads: Globalization, global commons, common good, and critical consciousness. *Prospects*, *48*(3), 99-113.

Trudeau, D. (2006). Politics of belonging in the construction of landscapes: place-making, boundary-drawing and exclusion. *Cultural Geographies*, *13*, 421–443.

Tucker, M. (2011). *Surpassing Shanghai: An agenda for american education built on the world's leading systems*. Harvard Education Press.

Turner, D.A. (2019). What is comparative education? in Wiseman, A.W. (Ed.), *Annual review of comparative and international education* (pp. 99-114). Emerald Publishing.

Turner, V. (1969). *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure*. Chicago: Aldine.

Tzfadia, E. (2006). Public housing as control: Spatial policy of settling immigrants in Israeli development towns. *Housing Studies*, *21*(4), 523-537.

Tzfadia, E. and Yacobi, H. (2011). *Rethinking Israeli space.* London: Routledge.

Uğuz, H. E., & Saygili, R. (2018). Turkish public diplomacy in the Balkans: The power of soft power. *Inquiry*, *3*(1), 1-23.

United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. United Nations.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2019). Global citizenship education. Retrieved from: https://en.unesco.org/themes/gced

Unterhalter, E. (2008). Cosmopolitanism, global social justice and gender equality in education. *Compare*, *38*(5), 539-553.

Unterhalter, E. (2018). *Measuring the unmeasurable in education*. Routledge

Van Gennep, A. (1909/1960) *Rites of passage*. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

VanderDussen Toukan, E. (2018). Educating citizens of 'the global': Mapping textual constructs of UNESCO's global citizenship education 2012–2015. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *13*(1), 51-64.

Veugelers, W. (2011). The moral and the political in global citizenship: Appreciating differences in education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 9*(3), 473-485.

Veugelers, W. (2020). How globalisation influences perspectives on citizenship education: from the social and political to the cultural and moral. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, (ahead of print).

Vigh, H. (2009). Wayward migration: On imagined futures and technological voids. *Ethnos*, *74*(1), 91-109.

Walford, G. (2005). Research ethical guidelines and anonymity. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, *28*(1), 83-93.

Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The modern world-system: capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world-economy in the sixteenth century*. New York: Academic Press

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. The Modern World-System. New York: Academic Press.

Wang, C., & Hoffman, D. M. (2016). Are WE the world? A critical reflection on selfhood in US global citizenship education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives/Archivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas*, *24*, 1-22.

Wang, C., & Hoffman, D. M. (2020). From Freire to Levinas: toward a post-humanist global citizenship education. *Educational Studies*, *56*(5), 435-455.

Wardle, J., Robb, K., & Johnson, F. (2002). Assessing socioeconomic status in adolescents: the validity of a home affluence scale. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, *56*(8), 595-599.

Warf, B. (2015). Global cities, cosmopolitanism, and geographies of tolerance. *Urban Geography*, *36*(6), 927-946.

Warf, B. & Arias, S., eds. (2009). *The spatial turn: Interdisciplinary perspectives*. Routledge.

Wilson, J. (1963). *Thinking with concepts.* Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, I. (2014). *International education programs and political influence: Manufacturing sympathy?* Palgrave Macmillan.

Wilson, I. (2015). Ends changed, means retained: Scholarship programs, political influence, and drifting goals. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, *17*(1), 130-151.

Wimmer, A., & Glick Schiller, N. (2002). Methodological nationalism and beyond: nation–state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks*, *2*(4), 301-334.

Wolff, F., & Borzikowsky, C. (2018). Intercultural competence by international experiences? An investigation of the impact of educational stays abroad on intercultural competence and its facets. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 49*(3), 488-514.

Wood, B. E. (2012). Scales of active citizenship: New Zealand teachers' diverse perceptions and practices. *International Journal of Progressive Education, 8*, 77–93.

Wood, B. E. (2014). Participatory capital: Bourdieu and citizenship education in diverse school communities. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *35,* 578–597.

Wood, Bronwyn E. (2015). Border spaces: Geographies of youth exclusion, inclusion and liminality. In P. Kraftl, K. Nairn & T. Skelton (Eds.), *Space, landscape and environment: Geographies of children and young people* (1–22). Springer.

Woodward, R. (2009). *The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)*. Routledge.

Worden, E. A., & Smith, A. (2017). Teaching for democracy in the absence of transitional justice: The case of Northern Ireland. *Comparative Education*, *53*(3), 379-395.

Yadgar, Y. (2011). Jewish secularism and ethno-national identity in Israel: The traditionist critique. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, *26*(3), 467-481.

Yazzie-Mintz, E., & McCormick, K. (2012). Finding the humanity in the data: Understanding, measuring, and strengthening student engagement. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 743–762). Springer.

Yemini, M. (2014). Internationalization of secondary education—Lessons from Israeli Palestinian-Arab schools in Tel Aviv-Jaffa. *Urban Education*, *49*(5), 471-498.

Yemini, M. (2015). Internationalisation discourse hits the tipping point: A new definition is needed. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, *19*(1), 19-22.

Yemini, M. (2017). Internationalization under intractable conflict: The influence of national conflict on Israeli higher education institutions' internationalization efforts. *European Education*, *49*(4), 293-303.

Yemini, M., & Fulop, A. (2015). The international, global and intercultural dimensions in schools: An analysis of four internationalised Israeli schools. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *13*(4), 528-552.

Yemini, M., & Gordon, N. (2017). Media representations of national and international standardized testing in the Israeli education system. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *38*(2), 262-276.

Yemini, M., & Maxwell, C. (2018). De-coupling or remaining closely coupled to 'home': Educational strategies around identity-making and advantage of Israeli global middle-class families in London. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *39*(7), 1030-1044.

Yemini, M., Bar-Nissan, H., & Shavit, Y. (2014). Cosmopolitanism versus nationalism in Israeli education. *Comparative Education Review, 58*(4), 708-728.

Yiftachel, O. & Tzfadia, E. (2004) Between periphery and 'third space': Identity of Mizrahim in Israel's development towns. In A. Kemp, D. Newman, U. Ram & O. Yiftachel (Eds.), *Israelis in conflict: hegemonies, identities and challenges* (pp. 203-235). Academic Press.

Yiftachel, O. (2000). Social control, urban planning and ethno-class relations: Mizrahi Jews in Israel's 'development towns'. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *24*(2), 418-438.

Yonah, Y. (2005). Israel as a multicultural democracy: Challenges and obstacles. *Israel Affairs*, *11*(1), 95-116.

Young, D. J. (1998). Ambition, self-concept, and achievement: A structural equation model for comparing rural and urban students. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, *14*, 34-44.

Yun, S. H., & Vibber, K. (2012). The strategic values and communicative actions of Chinese students for sociological Korean public diplomacy. *International Journal of Strategic Communication*, *6*(1), 77-92.

Yuval-Davis, N., Anthias, F., & Kofman, E. (2005). Secure borders and safe haven and the gendered politics of belonging: Beyond social cohesion. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *28*(3), 513-535.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Belonging and the politics of belonging. *Patterns of Prejudice*, *40*(3), 196–213.

Zaradez, N., Sela-Sheffy, R., & Tal, T. (2020). The identity work of environmental education teachers in Israel. *Environmental Education Research*, *26*(6), 812-829.

Zemach-Bersin, T. (2009). Selling the world: study abroad marketing and the privatization of global citizenship. In *Handbook of practice & research in study abroad* (pp. 303-320). Rutledge.

Zemach-Bersin, T. (2012). Entitled to the world: The rhetoric of U.S. global citizenship education and study abroad. In V. Oliveira Andreotti & L.M. de Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education*. Routledge.

Zhao, Y. (2020). Two decades of havoc: A synthesis of criticism against PISA. *Journal of Educational Change*, (ahead of print).

Appendix 1: Interview Protocol (Teachers from Different Sectors)

1. Tell me about your background, teaching experience, education, any experiences abroad, etc.?
2. Why did you become a teacher?
3. In what ways does teaching in your population/sector (?) differ, in your opinion from teaching in the other sectors?
4. What about specifically in terms of citizenship education?

5. Have you come across the term global citizenship education as part of the MA program you are studying in? What about other terms like democratic citizenship education etc.? in what context did these come up, if at all?
6. Has studying in the program given you new information or insights regarding the different sectors in the Israeli education system? What kinds of things have you learned about the proverbial 'other'?
7. How has the program affected (or how do you think it could affect) your own pedagogical views and the way you teach your pupils?

8. What does the term global citizenship mean to you? What kinds of ideas, dispositions, skills would you associate with it?
9. How about global citizenship education?
10. What do you think global citizenship education would look like, ideally, if it was implemented in your sector?
11. How about in the other sectors? Would there be a difference?
12. Now realistically- what do you think GCE would look like if it was implemented in your sector by the MOE? And in other sectors?
13. If the MOE were to implement GCE in the Israeli Education system as a whole, what do you think its official goals would be? What about latent goals?

14. Can you think of any advantages GCE could have for pupils in your sector? Are there differences between your school and other schools in the sector with regard to this?
15. Are there any differences between sectors with regard to the potential advantages?
16. How about disadvantages? Are there any dangers or conflicts you think GCE could amplify or create?
17. Can these disadvantages be foreseen and mitigated in any way?
18. Do you think GCE should be implemented in the Israeli education system? Only in your sector, only in other sectors? Would it need to be different in each sector? (in what ways?)

Appendix 2: Interview Protocol for Teachers from Centre/Periphery

1. Tell me about yourself and your professional experience?
2. How long have you lived in this city/neighborhood? (if previous experiences exist discuss further and get comparison and reasons for moving). How would you characterize this city/neighborhood/the school you work at?
3. What is important for you in preparing your pupils for their future? What do you imagine for them and what do you think they imagine for themselves?
4. What would you characterise as global in your school? (if they don't mention pupils, ask about it specifically)
5. What kind of global influences are your pupils exposed to in their area of residence and formal/ informal learning environments? Do you do anything to expose them to more and if so what and why?
6. Do you think that the global exposure in your pupil's life is different than for those residing in other neighborhoods or towns? How so? (compare to periphery/centre)
7. Do you think that global exposure in your pupil's life is different than for a pupil in London or New York? What about a pupil in rural areas of other countries? What similarities and differences can you think of?
8. Are your pupils global citizens? Do you think they should be?
9. What comes to mind when you hear the term global citizenship education? Do you think it is important and why? Are your pupils being educated for global citizenship and if so how and by whom?
10. Do you think your pupils should be educated to be part of a global society? Is it important for them? Is it more or less important for them than for pupils in other places? Why?

Appendix 3: Focus Group Protocols

1. Let's do a round of introductions. You don't need to say your names, as this is recorded, but I'd like to hear from each of you where the last place you went on vacation abroad was, and if you haven't been abroad I want to hear where you would like to go. It would also be good if you could tell be what your parents do for a living, but if you don't feel comfortable sharing that its totally fine.

2. Now tell me a little bit about your school, and specifically- what do you think is global about it? (if they have trouble answering prompt with- classes, languages, trips, activities).

3. (if they don't mention it) are there any pupils or teachers here that weren't born in Israel? Were any of your parents not born here? Does that make them global?

4. What about different cultures, are there people from different cultures at your school? Does it affect the school and how? Are any holidays or events noted or celebrated that don't necessarily apply to the whole school population?

5. What/how do you learn about the world at school? What classes? Do you think its interesting? Is it enough or would you like to learn more and what? Is there anything important you feel you don't learn enough about?

6. What about your city- what's global/international about your city? (prompt- companies, immigrants, events, cultures)- how is this different from other cities? Are there other global aspects in different places in Israel?

7. What about your every day lives? How is your life similar or different than that of a pupil in London or New York (if they have trouble answering- ask about hobbies, movies, music, online platforms, brands)

8. What about a pupil in a remote village in India? How if your life similar or different from theirs?

9. Do you think pupils in a different place in Israel (periphery/centre) would have more/less/different things in common in terms of global influences than you have in your city? Can their lives be more/less similar to children in India/London?

10. Is there something good/bad about this?

11. Have you even thought about going to live abroad when you are older? What would you do? How do you imagine it- do you have a plan? What gave you the idea?

12. Are there things you learn in school or at home that would help with that? What are they?

13. Do you think pupils in other places (in Israel and then in the world) think about living or working abroad more/less? Do you think they would need to do anything different than you to achieve this?

14. How/what do you learn about the world outside school at home from your parents/online/through activities?

15. Going back to the issue of other cultures- what does multiculturalism or diversity mean to you? Does it exist at your school? How to you lean about other cultures at your school, if at all?

16. Do you learn about world issues like global warming at your school? Do you think it is important? Is it more/less important somewhere else?

17. Do you think your school should prepare you to be part of a global society? How and why? Is it more or less important for pupils somewhere else to prepare for it? Why?

18. Do your teachers know more than you about the world?

19. Going back to the first question about where you have travelled or want to travel- can you tell me something about this experience? What did you learn from it? (only if all of them have travelled).

Appendix 4: UCL Ethical and Data Management Approval

Doctoral Student Ethics Application Form

Anyone conducting research under the auspices of the Institute of Education (staff, students or visitors) where the research involves human participants or the use of data collected from human participants, is required to gain ethical approval before starting. This includes preliminary and pilot studies. Please answer all relevant questions in simple terms that can be understood by a lay person and note that your form may be returned if incomplete.

Registering your study with the UCL Data Protection Officer as part of the UCL Research Ethics Review Process

If you are proposing to collect personal data i.e. data from which a living individual can be identified **you must be registered with the UCL Data Protection Office before you submit your ethics application for review**. To do this, email the complete ethics form to data-protection@ucl.ac.uk. Once your registration number is received, add it to the form* and submit it to your supervisor for approval.

If the Data Protection Office advises you to make changes to the way in which you propose to collect and store the data this should be reflected in your ethics application form.

Section 1 Project details		
a.	Project title	The GCE gap remapped: Considering the role of space and teachers in shaping student's perceptions of Global Citizenship Education
b.	Student name and ID number (e.g. ABC12345678)	Heela Goren 18027622

c.	***UCL Data Protection Registration Number**	Z6364106/2019/04/90 Date issued 11/04/2019
c.	Supervisor/Personal Tutor	Prof. Paul Morris
d.	Department	Education, Practice and Society

e.	Course category (Tick one)	PhD	☒	EdD ☐
		DEdPsy ☐		

f.	**If applicable,** state who the funder is and if funding has been confirmed.	
g.	Intended research start date	10/03/2019
h.	Intended research end date	01/01/2021
i.	Country fieldwork will be conducted in *If research to be conducted abroad please check* www.fco.gov.uk *and submit a completed travel risk assessment form (see guidelines). If the FCO advice is against travel this will be **required** before ethical approval can be granted:* http://ioe-net.inst.ioe.ac.uk/about/profservices/international/Pages/default.aspx	Israel

j.	Has this project been considered by another (external) Research Ethics Committee?	
	Yes ☐	External Committee Name:
	No ☒ ☐*go to Section 2*	Date of Approval:

If yes:
  − Submit a copy of the approval letter with this application.
  − Proceed to Section 10 Attachments**.**

> **Note**: Ensure that you check the guidelines carefully as research with some participants will require ethical approval from a different ethics committee such as the National Research Ethics Service (NRES) or Social Care Research Ethics Committee (SCREC). In addition, if your research is based in another institution then you may be required to apply to their research ethics committee.

Section 2 Research methods summary (tick all that apply)

☒ Interviews
☒ Focus groups
☐ Questionnaires
☐ Action research
☒ Observation
☒ Literature review

☐ Controlled trial/other intervention study
☐ Use of personal records
☒ Systematic review ☐*if only method used go to Section 5.*
☐ Secondary data analysis ☐*if secondary analysis used go to Section 6*
☐ Advisory/consultation/collaborative groups
☐ Other, give details:

Please provide an overview of the project, focusing on your methodology. This should include some or all of the following: purpose of the research, aims, main research questions, research design, participants, sampling, data collection (including justifications for methods chosen and description of topics/questions to be asked), reporting and dissemination. Please focus on your methodology; the theory, policy, or literary background of your work can be provided in an attached document (i.e. a full research proposal or case for support document). *Minimum 150 words required.*

The proposed thesis will address the following questions:

- How do students from different socioeconomic backgrounds residing in different cities (global/periphery) perceive GCE, their place in a global world, and their imagined futures?

- What factors do students see as relevant to their GCE (teachers, parents, environment, curricula, internet) and what practices and strategies do they identify as GCE related?

- How do teachers of students from different SE backgrounds residing in different cities construct meaning of GCE and how to they perceive their role in students' GCE?

- How do spatial elements of students' environment and characteristics of their place of residence manifest in students' and other educational actors (teachers) constructions of the meaning of GCE?

Research purpose

The purpose of this research is to contribute to the development of more contextually-sensitive forms of GCE both in scholarship and in policy by exposing discrepancies in how students from different backgrounds relate to GCE and the type of GCE they are exposed to in different educational settings and places of residence. I aim to

delineate strategies and contents that different populations associate with GCE and examine the extent to which these are compatible or contradictory to the type of GCE promoted by international organisations, as well as critically examine institutional forms of GCE with relation to bottom-up conceptions of the term by different actors (students, teachers, and head teachers) and challenge the dichotomous separation between global and local by examining the extent to which perceptions of the global are shaped by local spatial factors.

Proposed methodology

Study population and sampling method

The study will employ a collective case study method (Stake, 1995) through which four schools will be chosen to represent high and low SES schools in a global, central city and a non-and a peripheral city with less global influences (as per Carter, 2005). The cases include schools in the Jewish-Secular sector of the education system. The choice to concentrate on this sector stems from my most recently finished work, which consists of a comparison of Palestinian-Arab, Jewish-Religious and Jewish-Secular teachers' perceptions of global citizenship education with regards to their social group and their students' backgrounds (Goren, Maxwell & Yemini, 2018). The study revealed that the different groups associate strikingly different benefits, opportunities and threats with global citizenship due to their different status in Israeli society. These findings reiterate the importance of maintaining awareness for the vastly different ways GCE can be perceived in different contexts and show that a comparative study of global citizenship and global identities would face difficulties in the extent to which findings could be generalized. The proposed thesis will concentrate on students from the secular-Jewish, because the perception of GCE and the risks and opportunities associated with it that are prevalent among teachers in this sector are most similar to those previously depicted in the literature produced in other contexts, thereby increasing the transferability of the theoretical contributions.

The cases will be chosen purposely, two schools from Tel Aviv, a global city, and two schools from Or Akiva, a peripheral city that does not have the global financial, cultural, or academic influences associated with global cities. In each city a school serving primarily high SES population of students and a school serving primarily low SES population of students will be chosen and approached. Interviews will be conducted with the head-teacher or deputy head teacher in each secondary school, ten students between the ages of 14-16, and at least five teachers of subjects that are most commonly discussed in relation to global citizenship education (civics, history, geography, English). I will aspire to establish a gender-balanced sample.

Data collection

Data will be collected using semi-structured interviews with teachers and focus groups with students aged 14-1
Supplementary data will be collected through participant and non-participant observations
Semi-structured interviews were selected with the intention of granting participants an opportunity to elaborate
much as possible while maintaining a loose structure surrounding the study's areas of focus. The semi-structure
interview questions will be based on my previous studies of teacher perceptions of global citizenship, as well as
on the various aspects of GCE that I plan to identify through a systematic analysis of the GCE scholarship.
Focus groups with students will employ, spatial mapping (also sometimes referred to as participatory mapping
geovisualisation) a data collection and creation method in which participants (students) are asked to draw a
physical space as they perceive it (Literat, 2013; Jung, 2014; Powell, 2010). The space can be their school, their
route to school, their city, neighborhood and more. The maps are used to facilitate the discussion and used as da
- meaning they are compared and analysed as artifacts that emerge from the research (Jung, 2014; Powell, 2010
During the student interviews, they will be asked to draw a map of their city, neighborhood and school, marking
specific places they perceive as having global aspects or being a global influence or component in their
environment.

The interview protocol will make use of Inductive Probing, a method in which the researcher asks open ended
questions which connect the interviewee's own answers to the research at hand and its theoretical backdrop
(Guest, Mitchell, and Namey 2012). Interviews with students will concentrate on their imagined futures and
engagement with aspects of global citizenship as well as their perceptions of their environment; these interview
will begin with a semi structured conversation about a media segment or article concerning a current event of
global nature (these will be included as appendices), before moving onto a more concrete discussion. Interview
with teachers will be used to enrich and triangulate the data, to further clarify how they contribute to and shape
the students' engagement with global citizenship. The interviews will be conducted at the schools with students
and teachers to ensure a familiar environment for the participants.

The semi-structured interviews with students will concentrate on their perceptions of GCE and their
understanding of their environment's contribution to these perceptions, while interviews with teachers will be
used to triangulate and enrich the findings by concentrating on how these actors perceive the students' experien
in relation to GCE.

Section 3 Research Participants (tick all that apply)

☐ Early years/pre-school ☐ Ages 5-11 ☒ Ages 12-16 ☒ Young people aged 17-18	☒ Adults *please specify below* ☐ Unknown – specify below ☐ No participants Teachers

NB: Ensure that you check the guidelines carefully as research with some participants will require ethical approval from a different ethics committee such as the <u>National Research Ethics Service</u> (NRES) or <u>Social Care Research Ethics Committee</u> (SCREC).

Section 4 Security-sensitive material (only complete if applicable)

Security sensitive research includes: commissioned by the military; commissioned under an EU security call; involves the acquisition of security clearances; concerns terrorist or extreme groups.

a.	Will your project consider or encounter security-sensitive material?	Yes ☐ *	No ☒
b.	Will you be visiting websites associated with extreme or terrorist organisations?	Yes ☐ *	No ☒
c.	Will you be storing or transmitting any materials that could be interpreted as promoting or endorsing terrorist acts?	Yes ☐ *	No ☒

** Give further details in **Section 8 Ethical Issues** ☐*

Section 5 Systematic reviews of research (only complete if applicable)

a.	Will you be collecting any new data from participants?	Yes ☒ *	No ☐
b.	Will you be analysing any secondary data?	Yes ☐ *	No ☐

** Give further details in **Section 8 Ethical Issues** ☐*

*If your methods do not involve engagement with participants (e.g. systematic review, literature review) **and if** you have answered **No** to both questions, please go to **Section 8 Attachments.***

Section 6 Secondary data analysis (only complete if applicable)

a.	Name of dataset/s	
b.	Owner of dataset/s	
	Are the data in the public domain?	Yes ☐ No ☐

c.		***If no,*** *do you have the owner's permission/license* Yes ☐ No* ☐

d.	Are the data anonymised?	Yes ☐ No ☐	
		Do you plan to anonymise the data? Yes ☐ No* ☐	
		Do you plan to use individual level data? Yes* ☐ No ☐	
		Will you be linking data to individuals? Yes* ☐ No ☐	

e.	Are the data sensitive ([DPA 1998 definition](#))?	Yes* ☐	No ☐
f.	Will you be conducting analysis within the remit it was originally collected for?	Yes ☐	No* ☐
g.	**If no,** was consent gained from participants for subsequent/future analysis?	Yes ☐	No* ☐
h.	**If no,** was data collected prior to ethics approval process?	Yes ☐	No* ☐

** Give further details in **Section 8 Ethical Issues**☐*

*If secondary analysis is only method used **and** no answers with asterisks are ticked, go to **Section 9 Attachments**.*

Section 7 Data Storage and Security

Please ensure that you include all hard and electronic data when completing this section.

a.	**Data subjects -** Who will the data be collected from? Students aged 14-18, Teachers
b.	**What data will be collected?** Please provide details of the type of personal data to be collected some personal history, no sensitive material
c.	**Disclosure** – Who will the results of your project be disclosed to? results will be shared with my supervisors and disseminated through publications (after ensuring no identifying details are present)
d.	**Data storage** – Please provide details on how and where the data will be stored i.e. UCL network, encrypted USB stick*, encrypted laptop* etc. encrypted external hard drive *Advanced Encryption Standard 256 bit encryption which has been made a security standard within NHS

e.	**Data Safe Haven (Identifiable Data Handling Solution)** – Will the personal identifiable data collected and processed as part of this research be stored in the UCL Data Safe Haven (mainly used by SLMS divisions, institutes and departments)?	Yes ☐ No ☒
f.	How long will the data and records be kept for and in what format? Interview and focus groups will be recorded (audio only) and some will be transcribed. All recordings will be kept for one year after finishing the project, transcriptions (with no identifying details) will be kept for up to 3 years Will personal data be processed or be sent outside the European Economic Area? (If yes, please confirm that there are adequate levels of protections in compliance with the DPA 1998 and state what these arrangements are: no Will data be archived for use by other researchers? (If yes, please provide details.) no	

Section 8 Ethical issues

Please state clearly the ethical issues which may arise in the course of this research and how will they be addressed.

All issues that may apply should be addressed. Some examples are given below, further information can be found in the guidelines. *Minimum 150 words required.*

− Methods − Sampling − Recruitment − Gatekeepers − Informed consent − Potentially vulnerable participants − Safeguarding/child protection − Sensitive topics	− International research − Risks to participants and/or researchers − Confidentiality/Anonymity − Disclosures/limits to confidentiality − Data storage and security both during and after the research (including transfer, sharing, encryption, protection) − Reporting − Dissemination and use of findings

I am committed to an accurate representation of participants' views, and maintenance of complete anonymity of the study population (both between subjects and among colleagues and peers). In this study, despite of the seemingly non-controversial nature of its subject GCE and global influences), Gibton's (2015) timeline of ethical deliberations will be used to ensure that at every stage of the research, all relevant ethical issues were addressed. First, during the planning stage of t

study, the participant list will not be discussed other than with my advisor. Additionally, the research proposal has been reviewed and approved by the Chief Scientist at the Ministry of Education. In the stage of initial contact, when approaching teachers and students, I will not mention other schools and teachers who had participated in the study, even if prompted to do so.

Clear boundaries and obligations will be set upon initial contact with teacher and students by explaining the voluntary nature of the study and the strategies through which anonymity will be maintained and established. During the meetings, which will be held in a safe environment chosen by the participants, these obligations to the privacy and anonymity of participants will be repeated and they will be asked to review the informed consent letter and be informed that interview recordings would only be accessible by the researcher and that the interview will be transcribed without identifying details of neither the school nor the individual teachers, or students. Parental signature on a consent form will be required for all students participating in focus groups, as per the Israeli Ministry of Education's guidelines.

During snowball sampling, all approached individuals will be told that they were recommended by the school principal or one of their teachers, without mentioning names. In the data analysis phase, the data will be triangulated and reviewed by my advisors, and interpretations will be debated until a consensus is reached, in order to ensure a proper representation and understanding of the participants' own views, without imposing unreliable personal interpretations.

When writing the final product of the research, pseudonyms will be provided to all participants, and they will be divided by areas and SES rather than individual schools in order to maintain the anonymity of the establishments and the particular participants who were interviewed. Quotes will be used throughout the analysis section in order to provide a more accurate account and representation of teachers' own perceptions. These same stages will be repeated for publication, and will be maintained in the aftermath of this study. The Ethical aspects of the study were also approved by the Tel Aviv University board of Ethics and the Israeli Chief Scientist (permit number 10439, 2019), upon reading the proposal and reviewing the research questions, the safeguards put into place, and the informed consent letter introduced to all participants.

Section 9 Attachments Please attach the following items to this form, or explain if not attached		
a.	Information sheets, consent forms and other materials to be used to inform potential participants about the research *(List attachments below)*	Yes ☐ No ☒

The applicable sheets (consent forms for students, teachers, and parents) are in Hebrew and have been approved

by my secondary supervisor (Dr. Miri Yemini, UCL visiting professor and Tel Aviv University staff member).

necessary, they will be translated and submitted upon request

	If applicable/appropriate:		
b.	Approval letter from external Research Ethics Committee		Yes ☐
c.	The proposal ('case for support') for the project		Yes ☒
d.	Full risk assessment		Yes ☒

Section 10 Declaration

I confirm that to the best of my knowledge the information in this form is correct and that this is a full description of the ethical issues that may arise in the course of this project.

I have discussed the ethical issues relating to my research with my supervisor.   ☒   ☐

I have attended the appropriate ethics training provided by my course.   ☒   ☐

I confirm that to the best of my knowledge:

The above information is correct and that this is a full description of the ethics issues that may arise in the course of this project.

Name	Heela Goren
Date	12/05/2019

Please submit your completed ethics forms to your supervisor for review.

Notes and references

Professional code of ethics

You should read and understand relevant ethics guidelines, for example:

British Psychological Society (2009) *Code of Ethics and Conduct*, and (2014) *Code of Human Research Ethics*

or

British Educational Research Association (2011) *Ethical Guidelines*

or

British Sociological Association (2002) *Statement of Ethical Practice*

Please see the respective websites for these or later versions; direct links to the latest versions are available on the Institute of Education http://www.ucl.ac.uk/ioe/research/research-ethics

Disclosure and Barring Service checks

If you are planning to carry out research in regulated Education environments such as Schools, or if your research will bring you into contact with children and young people (under the age of 18), you will need to have a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) CHECK, before you start. The DBS was previously known as the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) . If you do not already hold a current DBS check, and have not registered with the DBS update service, you will need to obtain one through at IOE.

Ensure that you apply for the DBS check in plenty of time as will take around 4 weeks, though can take longer depending on the circumstances.

Further references

The www.ethicsguidebook.ac.uk website is very useful for assisting you to think through the ethical issues arising from your project.

Robson, Colin (2011). *Real world research: a resource for social scientists and practitioner researchers* (3rd edition). Oxford: Blackwell.
This text has a helpful section on ethical considerations.

Alderson, P. and Morrow, V. (2011) *The Ethics of Research with Children and Young People: A Practical Handbook.* London: Sage.

This text has useful suggestions if you are conducting research with children and young people.

Wiles, R. (2013) What are Qualitative Research Ethics? Bloomsbury.

Departmental use	

If a project raises particularly challenging ethics issues, or a more detailed review would be appropriate, the supervisor **must** refer the application to the Department Research Ethics Coordinator (via ioe.researchethics@ucl.ac.uk so that it can be submitted to the Research Ethics Committee for consideration. A departmental research ethics coordinator or representative can advise you, either to support your review process, or help decide whether an application should be referred to the REC. If unsure please refer to the guidelines explaining when to refer the ethics application to the IOE Research Ethics Committee, posted on the committee's website.

Student name	Heela Goren
Student department	IOE Education Practice and Society
Course	PhD thesis
Project title	The GCE gap remapped: Considering the role of space and teachers in shaping student's perceptions of Global Citizenship Education
Reviewer 1	
Supervisor/first reviewer name	Paul Morris
Do you foresee any ethical difficulties with this research?	No
Supervisor/first reviewer signature	Paul Morris
Date	14/05/19
Reviewer 2	
Second reviewer name	Miri Yemini
Do you foresee any ethical difficulties with this research?	no
Supervisor/second reviewer signature	
Date	15/5/19
Decision on behalf of reviews	

Decision	Approved	☒
	Approved subject to the following additional measures	☐
	Not approved for the reasons given below	☐
	Referred to REC for review	☐
Points to be noted by other reviewers and in report to REC		
Comments from reviewers for the applicant		

Once it is approved by both reviewers, students should submit their ethics application form to the Centre for Doctoral Education team: IOE.CDE@ucl.ac.uk.

Appendix 5: MOE Chief Scientist Approval (Hebrew) Permit 10439

מדינת ישראל
משרד החינוך
לשכת המדען הראשי

ירושלים, 8 ינואר, 2019
8 ינואר, 2019
תיק 10439 רו

היתר לאיסוף מידע לצורך המחקר בנושא
"האופן בו מרחב, סביבה, ומורים מעצבים את תפיסת המשמעות של המושג 'גלובלי' בקרב תלמידים"

עורכת המחקר : גב' הילה גורן

ההיתר בתוקף החל מהתאריך הרשום לעיל ועד לסיום שנת הלימודים תש"פ בלבד

במסמך זה ההתייחסות לחברי צוות המוסדר החינוכי היא בלשון זכר, זאת מטעמי נוחות בלבד, והכוונה היא גם לנקבה אם לא מצוין אחרת.

לצורך הכניסה לבית הספר יש להמציא העתק של היתר זה למנהל המוסד

לצורך איסוף המידע מהמורה יש להמציא לעיונו העתק של היתר זה

המסגרת שבה נערך המחקר: לימודיה של עורכת המחקר לקראת תואר שלישי באוניברסיטת UCL בלונדון, אנגליה.

עיקרי המרכיבים של המחקר לעניין היתר זה:

הנבדקים

- תלמידי כיתות ח'-י"ב
- מוריהם להיסטוריה או לאזרחות של התלמידים בכיתות שלעיל

פעולות איסוף המידע

- תצפית בשיעור, שמטרתה לבחון את השיח הלימודי בנושא העומד לבדיקה
- ראיון של התלמידים הנבדקים בנוגע לתפיסותיהם את משמעות המושג גלובלי (בינלאומי) בהקשר ללימודיהם ולחיי היום יום.
- ראיון של המורים הנבדקים על תפיסת תפקידם בכל הקשור לחשיפת תלמידיהם לתכנים גלובליים הרלוונטיים למקצוע הנלמד.

הבקשה לאיסוף המידע הנ"ל נבדקה על ידי לשכת המדען הראשי ונמצאה עומדת בכל התנאים הנוגעים בדבר הקבועים בנוהלי משרד החינוך לפעילות מחקרית במערכת החינוך.[1]
לאור זאת הוחלט להתיר את איסוף המידע המבוקש בקרב תלמידי כיתות ח'-י"ב בבתי ספר ממלכתיים במחוזות חיפה, תל אביב ומרכז.
ההיתר כפוף לכל התנאים שלהלן, אשר אותם על עורכת המחקר לקיים בשיתוף עם מנהל המוסד

---

[1] הנהלים מפורסמים בחוזר המנהלת הכללית – הוראות קבע – עה/9(לב) מחודש מאי 2015 ומופיעים גם באתר לשכת המדען הראשי.

1

<u>החינוכי הנוגע בדבר, אלא אם כן נקבע אחרת בתנאי עצמו:</u>

1. המנהל של המוסד החינוכי שבמסגרתו מתוכנן המחקר להיערך, התלמידים והמורים המועמדים להשתתף במחקר והורי התלמידים – כל אלה אינם תלויים בדרך כלשהי בעורכת המחקר ובכל אדם הפועל מטעמה, לרבות בגין יחסי כפיפות.

2. איסוף המידע ייערך אך ורק על ידי עורכת המחקר עצמה.

3. בכל אחת מפעולות איסוף המידע בה מעורבים תלמידים ישתתפו או ייכללו (בהתאמה לסוג הפעולה) אך ורק התלמידים, שהוריהם נתנו את הסכמתם לאיסוף מידע מילדם ו/או על אודותיו בהקשר לאותה פעולה. לצורך קיום תנאי זה תיערכנה פעולות אלה:

   א. עורכת המחקר תספק להנהלת המוסד החינוכי את הכמות הנחוצה של מכתבי הפנייה להורים בנושא למצ״ב נוסח המכתב וכתב ההסכמה, החתומים דיגיטלית, שאותם יש להפיץ בקרב ההורים.

   ב. הנהלת המוסד החינוכי תסדיר את הפצת המכתב להורים באמצעות התלמידים.[2]

   ג. ההורים המסכימים להשתתפות ילדם בלפחות אחת משתי פעולות   איסוף המידע המבוקשות יחזירו את כתב ההסכמה החתום על ידם להנהלת המוסד החינוכי, וממנה תאסוף עורכת המחקר את הטפסים הנ״ל, ותמסור העתק מהם לשמירה במוסד.[3]

4. תלמיד, שהוריו לא הסכימו לשיתופו בפעולות/בפעולות איסוף המידע המבוקשת/המבוקשות לא ייפגע בדרך כלשהי בעקבות החלטת הוריו.

5. לקראת איסוף המידע תתאר עורכת המחקר בפני כלל המועמדים להיבדק[4] את פעולות איסוף המידע המתוכננות במסגרת המחקר ותבהיר להם את זכותם שלא להיכלל באחת או בשתי פעולות איסוף מידע אלה. כמו כן, תבהיר עורכת המחקר   לכלל המשתתפים בריאיון את זכותם להפסיק את השתתפותם במחקר באמצע, מבלי שייפגעו בעקבות החלטתם באופן כלשהו.[5]

6. יישמרו בקפידה כלל זכויותיהם של המועמדים להיבדק ושל הורי התלמידים בנוגע לכלל הפעולות שלהן קשר לאיסוף המידע המתוכנן, וביניהן זכותם של הנבדקים לפרטיות במהלך הריאיון עמם, זאת בהתייחס לתלמידים מקרב הנבדקים, מבלי לפגוע ביכולתו של הצוות החינוכי להשגיח עליהם כנדרש.

7. כלל איסוף המידע ייערך בשטח בית הספר.

8. הראיון של התלמידים לא יפגע בהכנותיהם לקראת בחינות הבגרות בכיתות המוגעות בדבר ובהשתתפותם בהן. האחריות לקיום תנאי זה חלה על מנהל בית הספר.

9. לצורך השתתפות התלמיד בראיון, יצא כל תלמיד נבדק בתורו מהשיעור, בתיאום עם המורה.

10. הראיונות של התלמידים והמורים הנבדקים יתועדו באמצעות הקלטה קולית בלבד.

---

2. בהעדר הסכמת ההורים אין לאפשר לעורכת המחקר נגישות לפרטים מזהים כלשהם על אודות התלמידים, מלל כאלה שהיו נחוצים לה לצורך הפצת המכתב במחלחת עצמה.

3. המסמכים הנ״ל יישמרו לצמיתות על-ידי הנהלת המוסד החינוכי, ובאחריותה, במקום מאובטח.

4. כתלמיד המועמד להיבדק במסגרת אחת או יותר מפעולות איסוף המידע המבוקשות מוגדר מי שהוריו נתנו בכתובים את הסכמתם להכללתו בפעולת איסוף המידע.

5. זכויות אלה כמו גם זכויות הורי התלמידים מובהרות להורים במסגרת המכתב המופנה בקרבם המצורף להיתר זה.

11. תיעוד התצפית בשיעור ייערך בכתב בלבד.

12. תיעוד התצפית לא יכלול כל התייחסות להתנהלות של תלמיד, או להתנהלות המוגעת לתלמיד, שהוריו לא הסכימו להכללתו בתצפית.

13. לצורך המחקר לא יתועד כל פרט המאפשר זיהוי של הנבדקים או של כל אדם אחר.[6] בכלל זאת:

א. לפני תחילת הריאיון יונחו המועמדים ליטול חלק שלא לציין במהלכו כל פרט המזהה את עצמם או כל אדם אחר.

ב. אם בשל טעות הוקלט בכל זאת פרט המזהה אדם כלשהו, באחריותה של עורכת המחקר להסיר מההקלטה את הפרט המזהה הנ"ל מיד בתום הריאיון הנוגע בדבר.

14. משך הזמן המרבי שיוקדש לאיסוף המידע בקרב התלמידים לצורכי המחקר ייקבע על ידי המנהל. זאת, תוך התאמה להבהרות שרשומות במושא במכתב להורים.

15. איסוף המידע מהמורים לא ייערך בשעות המיועדות לעבודתם עם תלמידיהם.

16. כלל הפעולות הקשורות לאיסוף המידע ייערכו בשפת ההוראה העיקרית הנהוגה במוסד החינוכי.[7]

17. בעת הכניסה לבית הספר, על עורכת המחקר לשמור על הופעה ההולמת את המקובל במוסד.

עוד יובהר כדלהלן:

- עורכת המחקר התחייבה בכתובים לפני לשכת המדען הראשי לא לפרסם את ממצאי המחקר באופן שיאפשר את זיהוי הנבדקים.

- ההיתר ניתן אך ורק לאיסוף המידע באמצעות כלי המחקר שהוצגו לבדיקה ללשכת המדען הראשי, בנוסח ובמתכונת שהעברה שהותרו לשימוש.

- אם קיימות זכויות יוצרים בנוגע לכלי המחקר או בנוגע לתשובות או לתוצרים האחרים של הנבדקים הנוצרים במסגרת איסוף המידע ו/או הנמסרים לעורכת המחקר, באחריותה הבלעדית של עורכת המחקר להסדיר את הנושא בהתאם לכל הוראות החוק/ים הנוגעים בדבר.

- אין במסמך זה משום חיווי דעה של לשכת המדען הראשי על איכותו של המחקר.

- לא נדרש היתר נפרד מטעם המחוז.

רנה אוסיזון

מרכזת בכירה (בקרה ומעקב)

תפוצה:

גב' הילה מוק, אוניברסיטת UCL, לונדון, אנגליה

מנהלי מחוזות חיפה, מרכז ותל אביב

6. הטבלת המידע שייאסוף מהתלמידים תהיל אוחדותיהם ממקורות המידע השונים תיהרך ברשת הכיתה הנבדקת בלבד.
7. אם שפת ההוראה במוסד אינה עברית, האחריות לתרגום כלי המחקר והמכתב להורים ולהתאמתם לנוסח שהותר משפה העברית חיה על עורכת המחקר.

Appendix 6: Information Sheet and Consent Form for Teachers (Translated)

Information sheet for participation in a study on global aspects of education

Thank you for agreeing to participate in my study, which is being performed as part of my PhD at the University College London Institute of education. . The research is supervised by Prof. Paul Morris of UCL and Dr. Miri Yemini at Tel Aviv University. The research aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of how globalisation impacts education in different parts and areas of the education system.

As part of the research, I will be performing interviews with many teachers from different sectors and areas. The Interview will last between 45 and 90 minutes, it will be audio-recorded, and participation is completely confidential and voluntary. This means I won't disclose that you participated in the study nor will I discuss your responses with anyone other than my supervisors- and they won't know who you are.

You can stop the interview at any time, and please feel free to let me know if there are any questions you do not want to answer, or any that you think might be better phrased differently, so I can improve for my next interviews.

The data I collect (the recording) will be kept on an encrypted drive for a limited amount of time. Only I will have access to the full recording. I will also be transcribing parts of the interview to put in my research, but when I transcribe I will not use your name- and assign you a pseudonym. I will also not transcribe any information about your specific school or where you live- and give this information only in broad terms so that it would be impossible to identify you. Having said that- if at the end of the interview you want me to remove any information or if at any point you want me to stop the recording, feel free to let me know.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me: REDACTED or my supervisor Dr. Miri

Yemini: REDACTED. I am also reachable by phone: REDACTED.

Please sign this form to indicate that you understand the voluntary nature of the study and how

your information and identity will be protected, and consent to participate.

_____   _____   _____

 Full Name   Signature   Date

Appendix 7: Information Sheet and Consent Form for Parents (Translated)

<u>Information sheet for child's participation in a study on students' engagement with global influences</u>

The head-teacher of the class was asked to distribute this letter among the parents of all the students in their classroom.

As part of my PhD thesis at the University College London Institute of education, I am performing a study that concerns students' engagement with global influences. The research is supervised by Prof. Paul Morris of UCL and Dr. Miri Yemini at Tel Aviv University. The research aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of how educational environments can shape global engagement.

As part of the research, I will be performing focus group interviews with 5-8 students from each class chosen to participate, with 15 or 16 year old students who are interested in participating and whose parents have signed this form of consent.

In the focus groups, students will be asked to discuss the global influences they encounter in their daily lives, their future aspirations, their feelings about globalisation and similar topics. The sessions will be during school hours, in the students' school, without the presence of their teacher. The focus groups will be audio recorded, and students will sign forms reminding them of this and of the voluntary nature of their participation at the beginning of the session. Some students may be asked to participate in an interview in addition to the focus groups; this will also be voluntary and be held to the same standards of identity protection and privacy.

Relevant parts of the focus groups interviews will be transcribed, at which point any identifying details (names, school characteristics, neighbourhoods) will be removed and replaced with

pseudonyms where appropriate. The recordings themselves and the transcriptions will be saved on an encrypted external drive to which only I will have access, and will be shared with my supervisors alone. Teachers and other school or Ministry of Education staff will not have access to the raw data and it will not be discussed with them.

The research has been authorised by the UCL Ethics Committee (Pending), the MOE Chief Scientist Office (Approval number 10439), and the school principal. Your child's participation is completely voluntary and opting out will have no consequence for any student. I believe the discussion can be beneficial to the students in giving them an opportunity to reflect on what global impacts are present in their daily lives and the opportunities for engagement with the world that stem from globalisation.

Notice:

The controller for this project will be University College London (UCL). The UCL Data Protection Officer provides oversight of UCL activities involving the processing of personal data, and can be contacted at data-protection@ucl.ac.uk

This 'local' privacy notice sets out the information that applies to this particular study. Further information on how UCL uses participant information can be found in our 'general' privacy notice:

For participants in research studies, click [here](#)

The information that is required to be provided to participants under data protection legislation (GDPR and DPA 2018) is provided across both the 'local' and 'general' privacy notices.

The lawful basis that will be used to process your personal data are: 'Public task' for personal data.

Your personal data will be processed so long as it is required for the research project. If we are able to anonymise or pseudonymise the personal data you provide we will undertake this, and will endeavor to minimise the processing of personal data wherever possible.

If you are concerned about how your personal data is being processed, or if you would like to contact us about your rights, please contact UCL in the first instance at [data-protection@ucl.ac.uk.](mailto:data-protection@ucl.ac.uk)

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me: REDACTED or my supervisor Dr. Miri Yemini: REDACTED. I am also reachable by phone: REDACTED

If you agree to your child's participation in one or more of the research activities, I would be grateful if you could fill in the attached form and send it back to school with your child at your earliest convenience.

Thank you,

Heela Goren

PhD Candidate

Consent form for child's participation in a study on students' engagement with global influences

To: Ms. Heela Goren

1.	*I confirm that I have read and understood the Information Sheet for the above study. I have had an opportunity to consider the information and what will be expected of my child, should they choose to participate. I have also had the opportunity to ask questions which have been answered to my satisfaction *I give my consent for my child to take part in the following activity(ies) as part of the*	

	research project (please circle one or more of the following and initial next to the choice as well as in the box to the right) : - *a focus group discussion* - *an individual interview* - *a classroom observation*	
2.	*I consent for my child to participate in the study. I understand that their personal information *(school, grade level, and verbal responses in the focus group)* will be used for the purposes explained to me. I understand that according to data protection legislation, 'public task' will be the lawful basis for processing personal data.	
3.	**Use of the information for this project only** *I understand that all personal information will remain confidential and that all efforts will be made to ensure I cannot be identified and that my school will not be identified I understand that my data gathered in this study will be stored anonymously and securely in an encrypted external drive. In any publication pseudonyms will be used to protect my identity and my school affiliation and place of residence will be pseudonysed as well.	
4.	*I understand that raw data gathered about my child including audio recordings may be subject to review by responsible individuals from the University only for monitoring and audit purposes.	
5.	I understand the voluntary nature of the study and that my child will be able to leave or withdraw participation at any point with no repercussions.	
6.	I understand the direct/indirect benefits of participating.	
7.	I understand that the data will not be made available to any commercial organisations but is solely the responsibility of the researcher(s) undertaking this study.	
8.	I understand that I nor my child will not benefit financially from this study or from any possible outcome it may result in in the future.	
9.	I agree that my child's pseudonymised research data may be used by others for future research. [No one will be able to identify you when if data is shared.]	
10.	I consent to the interview/ focus group being audio recorded and understand that the recordings will be destroyed *following transcription and within 1 year of when data is collected* .	
11.	I hereby confirm that I understand the inclusion criteria as detailed in the Information Sheet and explained to me by the researcher.	
12.	I am aware of who I should contact if I wish to lodge a complaint.	
13.	Use of information for this project and beyond I understand that other authenticated researchers may have access to my child's pseudonymed transcribed data, but not to the raw data (recordings).	

_____   _____   _____
Name of parent   Date   Signature

_____

Name, grade and class number of student

Appendix 8: Information Sheet and Consent Form for Pupils (Translated)

Information sheet for student participation in a study on students' engagement with global influences

As part of my PhD thesis at the University College London Institute of education, I am performing a study that concerns students' engagement with global influences. The research is supervised by Prof. Paul Morris of UCL and Dr. Miri Yemini at Tel Aviv University. The research aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of how educational environments can shape global engagement.

As part of the research, I will be performing focus group interviews with 5-8 15-16 year old students from each class chosen to participate. Participation is limited to students who are interested in participating and whose parents have signed a form of consent. You can revoke your participation at any time, including after the session has started, and there will be no repercussions to this choice. If there are any questions you do not feel comfortable answering that is completely acceptable, and you will not be pushed to answer anything. Neither your teacher nor anyone at your school will have access to any of the raw data, nor will I tell them anything about how the focus group went. If asked, I will say that it went well.

In the focus groups, you and other participating students will be asked to discuss the global influences you encounter in in your daily life, your future aspirations, your feelings about globalisation and similar topics. The session will be during school hours, at the library or the school, without the presence of your teacher. The session will be audio recorded.

Relevant parts of the focus group interviews will be transcribed, at which point any identifying details (names, school characteristics, neighborhoods) will be removed and replaced with

pseudonyms where appropriate. The recordings themselves and the transcriptions will be saved on an encrypted external drive to which only I will have access, and will be shared with my supervisors alone. Teachers and other school or Ministry of Education staff will not have access to the raw data and it will not be discussed with them.

The research has been authorised by the UCL Ethics Committee (Pending), the MOE Chief Scientist Office (Approval number 10439), and the school principal.

Once again, your participation is completely voluntary and opting out will have no consequence for any student. I believe the discussion can be beneficial and interesting for you, and would be happy to gain your cooperation.

Notice:

The controller for this project will be University College London (UCL). The UCL Data Protection Officer provides oversight of UCL activities involving the processing of personal data, and can be contacted at data-protection@ucl.ac.uk

This 'local' privacy notice sets out the information that applies to this particular study. Further information on how UCL uses participant information can be found in our 'general' privacy notice:

For participants in research studies, click [here](#)

The information that is required to be provided to participants under data protection legislation (GDPR and DPA 2018) is provided across both the 'local' and 'general' privacy notices.

The lawful basis that will be used to process your personal data are: 'Public task' for personal data.

Your personal data will be processed so long as it is required for the research project. If we are able to anonymise or pseudonymise the personal data you provide we will undertake this, and will endeavor to minimise the processing of personal data wherever possible.

If you are concerned about how your personal data is being processed, or if you would like to contact us about your rights, please contact UCL in the first instance at data-protection@ucl.ac.uk

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me: Redacted or my supervisor Dr. Miri Yemini: REDACTED. I am also reachable by phone: REDACTED

If you agree to participate, I would be grateful if you could fill in the attached form. Thank you,

Heela Goren

PhD Candidate

Consent form for student participation in a study on students' engagement with global influences

<u>To: Ms. Heela Goren</u>

Please initial or sign on the box to the rights to verify you have understood and received the relevant information. If anything is unclear please contact me, 0547956936.

	14.	*I confirm that I have read and understood the Information Sheet for the above study. I have had an opportunity to consider the information and what will be expected of me if I choose to participate. I have also had the opportunity to ask questions which have been answered to my satisfaction *I agree to take part in the following activity(ies) as part of the research project (please circle one or more of the following and initial next to the choise as well as in the box to the right) :* - *a focus group discussion* - *an individual interview* - *a classroom observation*	
	15.	I understand that my personal information *(school, grade level, and verbal responses in the focus group)* will be used for the purposes explained to me, and have been given access to resources that further explain how my data will be protected.	
	16.	**Use of the information for this project only**	

	*I understand that all personal information will remain confidential and that all efforts will be made to ensure I cannot be identified and that my school will not be identified I understand that my data gathered in this study will be stored anonymously and securely in an encrypted external drive. In any publication pseudonyms will be used to protect my identity and my school affiliation and place of residence will be given pseudonyms as well, with any specific details removed.	
17.	*I understand that raw data gathered about me including audio recordings may be subject to review by responsible individuals from the University only for monitoring and audit purposes.	
18.	I understand the voluntary nature of the study and that my child will be able to leave or withdraw participation at any point with no repercussions.	
19.	I understand the direct/indirect benefits of participating.	
20.	I understand that the data will not be made available to any commercial organisations but is solely the responsibility of the researcher(s) undertaking this study.	
21.	I understand that I nor my child will not benefit financially from this study or from any possible outcome it may result in in the future.	
22.	I agree that my child's pseudonymised research data may be used by others for future research. [No one will be able to identify you when if data is shared.]	
23.	I consent to the interview/ focus group being audio recorded and understand that The recordings will be kept for up to one year after the thesis is submitted as per MOE requirements, but they will be kept on an encrypted external hard drive to which only Heela Goren will have direct access. .	
24.	I am aware that my teachers, parents ,and other school staff will not be given any specific details or information about anything said in the focus group, except in the event that something is said that could be interpreted as harmful to any student.	
25.	I am aware of who I should contact if I wish to lodge a complaint.	
26.	Use of information for this project and beyond I understand that other authenticated researchers may have access to my pseudonymed transcribed data, but not to the raw data (recordings).	

_____ _____ _____
Full name of student   Date   Signature

Appendix 9: OECD PISA Global Competence Framework 2018

Construct 1: Self efficacy Regarding Global Issues

Questions related to global competence in the student questionnaire

How easy do you think it would be for you to perform the following tasks on your own?

(Please select one response in each row.)

	I couldn't do this	I would struggle to do this on my own	I could do this with a bit of effort	I could do this easily
Explain how carbon-dioxide emissions affect global climate change	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04
Establish a connection between prices of textiles and working conditions in the countries of production	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04
Discuss the different reasons why people become refugees	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04
Explain why some countries suffer more from global climate change than others	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04
Explain how economic crises in single countries affect the global economy	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04
Discuss the consequences of economic development on the environment	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04

Construct: Self-efficacy regarding global issues

Construct 2: Awareness of Global Issues

How informed are you about the following topics?

(Please select one response in each row.)

	I have never heard of this	I have heard about this but I would not be able to explain what it is really about	I know something about this and could explain the general issue	I am familiar with this and I would be able to explain this well
Climate change and global warming	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
Global health (e.g. epidemics)	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
Migration (movement of people)	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
International conflicts	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
Hunger or malnutrition in different parts of the world	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
Causes of poverty	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
Equality between men and women in different parts of the world	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04

Construct: Awareness of global issues

Construct 3: Perspective-Taking

How well does each of the following statements below describe you?

(Please select one response in each row.)

	Very much like me	Mostly like me	Somewhat like me	Not much like me	Not at all like me
I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision.	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04	☐05
I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both.	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04	☐05
I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective.	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04	☐05
Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place.	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04	☐05
When I'm upset at someone, I try to take the perspective of that person for a while.	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04	☐05

Construct: Perspective-taking

Construct 4: Adaptability

How well does each of the following statements below describe you?

(Please select one response in each row.)

	Very much like me	Mostly like me	Somewhat like me	Not much like me	Not at all like me
I can deal with unusual situations.	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04	☐05
I can change my behaviour to meet the needs of new situations.	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04	☐05
I can adapt to different situations even when under stress or pressure.	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04	☐05
I can adapt easily to a new culture.	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04	☐05
When encountering difficult situations with other people, I can think of a way to resolve the situation.	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04	☐05
I am capable of overcoming my difficulties in interacting with people from other cultures.	☐01	☐02	☐03	☐04	☐05

Construct: Adaptability

Construct 5: Awareness of Intercultural Communication

Imagine you are talking in your native language to people whose native language is different from yours.

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

(Please select one response in each row.)

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I carefully observe their reactions.	□ 01	□ 02	□ 03	□ 04
I frequently check that we are understanding each other correctly.	□ 01	□ 02	□ 03	□ 04
I listen carefully to what they say.	□ 01	□ 02	□ 03	□ 04
I choose my words carefully.	□ 01	□ 02	□ 03	□ 04
I give concrete examples to explain my ideas.	□ 01	□ 02	□ 03	□ 04
I explain things very carefully.	□ 01	□ 02	□ 03	□ 04
If there is a problem with communication, I find ways around it (e.g. by using gestures, re-explaining, writing etc.).	□ 01	□ 02	□ 03	□ 04

Construct: Awareness of intercultural communication

Construct 6: Students Engagement with Others Regarding Global Issues

Are you involved in the following activities?

(Please select one response in each row.)

	Yes	No
I reduce the energy I use at home (e.g. by turning the heating down or turning the air conditioning up or down or by turning off the lights when leaving a room) to protect the environment.	☐ 01	☐ 02
I choose certain products for ethical or environmental reasons, even if they are a bit more expensive.	☐ 01	☐ 02
I sign environmental or social petitions online.	☐ 01	☐ 02
I keep myself informed about world events via <Twitter> or <Facebook>.	☐ 01	☐ 02
I boycott products or companies for political, ethical or environmental reasons.	☐ 01	☐ 02
I participate in activities promoting equality between men and women.	☐ 01	☐ 02
I participate in activities in favour of environmental protection.	☐ 01	☐ 02
I regularly read websites on international social issues (e.g. poverty, human rights).	☐ 01	☐ 02

Construct: Student's engagement (with others) regarding global issues

Constructs 7 and 8: Interest in Learning about Other Cultures; Contact with People from Other Countries

How well does each of the following statements below describe you?

(Please select one response in each row.)

	Very much like me	Mostly like me	Somewhat like me	Not much like me	Not at all like me
I want to learn how people live in different countries.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04	☐ 05
I want to learn more about the religions of the world.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04	☐ 05
I am interested in how people from various cultures see the world.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04	☐ 05
I am interested in finding out about the traditions of other cultures.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04	☐ 05

Construct: Interest in learning about other cultures

Do you have contact with people from other countries?

(Please select one response in each row.)

	Yes	No
In your family	☐ 01	☐ 02
At school	☐ 01	☐ 02
In your neighbourhood	☐ 01	☐ 02
In your circle of friends	☐ 01	☐ 02

Construct: Contact with people from other countries

Construct 9: Respect for People from Other Cultural Backgrounds

How well does each of the following statements below describe you?

(Please select one response in each row.)

	Very much like me	Mostly like me	Somewhat like me	Not much like me	Not at all like me
I respect people from other cultures as equal human beings.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04	☐ 05
I treat all people with respect regardless of their cultural background.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04	☐ 05
I give space to people from other cultures to express themselves.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04	☐ 05
I respect the values of people from different cultures.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04	☐ 05
I value the opinions of people from different cultures.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04	☐ 05

Construct: Respect for people from other cultural backgrounds

Construct 10: Global Mindedness

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

(Please select one response in each row.)

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I think of myself as a citizen of the world.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
When I see the poor conditions that some people in the world live under, I feel a responsibility to do something about it.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
I think my behaviour can impact people in other countries.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
It is right to boycott companies that are known to provide poor workplace conditions for their employees.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
I can do something about the problems of the world.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
Looking after the global environment is important to me.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04

Construct: Global mindedness

Constructs 11 and 12: Attitudes Towards Immigrants; Number of Languages Spoken

People are increasingly moving from one country to another. How much do you agree with the following statements about immigrants?

(Please select one response in each row.)

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Immigrant children should have the same opportunities for education that other children in the country have.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
Immigrants who live in a country for several years should have the opportunity to vote in elections.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
Immigrants should have the opportunity to continue their own customs and lifestyle.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
Immigrants should have all the same rights that everyone else in the country has.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04

Construct: Attitudes towards immigrants

How many languages, including the language(s) you speak at home, do you and your parents speak well enough to converse with others?

(Please select one response in each row.)

	One	Two	Three	Four or more
You	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
Your mother	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
Your father	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04

Construct: Number of languages spoken

Constructs 13 and 14: Number of Foreign Languages Learnt at School; Global Competence Activities at School

How many foreign languages do you learn at your school this school year?

(Please enter a number. Enter "0" (zero) if you do not have any foreign language courses this school year.)

Number of foreign languages _____ 01

Construct: Number of foreign languages learnt at school

Do you learn the following at school?

(Please select one response in each row.)

	Yes	No
I learn about the interconnectedness of countries' economies.	☐ 01	☐ 02
I learn how to solve conflicts with other people in our classrooms.	☐ 01	☐ 02
I learn about different cultures.	☐ 01	☐ 02
We read newspapers, look for news on the internet or watch the news together during classes.	☐ 01	☐ 02
I am often invited by my teachers to give my personal opinion about international news.	☐ 01	☐ 02
I participate in events celebrating cultural diversity throughout the school year.	☐ 01	☐ 02
I participate in classroom discussions about world events as part of the regular instruction.	☐ 01	☐ 02
I analyse global issues together with my classmates in small groups during class.	☐ 01	☐ 02
I learn that how people from different cultures can have different perspectives on some issues.	☐ 01	☐ 02
I learn how to communicate with people from different backgrounds.	☐ 01	☐ 02

Construct: Global competence activities at school

Construct 15: Intercultural Attitudes of Teachers

Thinking about teachers in your school: to how many of them do the following statements apply?

(Please select one response in each row.)

	To none or almost none of them	To some of them	To most of them	To all or almost all of them
They have misconceptions about the history of some cultural groups.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
They say negative things about people of some cultural groups.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
They blame people of some cultural groups for problems faced by <country of test>.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04
They have lower academic expectations for students of some cultural groups.	☐ 01	☐ 02	☐ 03	☐ 04

Construct: Intercultural attitudes of teachers

Appendix 10: Translated Transcribed and Coded Interview with Teacher

Appendix XX: Example of fully transcribed interview (translated from Hebrew)- Alias Mahmoud

Heela: So, we'll start with a quick introduction to reiterate the main points of the consent form you have signed just so we have it on the record. So this interview is being conducted as part of my doctoral research at University College London I'm on the first year of my PhD program and the study concerns the concept of global citizenship education and how it is perceived by teachers in different places. The interview is completely voluntary if there are any questions that I ask that you're not comfortable answering feel free to let me know and we'll move on if you'd like to end the interview at any point that's certainly fine, and I've outlined the measures I'll be taking to maintain your privacy and anonymity, using pseudonyms in any publications or the thesis itself; deleting any identifying information about you or the school from the transcriptions, etc.

I: Yes that's fine I agree

H: can you tell me a little bit about your background where you grew up when school what's your professional experience?

I: Yes well I've been a teacher for 25 years in the Israeli education system out of those I spent 17 years as a secondary school teacher. I was born in*** and taught there for the first ten years of my career and then I moved to the area where I work now. I teach computer science. I started out my career as a graduate of a teaching college. I got my bachelors in computer science and information systems and I also learned software engineering at [university name]. I participated in a leadership program in 2006 and 2007 and receive a scholarship to travel four times to San Francisco for program called*** .

H: great

I: so after that I did 2 degrees at XXX university. one in exact sciences and one in educational leadership. The first year of the competition for best teacher in the state the first time they had that competition you know it right?

H: yes

I: I was in the semifinals out of 4000 teachers

H: amazing

I: so I was in the semifinals and there was an article about me in the newspaper and I was in the last 20 but I didn't win. When I was in the United states I started a program with an American organization that promotes multiculturalism called XXX. So this program is something I work with on the side as volunteer work, an you can read about me there on their website. There are about 250 alumni and they are given tools to navigate the world and the different cultures. So when you talk about global citizenship then I think it's very relevant to your work I think the global job market can be a way for Israeli Arabs and Palestinian Arabs living here to get out because there's this inner conflict or inner paradox between citizenship and belonging

H: interesting, we'll talk more about that soon

I: I also have five children, the oldest is 23 studying engineering at university. I have a daughter who is third year in behavioral studies at ***. And another girl who is studying communication and informal education, a high school student and another child who just started first grade at my school.

H: excellent. What is the background of the students you teach at your school now- in terms of socioeconomic background and religion.

I: I would say middle to middle-low income. All Muslim, all live in the village where the school is. Their mothers are... many of them work as teachers and their fathers work in a lot of fields but mostly manual labour.

H: you mentioned the meaning of global citizenship for you briefly earlier and I'd like to get a bit more information on that. What kinds of things do you associate with this term or this idea- but comes to mind when you think about it?

I: well I haven't read much about it or anything

H: that's fine, I just want to know what you think

I: OK so I think global citizenship is a sort of belonging to humanity and to all the world. It's a belonging to human beings sort of utopian it's not... it doesn't really have a defined meaning. But it's a belonging that can come about in global situations and in global frameworks like when we talk about certain natural phenomenon then we feel this belonging. So for example natural disasters or all sorts of international conflict. And also other global issues like environment or clean water or wars or energy. The idea of energy is very important period or we could talk about world interests to move forward, so you feel like you belong to the world when you talk about anything today you talk about breaking boundaries and the world turning into a small village and the ability to communicate and connect to anyone in the world which we didn't have before. It used to be very limited. We used to feel like our world was the close area that we lived in. Today, these myths are being broken. This belonging to global society is breaking boundaries, it's building communities and communities of interest that go past the value based or religion based or nationality based belonging. It breaks all of these. So today we have people who have an interest in a certain culture they have an interest in a certain population or a certain belief or belief system, so for them the person sitting at the far end of the world might feel closer to them than people that they're geographically or physically related to by blood.

So today this is evolving an this evolution, the social network and all these things are making it easier for people around the world to connect to communities that relate to their beliefs and the values that they believe in, that have the same areas of interest, and also that have the same concerns. People can be concerned about the same thing in different places in the world. We can also see communities cooperating on all sorts of subjects weather be realistic or imaginary. For example I've heard about communities and citizenship for those who feel like we need to be getting ready for a war in space or on Mars so there are these communities and there are people who believe that they belong to this community even if they've never met each other. So basically this global citizenship dismantles the narrow belonging like I said to nationality, to religion, to these very narrow concepts, and it's more human. So this virtual space has given this option and opened this opportunity for people to connect and to feel like they really relate to each other

Without this virtual space people would have to buy plane tickets and travel hours upon hours to meet people that they feel like they are in the same place with or they belong to the same group in the same world.

Commented [HG1]: belonging

Commented [HG2]: utopian and abstract

Commented [HG3]: environment

Commented [HG4]: global connections, borders

Commented [HG5]: different types/bases of belonging

Commented [HG6]: belonging without boundaries

Commented [HG7]: importance of the interned

293

Today it's not like that they can talk and meet virtually as well. So this issue over the last couple of years has really grown as a result of all the people involved in these processes of globalization. Whether it be in education in economics in trade, or environment. Anyone who is looking for something can find the people and the group that can help further their interests

So it's not necessarily the people who are closest to him. Quite the opposite, the people closest to him might being his way but the people farther away might be able to help him to advance his interests in all different areas of life. So I think this spiritual or emotional or political sometimes belonging is different today. I don't know if that makes sense.

H: it makes a lot of sense and its excellent thank you. I did want to ask something for clarification- you mentioned that everything is going in the direction of this global citizenship and you briefly mentioned education- do you see that happening in the Israeli education system or in the education your children are getting?

I: I can see sparks of these changes- not something systematic yet. Mostly taking ideas from other places. If you open YouTube for example and if you're talking about education then you can go in and see all sorts of experiences and experiments also human experiments of different educational approaches around the world. Different pedagogies and different ways of doing things. The most classic example today would be if we think about Finland or when we talk about Singapore. So Singapore and Finland you can see in a certain way in this world that some education professionals can relate to these ways of doing things and for others it seems bad. So some of them would want to mimic that and others might want to buy it and sometimes it can go against the local or national policy that says other things or has other priorities. So online people can find a place to express these opinions or get educated or get encouragement to go in the direction they believe in. And they can find support for this on line. So, what's fascinating today is that if you find these people around the world who support your same educational worldview or agenda, you can easily build this coalition and this group and then it's easier to communicate to connect to ask questions, to get answers, to share ideas, feelings, successes, failures so online we have this global community in the world of education

So educators around the world can easily connect to each other. Some of them start all sorts of organisations and communities sometimes it can be free sometimes it can be paid but then they feel part of a community of educators in this world or in a certain field and they get invited to conferences and it becomes a real interpersonal connection of people who believe the same thing and the same way so for example today the idea of educating people who are autistic

Because in the community there are few people who are autistic. So sometimes they can feel very lonely so where will they find themselves belonging or feeling more part of a group? In global communities online.

I also know of a very interesting type of global community of people who are deaf and mute. In my village two people got married to women to a deaf woman and mute woman from Finland. So this deaf person and this mute person couldn't find people around them in their close environment and they felt like they didn't belong and not a lot of people could help them with their needs so they found another place in the world with people who are more like him and they got married. I see them in the village. You see this woman from Finland with a mute person from my village. It's very interesting. So I see this as a type of global citizenship and broader belonging to the world.

294

Heela: You spoke earlier specifically about this identity paradox that students from the Arab sector might feel that global citizenship will enable them to look past. Can you elaborate on that? What does this mean for the relevance of global citizenship education in your sector? Would it have different goals than in the Jewish sector?

I: look, this whole idea of sectorial belonging, religious belonging, and national belonging, can sometimes be obstructive. It can limit the space for development. It limits the way people can express themselves so they look for broader spaces and bigger spaces and today the world is open and there's more accessibility to the information and everything on line helps find different fields and developed. I think the best example of this today would be the whole industry of high tech that knows no national boundaries or community bounds and people can take part and that's part of globalization. So when you're working in high tech there is no boundaries and anyone today who has interest in these fields can work anywhere in the world from their house and feel like they belong. People usually belong where their interests are met.

> **Commented [HG12]:** categories of belonging- and the way they limit ability to belong to broader communities or compete with it

> **Commented [HG13]:** technology and globalisation

Or if they have room to develop and to feel like they're making use of themselves and making the best of themselves and where they feel respected. And that's a matter of these values so respect in partnership. These are values that the immediate community and the geographic physical state might not be able to meet or supply so people look for different more interesting farther away places that will let them express themselves and their opinions and their visions. So some people have this opportunity to go past the boundaries.

> **Commented [HG14]:** values as a component of citizenship and belonging

So yes, today when you feel like you're in a country and there may be some things that you can express and that you can be but some things that you feel limited in and you want something broader, something more global, then people find that and they go past the boundaries, it's very simple.

> **Commented [HG15]:** vacuum of belonging can lead to global citizenship

Heela: And do you think students in your sector might connect to this differently or more so than students in the other sectors of the Israeli education system?

I: I think it depends on the extent that they feel lonely the lonelier a person feels or the less able they feel they would feel like they need to look for this other place that would make them feel better and more important and more wanted and respected. So today as long as Israeli society continues to ostracize and marginalized the Arab sector and the whole idea of racism that we've been seeing these past few years that's really been expanding and becoming more common, then people might feel avoid an they might feel that they can better relate to a different place that will make them feel more belonging more respected and closer. And one of these environments is the Arab world as a whole today. Today, the Palestinians in Israel feel like they can connect to all sorts of communities also religiously and this is also very important period so even today people are taking part in all sorts of on line forums and communities that are more related to their opinions and views and beliefs so it depends.

> **Commented [HG16]:** vacuum of belonging- loneliness

> **Commented [HG17]:** racism as catalyst or raising the need for GC

> **Commented [HG18]:** religious base to GC and communities

And I think that this is also a type of global citizenship finding these communities that might not be in your immediate area. I think in this sense another thing that's interesting to think about is global coins like bitcoins coin or currency that doesn't belong to any country. It's a currency that I can use anywhere at anytime and it has nothing to do with boundaries or geographic place. It's global. I can buy and sell using it and it gives a feeling that it's not tide down to one place. so if I can make deals and make money in the world and if I find out that my goods my product or my service will find clients all over the world

and they can pay me in global currency, then what do I have in the place that I live in? You start to feel like you don't belong. Why? My interest is everywhere in the world and that comes into view and all sorts of ways. So I really like this idea of global currencies.

I think that this also has to do with tourism. Being part of a tourist community the fact that you can feel like you can go anywhere in the world and there are people who will accept you. So you won't have any trouble finding partners, partners for interests in friends anywhere in the world who can accept you an host you and you can host them. I think without technology and social networks we wouldn't be able to have this to the same extent. I think smartphones in that whole technology also really helps to facilitate this. It helps people to make this utopia a reality. This idea that I belong to the world. I don't belong to one specific place I don't have limits I don't have boundaries or state lines.

Heela: So what if we take this to education. What do you think that educating students for global citizenship would look like? Do you think that the Ministry of Education would adopt something like this?

I: do I think it can promote it?

Heela: Yes

I: that depends on what the interests are. It depends, does it go against the vision of the state. The vision and the definition, so sometimes the system or the institution might see it as a threat. They might see it as a threat if you raise children for global society. There might be a threat of them losing their belonging to the state itself, and then it can become a real threat to statehood. So local belonging and national belonging would become weaker in light of global belonging and global citizenship so decision makers might see that as a danger.

Heela: And what about in the Arab sector? If they tried to insert global citizenship education to your sector Can you imagine that?

I: I think that for my students in the Arab sector then global citizenship could have a lot of benefits. I think the Ministry of Education could give them this channel, these tools to feel like global citizens and they could feel like they belong more. As long as I'm satisfied within my own country then I don't need global citizenship, I need general values that make the world work like the community dealing with the ozone and global warming and preserving the environment... But these aren't the same type of global citizenship that I am talking about.

So I think what I'm saying for the Ministry of Education it depends on their interests with relation to each group and for the majority, then it would be a threat, because Jewish students have this sense of belonging. But for Arab students then it can have benefits but I don't know if the Ministry of Education has an interest to promote it. But I think a main part of this is that it would be hard to promote in one sector and not in the other and as long as it puts the majority the Jewish sector at risk then it won't be inserted to the Arab sector.

So the more the minority feels like they're global citizens this can make them stronger and give them a different way to look at the world and this would make their belonging to their physical geographic surroundings become less strong maybe, it depends. But in the case of the Arabs, the country might prefer that they feel less strongly about the land...

But if we are talking about being global citizens I also think that you need to separate between the school and the adults in the community, and the pupils, in their private lives. These pupils are already global, they are already exposed- but there is no filter. They can connect with Muslims like them living all over the world- some of this exposure will make them want better lives, have aspirations. Some of it will take them in dangerous directions, give them wrong ideas.

Heela: like what?

I: like radical groups and hearing all sorts of promises and ideas that can make them feel frustrated or unhappy. This is the type of global communities that I think we need to be careful from and maybe actually if the ministry of education decides to have global citizenship education then it can also help to minimize this from happening. I think that if we try to make students feel like part of the world in a healthy way it can be better for everyone- but the ministry of education- I don't know what their interests might be.

Heela: Yes

I: but I think I can give another example that might explain this better in terms of this whole belonging issue. The Jews of the world feel like they belong to the Jews and to Judaism more than they belong to their own country... so what is global? Every Jewish person in the world is your brother, right? Just like every Muslim person in the world is my brother. So even though we live in the same country, you might feel more connected to a Jewish person living in Argentina just like I feel closer to a Muslim person in Indonesia or Malaysia more than I feel close or related to you. So, this is the idea of GC as I see it- it transcends nationality and geography.

Another example is in the 90s I visited Switzerland, and in Zurich I met a French citizen who lived there, very close to France. I asked him where he felt he belonged, who he felt were his fellow citizens- and he explained that he felt closer to a German national living in Zurich than to a French national living in Paris. He said, 'The French-man and I may share the same language, but he does not share my life or experience- as opposed to the German in Zurich'. So, he felt like the people in Zurich wanted him there and Switzerland was the country that provided his needs, and he was living well with a high quality of life... So, to me this shows that belonging depends on who satisfies your basic needs, lets you feel appreciated and fulfilled and wanted. If I felt that all my needs were being filled by whatever state I lived in with whichever borders it may have, and the definition of the place where I live included me and provided me with self-definition then I wouldn't care about sharing it with another people [Jewish, in this case]. But if the place where I live doesn't provide these needs and I don't feel I belong then I will look outside of it to belong, and this is GC.

Heela: Thank you very much, Mahmoud, this was really eye opening and fascinating

Commented [HG25]: passive GC- exposure to the internet

Commented [HG26]: religious basis for GC

Commented [HG27]: dangers of GC based on religion?

Commented [HG28]: Institutionalizing GC to minimize risks

Commented [HG29]: Religion as base for belonging

Commented [HG30]: Religion as belonging, as GC

Commented [HG31]: Needs and belonging as basic needs

Commented [HG32]: GC as filling gap in belonging by finding a community that isn't rooted necessarily where you live