

GLOBALISM FOR UNDERGRADUATES

GLOBALISM FOR UNDERGRADUATES:
PEDAGOGIES AND TECHNOLOGIES OF GLOBAL EDUCATION
IN THE US AND CANADA

By SARAH D'ADAMO, BA, MA

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University, © Copyright by Sarah D'Adamo, 2022

McMaster University DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (2022) Hamilton, Ontario (English and Cultural Studies)

TITLE: Globalism for Undergraduates: Pedagogies and Technologies of Global Education in the US and Canada

AUTHOR: Sarah D'Adamo, BA (University of Virginia), MA (University of Virginia)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Susie O'Brien

NUMBER OF PAGES: viii, 448

LAY ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines globalism's pedagogical and technological expressions in undergraduate student experience in the US and Canada. This study reads the global projects of these higher education systems as an infrastructure that conditions learning and credentialing as forms of anti-social, settler national and managerial self-development. By taking up the global connectivity era of the past three decades, this work brings digital infrastructures into dialogue with globalist education policies and administrative and disciplinary curricular projects in the context of degraded institutional legitimacy and downgrading credentials for undergraduates in these dominant inter/national sites for global education. It ultimately argues that the double binds produced by university globalism in these settings present a pedagogical occasion for abolitionist study in our time of planetary crises, unmasking the university as a knowable cultural object in a global cultural field and its infrastructure as a glitch-filled archive of relations of power, empire, and social reproduction.

ABSTRACT

Examining contemporary higher education in the US and Canada, this study posits globalism as the reproductive condition for these postsecondary education systems and their infrastructures that has emerged within regional conditions of degraded institutional legitimacy and downgrading credentials. Across its chapters, university globalism is defined and cataloged via institutional practices that shape learning and labouring conditions for students, their surrounding environments, and the pedagogies administered to market and credential student experience. Chapters examine the global university, the global learning interface, the global curricular programme, the global student and the global classroom as multi-scalar sites for observing university globalism's forms and their effects, especially on the situation of undergraduates. This formation is studied via infrastructuralism as an analytic shortcut to questions of social reproduction, political economy and their geohistories in these Global North contexts as globally dominant, mass cultural sites for global education.

I posit the framework of connectivity, defined as the social and infrastructural good through which globalism is variously represented and embedded into undergraduate study, to periodize this shared regional institutional culture from the 1990s to the present. Connectivity links higher ed's digitalization with its cosmopolitan modes of networking, identity formation, and human capital development that emerge across the institutional spectrum in public pedagogies and curriculum studied herein. This infrastructure is managerial, extractive, and socially reproduced, conditioning ambivalence and pessimism into the institutionalist modes of learning, networking and credentialing promoted by university globalism. Connectivity's pro-social ideologies of global citizenship, inclusive excellence and social innovation are analyzed against higher ed's proletarianizing material conditions and its anti-social foundations in racial capitalism and settler nationalism within US and Canada. This study aims to illuminate global study's contradictory terms for undergraduates alongside their organic intellectualism within university conditions, and their affordances for critical global pedagogical practice to meet the crises of the present.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project has spanned the better part of a decade, and I have been fortunate to receive many kinds of support across the years and the contexts in which this research has come into being. I would like to thank the Ontario Trillium Foundation and McMaster's Department of English and Cultural Studies for their foundational joint support of my PhD candidacy as an international student. Additional thanks to the Department for enabling my participation in vital travel-based conferencing and research experiences, in particular for their award of the Elizabeth Edna Ross Reeves Scholarship for my participation in the Institute for World Literature in 2015. I also wish to acknowledge faculty and staff members who contributed to my intellectual development through ongoing collegiality and conversation, with gratitude to Peter Walmsley, Daniel Coleman, Chandrima Chakrabarty, Ilona Forgo-Smith and Antoinette Somo. I am especially thankful to Amber Dean for providing many doctoral students, including two years for me, with opportunities for independent development of curricular and teaching practices, and for her willingness to co-navigate the institution with us as junior scholars.

Greatest thanks are owed to my supervisory committee, Susie O'Brien, Nadine Attewell, and Neil Lazarus, who were willing to continue serving in these roles while I was working independently of the university to avoid student debt. Your guidance and labor have extended far in excess of your formal responsibilities, and it is no exaggeration to say that none of this would have been possible without your commitment to me and my work. I am humbled by the ethos that each of you demonstrate in the profession, and by my luck in ending up with such collaborators. Susie's approach to supervision has provided a model of collaborative generosity and mentorship that I hope to emulate, with emphasis on strengthening the intellectual agency of students and supporting their goals by engaging their terms and together improving upon them. Across our classroom and research work together, Nadine has modeled intellectual presence and evolution as a site of shared social practice in ways that have been generative, challenging and affirming for me as well; I'm more grateful than I can say for your decade-long invitations into this relational space and its rigors. And Neil, whose engagement with my work predates my enrollment at McMaster, has extended his time and thought to me for over 12 years, with conviviality and curiosity that defies the narrowness of institutional conditions and arrangements and has helped to inspire renewed commitment to academic work for me over the years.

Several others have contributed fundamental support to my research, especially its inclusion of ethnographic elements as approved by McMaster's Research Ethics Board. Both the Equity and Inclusion Office and the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis at McMaster have provided me with access to confidential data along with guidance for its use that has been essential, with thanks to Arig al Shaibah and Joanne Gittens. I am also indebted to staff and faculty at McMaster's Institute for Globalization and the Human Condition for offering their insights about curriculum to support my interviews with students, especially to Donald Goellnicht and Petra Rethman. Liam Stockdale has also been an important pedagogical source and interlocutor: many thanks for being willing to discuss and share your curriculum for analysis in my research about McMaster's programming, as well as for your assistance with recruiting student participants for my interviews. Likewise, my thanks to the Office of Global Learning

Initiatives at Florida International University for assistance to my global programming research, with special thanks to Eric Feldman for working closely with me to recruit student participants. I also offer my gratitude to Sarah Maher for several phone conversations about her experiences of curricular development and practice at FIU. To the 12 undergraduates who volunteered their time to participate in these interviews, many thanks for your thoughtfulness and candor.

The “lifeworld” of this project has been multiple, as much of what makes academic writing possible in the world for me is based in ongoing conversation and exchange as sites for comradeship, co-thinking and sorting through institutionalized life. From my time in Hamilton, thank you to Jessie Forsyth, Jocelyn Sakal, Ben Prus, Alessia Iani, Jean-Thomas Tremblay, Danielle Wong, and Evan Mauro. Additional thanks to my collaborators from this space, Jesse Arsenault, Helene Strauss, Hugh O’Neill and Shandell Houlden; working with each of you was expansive in its own way. From Baltimore, gratitude for keeping me sane, and solidarity, to Steph Saxton, Connie Scozzaro, Evan Loker, Alex Lewis, Emily Riehl, Kevin Muhitch, Rachel Mulheren, and Christian Dambreville. And elsewhere, as long term interlocutors more than weak ties: thank you to Pablo Mukherjee, Ricky Varghese, Jeff Nagy, Jessica Smith, John McCraw and Pat Abatiell. Thank you to Rich Simpson for sharing your comradesly collaborative spirit unhesitatingly and still. Extra gratitude goes to Emily Coyle, Miranda McLeod, Sarah Arens, and Madeline Bedecarre as co-survivors of scholarly isolation via invaluable co-writing sessions. Ki’en Debicki, the depth of loving hospitality you showed to me immediately made a kind of home in me, teaching me how to think and relate across experiences of place, dislocation and kinship: thank you. And Christien Garcia, our years in dialogue have enabled a formative embrace of intellectual promiscuity in the most generous possible terms and me to find life at the edges of selves and objects; here’s to more years of twinned movements.

Much of this project was completed independent of a department, so I have been fortunate to find community resources to rely on for my writing work. I owe uncountable thanks to higher ed Twitter, at its best a space and routine of connectivism from which I learned and scavenged constantly, and through which I found essential interlocutors and rationales for continuing to write when other logics had unraveled. Thank you to my fellow farmers in Baltimore for grounding me in the rhythms of place, abundance and relationship. Especially to Kenya Miles: farming in community beside you has afforded me the counter-spirit I needed to be able to finish this big independent project. I am deeply appreciative of Kate O’Brien and the O’Brien family for years of opening their coastal home to me, as a retreat where much of this writing was developed; and to April Camlin for being the thread.

Melissa Webb, thanks for going anywhere in kinship with me, including into academic creativity that few others care to engage; what a blessing that you are family. Love and gratitude to my immediate family for their sustaining cheerleading, for sharing their resources without hesitation, and for their affectionate patience with my slow, perambulatory ways of doing things in the world. And to Matt Yake, to whom I owe all the capaciousness this work has required, for his wide-open heart as a home for me, and for supporting me all the way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INFRASTRUCTURES OF UNIVERSITY GLOBALISM: AN INTRODUCTION.....	1
Positioning: Terms and Methods.....	22
Forms and Infrastructures: The Chapters.....	32
CHAPTER ONE: THE FORMS AND PROJECTS OF UNIVERSITY GLOBALISM.....	38
Site: Florida International University in Miami, Florida, USA.....	41
Defining University Globalism.....	50
Site: McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.....	74
The Global University Student Experience.....	85
CHAPTER TWO: THE GLOBAL LEARNING INTERFACE.....	91
Curriculum in the Learning Paradigm.....	94
The Globalism of Ed-Tech.....	109
Knowledge in a Marketized Global Landscape.....	125
CHAPTER THREE: PROGRAMMING GLOBAL EXPERIENCE.....	129
Curriculum’s Globalist Framings.....	132
Sentimental Globalism in Connectivity Infrastructures.....	148
Global Citizenship Education’s Institutional Strand.....	160
Epistemic Infrastructures for Global Study.....	174
CHAPTER FOUR: THE GLOBAL STUDENT.....	184
Student Genres.....	184
Students in and as Globalist Infrastructure.....	191
Social Citizenship and Diversity Transactions.....	208
CHAPTER FIVE: THE GLOBAL CLASSROOM.....	224
Ethnographies of global learning at FIU.....	231
Ethnographies of studying global citizenship at McMaster University.....	247
Concluding Remarks: In the Gap.....	263
CONCLUSION: GLOBAL OCCASION.....	266
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	296
APPENDIX A: TAGG & TARR’S COMPARING EDUCATIONAL PARADIGMS.....	328
APPENDIX B: STUDENT INTERVIEW MATERIALS.....	330

LIST of ABBREVIATIONS

ACE:	American Council on Education
AAC&U:	American Association of Colleges and Universities
AUCC:	Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada
CBIE:	Canadian Bureau for International Education
EDI:	Equity, Diversity and Inclusion
EGM:	“Emerging Global Model”
FIU:	Florida International University
FWI:	Forward With Integrity
GCE:	Global Citizenship Education
GL:	Global Learning
GLOs:	Global Learning Outcomes
HCT:	Human Capital Theory
IGHC:	Institute on Globalization and the Human Condition
LMS:	Learning Management System
LOs:	Learning Outcomes
OPM:	Online Program Manager
PMC:	Professional and Managerial Classes
PSE:	Postsecondary Education
URS:	“Historically Underrepresented Racially Marginalized Students”

INFRASTRUCTURES OF UNIVERSITY GLOBALISM: An Introduction

It has become a commonplace in the 21st century to refer to aspects of ourselves, our experiences and our problems as “global.” Like most large-scale concepts, “global” carries a weak commonsensical understanding. It generally summons associations with a whole or totality, the earth or the planet, connection and technology, or processes abstracted to maximal human scale. “Global” has shifted in tone and usage throughout the writing of this project, during which somewhat specialized academic, policy and activist debates about globalization and its economic and cultural effects have morphed into more widespread discourses on globalism. In such rhetoric based in my social locations of the US and Canada, particularly from a standpoint within their academic and education sectors, globalism has come to function as an ideological indicator: alternatively a coded political bogeyman for ethnicized and isolationist far-right nationalisms, or an economic-cultural programme of diversity, transnational mobility, and borderless capital management for global capitalist institutions as described by its political analysts and leftist critics (also known as “neoliberal globalism”).¹ In the former usage, globalism signals the scalar, anti-semitic bigotries and conspiracism of a reactionary platform that charges universities with leftist pedagogical indoctrination, a site of anti-institutional cultural politics that does not appear in the data of institutionalized experience that this work organizes.

Instead, this thesis focuses on the persistent operativity of the economic-cultural programme named in the latter usage as globalist capitalist practice in US and Canadian postsecondary education (PSE). I analyze its expressions in the disparate, interconnected

¹ Quinn Slobodian’s definition of this term qua philosophy is consistent with the institutional genealogy of globalism that I use throughout the thesis: “less a doctrine of economics than a doctrine of ordering—of creating the institutions that provide for the reproduction of the totality ... Neoliberal globalism can be thought of in its own terms as a negative theology, contending that the world economy is sublime and ineffable with a small number of people having special insight and ability to craft institutions that will ... encase the sublime world economy.” Source: https://harvardpress.typepad.com/hup_publicity/2018/03/making-sense-of-neoliberalism-quinn-slobodian.html

landscapes of US and Canadian higher education and among their institutional agents, where globalism serves settler nationalist continuity through institutional infrastructures of racial capitalism and expanding credentialism. What forms does such globalism take in undergraduate education? In what ways do its hegemonic institutionalized meanings act out a pedagogical program? The manifold possible answers and their supporting data that can be read as organizing such a programme make up my study of institutionalized social infrastructure. This work thus organizes a critical account of university globalism as a durable institutional orientation that produces a pedagogy directed at undergraduates, forming a managerial project that recasts higher ed's fragmenting human capital training as a personal good via cosmopolitan processes of connectivity. This focus on globalism in the scene of PSE is motivated by a concern with how late capitalist institutions shape subject formation in global terms and with the forms of agency, literacy and imagination that this formation disables and enables.

The projection of globality from these university settings works to (re)present the material contours of their geographic situation in abstract terms, enacting a kind of institutional re-mapping. While some institutions may literally have a "global footprint" in cartographic terms, "global" as an institutional identity functions for most universities as a site of imaginative capital or rhetorical surplus in the Global North² and settler colonial geohistories of these locations. Accordingly, this study aims to investigate and elaborate what, how, and for whom

² The terms "Global North" and "Global South" are no longer adequately descriptive of global development dynamics within and across countries, which economists instead represent in terms of low-, middle- and high-income countries at the time of writing to reflect contemporary development's dynamic multi-polarity. I continue to use these descriptors here as diagnoses of the effective global organization of PSE and its resource and policy histories, still dominated by institutional milieux that reflect the persistence of 20th-century imperial forms in international flows of knowledge goods, people and capital toward the institutional geography that Global North designates. While Asian universities are increasingly investing in globalist programming that uses terms similar to those in the US and Canada, these programmes are typically Anglophone and oriented toward a US-dominated global knowledge economy. See an overview of the region's developments here: <https://globalejournal.org/global-e/february-2017/rise-global-studies-east-asia-institutions-and-ideology-national-education>. International enrolment in the US and Canada is also disproportionately sought by Asian students, with the majority of global PSE exchange flowing toward white settler nations.

“global” performs and organizes in these institutional cultures. The data made clear that an account of pedagogical globalism in the US and Canada could reasonably begin in the 1990s, with a prehistory extending to the global financial and institutional shifts of the early 1970s and on into a turbulent, complex present that continually portends future contingency.

I read these national university systems together for their shared settler colonial and racial capitalist genealogies that extend into their globalist practices. Their differences as well as their entanglements are evidenced by shared histories of student exchange, academic competition and cross-pollination, and global policy orientations. Mapping both US and Canadian PSE helps to demarcate the form university globalism takes in the region, where it is situated with globally unique elaboration due to the central role of liberal arts education. Rather than approach these contexts comparatively or as discrete cases, I use siting as a research approach elaborated by political analysts of global capitalism. In a global analytic context or political inquiry, “particular sites offer a view of the general not because they are *cases* of it but because they are *constitutive* of it— along with any other sites across the world” (Riofrancos 108, emphasis in original). Accordingly, my aim is not to reify either national higher ed context as superlatively global but to examine their linked processes and institutional subjectivities as settler national projects that constitute contemporary sites of Empire’s extended crisis and its management.

The work of delimiting such a broad and dynamic archive so that general observation and concrete analysis become possible has required a transdisciplinary approach, drawing methods from critical geography, critical university studies, sociology, anthropology, social, political and literary theory, postcolonial critique, interdisciplinary global studies, educational policy and curriculum studies, and the scholarship of teaching and learning into a cultural studies frame. This choice to treat universities as objects or cultural fields suitable to cultural studies

approaches is also grounded in my experiences and observations of their institutionalized life, bringing autoethnographic elements into dialogue with ethnographic and political economic inquiry to thicken description and analysis of the social forms therein. This “undisciplined” research approach integrates my own social positioning, but has also emerged as a consequence of reading globalism’s pedagogical performativity by analyzing its surrounding infrastructure, a unit of analysis that Lauren Berlant has defined as “the lifeworld of structure” and “the living mediation of what organizes life ... into a world-sustaining relation” (“The Commons” 393).

Infrastructure has emerged as a popular analytical framework across disciplines as conditions of flux, precarity, transition and uneven development become more generalized and as 21st-century academic knowledge production has tilted toward activist or engaged public modes. Generally, this work with infrastructure registers a range of situated, interconnected social and material phenomena —or, in the negative mode, “glitches”³— in our time that are symptoms of global capitalism, its world ecology, and its contradictions or crises, including conditions within the university form as a waning public or social good. As the thesis’s conclusion takes up in terms of pedagogical practice, infrastructural study requires acts of abstraction and multi-scalar thinking that help to make normative structures or social forms visible, readable or mappable. Within the “entrenched patterns of routine and reenactment” (Levine, “Infrastructuralism” 69) that make up social infrastructures of institutions, infrastructuralism as method takes up the ways that “universities resist knowledge of themselves” (Boggs et al, 2) as the ground for undergraduate learning’s reproduction. Today’s students and instructors must navigate PSE as a globalized industry alongside the spasms and shocks of a contracting public education landscape, including college and branch campus closures, declining enrolments and curricular downsizing,

³A glitch indexes a rupture “in the reproduction of life...[and] an interruption within a transition, a troubled transmission. A glitch is also the revelation of an infrastructural failure” (Berlant “The Commons” 393).

deepening public defunding, and the withdrawal of services for student welfare and financial support. A critical global pedagogy thus relies on the social facts, lacunae, and entanglements that infrastructural study reveals to take up such institutional situations as theorizable objects and realist indicators of what is shared in conditions for postsecondary learning and its labours.

Reading the very universities in which student learning is set for their globalist infrastructures also makes it possible to invoke institutional geohistories and the genealogies of imperialism that persists in their present “global” forms. Universities have always been infrastructural for the national projects of the US and Canada, given their roles in respective histories of land-grant and Christian settler colonial expansion. Further, as Roderick Ferguson’s account of the 20th-century institutionalization of the minoritized interdisciplines reminds, the university in context with its national settler colonial history should be understood as “an agent of broadly conceived imperial power” that, here quoting American historian Frederick Jackson Turner on his frontier thesis, exists “to create tendencies and to direct them” and “produces effects at the level of desire and also at the level of knowledge” (*The Reorder of Things* 229). University globalism and its hegemonic modes of knowledge production and subject formation thus should be understood as yet another expression of this historical orientation, and its ongoing mutations as a glitch-filled archive of relations of power, empire and social reproduction.

Institutional Worlding and Global Composition

To begin, this introduction examines how we might think the university’s “global” performativity in relation to its everyday naturalization of the settler national and racial capitalist infrastructure that organizes US and Canadian universities at the scale of institutionalized life. For indeed, institutions want us to feel held by them: to feel worlded. This worlding is presented

as a realist project,⁴ situating an institution's terroir "in nature and therefore, in reason" (Douglas 52). To sustain their own centrality and capital as such institutions in situ, today's universities foster social attachment, identification, and investment through branding, the curation of environment, security and metrics of social and professional status, and their hospitality to relationship-building and networking. This administration of experience presumes particular modes of sociability and desire. In short, universities provide an infrastructure that concertedly produces and reproduces capitalist social relations. Such rationalization through the university is perceptible to its members as a surface process, regardless of whether the self-images that institutions peddle have been accepted as effectively realist or desirable or necessary.

Affiliation with particular kinds of formal, late capitalist institutions in the US or Canada also has a strong determinative effect on an individual's access to resources, social fields and opportunities, and possible futures. A significant body of social science literature is preoccupied with how credentialing operates as the most central tool to signal the value of PSE to the marketplace and to society at large. The educational credential, which falls under the broader definition of the credential as "a form of social credit that symbolically facilitates exchanges under conditions of social uncertainty" (Brown 26), is often what is meant by the "value proposition" in economic parlance. Such signalling operates both in place-based networks of social and institutional connections and via deterritorialized performance, as a shorthand

⁴My invocation of "world" or "worlding" is informed by definitions of the concept such as Rob Sean Wilson's in *The Worlding Project*: worlding as "building up a life-world palpably disclosing its lived-in modalities, boundaries, tactics, and historical processes" (21); or the world in world-systems analysis, summarized by Eric Hayot as "an adjective, referring not to the world but to the quality of worldedness, the self-constituting and inner-directed force, of a given system" (129). Additionally resonant, given the emphasis on desire I am placing here, is a basic observation about desire as the organizing foundation for group experience from Sigmund Freud's "Group Psychology and The Analysis of the Ego: "a group is clearly held together by a power of some kind: and to what power could this feat be better ascribed than to Eros, which holds together everything in the world?" (91). Gayatri Spivak's theorization of worlding as cartographic transformation imposed by empire also obtains: "the necessary yet contradictory assumption of an un-inscribed earth which is the condition of possibility of the worlding of a world generates the force to make the 'native' see himself as 'other'" ("The Rani of Surmir" 254).

currency for an experience of socialization that has produced translatable human and social capital. The higher education credential is thus a kind of representational summary of institutional worlding, an index of social affiliation and vetted experiences intended to shift and elevate the prospective positioning of its owner in social and professional networks.⁵ The globalism of undergraduate education also registers in such a summary, often explicitly, as a kind of cosmopolitan boosterism for the credentialed individual and the granting institution, through which universities claim their ongoing centrality and utility for the global knowledge economy.

For universities, this worldly production is also expansionary beyond the confines of campus buildings, offices, quads and interfaces. As an immediate example, my institutional affiliation as a part-time instructional staff member at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland furnished me with an ID card that grants access to free urban transit, grocery, fitness and health discounts around the city, entry to other universities, and unlimited library services — all services and benefits that organize a separate class of members with privileges conspicuously unavailable to the historically and durably underserved and redlined populations of the city. JHU students are at the same time advised to remain within designated geographic areas that are bordered by these extra-institutional populations onto which risk and insecurity have been shifted (and racialized).⁶ In this way, the exclusivity and the capital intensity of the institutional world that produces credentials begin to give the lie to its globalist claims by also expressing a carceral logic, through which, as Jennifer Doyle writes in *Campus Sex, Campus Security*, “we encounter

⁵As many writers on credentialing have observed, the credential has ‘worked’ on behalf of the college graduate precisely for its symbolic value, which is tied to local and global recognition of quality and credibility in a particular institution’s brand. Gerald Coles, for e.g., observes throughout *Miseducating For the Global Economy* how the credential is intended to help you get a job but not *do* a job.

⁶For more on the history of the relationship between JHU and the wider Baltimore community and its racialized geography, see Antero Pietilla’s *The Ghosts of Johns Hopkins*, Rowman and Littlefield, 2018; Marisela Gomez’s *Race, Class, Power and Organizing in East Baltimore: Rebuilding Abandoned Communities in America*, Lexington Books, 2013, which focuses on JHU’s medical campus development and community resistance; and as a recurring example in Davarian Baldwin’s *In The Shadow of the Ivory Tower: How Universities Are Plundering Our Cities*.

the university not as a classroom, but as a moving wall, a shield, a security apparatus” (97).

Indeed, as many of the university’s critics have charged, the social reproduction of university worlds and their present-day worldly appeal is reliant upon a fundamentally anti-social premise of competitive membership that disguises itself as a pro-social engine. Ashon Crawley summarizes the university in its US situation as an idea or a concept that is “a way to think antisociality as the grounds for relation”, for it “thrives in the antithesis to abundance, thrives in producing knowledge as a limited resource and good, a limited supply and store” (6). Despite Canada’s more robust international reputation for a national commitment to social and public goods, this critique has been made of the national role of its PSE system as well, wherein the celebrated “lie of multiculturalism ... functions to produce a compact in which certain kinds of diversity can be celebrated as standing in for collective representation” while upholding the central white-supremacist myth of Canada’s Eurocentric “founding” into which select others are benevolently “included” (Walcott, “The End of Diversity” 396-7). Yet, for university affiliates, a discrete geography of social connectivity exists for their navigation and alleged benefit.

So in one sense, the institutional worlds of universities are a product of this translation of human experiences into privileged social credit, or abstract as well as concrete forms of value that are associated with limited and competitive access to resources, opportunity, and social development. The “value of a university education” is publicly invoked today as a shorthand for job market prospecting, while less quantifiable affordances such as public, civic, moral or personal value are assumed to attend secondarily on learning and knowledge production. Higher education scholars have described this admixture as representative of “the conflictive interface between the civic and corporate university imaginaries” (Andreotti, Stein, Pashby & Nicolson 7), in which, I argue, the globalist imaginary of PSE’s cosmopolitan value is operative as well.

Yet as many of its critics have documented, university affiliation modulates and reproduces existing inequity and uneven development in the environment in which the institution is situated. This element of credentialing mediates and interferes with the attachment-forming and worlding that the university attempts to manufacture and manage — not to mention with the image of university education as *Bildung*, or the process of self-cultivation,⁷ marketed to students and presented as a shared legacy to alumni as stakeholders. Further, universities in the US and Canada have been additionally shifting risk onto students and instructors since the mid 1990s through policies that have dramatically expanded student debt and the adjunctification and deprofessionalization of instructional labour. This has generated majority conditions of precarity among these members, while at the same time international student markets have been elevated as a budgetary and marketing priority as part of “global” institutional orientations. These conditions are commonly described as effects of the marketization, financialization, privatization, and corporatization of the public university form, processes which generally coincide with national timelines of material and social divestment from public goods and the increasing power of global finance over these domestic institutional political economies.

Such conditions are further exacerbated by the integration of universities into the circulation of global capital as “site[s] of accumulation and investment,” sustained through “sinks or pools [of] construction, endowments, loans, and R&D” (Whitener and Nemser 166) that also intensify gentrification and housing crises for university members and local residents alike. This briefly summarizes one global valence of the university systems this study

⁷The concept of *Bildung* is inherited from Germany’s 19th-century Humboldtian university as the model for the elaboration of US and Canadian universities, however restricted to elite male students in these early forms. Its concept of learning is holistic and more existential and ecumenical than economic or skill-based: “the rationalist foundation of the university meant that it concentrated on the idea of *bildung* (building) the whole man ... The Humboldtian university was cosmopolitan, with the goal of making its students citizens of the world. It combined research and teaching, science and the arts, all considered necessary schooling for the socially responsible individual” (Davidson 28).

investigates that is parsed in Chapter 1 on “the global university”, in which capital projects have become central to the pursuit of global competitiveness and stable institutional credit ratings, and “student” primarily designates a source of revenue and secondarily an educational products consumer sourced from domestic and global markets. Given how these priorities sit alongside the erosion of instructional labour power and faculty governance, it is increasingly common to see critical commentary that asserts the evacuation of curricular experiences from university infrastructures, particularly in the humanities. By aligning institutional inertia and reproduction with the mechanisms of global finance and corporate agency, the contemporary university becomes merely “a financial concern with some classrooms attached” (Clover, “Speechbros”), or a mechanism for “accumulation-by-education” (Boggs and Mitchell 453).

Extending from this, the higher education credential has become fragile and contested in public discourse at the time of writing. Its promised conduit to employment opportunities for young people and graduates has been eroded by the increasing casualization of employment in what Robert Brenner has termed the “long downturn” (xix) conditions of the deindustrialized economies of the Global North.⁸ In the context of wage stagnation, financialized over-accumulation, and post-productivity capitalism, a spate of critiques of credentialization have circulated across the ideological spectrum. Many assert a “skills gap” to deride the specialization of university curricula as out of step with the changing nature of work and to suggest the economic necessity of “unbundling” the university credential. This disruptive approach to the higher ed industry aims to proliferate alternatives to university degree programmes through competencies, digital badges and micro-credentials, or assessment-based itemized skills measurements outside of traditional institutional settings that can be

⁸Annie McClanahan, Joshua Clover and Sarah Brouillette have suggested Brenner’s formulation be updated to “The Long Crisis” instead, to accommodate the orthodox economic theory of secular stagnation; see “Introduction: Late, Autumnal, Immiserating, Terminal,” *Theory & Event* vol. 22 no. 2, 2019, pp. 325-336.

instrumentalized for the vicissitudes of a globalized labour market. These have overwhelmingly manifested via educational technologies or “ed-tech”, though such capital projects have been internalized through private-public-partnership business models as discussed in Chapter 1. The contours of higher ed’s digitalization are explored in Chapter 2, on “the global learning interface,” as another site of globalist practice, with effects visible in stacked institutionalized conceptions of learning, instruction, curriculum, and global connectivity. While the technology sector in both national contexts tends to drive this extra-institutional programme for labour re-skilling and flexibility, contestations of university legitimacy are now widespread across the ideological spectrum, including from the disruptors above, via anti-intellectual, anti-institutional and anti-globalist conservatism, as well as via leftist critique that informs my study here. The latter includes work that reads universities in infrastructural terms that reveal their structural racism and racializing policy, historical development via settler colonialism and slavery, imperial spread in extranational contexts, extractive forms of academic, urban and financial capitalism, exploitative labour, sexual and carceral discipline, relationships to radical intellectual movements and struggles, and possibilities for abolitionist and decolonizing education therein.⁹

⁹These works include, respectively to the topics listed above: Chris Newfield’s trilogy of books on the US public university system’s development and its racialized devolution, *Ivy and Industry: Business and the Making of the American University, 1880-1980* (2003), *Unmaking the Public University: The Forty Year Assault on the Middle Class* (2008); and *The Great Mistake: How We Wrecked Public Universities and How We Can Fix Them* (2016), Laura Hamilton and Kelly Nielsen’s *Broke: The Racial Consequences of Underfunding Public Universities* (2021) and Tressie McMillan Cottom’s *Lower Ed: The Troubling Rise of For-Profit Colleges in the New Economy* (2017); Craig Steven Wilder’s *Ebony and Ivory: Race, Slavery and the Troubled History of America’s Universities* (2013) and Sandy Grande’s “Refusing the University” (2018) as supplement to *Red Pedagogy* (2003); Neha Vora’s *Teach for Arabia: American Universities, Liberalism and Transnational Qatar* (2018) and Piya Chatterjee and Sunaina Maira’s *The Imperial University: Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent* (2014); Sheila Slaughter’s *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy* (1997), Marc Bousquet’s *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low Wage Nation* (2008), and Charlie Eaton’s *Bankers in the Ivory Tower: The Troubling Rise of Financiers in Higher Education* (2022); Davarian Baldwin’s *In the Shadow of the Ivory Tower: How Universities are Plundering Our Cities* (2021) and Jennifer Doyle’s *Campus Sex, Campus Security* (2015); Leigh Patel’s *No Study Without Struggle: Confronting Settler Colonialism in Higher Education* (2021), Roderick Ferguson’s *We Demand: The University and Student Protests* (2017) and Eli Meyerhoff’s *Beyond Education: Radical Studying for Another World* (2019); and Abigail Boggs, Eli Meyerhoff, Nick Mitchell, and Zach Schwartz-Weinstein’s “Abolitionist University Studies: An Invitation” (2019), and la paperson’s *A Third University is Possible* (2017).

This collapsing legitimacy has thus heightened awareness that reformist institutional cultures are deeply shaped by what Sara Ahmed calls “non-performativity,” through which institutional speech acts in the name of equality and access “work” by not producing the effects named in such commitments and initiatives but maintaining their rhetorical infrastructure regardless (105). 2017’s *The Equity Myth: Racialization and Indigeneity at Canadian Universities* contributed a major critique of Canada’s self-celebrating commitment to equity as a nationwide institutional programme, exposed therein as a product of “neoliberal frameworks of competitiveness and a market model of students as consumers” (205) that serve the productivity and brand image of universities while obscuring actually existing racism in these institutions. This is also consistent with a more general observation that the expansion of credentialization is a result of declining worker power, one that employers leverage to expect higher levels of educational attainment, rather than evidence of the putative skills gap between universities and the labour market. Further, economic disadvantage is compounded for students of color who also suffer from the disparities produced by whiteness as itself a credential within racialized or predominantly white institutions (PWIs)¹⁰ and throughout these racial capitalist contexts. Tressie McMillan Cottom’s 2017 monograph *Lower Ed: The Troubling Rise of For-Profit Colleges in the New Economy* provides a critical ethnography of how those same racializing and neoliberal frameworks operate in a continuum from the most elite higher educational institutions to the most openly predatory, shaping the for-profit college industry in the US as an exemplary site through which to understand the effects of credentialization on society’s most vulnerable groups.

¹⁰For more on the uneven effects of credential expansion, see “The Student Debt Crisis, Labor Market, Credentialization, and Racial Inequality,” *Roosevelt Institute*, 2018: http://rooseveltinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/The-Student-Debt-Crisis-and-Labor-Market-Credentialization_FINAL.pdf. On the status of whiteness as a credential in racialized organizations (and, conversely, the sociological understanding of Blackness as a “negative credential”) that exists to shore up whiteness as the property relation upon which the US and Canada as settler colonial nations have been premised, see Victor Ray, “A Theory of Racialized Organizations,” *American Sociological Review* vol. 0 no. 00, 2019, pg. 1-28.

In this subsector of American PSE¹¹ that absorbs “single mothers, downsized workers, veterans, people of color, and people transitioning from welfare to work” (McMillan Cottom *Lower Ed* 11), the credential has thus far indeed proved to be non-performative, imposing extreme debt loads with little to no promised returns in wages, employment opportunity or social networks.

At the time of writing, despite the increasing instability of the wage premium associated with higher education that will be examined in Chapter 4, the machinery of institutional credentialing continues apace due to what economists W. Norton Grubb and Marvin Lazerson term the “education gospel,” or “our faith in education as moral, personally edifying, collectively beneficial, and a worthwhile investment no matter the cost, either individual or societal” (*Lower Ed* 11). McMillan Cottom’s work traces the consequences of higher ed’s shift in status from a public or social good to a personal good, yet one that is still believed to be a moral enterprise precisely because it serves market interests and ostensibly leads to jobs. This logic of “moral because marketable” goods has heightened crises in these post-public university systems, most egregiously for students and especially for populations historically subject to systemic and institutional bigotries. This logic is also part of what has given rise to the Canadian or American university’s rhetorical and material investments in globalism. Consider the relationship between institutional commitments to “equity and diversity” and the global identity that universities have arrogated to themselves, in which the latter is wielded in an administrative sleight of hand that flaccidly fulfills the former. International students, the object of much of PSE’s “global” marketing as prospective “full-paying” students, can appear to resolve diversity requirements

¹¹“Lower Ed” is McMillan Cottom’s term for this sector, so named for how its low-prestige positioning within the range of PSE offerings is a reflection of the whole US system, and defined as “the subsector of high-risk post-secondary schools and colleges that are part of the same system as the most elite institutions. . . . Lower Ed encompasses all credential expansion that leverages our faith in education without challenging its market imperatives and that preserves the status quo of race, class and gender inequalities in education and work. When we offer more credentials in lieu of a stronger social contract, it is Lower Ed” (11-12).

regardless of sociocultural resources available within institutions; or, domestic students classified as national or ethnic minorities perform globality and diversity at once through their diasporic or transnational identities, so the institution can exploit their positioning for its extra-national surplus without regard to their civic realities as racialized minorities. University of Calgary's international strategy summarizes this promotional line: "A commitment to equity and diversity is not only consistent with, but also necessary to a university intent on becoming a 'global intellectual hub' and 'fully' engaging the communities we both serve and lead" (Henry et al 172).

We can see that both diversity and globalism publicly operate as social goods within the institutional subjectivity of Canadian and American universities, sometimes interchangeably. This elevation of forms of abstract, institutionalized difference works to extend the life of the education gospel through the provision of manageable difference that can burnish the image of university experience more broadly — that the university can treat as “an asset primed for accumulation” (Mitchell, “Diversity” 72). But at scale and in a context of increasing institutional stratification, the brittleness of such work is apparent, organizing the expansion of risk for the institutional parties most affected by inequity and so most invested in educational opportunity as a necessary site of faith. At the time of writing, the value of the US or Canadian PSE credential also is presumed to be relatively robust globally, as a mutual transaction of cosmopolitan social credit for international students that has only been minorly disrupted by the white supremacist cultural revival targeting university campuses on both sides of the border. Yet an increasingly ethnicized, polarized, and privatized public sphere is eroding this mechanism of institutional worlding, sometimes directly via national border regimes that deny the transnational mobilities that universities seek to expand and exploit.

Flux may be an expected component of institutional reflexivity, but specific trends are

nevertheless clear and notable: even while international student tuition is funding up to a third of university budgets, international student enrolment has been steadily diminishing in the US since the 2016 election ushered anti-globalist backlash into policy and institutional cultures, accelerating a decline that began earlier in the decade.¹² Some of those students have shifted into Canadian higher ed, where the annual growth in its international student enrolment has recently become singularly rapid in the global field, encouraged by more accessible entry requirements, work opportunities, and Canada's liberal branding through state multiculturalist rhetoric.

Given their centrality to the current post-public business model, the international networks, institutional entanglements and student markets that materialize university globalism comprise a consequential site of competition for universities in and across both national systems. While it isn't possible or responsible to generalize about how this dynamic enterprise is altering the social character of institutional cultures, some social facts can indicate the general world composition of student bodies on campuses. Recent data indicates that the public universities that provided America's "access education" in the 20th century's second half have been quietly reducing access to domestic Black students. A 2018 study by think tank Demos found that US higher ed has been resegregating over the past 20 years, with half of the 67 more selective public universities studied admitting progressively smaller percentages of Black students despite increasing secondary graduation rates; this trend is also consistent with the predatory for-profit sector's timeline of expansion. While 60% of selective colleges and universities had publicly declared they considered race in admissions in 1994, by 2014 the number had dropped to 35% (Huelsman). And a 2019 American Council of Education (ACE) report on equity in US PSE found that barriers to performance for Black students are uniquely persistent, with higher debt

¹²This is in part due to increasing competitiveness of domestic PSE systems in many countries of origin for the US and Canada's international student populations, such as in China, India, South Korea, etc, as Chapter 4 will discuss.

loads, gender gaps, dropout rates, and rates of unemployment post-degree.¹³

This account of the deepening of institutionalized anti-Blackness reflects institutional trends in the US, as Canadian universities do not practice systematic data collection on student demographics in terms of race and ethnicity (nor religious beliefs).¹⁴ Although a few Canadian universities have announced plans to collect student data via self-identification, this information has not materialized at the time of writing, and 63 of 76 surveyed confirmed that they don't and don't plan to collect comprehensive student data on the basis of legal or reputational concerns.¹⁵ This reluctance is shared by critics of this demand for a strengthened data regime, who defend the black box around race and ethnicity in Canada as per its origin in human rights code, which suggests that protection from discrimination also protects citizens (or students) from inquiries about their race/ethnicity status that could (re)produce discrimination. This de facto theory of racialization suits the projection of liberal state multiculturalism that Canada has promoted since the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988.¹⁶ Its critics highlight how a national history of carceral and colonialist policies around labour and citizenship, enforced via race-based classification (of Indigenous peoples, of Chinese, Japanese and other immigrant populations, of

¹³N.B. Throughout the thesis, I rely on a range of sources as rhetorical and sociological data that contribute to my meta-analysis of phenomena in higher ed that reveal aspects of globalist projects and their social reproduction. Rather than citing these works for their textual contents and authorship using the customs of MLA format, they appear as a kind of metadata that provides contextual information about other data that I examine more closely. My use of these sources is based in summary of their data or synthesis of their social portraiture into a more general or generic fact that bears on my analysis. Accordingly, I will go on to cite these (online) metadata sources with their hyperlinks in footnotes instead of in-text or as textual content engaged for the thesis's bibliography.

On the conditions above that characterize credentialism for Black graduates in the US, see www.equityinhighered.org/; and www.chronicle.com/article/Nearly-Half-of-Undergraduates/245692/.

¹⁴This lack of student data present issues of assessment and programming for administering PSE, in addition to raising concerns of possible harm to minority students caused by the undifferentiated category of "visible minority" operative under anti-discrimination laws since the 1980s (applicable to everyone who isn't white or Indigenous).

¹⁵More information on the CBC survey and details of specific universities and their practices here: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/race-canadian-universities-1.4030537>

¹⁶ This practice is contested by legal scholars, social scientists and historians of Canada, as well as a UN anti-racism oversight body. For a summary of this issue, see:

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/term-visible-minorities-may-be-discriminatory-un-body-warns-canada-1.690247>

African peoples, et al), clearly persists through what piecemeal indicators are available.¹⁷ Their work shows the lie of the celebrated corrective that is Canada's points-based immigration system, seen as a policy mechanism that promotes diversity on the basis of (primarily economic) merit rather than through a racializing basis such as national origin.

Yet despite these uneven conditions revealed by realist critique, the success narrative of Canada's immigration meritocracy is sufficiently effective for the nation and its education system to place among the top 10 globally in the OECD's annual PISA tests tracking programming and performance for international students, where the immigration system is cited as the basis for national exemplarity. A similar ranking in Times of Higher Education's World University Rankings, judging global performance as "University Impact" per an institution's fulfillment of UN Sustainable Development Goals, ranked McMaster University second in the world, followed closely behind by UBC, U of Montreal, and U of Waterloo.¹⁸ Institutional evidence apparently abounds to show Canada as a global "educational superpower,"¹⁹ especially based on student diversity and immigrant selectivity as contributions to national human capital.

Given this terrain, an anti-social infrastructure can be located between the "diverse" worlding produced by university globalism in the US and Canada and its foundations in anti-Blackness and anti-Asian exclusionary policy. At the same time as Canada's 2019 federal budget outlined a five-year strategy for education promotion and outbound student mobility abroad (Barbarič), a mix of acceleration and deceleration of internationalization initiatives was

¹⁷One site of data collection is based in the Toronto District School Board's programme tracking race-based indicators based on student self-identification. Thus far it has traced how fewer Black students go on to university education because most are "streamed" into vocational programmes at the secondary level, that greater numbers of black students are subject to punitive discipline which has led to higher dropout rates, and that "Black, Latino, and Southeast Asian students were less prepared for post-secondary education than White students"; see more in Karen Robson, Paul Anisef, Robert S. Brown, and R. C. George, "Under-represented Students and the Transition to Post-secondary Education: Comparing Two Toronto Cohorts", *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* vol. 48 no. 1, 2018, pg 39-59.

¹⁸See full rankings and details here: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/rankings/impact/2019/overall>.

¹⁹See this account in full here: <https://www.bbc.com/news/business-40708421>.

playing out among US institutions per wider patterns of deepening institutional stratification and austerity.²⁰ While Canadian PSE competes with US universities for global performance and especially for “global”, especially Asian international, students as one of its indicators and funding sources, de facto anti-Blackness is increasing in institutional practice, for this competition provides market justification for divestment from domestic Black students in the US. Thus Canada’s globalist higher ed also contributes to the anti-sociality of diversity-washed and bordered institutional cultures in the US, while it masks the unequal situation of Black students in its own PSE, where their Blackness often intersects with immigrant status to produce compounded forms of discrimination and neglect rather than globality.

“Global” higher ed experience thus begins to emerge, in which its globalism organizes a bundle of international corporate and economic practices that marks the horizon of the antisocial logic of the university and its rationality, still powered in part by inertia and nostalgia. As Lauren Berlant has summarized, “institutions generate the positivity of attachment and protocol even while destroying the livelihood of the attached lives” (“The Commons” 403). Globalist university experience thus acts as a site by which to locate and represent the “structural limits of our desires for an inclusive society in which foundational antiblackness continues to shape ... more broadly North American regimes of power and belonging” (Walcott, “The End of Diversity” 394). Indeed, as institutional rationality and legitimacy becomes more obviously threadbare, institutional members are openly interrogating the irrationality of it all. From the public as their putative underwriters, this challenge often appears in the campus-focused arena of the “free speech debate” — itself a subject of significant social and political complexity that this study does not take up as such. In my query, it functions as a cudgel of political formations on

²⁰See Karin Fischer’s “How International Education’s Golden Age Lost Its Sheen,” on the slowing of internationalization in the US: <https://www.chronicle.com/interactives/2019-03-28-golden-age>.

the right in both national contexts that has revived the culture wars, while effectively protecting elements of institutional infrastructure that either perform or operate via university globalism, especially administrative circuits of whiteness and wealth enshrined by a global financial model.

This thesis participates in an academic genre that is autotheoretical of institutionalized cultures and the positions, contradictions and crises produced by these worlds. Critical examinations of ambivalence and contradiction in university affiliation and the effects of institutionalization on certain critical knowledge projects have become increasingly widespread. Different from reformist or “disruptive” broad-scale analysis of higher ed, such reflexive interrogation of institutionalized social and academic practice highlights, say, feminist pleasures “that attach to the very positions and locations that we incessantly describe as constraining us” or “in the interdisciplinary and institutional ‘travels’ of women’s studies’ key analytics like intersectionality and transnationalism” (Nash and Owens vii). This work invests in “critical intimacy” as a method to read the situated infrastructures of particular university environments that also extend to globalizing structures, or the kind of “speaking from inside” in the work of affirmative deconstruction that Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak has opposed to the scholarly tradition of critical distance.²¹ Consider a 2018 interview with Fred Moten, in a lineage with Bill Readings’s *The University in Ruins* (1997) as the progenitor text for critical university studies, that sees him assert “*I can’t live within her but still I can’t leave her*. That is one possible way of describing my relation to the university. Look. It’s *dying*. ... Still, there are a lot of resources still

²¹This formulation first appeared in 1999 in Spivak’s *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*, with little exposition, in the following sentence presented as a standalone paragraph: “Such critical intimacy – rather than the usual critical distance – is a mark of affirmative deconstruction” (425). A 2016 LARB interview brought the term to headline status; there she elaborates slightly: “That’s what deconstruction is about, right? It’s not just destruction. It’s also construction. It’s critical intimacy, not critical distance. So you actually speak from inside. That’s deconstruction. My teacher Paul de Man once said to another very great critic, Fredric Jameson, “Fred, you can only deconstruct what you love.” Because you are doing it from the inside, with real intimacy. You’re kind of turning it around. It’s that kind of critique” (“Critical Intimacy”).

collected in the university and we should try to get as much of it as we can” (Moten, Interview). Despite the polemical line from Moten and Stefano Harney’s *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning & Black Study* that has brought their abolitionist thought into a kind of contemporary radical canon about universities — “THE ONLY POSSIBLE RELATIONSHIP TO THE UNIVERSITY TODAY IS A CRIMINAL ONE” (26, emphasis in original) — Moten’s more recent comments don’t shy away from ongoing attachment to university worlds, instead suggesting a more intimate harvesting of resources and value to be found in their endings.

Accordingly, what follows is grounded in my experiences as an international graduate student and university worker at McMaster University, a junior humanities researcher in a time of deprofessionalization, and a career international or “global” educator, as well as in my subject position as a product of US public education and a white cisgendered woman raised in a suburb of and living in Baltimore, MD throughout this writing project. To situate myself in the globalist ecosystem further: prior to doctoral study, I completed two degrees in English Literature at public University of Virginia in the US, studied abroad at the University of Edinburgh in Scotland, and taught in international secondary schools in Morocco and India, which respectively used American and international curricula and Canadian and British curricula. After four years of funded doctoral study, I continued working on doctoral research in the US while withdrawn from McMaster to avoid accruing debt via international graduate tuition rates of 20,000+ CAD per year. During this period I have worked for JHU’s Student Services, providing tutoring and mentorship to international MBA students primarily from China, taught the same population of students academic writing and research in an intensive, culturally specified preparatory programme for US graduate-level academic norms, and worked for JHU’s Center for Educational Resources writing pedagogical resources for instructors to enhance student

engagement and equitable instruction and access, particularly for students with disability. I have also been teaching a preparatory academic writing class online to incoming undergraduates at US, Canadian and UK universities from NZ, Australia and a range of Asian countries for several years. This labour history summarizes experiences that represent and interact with aspects of university globalism's infrastructure explored herein, and its inclusion of both complicity and the work of meeting student needs informs my coordinates for analysis. Such a critically intimate mode enables study of institutionalized life in a reflexive and practical fashion that attends to its sites of creativity, complicity and crisis. Given the political stakes of the lived conditions produced by university worlds, I seek to avoid what Imre Szeman names as "the problem of 'affirmative culture,' which arises out of the tendency to focus on objects (specific literary and cultural texts, cultural producers, genres, etc.) rather than cultural processes" (106).

Rather, by mobilizing both objects and processes in situ, this study aims to put pressure on the spaces of learning and attachment found between a "criminal" or abolitionist relationship to the university and a normative or nostalgic relationship to the university. In the former, the university's foundational anti-sociality is met with and contested by other forms of anti-sociality containing transformative or revaluative political potential.²² In the latter, the university's current glitches reflect a neoliberal mutation of its relatively more acceptable "public good" form, or are viewed as the coming death of a kind of sentimental maternal site of resources and *Bildung*. As the introduction will conclude, this study's organizing objects share a common-sense sedimentation with the term "university" and the frictive mix of social projects it organizes today. In this way, this thesis also participates in a Gramscian mode of studying culture, in which

²²Such "other forms of antisociality" are drawn from traditions of negative politics, including anticolonial and decolonial theory, queer theory and queer of color critique, Black studies, abolitionist theory and activism against the prison-industrial complex and gender-based violence, non-reformist reformism, anti-racist and Marxist feminisms, and anti-capitalist, climate justice or degrowth platforms.

difference and its reproduction via the university are taken up as “a complex knotting together of economic, social, and political realities with narratives of those realities” (Crehan xii).

POSITIONING: TERMS AND METHODS

I began this introduction by describing this thesis and its methods of research as “undisciplined” for reasons that warrant elaboration. The antidisciplinary or postdisciplinary nature of this project’s main organizing scholarly fields — critical pedagogy, cultural studies, critical university studies, or global studies — combines here with the low stature of pedagogical expertise within the academy, where it is typically relegated to an informal zone of everyday, embodied knowledge and collegial skills-sharing beneath scholarship’s production and diffusion.²³ So any scholarly project on higher ed pedagogy more broadly must draw upon a range of fields that rarely interact, e.g. sociology of education and education policy, data-driven research on cognition, learning and learning technologies, social theory of relational or intimate classroom pedagogies, and cultural studies on public pedagogies in spaces, environments and media. Yet even a specialized commitment to pedagogy presents certain inherent limitations for the thesis as an academic genre, as it requires the translation of what is ostensibly a socially generative and collectively contextualized mode of epistemic dialogue and encounter into anecdotes for the lyric scholar mode and a kind of individualized intellectual capital. Outside of the crafting of particular forms of assessment or strategies for instructional delivery, pedagogical practice is also contingent and non-repeatable by nature, and therefore resistant to the kinds of generalization that animate these other fields on universities, culture or globality.

Accordingly, this thesis’s organization of critical sociology in dialogue with social and

²³This situation has given rise to the Teaching and Learning Centre as a capital project for universities, which arguably exist in appropriative, extractive relationships to instructors and their expertise, as explored in Chapter 2.

pedagogical theory would benefit from a team research process for analysis of the iterability, extent, and case variations of the infrastructural phenomena I examine alone here, in an inquiry oriented toward narrative argument and critical synthesis. That this latter labour arrangement (the lyric scholar mode) is the institutional default in the political economy of US and Canadian contemporary academe is necessary to note— as workers, those of us pursuing doctoral study and/or the ever-diminishing possibility of sustainable academic employment are necessarily interpellated by knowledge work's individuation. That this socio-intellectual capital is also a site of attachment and identification for many academics and peers has been a site of ambivalence and alienation for me as well as, ultimately, motivation for this project's thinking on institutionalized life and pedagogies. Of course, this organization of learning applies generally in higher ed and therefore animates the classroom and the sorts of encounters and knowledge projects possible with undergraduates in fundamental ways, as Chapters 4 & 5 discuss. Pedagogy as an organizing term has also shifted in its conceptual function in the process of this research, from an emphasis on reflexivity to a performative mode incorporating heuristics.

In the course of preparing for my comprehensive exams by reading lists of postcolonial theory and novels, my initial doctoral project on the ethics and pedagogies in postcolonial novels lost coherence. These supplementary archives elaborated the field's intractable debates on praxis that had produced self-accusations of melancholia and failure. The charge of excessive culturalism and representationalism made by postcolonial materialists forced my attention to the gap between postcolonial critics and postcolonial citizen-subjects, to the gap between postcolonial subjects specializing in academic postcolonial study and white and settler subjects like myself doing the same, and to the gap wider still between postcolonial critics in the US or Canadian academy and the domestic and international students in their courses within these

social locations. It became clear I had fatally undertheorized my social location as a pedagogical medium for this work, such that a default of dehistoricized cosmopolitanism would manifest as the terrain of postcolonial ethics. Further, I saw that to theorize it would necessarily position me in a complicit relation to the administration of knowledge projects like those in postcolonial and cosmopolitan curricula by settler colonial and primarily white institutions. A merely reflexive pedagogical mode in such settings would mainly reproduce these dynamics, even if nuanced with antagonism, critique and complexity, through an “academic tourism” cosmopolitanization of students that is compatible with a human-capital-driven global credential.

At the same time, another unfolding archive became a site of obsessive reading. While I was being trained in the logics of the profession, reportage on their unraveling began to intensify and spread across my newfound academic and online networks. The crisis in the humanities became intertwined, in this other project of reading, with the increasing promotion of global anglophone cultures and world literatures as institutional and pedagogical formations, developing in parallel but never in conversation with the deepening precarization of academic workers and the primacy of indebtedness and threats to social reproduction in undergraduate experience for the statistical majority of students. Postcolonialism’s diminishing appearance in course or job descriptions suggested the need for a new frame for the problems and frontiers of cultural capital shaping curricular trends in the contemporary corporate university. “Global” and “world” emerged as new terms with a dual function: as indicators of the marketing and marketability of cosmopolitan literacy in cultural difference, and as indicators of an institutional shift away from the postcolonial as that “asset primed for accumulation” (Mitchell, “Diversity” 72) along with its potentially attendant projects of anticolonial and historical materialist critique, despite decolonial scholarship’s emergent popularity concurrent to these global frameworks. Via

the promiscuity of the “global” label or moniker, the universities in which I had been embedded for study and teaching began to more openly reflect their investments in the continuance of Global North cultural and economic supremacy, and the discipline of literary studies its compatibility with a romantic curricular imaginary of globalized life, wherein culture acts as “the primary site where individual and collective identities are shaped and formed” (Szeman 97) over and above structural, ontological, climatological or material problems and processes. Despite scholarly debate about the utility and politics of these new frameworks, it became clear that a “global” curricular shift was enabling the alignment and consolidation of institutional interests into modes of branding and valuation that are themselves public pedagogies of globalism as a sociopolitical discourse and ideological project.

To be clear, I take up “globalism” as our default epistemological framework rather than embarking from the premise of the unevenness wrought by globalization. By posturing as neutral in an educational setting, globalism manifests the assumption that market-driven, worldwide “greater connectivity inevitably leads to a more open, democratic, and prosperous public sphere” (Roudometof 65). I argue that this version of globalism tailored to US and Canadian higher education worlds is a central fabric for a range of processes of rationalization, through which global training and cultural study serves the economic internationalism of universities in excess of their national settings by promoting a pro-social ideology of connectivity. This is my primary claim about the nature of university globalism as a pedagogy: that connectivity is the social and infrastructural good through which globalism is variously represented and embedded into undergraduate study. Further, this promotion of connectivity enables a managerial project that is expressed via an institutional infrastructure of global financial and technological capital, and via a culturalist infrastructure promoting diversity and complexity in forms that accord with the

institutional maintenance of settler national futurity and the extractive structures of racial capitalism in the US and Canada. The project of global study in the region's higher ed thus organizes connective, cosmopolitan terms for participation that invite students to expand or position themselves beyond their prior social situation, while the university's own extractive and expropriative development projects are buried under promotional discourses of producing global citizens and relevant credentials for the global knowledge economy.

My arguments draw upon recent scholarship on globalism's intellectual history that helps to clarify the institutionalist strand of university globalism. Quinn Slobodian's 2018 monograph *Globalists: The End of Empire and The Birth of Neoliberalism* reorients the dominant story of neoliberalism as an ideology — in which markets represent the highest form of autonomy as self-regulating, democratic entities over and above states and civic systems, and individualism is the highest site of human freedom as expressed through economic rationality and competition. Slobodian instead narrates a project of global design to create an institutional infrastructure that would protect global capitalism from any alternatives and from the demos: its goal was

not to liberate markets but to encase them, to inoculate capitalism against the threat of democracy, to create a framework to contain often-irrational human behavior, and to reorder the world after empire as a space of competing states in which borders fulfill a necessary function (Slobodian 2).²⁴

Twentieth-century decolonization was central and built into the designs for global political economy of such an institutional framework, for the international state system made it possible to assert a single world market that obscured local economies under a universal, unknowably complex global economy, and to hide “not the state but asymmetries of power” (Slobodian 269).

²⁴ See pages 7-13, where Slobodian introduces the “Geneva School” neoliberals as “stalwart critics of national sovereignty, believing that after empire, nations must remain embedded in an international institutional order that safeguarded capital and protected its right to move throughout the world” (9) and “prescribed neither an obliteration of politics by economics nor the dissolution of states into a global marketplace but a carefully structured and regulated settlement between the two” (12).

This project of what Slobodian calls the institutional encasement of “the world economy” (contra the common metaphor used to critique neoliberalism, the “unfettered market”) was essentially anti-political and anti-democratic in its cosmopolitan infrastructure. Its goal was “to prevent state projects of egalitarian redistribution and secure competition” as well as to “make projects of social justice, equality, or redistribution unthinkable” by disappearing the economy or economies from the lived scale of politics (Slobodian 19, 269). This institutional expansion included a global humanitarian infrastructure in which neocolonial mechanisms also took root in a range of para- and sub-institutions, including in educational policy institutions and universities in the Global North alongside extra- and non-governmental projects of charity, aid, structural adjustment and development, with the moral patina of late liberalism that has constituted Global North-South relations. While Slobodian has since joined others in projecting the effective end of this global economic governance infrastructure in today’s global political economy,²⁵ my focus here is on the way the US and Canadian university sectors embody and perform this wider institutional framework of globalism as a kind of public pedagogy in institutional environments. In simple terms, this has produced a post-civic dynamic in the higher education sector by which students are educated for but not about the global economy, and, absent meaningful global arenas for political agency by individual citizens or groups, universities themselves are often seen as the actors who are capable of global citizenship.

The infrastructural shift that Slobodian’s genealogy of globalism describes found its

²⁵Slobodian covered this subject in a 2021 McMaster lecture series, “The End of Neoliberal Globalism?” <https://www.humanities.mcmaster.ca/stories/prestigious-lecture-series-welcomes-historian-quinn-slobodian/>. Jamie Merchant’s “Endgame: Finance and the Close of the Market System,” *The Brooklyn Rail*, March 2022 <https://brooklynrail.org/2022/03/field-notes/Endgame-Finance-and-the-Close-of-the-Market-System> and March/April 2022 *Verso* blogposts “Static and Signal: Parts One and Two” by Joshua Clover and Nikhil Singh also both present arguments for how neoliberalism has fitfully collapsed over the past few years and explore its replacements: <https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/5308-static-and-signal-part-one;> [https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/5314-static-and-signal-part-two.](https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/5314-static-and-signal-part-two)

fullest expression in the 1990s, “the highpoint of neoliberal globalism as an institution building project” (283), which also marks the rough origin point of the genealogy of pedagogical university globalism as aforementioned. This has also coincided with the scalar expansion of infrastructures of connectivity, a “relative shift from circulation to connectivity [which] is implicated in the displacement of revolutionary optimism by political pessimism” (Duffield 5). Accompanying that infrastructural shift has been a kind of epistemological crisis, in which data and machine-learning have come to be relied upon in the way that “deductive ‘knowledge’ framed by history and causation” (Duffield 3) had been in order to elaborate projects of humanism and their worldliness. Accordingly, global connectivity infrastructures are dominated by “narrow empiricism, unmediated experience and data behaviorism” and “asserting the design principle over any need for radical change” (Duffield 10), compatible with an expanding, fragmenting post-social order of the global contemporary. This connective landscape syncs with a new 21st-century phase of global development that geographers specializing in global poverty posit as a replacement for the developed/developing schema that has accompanied the Global North and South categories: the term “converging divergence” acknowledges the global reduction of poverty at scale concurrent to intensifying inequality within countries across the globe (Horner and Hulme 349). In this post-social landscape, governance is abstracted through everyday technologies that shape new forms of social reproduction celebrated as resilience, complexity, and authenticity via consumption and “smart” connectivity.

These design approaches also accord with general shifts in learning and pedagogy underway in 21st-century undergraduate education, whose digitalization and global citizenship programming I read as formations that are expressive of the ideology of “social innovation” via connectivity rather than the human rights and humanitarian paradigm of development. In the US

and Canada, global education promotes an accompanying vision of particular cosmopolitan and entrepreneurial selfhoods, manifesting innovation's pessimistic emphasis "on processes rather than outcomes and individual brilliance over social structures" and asking students "to accommodate global inequality, rather than challenge it" (Leary, "Innovation"). As will be mapped through the institutional forms that organize the thesis's chapters, connectivity is a site of celebration and investment by the academy in tension with its pessimistic infrastructure, yet one that is still hospitable to antipolitical discourses of sustainability, innovation, and networking as the institutional containers for individualized human capital and affect management.

At the same time, the liberal orientation of Canadian and American universities persists, however brittly, as part of the imperial cultural production that fosters the "support of a liberal class that is always critical for the maintenance of 'benevolent empire'" (Chatterjee and Maira 7). This marks the culturalist strand of university globalism with which it was partially defined at the start of this section, which is particularly expressed in humanities and social sciences education. Informed by Christina Klein's study of post-Cold War global integrationism, I read this strand as an inheritance of the "sentimental globalism" that became hegemonic from the 1990s onwards to promote conditions for the acceptance of a new global economic order with America as its dominant actor and lodestar and Canada as its more anodyne sidekick. Pursuant to international integration's accompanying "ideology of global interdependence rather than one of racial difference" (Klein 16), Global North institutional networks including universities have promoted the premises of interconnectedness, reciprocity and exchange, and bonds of "community" across difference. As Chapter 3's study of global programming discusses, this sentimental vision of the connected "self-in-relation" (Klein 14) as domestic to higher ed in the US and in Canada has persisted through global citizenship curriculum and corporate discourses

of diversity and multiculturalism that still broadly organize institutionalized global study.

Cosmopolitanization is a necessary consequence of this mode of study, too, and unavoidable if its classical philosophical meaning of “citizen of the world”, or affiliation in excess of local community or polity, is invoked through the contents and methods of a given curriculum. It is part of the materialist infrastructure of global study as well — not to the extreme of the class designation given to the extremely wealthy who can purchase citizenship, operate extra-judicially, and move seamlessly between global cities due to the homogenizing effects of global capital, but in some real relation to that elite experience. (Some students at elite universities or studying internationally, especially through satellite campuses around the world, may have experiences analogous to or overlapping with this elite milieu.) Globally speaking, students in Canada or the US have an exceptional position in terms of time, access and means to post-basic education. They represent what Sarah Brouillette calls a “bourgeois sociolect” (“Neoliberalism” 288), however residual today. Additionally, global literacy and its attendant competencies in communication, adaptability, and intercultural fluency (to name a few) are highly desirable to employers in the contemporary global marketplace, crystallizing cosmopolitanism into forms of corporate training. Consonant with polarizing and intensifying crisis conditions centering mobility and migration in the current decade, critiques of cosmopolitanism are evidently abundant. These charges extend from the cultural myopia or elitism in worldliness, to the neoliberal creative economization of culture and place it supports and engenders, to an ecological systemic critique of transnational travel, elective mobilities, and digital circulation in our petro-time of planetary climate breakdown.²⁶

²⁶See respectively, to name just a few examples, Joseph Slaughter’s “World Literature as Property,” *Alif* vol. 34, 2014, pg 1-35; Sarah Brouillette’s *Literature and the Creative Economy*, Stanford University Press, 2014; Giorgos Kallis, Susan Paulson, Giacomo D’Alisa and Federico Demaria’s *The Case for Degrowth*, Polity Press, 2020.

Yet a performance of a cosmopolitan orientation by way of global study also provides the means to foreground its problems and contradictions. Perhaps like the project of worlding for a university that presumes an underpinning social desire, cosmopolitanism describes an attachment and so requires sentiment for it to approach a politics, and then characteristically takes sentiment as the horizon of politics. At the same time, cosmopolitanism is a site for Spivakian commitment to “the persistent critique of what one cannot not want” (*A Critique of Postcolonial Reason* 110), especially as it is regularly opposed to the populism and patriotism of authoritarian ethnonationalist and eco-fascistic politics of state isolationism in the global contemporary. The crises that must mobilize critical humanism for an oppositional praxis within capitalist social relations and as a dynamic component of pursuing posthumanist infrastructure and multi-species justice are indeed planetary, requiring care for the world, or at least for the idea of a world, with all of its capaciousness and heterogeneity. Global climate breakdown, expansionary settler colonial accumulation and dispossession, widening landscapes of social control via debt, precarity, surveillance and carcerality, the *longue durée* and future anteriors of racialization and financialization of rights, mobilities, resources, and infrastructures: to teach about any of these crises or the structures and institutions that have given rise to or manipulated them requires a global valence, as a historical and present context to be acknowledged if not directly studied. The inverse is also true: to teach with a global framework necessitates engagement with these crises, including those of the contemporary university in its global valence. Thus, cosmopolitanism marks a double bind that is the condition of global study for today’s indebted undergraduates. Chapter 4 on “the global student” accounts for this positioning, in dialogue with undergraduate students whom I interviewed on their experiences of global study in Chapter 5.

In taking up global pedagogies as part of a relatively stable curricular and environmental

formation in contemporary Canadian and American universities, my aim is to center the hegemonic forces of abstraction that can discipline, immobilize or alienate undergraduates as located political subjects and to consider how their contradictions produce pedagogical opportunities— for multi-scalar thinking, for situated critical geography, and for literacy in social infrastructure that is politically generative for the frictive worlds in which undergraduates are situated. Such forces of abstraction are global in nature as well as determinative for the social locations of these undergraduate students. This approach enables me to center a “search for situational unity”²⁷ (Spivak “Teaching” 5) over particularized curricular and cultural content as an epistemic imperative for institutionalized teaching and learning in today’s crisis conditions.

FORMS AND INFRASTRUCTURE: THE CHAPTERS

I began this introduction by identifying infrastructure as the framework and the method through which my analysis is organized, and have gestured to the sites through which my chapters will progressively pursue this: the global university, the global learning interface, the global curricular programme, the global student, and the global classroom. These sites organize the data generated by my research into university globalism’s core phenomena — or according to its “phenomenal form—the spatial, temporal organization of an object” (Lehman 252).

Additionally, these forms of university globalism represent the infrastructure through which the critical global pedagogy that this thesis offers as an orientation within the contemporary

²⁷In “Teaching For the Times,” Spivak imagines mobilizing an increasingly institutionalized liberal multiculturalism for collectivizing practice in the university: “Under these circumstances, essentializing difference, however sophisticated we might be at it, may lead to unproductive conflict among ourselves. . . . We must find some basis for unity. It is a travesty of philosophy, a turning of philosophy into a direct blueprint for policy-making, to suggest that the search for a situational unity goes against the lesson of deconstruction. If we perceive our emergence into the dominant as a situation, we see the importance of inventing a unity that depends upon that situation. I am not a situational relativist. No situation is saturated. But imperatives arise out of situations and, however unthinkingly, we act by imagining imperatives. We must therefore scrupulously imagine a situation in order to act. Pure difference cannot appear. Difference cannot provide an adequate theory of practice.”

university is both developed and performed throughout. As the chapters respectively examine in more detail, the university environment, learning and its (re)definition by global interfaces and technologies, curriculum as student experience, the self-development of undergraduates, and the classroom's sociability are core objects in the social infrastructure of higher ed. Each represents an abstract moral good that has been mobilized and recast in the name of global capitalist and administrative logics and practices, yet still contains a utopian edge that is either politically undermined or nostalgically idealized in their midst. It is in and through this double bind, or this ambivalent humanist positioning toward these worlding elements of university globalism, that I develop a pedagogy that performs and deforms its hegemonic mode of social reproduction.

Given the force of organizational and cultural variation in PSE, I have made several choices to delimit my discussion of these forms and anchor their effects in local and comparative textures of institutional realism. One major choice has appeared throughout this introductory discussion, which is a focus on the public university as the unit of translation across American and Canadian higher ed systems. In both national contexts, enrollment data from the 1990s to the present shows that roughly two-thirds of students have been enrolled in public universities in Canada, with the remainder in college and vocational programmes, and roughly three-quarters of US-based students have been enrolled in public universities rather than private non-profit or private for-profit institutions. Higher ed scholars have also noted that, if ranked within the US system, Canadian universities (including the most research-intensive and elite such as the G13) would generally appear among "Big Ten" US public universities, which are similar in population, infrastructural breadth and global rankings (Srebrnik 66). So I take up the public university for its location of a *median* undergraduate student experience in both settings, while gesturing to phenomena at the more extreme ends of the institutional cultural spectrum when

their data is revelatory of trends, foundational logics, or mutations of the higher ed landscape.

This approach makes infrastructural analysis more viable and generative of what is shared about US and Canadian settler national projects routed through university globalism.

Second, I use two core institutional sites to organize readings of university globalism at multiple scales. I take McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario as my Canadian site, and Florida International University in Miami, Florida as my American site. Both draw the majority of their student populations from the local surrounding areas, yet have explicitly positioned institutional globality as central to their mandates. Inquiry using these sites spans the thesis. Observations made at the level of generality are a product of reading for narrative data from a range of sources, including administrative reports, budgets, policy documents, higher ed reportage including publications such as blogs, scholarly research, university websites and media, syllabi, and statistics. Close reading of such discursive and material production embedded in a particular university culture allows me to explore their dynamics and to place them in dialogue with classroom experiences. While the experiences of course instructors and other education workers are a significant gap in this study (and worthy of another thesis-length inquiry), I focus on student experience and its administration through the range of pedagogical projects presented by university environments in order to articulate the labour and learning conditions for students as a situation requiring a critical global pedagogy.

The form of this thesis is itself instructive of the multiscale and infrastructural pedagogical mode I seek to perform here. Its central chapters, 1 - 5, inhabit a discursive register that is a mix of diagnostic and analytical writing, containing select close readings but sustaining a scope requiring summary and synthesis. These each pursue a reading of a form, located at a particular scale and/or site within institutional cultures, using a heuristic approach: what is

revealed if I read the university, the interface, the curriculum, the student, the classroom in terms of globalism? How do its projects sediment and shape the worlds that teachers and students become attached to and must navigate? What does this allow me to think that “global” performs? This impetus produces a rhetorical density, as I write at the median of the various registers in disciplinary and public discourses that serve as that form’s inputs or data. Perhaps this is the expected product of interdisciplinary inquiry: a kind of critical reportage that aims to be logical and evidentiary while also acting as narrative argument. This, to me, expresses a critical geographical approach to institutionalized global study – an approach that is both situated and imaginative – that this dissertation aims to develop. It also reflects my own learning in progress, working at the boundaries of my training in literary and cultural studies with modes of reading and conceptualization that might approach an aesthetic object or cultural form through a kind of realist critique in order to develop a broader theoretical mode of “provisional generalization”²⁸ that is politically useful to student life and for solidaristic praxis in university worlds.

A few notes of caution to acknowledge the performative contradictions that animate this research. First, as this introduction has alluded, institutionalized global study takes an elite position within the profoundly uneven global reality of who has “the right to intellectual labour”, the understanding of which is itself the product of such intellectual labour (Spivak “Cultural Pluralism?” 448). Second, the academy’s neutering hospitality to political interventions that are seen as having their own kind of institutional capital based in radicalism is also at play. Given the role that abolitionism will have in the pedagogical applications I explore in the thesis’s conclusion, a critical global pedagogy inclusive of decolonial critique, social reproduction theory

²⁸Lauren Berlant is here paraphrasing Spivak, without offering a direct referent, in *Desire/Love*: “Theory, as Gayatri Spivak writes, is at best provisional generalization: I am tracking patterns to enable my readers to see them elsewhere or not to see them, and to invent other explanations” (3). Bruce Robbins provides another formulation of generalization about the horizon of critical social thought: “If we agree that there is ‘no easy generalization,’ don’t we want to retain the right to difficult generalization?” (Robbins 251).

and the negative politics of anti-capitalism and planetary trans-species justice has the potential to exist in either a comfortably bourgeois habitus within elite spaces of university globalism or in no institutional space at all. And third, while the university is of course itself a site of political struggle, as worker, student and community resistance across the thesis's timeframe continually makes clear, I am also mindful of the risk of myopia attendant upon a focus on institutional cultures, summarized by Sarah Brouillette of "simply mapping the mapmakers, showing where they themselves fit in the networks, fields, forces, institutions" ("Paranoid Subjectivity"). Accordingly, any critical global pedagogy that this thesis might proffer seeks to fulfill the corrective she offers of "foregrounding the importance of a given map's relationship to struggle ... and effective praxis" ("Paranoid Subjectivity").

Global study itself represents these risks, requiring acts of abstraction that, at best, hinge on what Edward Said called globalization's "happy capitalist model" and its tendency to promote "synthesis and the transcendence of opposites" (66), and that typically take the world's composition by imperial modernity as a necessary premise. Yet because the global also represents "an open space of cross-cultural connection extending beyond the postcolonial horizon" (Hena 295) at a time of accelerating polarization and planetary crisis, such abstraction is worth claiming and pursuing in whatever spaces of de facto collective study are available. To make use of the performative, heuristic-based approach this introduction has summarized, I see infrastructuralism as organizing a pedagogy of social cartography, exploring maps that are self-consciously situated rather than generalizable, and not rooted in an objective of mastery but intended for contestatory and revisionary engagement. First introduced in the work of Rolland Paulston, social cartography is a method of agonistic and situated study that uses collective mapping to "open up meanings, to uncover limits within cultural fields, and to highlight

reactionary attempts to seal borders and prohibit translations”, in order to enable accounts of “paradoxes, and of situated investments, attachments and desires that shape responses to the shifting grounds of higher education” (Andreotti et al 2). More anarchist in its understanding of the politics of undergraduate learning than interested in a political programme of conversion or ideology critique, this approach embraces the intimate processes of encounter and articulation, a project of epistemological rupture, and the existing and potential organic intellectualism among globalism’s institutionalized subjects.

As core social institutions in the US and Canada contract, mutate and amalgamate in the background of rising authoritarianism, ethno-supremacism and an increasingly visible landscape of everyday crises of social reproduction around the globe, the character of globalism, and university globalism as a more located site of its expression, can seem confoundingly mixed. Yet in these social locations of the Global North, global frameworks perform “the paradox that we find ourselves in ... in which, even to decenter whiteness and produce a different kind of world, we find ourselves working to pacify whiteness so that other possibilities might emerge” (Walcott, “The End of Diversity” 399). The university in its current forms is itself one such obstacle to other world possibilities, yet its double binds that are lived out by institutional members present a pedagogical opportunity. Despite its route through the contradictory and performative worlds of global institutional identities and programming, this is where this scholarly study ultimately has purpose and should find its life: as a method for study, among the students and workers with whom its infrastructural map is situated and entangled.

CHAPTER 1: THE FORMS AND PROJECTS OF UNIVERSITY GLOBALISM

In a 2013 webcast for Coursera, the founding for-profit provider of online university education through massive open online courses (MOOCs) supported by the US government, a panel of humanities instructors discussed challenges and strategies of teaching critical thinking skills in a disembodied and digitally mediated platform. Michael Roth, then President of Wesleyan University teaching an interdisciplinary course entitled “The Modern and the Postmodern,” voiced the main insight that emerged from their presentations on teaching “beyond content delivery”: it is not access to content (the publicized *raison d’etre*) that MOOCs should ultimately be providing, but rather to a “context of learning” in which students can “upload their experience” (Roth). The “MOOC Moment”²⁹ had been trumpeted by mainstream press as the “online revolution”³⁰ that would cheaply transform and massify access to free academic content broadcast by MIT, Harvard, and Stanford experts and replace learning under brick-and-mortar constraints. Yet at that time it was already fading, and its practitioners finessing new logics out of these disruptive educational platforms. 2012-2013’s “Year of the MOOC”³¹ is long considered to have passed due to poor learning outcomes, low completion rates and cheating among students, yet its aims and infrastructures have remained fruitful for university leaders and educational technologists in institutional contexts that increasingly emphasize the technologies, assessment, efficiency and potential global reach of instructional delivery regardless of classroom type.

Since then, especially following the “moonshot”³² for the region’s PSE that was its

²⁹See *The MOOC Moment: A Selection of Inside Higher Ed Articles and Essays on Massive Open Online Courses. Inside Higher Ed*. Washington, DC: Inside Higher Ed (2013).

³⁰See John Chubb and Terry Moe, “Chubb and Moe: Higher Education's Online Revolution”, *Wall Street Journal*, May 30 2012, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702304019404577416631206583286>.

³¹See Laura Papano, “The Year of the MOOC”, *New York Times*, Nov 2 2012, <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/04/education/edlife/massive-open-online-courses-are-multiplying-at-a-rapid-pace.html>.

³²Spoken by the University of Kentucky’s President Eli Capilouto, as cited in Anemona Harticollis, “Fever Checks

temporary mass transition to online course delivery in 2020-2021 catalyzed by the global pandemic, virtual classrooms have become ubiquitous across institutional types and are administered both from within and beyond campus-based locations. Coursera announced a major re-institutionalization of its infrastructure in partnership with Google in December 2021, offering subscription-based career certificate programmes with credentials completed in six months and recognized as the equivalent of four undergraduate courses by an employer consortium of 150 major US companies and accrediting body, the American Council on Education (ACE).³³ Google equates these certificates with bachelors degrees in its own hiring while also making its programming freely available to US community colleges and technical and vocational secondary schools, with AI-powered tutoring, coaching and advising platforms part of the software suite. Within a decade, the fear that disruptive Silicon Valley educational products embraced by university leadership could represent “the capture of public education” (Bady) has been borne out, albeit not exactly per their originary transformational terms. What does this infrastructural shift represent, and how do we locate the projects of university globalism therein?

The relocation of instruction and credentialing to digital platforms and public-private partnerships is just one of several processes underway in the thesis’s period of study that have shifted public higher ed toward more privatized versions of learning and skilling that sync with global education and its globalist infrastructure in US and Canadian PSE. University infrastructures in their explicitly global iterations, observable from the 1990s onwards, have been omnivorous and rapacious, yet threadbare and driven by risk management. Despite contemporaneous public discourses of crisis in the PSE sector, globalist projects have supplied

and Quarantine Dorms: The Fall College Experience?”, *New York Times*, May 19 2020, <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/19/us/college-fall-2020-coronavirus.html>.

³³See Ray Schroeder, “Google Enters Higher Ed in a Big Way,” *Inside Higher Ed*, December 14 2021, <https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/blogs/online-trending-now/google-enters-higher-ed-big-way>.

universities of all types and defunded publics especially with the means to continued expansion, market capture, innovation and legitimacy across a period that has recharacterized these increasingly leveraged institutions as post-civic and post-public per their convergence toward corporate finance, governance, programming and modes of social citizenship. Globalist practices have enabled US and Canadian universities to continue projecting themselves as globally popular agents of development at multiple scales and learning sites. These will be elaborated throughout the thesis and include virtual learning environments marketed with a global reach or global base of potential participants, global institutional networks, educational policy, partnerships and their academic reproduction, and curriculum in situ that organizes interdisciplinary projects to promote global knowledge, kinds of literacy, and forms of application or participation. The market forms represented above in the site of Coursera are examples of this morphology, where global economic context and global corporate prestige develop and dominate the kinds of learning on offer, while global referents may be more or less present in their public-facing discourses. As this chapter begins to map, university globalism summarizes a set of practices, cultures, and their infrastructures that enable Canadian and American universities to reproduce themselves and the legibility of their educational products globally, as well as the globalist institutional infrastructure of which they are a part, as constitutive sites for its reproduction.

This chapter will focus on the environmental and pedagogical “context of learning” produced by this infrastructure, as part of the multi-pronged and multi-scalar effort to extend university operations, property holdings and pedagogies toward a global scale or institutional and cultural form. The common institutional form that circulates almost mythically to describe this is “the global university.” Generically, this describes how PSE institutions have become reflexive to the dynamics of economic and cultural globalization in their policies and programming, with

visible changes in how they work, populate themselves, teach and credentialize. These structuring dynamics are, for the purposes of this portrait of institutionality, globalization as the world-wide spread of capitalist social relations, however uneven in its particular developments, and this worlding's concomitant condition of connectivity. Through expansionary networked activity, universities have industriously developed and internalized their own globalism, an active project that has been summarized as “a conscious process of globalization or a set of policies designed specifically to effect greater global rather than international interactions” (Obyrne and Hensby 15). While universities have been host to international infrastructures of academic mobility and exchange as long as they've existed, this newer form often becomes legible through administrative initiatives for internationalization, through which the Canadian or American university itself becomes reordered as declaratively “global” in character. A range of indicators by which to trace a particular internationalized university's globalist infrastructures will go on to be explored in subsequent chapters, focused on its recharacterization of learning, curriculum, and student learning and labouring conditions. Here, I focus on the effects of this globalist paradigm's fundamental contradiction, namely the administrative coupling of managerial consolidation with expansionary connectivity, on the university form and the related programmes and environments it organizes for undergraduates.

Site: Florida International University in Miami, Florida, USA

Let us take up an example that illustrates this contradiction. As higher education's swerve toward a global field became increasingly clear in public discourse, my research into undergraduate experiences of global study led me to Florida International University for its exemplary institution-wide effort to internationalize through global programming. FIU's

“International” title began as a marketing foundation to invite greater Miami's immigrant populations to find an intercultural home in a local institution per its founding in 1965. Now the fourth-largest public university in the US, FIU's 81% minority population reflects what Christopher Newfield calls higher ed's “Great Democratization,” or “the post-World War II reformation of universities in the West, which created mass access to university studies roughly equal in quality to those elites enjoyed” (“The Counterreformation”). Mature, low-income, racial and ethnic minority, and community college transfer students make up a large fraction of its demographics. Since the inception of FIU's “Global Learning for Global Citizenship” initiative in 2010, undergraduates have been fulfilling a global learning requirement via, at minimum, one interdisciplinary general education course and one discipline-specific course required for the major. Accordingly, their faculty senate, led by a Global Learning Curriculum Committee, approved 160 courses that engage with FIU's mandatory global learning outcomes (GLOs) for every discipline but chemistry; a majority of these are available additionally or exclusively online, often “blended” with a mix of asynchronous and voluntary synchronous elements. These institutional learning outcomes, measured upon matriculation as well as at point of graduation by indices such as the Global Perspective Inventory,³⁴ are defined by FIU's Directors of the Office of Global Learning Initiatives Hilary Landorf and Stephanie Doscher as:

(1) **global awareness**, or knowledge of the interrelatedness of local, global, international, and intercultural issues, trends, and systems; (2) **global perspective**, or the ability to conduct a multiperspective analysis of local, global, international, and intercultural problems; and (3) **global engagement**, or the willingness to engage in local, global, international, and intercultural problem solving (“Defining Global Learning” 24, boldface in original).

FIU's pedagogical investments in “global awareness, perspective, and engagement in cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal dimensions” (“Global Learning”) are being expressed

³⁴See the GPI website for more information on this assessment tool, its norms, and a list of around 200 participating institutions: <https://gpi.central.edu/index.cfm?myAction=Information>.

in team-lecture courses like “How We Know What We Know” on information literacy and global media, “Global Supply Chains and Logistics,” a mixture of engineering, business, and geography lenses for examining the relationship between society and business practices around the world, or “Cultural and Social Foundations of Education,” on comparative analyses of urban education systems across a range of sites. Faculty were initially presented with the opportunity to collectively develop a definition for “global citizenship” across the disciplines, alongside additional pedagogical support for adapting Global Learning (GL) outcomes to discipline-specific outcomes, although this support was not funded or sustained past the initial development period. Nevertheless, GL courses are required to “include appropriate content with multiple perspectives on the theme or topic of the course, a syllabus that incorporates active learning strategies, and an assessment plan to ensure students are meeting the global learning outcomes” (“Global Learning”). As a curricular project (discussed in detail in Chapters 3 and 5), FIU's initiative presents a comprehensive programme on behalf of undergraduate learning, which, according to its director and Professor of International Education Hilary Landorf, is centered around diversity, collaboration and problem solving (“Defining Global Learning”).

Upon closer look, two shifts helped to catalyze this intensified relationship to global study at an institutional scale. First, the university was undergoing a reaccreditation process in 2007 required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, also known as a Quality Enhancement Plan or QEP, when the initiative was first conceived. During this same year, the Board of Governors who oversees Florida's public higher education system collaborated with then-Governor Charlie Crist to allow certain research universities to raise in-state tuition by 30-40% to accommodate rising operational and research costs in lieu of increasing public funding or an enrolment cap; this policy was extended to Florida International University (one of

five at that time) in 2008 and is seen as the beginning of the multi-tier system that developed into Florida's current competitive performance-based funding model.³⁵ Second, that same year “a series of conversations with stakeholders to choose a theme for advancing student achievement that would impact all students” (“Global Learning”) was held that produced the imperative to re-engage with the “International” in FIU, in keeping with the *zeitgeist* of higher education in the US and Canada that sees itself refigured by 21st-century globalization. As a Miami-based majority-minority and public research university host to a significant Hispanic/Latinx diaspora, the repackaging of FIU as a global hub was not a difficult task for current (and future) stakeholders. The resources for the global face of FIU were seen as already in attendance but their deterritorialized potential untapped, and Miami itself as an exemplary site for staging a more cosmopolitan education, offering itself as “a global crossroads” (“Defining Global Learning”). As Landorf explains, “that diverse, global aspect wasn't actually being put to use for student learning. ...We had all the components [of GL] and yet there was this gap in terms of putting them to use to prepare our students for global citizenship in an interconnected world. We call this our internationalization gap” (“Global Learning”).

What is the nature of this gap? What sources within and without the university provide the incentives for its closure, and who benefits? How is the situation of teaching (and teachers) and learning (and learners) altered or repurposed by the institutional impetus for self-revision and transformation in name of global social orientations like awareness, engagement, and perspective? How do an institution's modes of inclusion and reapportionment of resources in the name of this gap in fact produce new gaps or entrench existing ones at smaller scales? And how

³⁵See Florida Senate Bill SB-1710 (<http://archive.flsenate.gov/data/session/2007/Senate/bills/billtext/pdf/s1710.pdf>) and its 2008 and 2009 expansions for more details; see also a post to The Academe Blog by Rudy Fichtenbaum, current President of the AAUP, on the distortion inherent in the metrics for evaluating a university's “performance” in this state funding model: <http://academeblog.org/2015/06/19/whats-wrong-with-performance-based-funding/>.

does institutional “use” or management of “global” assets become interlaced with pedagogy, reproducing norms of economic rationality, extractive consumption and entrepreneurial self-management? These are the questions to which this chapter will attend as it surveys self-declared global universities in the US and Canada.

At FIU, which will appear as a site throughout the thesis, we can observe an effort to spread globalist infrastructure via the classroom and its pedagogies as well as across disciplinary axes of undergraduate curriculum, and in its extra-institutional and pre-professional extensions that are called co-curricular. That FIU's administration identified its student body as incipiently global(ized) is logical enough in descriptive terms, and their wide-ranging investment in global curricular resources encompasses applied fields, social justice oriented social sciences and humanities, and more openly entrepreneurial and career-oriented programmes. Yet, the above questions become more material as we examine FIU's global turn at other scales. For institutional administration, the initiative requires educational and pedagogical consolidation, as it was implemented with its own metrics for unifying, evaluating and ergo managing consistency with FIU's declared Global Learning (GL) outcomes, as well as for documenting shifts in student worldview throughout the degree. This global alignment enables new curriculum, once developed, to be considered “canned content” that can be handed off to interface managers and adjunct faculty to offer at lower cost to the university than the labour-rich team of faculty who authored it— as has already been reported in FIU's case.³⁶ The initiative also is in dialogue with

³⁶Email and phone conversations with FIU's Dr. Sarah Mahler of the Global and Sociocultural Studies department illuminated the global curriculum's development history, per her own role in creating one of its inaugural foundation courses, “Loosening Cultural Comfort, Gaining Global Perspective.” Like many of the original GL foundation courses, Mahler's course was designed to be team-taught as a hybrid online/face-to-face interdisciplinary studies course. The course topic funneled the relativistic lessons of anthropology and cultural geography into team-based learning, a pedagogical innovation that uses team contracts to set up group active learning for the entire course and routine individual and team quizzes to assess learning's progress. Dr. Mahler, who was highly involved in GL's development at FIU (and is a passionate professional advocate for team-based learning), relayed how FIU's GL curriculum was developed as one of several 10-year plans by the faculty senate, voted in by faculty, and implemented with a team of curricular specialists and initial investment in course development. However, she noted

local institutions and industry via the university's public-private partnerships, and conceived on behalf of the student and their speculative value as a burgeoning global citizen, humanitarian, or knowledge worker, regardless of their desires for or prior relationship to those labour structures; this desire is generally assumed, as coterminous with the desire for higher education itself.

FIU's initiative, instituted in 2010 after Florida's higher education system had suffered a 40% decrease in state funding from its 2007 levels,³⁷ highlights how FIU's "International" banner also operates at multiple sites of signification that help to convey the institution's self-conception as an actor in a global network. It has corresponded with a yearly increase in student tuition, expansion in finance, industry and global institutional partnerships, and the university's competitive internal alignment with the metrics in the Florida legislature's funding system. Since GL's implementation, FIU has placed as a top three university and recipient of maximum bonus funding among the state's 12 public universities.³⁸ The initiative also manifests beyond the university campus toward other globalist networks, especially promoting its GL approach among international education developers and analysts. FIU maintains these curricular investments to project Miami as a global site in the borderless world of transnational capital, or even Miami *as* the world, despite its own observation that "the majority of our graduates hail from our city...and go on to spend their working lives here" ("Defining Global Learning"). FIU

how the new programming created intensive additional reporting duties for faculty that were not accompanied by any training in curricular alignment, generating dissensus among faculty over time. Mahler's co-taught course was abandoned after two years due to its resource intensity seen as unsustainable by university admin; elements of the course have since filtered down into Intro to Anthropology as a discipline-based GL course, which appears in Chapter 5's data. Dr. Mahler also reported, anecdotally, that most students are not organically motivated by the global frame nor familiar with the general education model, given the population's bent toward students who are older, working, international and/or bicultural, and so generally take these courses because they are required.

³⁷This figure is drawn from joint analysis by the national policy center Demos and FIU's Research Institute on Social & Economic Policy; see "Florida's Great Cost Shift: How Higher Education Cuts Undermine its Future Middle Class," *Demos*, August 20 2012, <https://www.demos.org/policy-briefs/floridas-great-cost-shift-how-higher-education-cuts-undermine-its-future-middle-class>.

³⁸See this January 2015 report on FIU's strategic five-year funding plan for more of these details: <http://news.fiu.edu/2015/01/universitys-next-strategic-plan-to-align-closely-with-bog-performance-funding-model/84289>.

consolidated its GL elements in 2014 into the GL Medallion Program, which honors superlatively globalist undergraduates upon graduation with a credential in global citizenship to present to prospective employers. The program confers excellence to

students who graduate having completed at least four GL courses, a significant number of GL cocurricular activities, a capstone project, and a personal reflection. Students value the medallion as recognition of their personal successes. But we believe that the strongest benefits will accrue not to individual students alone, but to Miami, home to an ever-growing contingent of engaged global citizens (“Defining Global Learning”).

This list of pedagogical activity is generically characteristic for the individual global learner, as subsequent chapters on common globalist curricula will go on to show, integrating personal experience via reflection and pre-professional labour alongside an individual or group project that is supplemented by classroom study of global themes and problems. Yet in Landorf's description of the GL Medallion's recipients, we can observe a transference that instrumentalizes student learning as urban capital, for a polity that the university's disjunctive discourse casts as an exemplary site to people with cosmopolitans as well as to read in globalist terms compatible with ongoing uneven development.

Associate director Stephanie Doscher writes how “Miami's multicultural populace and multifaceted problems drive our approach,” before reporting that Anthony Appiah's essay “The Case for Contamination” recently had been the mandatory anchor text across GL foundations courses, selected because it “explores concepts of globalization and the cosmopolitan movement of ideas” (“Global Learning”). A more critical or situated synopsis would point to Appiah's sanguine elevation of cosmopolitanism as a renewal of pluralism and individual opportunity for (cultural, technological, geographical) mobility over questions raised by simultaneous processes of economic and climate refugeeism, extractivist frontierism and ecocide, and overaccumulation by dispossession, expropriation and labour offshoring and arbitrage in global capitalism.

Globalization is here figured as the enabler of a benevolent elitism and melioristic liberalism's possibilities rather than for its expansion and intensification of the stakes for collective life and (in)justice. This imagery assumes that upon graduation this individualist cosmopolitan posture extends toward the figure of "Miami" promoted here as well, and that students will be working to transform their relationships to these processes locally. This potential outcome is reinforced by GL's administrative alliance with FIU's Service Learning programmes that focus on leadership and humanitarianism in local industry and community work; its Peace Corps Prep programme that boosts a GL credential in formal partnership with the Peace Corps national office³⁹; or its Millenium Fellowships that fund "student leadership advancing UN goals on worldwide campuses," manifesting in the "design and implement[ation of] a project to advance the 17 Sustainable Development Goals impacting the local community" ("Millennium Fellowship").

Finally, the GL initiative has been projected beyond the campus as a resource with which to speculate on American higher ed's futurity in its globalized educational services industry context. In a plenary address co-written with Hilary Landorf and a faculty geographer, FIU President Mark Rosenberg presented the initiative to a 2014 international education conference on "Internationalization of US Education in the 21st Century: The future of International and Foreign Language Studies." In addition to detailing the values of an education for global citizenship in a context of uncertain futures and the centrality of undergraduate learning in their establishment, Rosenberg's text ranges over the primary risks and challenges produced by globalization, especially highlighting cybersecurity, "Big Data" and disorderly world economic markets (which he titles as "the Rise of the #Rest") – the very same forces for which Coursera, its MOOCs and career certificates have sought to provide a disruptive solution. In his conclusion, Rosenberg presents a kind of syllogism that summarizes his remarks: first, the premise that

³⁹Source: <https://goglobal.fiu.edu/students/peace-corps-prep/index.html>.

"Teaching and learning are now globalized as a result of information technology" (13). He asserts that the university must defend itself against education's deinstitutionalized backdrop via ambient interconnection and data flows, renewing its especial function by offering quality and innovative formalized instruction for a globalized context. Next, to take up the challenge of this connective and technologized landscape – in particular, to innovate – he avers that:

even if a globalizing institution were to fully take advantage of technology, robust partnerships, intense faculty, and student exchange, it still might be missing one of the great new disruptive opportunities of the 21st century: namely, developing a capability to teach large groups of new off-shore students through expanded on-line education (Rosenburg 13).

In this frontierist formulation, the quest for new educational markets and their potential for profits and expanded influence is couched in terms of new opportunities for service and development, as if "rising demands for literacy and competence to improve quality of living and well-being" are a contemporary and off-shore phenomenon only just discovered, rather than the conditions surrounding and reproduced by educational institutions everywhere. Accordingly, it is via the industry product for capturing those extraterritorial demands – "on-line learning management systems" (LMSs) – that the university is recommended to invest for its growth and transformation. Thus, finally, he concludes the syllogism and his address with a clarion call for mastery and control of the educational landscape, whose imperial undertones are conspicuous: "We must shape this brave new world before it shapes us" (Rosenberg 13).

As I hope the remainder of this chapter will make clear, FIU is both an extraordinary and ordinary instantiation of the global university: extraordinary in its relative attention to the curricular content and purpose of global learning under its purview, yet ordinary in its readiness to cast itself as an actor in globalist networks bearing resources (the student, her potential human capital and global citizenship, innovative programming and knowledge production within the

institution's mandatory initiatives) for its ongoing reproduction and capitalist management. This particular case also invites an inquiry into the broader context at hand: what is the “global university”, exactly, or what isn't it? How is the US or Canadian university situated in global phenomena, and how are global phenomena figured in these universities?

Defining University Globalism

One argument that my study will promote is that “global” names an infrastructural condition in the settler nations of the US and Canada: in higher ed specifically and perhaps especially, globalism has set the terms for material and social reproduction for capitalist institutions that must persist by capturing or competing within a world market, regardless of the public legitimacy and political status of the region’s globalist projects. We can begin elaborating this condition by considering its immediate antecedent, US and Canadian universities of the Cold War era. Their infrastructures were oriented internationally by assisting in the imperial production of military and other technologies, alongside the academic production of area studies and their accompanying anticommunism, promotion of intercultural liberalism, and specialized culturalist knowledge available as expertise for strategic national security, counterinsurgency, and development programs. Institutional formations of this period are well-studied in the US, where “scholars collaborating with the security apparatus were employed to actively reproduce a vision of the world as a strategic space occupied by discrete nation-states, operating within an international system of states, and with the United States at its center” (Kamola 2). Often used synonymously with international studies in an echo of its political scientific emphasis on international relations, area studies united the philanthropic industry, the state and universities – especially geography departments – from 1958 until roughly 1990 in the “training of vast

numbers of US citizens in languages and cultures . . . , most frequently, of the places of the world which are of geo-strategic concern to the United States” (Asif 1). This practice and pedagogy of converting the worlds of others into property or resource and objects of study and management⁴⁰ has antecedents in settler colonial practices of official ethnography, philology and cartography of Indigenous nations on the North American continent as well as in the British Empire’s colonial administration of India, and has morphed past humanistic and social scientific area studies into today’s institutionalized data sciences and management, as the next chapter will discuss; all are, in a word, infrastructural. Canada’s less studied institutionalization of area studies in this same period also worked to support its international politics of providing development assistance, achieved by federal development of Canada’s universities through “policies, mechanisms and financing to help universities develop international relations in the areas of teaching, research, and community service” (Lemasson 9), which later expanded into provisions of international development assistance on an individual institutional basis.

The shift to a global framework for these same mechanisms of development and management emerged following the end of the Cold War, generally attributed to changes in political economy driven by transnational capitalism and multi-national US corporations pursuing their interests without geographic limit, with accompanying funding and policy redirection from states, philanthropic foundations and organizational restructuring towards a global scale. This new logic for development was led by the globalist form of the corporation and its practices of market integration via promoting multiculturalism, technological innovation, and borderless capital mobility and management. A policy infrastructure linking universities in

⁴⁰ la paperson would call this a “settler technology,” which includes land tenancy laws, debt and the privatization of land that “enable the ‘eventful’ history of plunder and disappearance,” alongside the “weapons that enforce it, the knowledge institutions that legitimize it, the financial institutions that operationalize it” as the technology evolves and spreads (4).

the US and Canada as agents of development to global governance institutions and policymaking bodies like UNESCO, the IMF and the World Bank solidified in the 1990s and 2000s that mainstreamed the new productive conditions of the “global knowledge economy,” accompanied by increasing market penetration into university-produced forms of research, technological development and training for knowledge workers, as the next two chapters will discuss.

Per my opening discussion of Slobodian’s institution-building neoliberal globalists, this development is often explained as neoliberal before it is global. This commonplace persists in part because not all PSE institutions are explicitly global-facing in their marketing and programming and in part because institutional policies of economic austerity and entrepreneurialism have eroded academic labour conditions, especially targeting liberal arts education and scholarly fields that center on inquiry like abstract sciences, mathematics and the humanities for their inability to sufficiently marketize their labour-intensive research and teaching. The university’s neoliberal turn is often narrated as the privatization, marketization and casualization of domestic academic sectors, summarized by Andrew Ross as the “reproduction of knowledge capital” (202) and “enterprise culture” (75) alongside public budgetary austerity, deepening structural racism, “selective cross-subsidies favoring business and technology” (Newfield “Universities after neoliberalism” 77) and the priority of economic rationality. These analytics have been hospitable to nostalgia for the university before the neoliberal era among institutionalized members, which assumes a mass-democratized, pastoral enclave that was protected and “free from injustice, disconnected from the reproduction of classed, gendered, raced relations and from the formation of a particular employment strata, that is, the technocratic and professional-managerial elite.” (Brouillette “Neoliberalism” 278). Of course, the university has only actualized this liberal enclave in piecemeal and temporary gestures. While the period

under study here extends into the much-debated present ending of neoliberalism in the fragmenting global economy and its governance institutions, I use neoliberalism or neoliberal descriptively in the thesis as a temporal and infrastructural term diagnosing organizational changes in US and Canadian PSE as Global North domains in which to observe the effects of the global economic governance paradigm, as well as the differential, waning production of professional-managerial graduates across institutional types. Put back in terms of globalism, the organizational consequences of university investments in these modes of development on a global scale are consistent with general social systemic threats identified by globalization's critics: a combination of homogenization and targeted segmentation of institutional cultures; increased unevenness and inequality of resources that amplify settler colonial, imperial and corporate forms of accumulation, often justified by innovation and risk management; and greater mobility and integration at some levels that deepens exclusion at others. As this chapter begins to track, the work of institutional reproduction via the aforementioned practice and pedagogy of converting the worlds of others into property or resource and objects of study and management has become more generalized and penetrative across local, domestic, diasporic and international populations under university globalism.

Universities have taken up globalism in maximalist terms, manifesting across all core reproductive activities of teaching, research and service as well as in their expansionary models for providing educational and auxiliary services under a global university brand. This followed from the general consensus among university leaders in the 1990s that "higher education was like any other product marketed in a competitive economy" and so "would be most efficiently produced and delivered by private-sector methods" (Newfield "Universities" 81), supported by liberalizing policies for privatizing educational products and corporate subsidy of research and

development regardless of an institution's declared public or private status. Given their provenance mentioned above as part of Global North projects of statecraft and military and technological dominance, this maximalism is especially visible in research universities. By 2008 increasingly common strategies for global reach and investment were designated in *Higher Education Policy* as the transitioning research university's 21st-century expression worldwide: the "Emerging Global Model" or EGM. This term summarizes a pattern of shifting investments and practices with eight general characteristics: "global mission, research intensity, new roles for professors, diversified funding, worldwide recruitment, increasing complexity, new relationships with government and industry, and global collaboration with similar institutions" (Mohrman et al 5). This list is specific to the "super research university at one end of a continuum of institutional types" (Mohrman et al 21), and its elaboration throughout the report doesn't address how the EGM's characteristics might reposition other, less super types of institutions navigating the same globally competitive field for students and organizational resources. Discussion of how this might trickle down to the undergraduate classroom and the mechanics of teaching and learning is also absent.⁴¹ The EGM also outlines how global flows have been elaborated and internalized in higher ed's general orientation toward student and faculty resources. These, I would add, are increasingly organized around a given institution's policies and programming in line with the consolidating metrics of global rankings systems, by private finance models that center revenue and expansion through international and industry recruitment and partnerships,

⁴¹Education analysts and practitioners have been discussing the "Global Educational Reform Movement" or GERM as a description of structural changes to primary and secondary education since the 1980s observable across national contexts, after the term's 2012 coinage by a Finnish educator. He names five reforming features in the organization of schools: standardization, a focus on core subjects like literacy and numeracy, orientation toward low-risk ways to achieve learning goals, the use of corporate management models, and test-based accountability policies; see <https://pasisahlberg.com/global-educational-reform-movement-is-here/>. Others thinking with this term as a rubric for transcontextual analysis of schooling's evolution since the 80s have conjectured an origin for these evolving practices in the countries that are seen as history's progenitors of neoliberal policymaking: Chile, the US and the UK; see Kay Fuller & Howard Stevenson, "Global education reform: understanding the movement," *Educational Review* 71.1 (2019): 1-4.

and by the allocation of resources to provide experiential contexts for the undergraduate student as an educational services consumer in a global (contra national or regional) PSE marketplace.

Popular journalism and scholarly works by university critics and public intellectuals on higher education has variously detailed how most PSE institutions – especially in median forms ranging from the flagship, high-ranking public research university to selective regional publics to the small liberal arts college⁴² – are undergoing heightened problems of finance, labour, and inequity while invested in the above processes and transitions. While elite expressions of globalist university practice mimic the forms that comprise the sublime of transnational capitalism's “decentered global network” (Jameson 38) at a systemic scale, shaped like corporate markets with global reach yet decentralized structure, more brittle mutations of globalist practice are increasingly observable across institutional types. One common indicator of globalist infrastructure is a university's embeddedness in forms of investment and enclosure that are contiguous with the institutions of global financial capitalism. The moniker “the financialized university” accurately diagnoses the entanglement between higher education and credit ratings agencies, capital markets, global resource speculation, and offshoring. Andrew Ross notes how “since 9/11, the pace of offshoring has surged and is being pursued across the entire spectrum of institutions that populate the higher education landscape” (Ross “The Rise” 18). This expansion toward the labour and revenue model of the global corporation emerged in the US-led push for

⁴²Canadian PSE consists of 223 public and private universities, and 213 public colleges and institutes, with just 19 universities classified as private, many of which were or are Christian denominational institutions. Because the vast majority of universities are government funded, they are all classified the same way (as research universities) despite the smallest serving a SLAC-like population of 2,000 students and the largest (University of Toronto) serving over 62,000; the institutional spectrum within its university sector can also be described in the terms above. Its colleges and technical institutes, organized under the Canadian Association of Community Colleges, offer short-term certificate programmes as well as diplomas, with some arguing that the difference between colleges and universities is increasingly blurred due to credential expansion and similar recruitment of international student populations. See a systemic view from the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada here: https://www.cmec.ca/299/Education_in_Canada_An_Overview.html; and analysis of the minor private university sector in Li, S. X. & Jones, G.A. “The ‘Invisible’ Sector: Private Higher Education in Canada”, in *Private Higher Education: A Global Perspective*, eds Joshi, K.M. & Paivandi, S., B.R. Publishing, 2015, pg 1-33.

trade services liberalization to capitalize upon higher education's estimated global market of 77 billion USD⁴³, registered by both US and Canadian PSE sectors. At the time of writing, education export services are the sixth largest in the US⁴⁴ and 11th largest in Canada, with plans underway there via federal investment to grow the industry by 200% over the next decade⁴⁵.

The general shift toward global characteristics from the 1990s to present-day in both US and Canadian PSE contexts has followed a loose and cumulative logic: from the national university host to “foreign” students and academic subjects; to an “internationalized” undergraduate degree primarily pursued through study abroad programmes, international student recruitment and new intercultural curricular initiatives; to the more contemporary pursuit that extends established rationales for cultural exchange or immersion experiences through travel-based study to globalizing and digitalizing the domestic curriculum, sometimes called “internationalization at home.”⁴⁶ Alongside deepening curricular commitments to global frameworks for knowledge work, globalist practices of maximum market capture and optimization are in the academic capitalism mix. Students in fully online programmes in fact sometimes pay the same rates and fees as in-state or in-province students and sometimes slightly more.⁴⁷ International students are recruited for the highest tuition bracket, paying 25,000 - 35,000

⁴³Source: <https://www.marketdataforecast.com/market-reports/higher-education-market>.

⁴⁴Source: <https://www.trade.gov/education-service-exports>.

⁴⁵This planned intensification is outlined by Global Affairs Canada in “International Education: A Key Driver of Canada's Future Prosperity”:

<http://www.international.gc.ca/education/report-rapport/strategy-strategie/index.aspx?lang=eng>. One excerpt:

“Canada’s international education services for long-term students alone contribute to the equivalent of 1.7% of Canada’s total export in goods to the world. However, for top international student source countries such as China, South Korea, and Saudi Arabia, Canada’s international education services to these countries contribute to more than 10% of Canada’s export in goods to these countries.”

⁴⁶Notably, this final shift that seeks to make the campus environment rich in knowledge-based global experience does not address multiculturalism as a classroom framework. This is likely because multiculturalism has more fundamentally guided national projects of intercultural literacy. However, intercultural competency does analogously appear in education scholarship under the frame of ‘internationalization’, generally referring to study abroad curriculum and occasionally programming tailored to international students on home campuses, and continues to inform learning discourses for global education as a professionalizing curriculum for local yet internationalized corporate settings.

⁴⁷For more on this data, see <https://educationdata.org/average-cost-of-online-college>.

USD in tuition alone per year at a public university and 30,000 - 45,000 USD at private colleges on average in the US⁴⁸, and in Canada, often paying three or four times the rate of domestic students with an average of 33,623 CAD per year.⁴⁹ The revenue-seeking infrastructures for online higher ed and ed-tech have co-emerged with the primacy of international student enrolments in the deepening corporatization of higher ed administration and governance in the US and Canada during the connectivity era. The former represents the cost-saving opportunities of divestment from faculty governance and brick-and-mortar infrastructure, and the latter the maximalist “full-paying” revenue and campus model that finances university bonds for its auxiliary amenities and development projects. Observable global expansion has been pursued via a scaling up of the distance learning industry, coincident with the proliferation of ed-tech and campus-less digital platforms, and via “foreign direct investment in the form of satellite branches of institutions” (Ross “The Rise” 21) emplaced in strategic development sites around the world; Chapter 4 will also explore increasing entanglement between digital and “satellite” globalisms.

Campus frontierism, exemplified by NYU's Abu Dhabi, Shanghai, and Singapore satellite universities, is often cited as the global university's paradigmatic initiative and has been decried for its “aggressively futuristic, revenue-oriented placement” (Chow). NYU promotes these sites as part of a single, hyper-cosmopolitan “Global Network University ... that challenges the idea that a university can only deliver education at a single home campus”, instead existing “both 'in and of the city' and 'in and of the world’” (“Global Network University Reflection”). While often pursued budgetarily as a way to extend a university’s brand equity and recruitment field for the home campus, as study abroad programmes initially were, the infrastructural contribution of branch or satellite campuses “at home” is also casually colonial, such as with the University of

⁴⁸Source:

<https://blog.iefaf.org/2021/01/18/how-much-does-it-cost-for-an-international-student-to-study-at-university-in-the-us>.

⁴⁹Source: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/210908/dq210908a-eng.htm>.

California system's contract to co-sponsor a new university in Saudi Arabia with justification that it would "improve our facilities here in California and fund a stream of graduate students, without taxing our existing infrastructure in the US" (Lim 29). With curricula and administration that may operate all but independently from the university's own geographical and material contexts, some instantiations of the global university, like NYU's, provide obvious imagery of the scalar American university maintaining a form of global imperium in the educational services trade sector. Canada's satellite campuses more often take form via institutional partnerships, such as those enabling joint degree programmes, although business schools like the University of Western Ontario's Ivey Asia in China or McGill's MBA Japan suggest the site-based "outpost" (Asif 27) model is among its PSE system's university practices, too.⁵⁰

Branch campuses have also become increasingly complex as cosmopolitan sites of encounter and contradiction evolving alongside their governments and industries in situ, expressing dynamics of colliding institutional and pedagogical norms, foreign policies and evolving globalisms in the world system.⁵¹ Rather than decrying these developments as always imperial, institution-building funded as part of Qatar's modernization agenda, for example, suggests that competing development programmes can create a "contact zone" (Vora 20) that stages categories of difference and cultural essentialism as available for contestation by students and residents local to university campus environments. Neha Vora narrates in *Teach For Arabia*, an ethnographic analysis of the Qatar Foundation and its American branch campuses in Education City, how "liberal and illiberal, as well as Qatar and America, emerge in discussions

⁵⁰For a full list of branch or satellite campuses, see <http://cbert.org/resources-data/intl-campus/>.

⁵¹Chinese globalism as an expansionary force in global political economy and infrastructural development has been a major factor in the international student market's flux and evolving strategies over the last decade, given that Chinese students have been the most numerous in the US and Canada for much of the 21st-century. Chinese universities have also been elaborating similar programming to compete directly with the US and Canada, which has been a factor in the diminishing rate of international study at US universities in the last decade, among others.

about branch campuses (and within the branch campuses themselves) as seemingly oppositional spaces and ideas” (20) despite the rejection of these binaries by students navigating their programming. As a petro-state, Canada has also taken up Qatar’s funded branch campus offering with the University of Calgary Qatar and College of the North Atlantic Qatar in Doha, which are also programmed as part of UNESCO’s global sponsorship of vocational education.⁵² Notably, to return to the question of what the global university is and is not, campuses like the University of Puerto Rico or University of Guam in US territories never figure in discussions of “satellite” locations, though are taken up under the “imperial university” banner by university critics. One goal of this study is to draw these divisions into a single frame, the pro-social patina of globalism and its anti-social infrastructures, by mapping the terms of connectivity generated by universities and their maintenance practices as globalist actors, and to make visible the mechanisms of racial capitalism therein that encompass Global South labour infrastructures, the historical sedimentation of racialized population management in Canada and the US as well as their extension of capital’s racialized global history.

The infrastructural expansion for digital higher ed is comparatively invisible, except perhaps for its aggressive marketing presence in physical and digital spaces that targets prospective students who are working adults, especially those who never completed their degrees. Often administered as part of the mega-university form,⁵³ these online degree programmes emphasize competency-based education “in which students earn credits from life

⁵²See, for example,

<https://unevoc.unesco.org/home/Explore+the+UNEVOC+Network/centre=2776#:~:text=The%20College%20of%20the%20North,other%20institutions%20of%20higher%20education.>

⁵³This new institutional form incorporates a wide range of “unbundled” approaches to the PSE marketplace in order to maximize revenue and stability – a kind of ongoing institutional merger under a public university’s brand: “While some so-called mega-universities have physical campuses, they’ve focused intensely on building online programmes. They’ve emphasized recruiting working adults over fresh high-school graduates. They’ve embraced competency-based education, in which students earn credits from life experiences and from demonstrating proficiency in a subject. They market widely and vigorously, and lean into, rather than recoil from, some other common corporate practices and philosophies” (Gardner).

experiences and from demonstrating proficiency in a subject” (Gardner). While large online degree providers are neither new nor uniform, mega-universities are designated as such for the sheer size of their student populations, at least 80,000, in combination with popular online programming that often dwarfs their co-existing brick-and-mortar infrastructure. In keeping with the expansion of platform capitalism⁵⁴ into major social institutions, the term also acknowledges the force of platformization in scaling up organizational operations, in which “once-decentralized digital spaces like message boards and personal websites are now consolidated in the hands of a few platform operators... [and] the logic and economy of platforms are extending into spheres of life once spared from digital connectivity and control” (Nichols et al 346). Germane here are two core practices of internet technologies that Tressie McMillan Cottom identifies as dovetailing with racial capitalism: “privatization through opacity and exclusion via inclusion” (“Where Platform Capitalism” 2). Research on privatization within US public universities details the increasingly deep and widespread penetration of platforms into university administration and learning infrastructures via private, for-profit online programme managers, or OPMs. Following their emergence in the early 2000s, OPMS are estimated to have contracts for “bundled services” with up to 80% of non-profit public institutions at the time of writing, including “instructional design, marketing, student recruitment, curricular provision, operational services, technological platforms and more” (Hamilton et al 1). Reliant on a revenue share pricing model that

⁵⁴Frank Pasquale defines platforms as “firms of digital capitalism... ranking and rating other entities rather than directly providing goods and services. This strategy enables the platform to outsource risk to vendors and consumers, while it reliably collects a cut from each transaction”; source: “Tech Platforms and the Knowledge Problem”, *American Affairs*, May 2018, <https://americanaffairsjournal.org/2018/05/tech-platforms-and-the-knowledge-problem/>. Platform capitalism is used per the following definition: “Platform capitalism occurs when digital platforms produce profit through the everyday activities of individuals; people increasingly rely on platforms to meet basic needs, such as connecting with family and friends, networking, locating housing, engaging in paid labour, purchasing goods, and participating in higher education. ... Platforms produce profit by commodifying the conduits through which goods and services flow. ... They also produce profit by extracting and commodifying information about users and may outsource risk from companies to individuals, consumers, organizations, and communities that are supplying or purchasing a good or service via platforms” (Hamilton et al 3).

incentivizes maximum enrolments and rising tuition, this arrangement transacts into an estimated 4 - 7 billion USD market in annual revenue, “at least as large, and likely substantially larger, than for-profit colleges at their apex” (Hamilton et al 2).

Some OPMs are conversions from for-profit colleges in order to quickly scale up online infrastructures for mega-university publics. Former MOOC providers like Coursera also now operate essentially as OPMs, and LMSs such as Blackboard, Desire2Learn, et al now overlap with and include some OPM services; a majority of OPMs were also found to be financed and governed by private equity and venture capital (Hamilton et al 24). Crucially, OPM contracts often enable them to make use of university domains, limit OPM brand visibility, and pursue separate, targeted marketing and student recruitment for the host university while obscuring OPM involvement, leaving students unaware that their degrees are provided by for-profit university partners. Following from platform capitalism’s main mechanisms named by McMillan Cottom above, the administrative practices that accompany these privatized infrastructures generate institutional dependency on platforms and include “targeting marginalized students, revenue extraction, privatization by obfuscation, for-profit creep, and university captivity” (Hamilton et al 7). These developments affect a sizable proportion of students attending US public universities, where the online sector’s growth is happening exclusively and serves an estimated 2 million students, surpassing enrolments in private non-profit and private for-profit institutions by over 1 million. Additional research on OPMs reveals their practice of directing students toward high-risk loan products from the “shadow student debt” market with links to preferred private lenders on university programme websites, especially pairing micro-credential programmes like “bootcamps” with extremely expensive and punitive debt terms.⁵⁵ These

⁵⁵Source:

<https://protectborrowers.org/new-report-finds-public-universities-are-driving-students-toward-risky-private-student-l>

developments are scalar, such as with Amazon Web Services (AWS) cloud infrastructure. AWS increasingly operates as “a state-like corporation and a globalized governance actor in education systems at an international scale and scope,” influencing education through a connective architecture of cloud computing and platform technologies: it organizes third-party vendors under its infrastructure as a supra-platform, administers its own micro-credentials, and offers AI-enabled instructional software while extracting from university clients as “data lakes” for its global cloud computing networks (Williamson et al 8, 14). Subsequent chapters will explore the extractive terms and degraded learning conditions of digitalized globalist higher ed that rely upon and amplify existing unequal social infrastructures.

Advocates for both territory-based and digital policies of expansion often invoke higher ed’s presumed service ethos, claiming that the fact of university or programming expansion is evidence of growing educational quality alongside a global democratization of access to education, which may be the case for cosmopolitan elites or older adults with spare time and elective learning interests. For most, administration by Global North institutions alongside the centrality of revenue enabled by “canned content,” temporary labour and second-class institutional citizenship or credentialing aligns these expansionary projects more so with the conventions of colonial education than with a prospective global demos. Achille Mbembe, observing the global university's effects in South Africa and as a deterritorialized academic, critiques its production of international student mobility and educational migration as capitalist “zoning or warehousing”, and its landscape of global inter-institutional competition as “a new era of global Apartheid” organizing students into world class universities vs “global bush colleges” (“Decolonizing Knowledge”). Increasingly, as I will explore throughout, this division

is collapsing within US and Canadian contexts.

In addition to these relationships to emerging markets and new revenue streams, the global university coordinates intensified involvement with financial speculation itself. Beyond the domains for profit via the “university-as-real-estate-broker” and the “university-as-curriculum-broker” (Kniffin 48), the imperative for asset growth ties the university to investment in capital markets that enable them to uphold their positive credit ratings – in other words, toward continual endowment growth and capital accumulation. Economic sociologists summarize the managerial changes brought by financialized universities as an exposure of “the relationship between resource-based power struggles, professional closure of financial governance, expanding debt, and new investments in profit centers beyond the university’s core mission” (Eaton et al 9-10). Accordingly, student enrolment drives may attend rhetorically or tokenistically to diversity and expanded educational access, but are often discriminating according to the priority of students who can pay full tuition's value (whether via debt or private assets) or are algorithmically determined as likely to pay a high fraction of tuition if granted student aid, which is thus often extended to families not in need of it while those who are will be instead offered loans or “income share agreements.”⁵⁶ Even while revenue from student tuition and debt is technically unsecured, it is used to leverage a guarantee of liquidity that the university can use for investment and campus-based and digital infrastructural development that secure maximal market capture both locally and globally. For example, in the 21st-century’s first decade, California’s public university system paid \$6.5 billion in interest to Wall Street for debt or borrowing to continue developing auxiliary services like campus or urban amenities, while

⁵⁶For more on the faux nature of student financial aid packages, especially in the US, see <https://slate.com/business/2022/07/college-financial-aid-sham.html>. On income share agreements, see reporting on Purdue University’s use of this profit model: <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2022/06/23/purdue-pauses-new-income-share-agreement-enrollments>.

instructional spending remained flat, effectively turning away “hundreds of thousands of qualified students” (Eaton and Stewart 4). Another financialized practice of “zoning” deepens the entanglement between global finance and the public PSE sector’s current modes of reproduction via “tranches of the student loan book ... sold off at differential rates depending on the ‘credit-worthiness’ of an institution’s cohort of graduates, something that could also affect a university’s ability to raise money in the capital markets” (Collini). Whether via direct or indirect capitalization, it's clear that the global university's financial network operates at the expense of its student body on multiple scales, especially in institutions that still claim a “public” banner.

Kelly Nielsen and Laura Hamilton’s analysis of underfunded public universities explores a version of this dynamic under the term “postsecondary racial neoliberalism” that reflects the relative systemic position of mid-ranked public institutions within university globalism as the broader condition and tendency through which universities must now reproduce themselves. Nielsen and Hamilton define a suite of institutional practices as “the particular way that race and class, as systems of oppression, have recently intertwined in higher education – blocking access to postsecondary resources for [historically underrepresented racially marginalized students or] URS and disadvantaging universities serving these students,” while “reproducing racial hierarchies in part by intensifying the role of class resources in individual and organizational success” (14). The phenomena they examine appear under a category of public institution they term the new university, which emerges from demands for access to research universities as an imperative of the global knowledge economy in a segregated system, with historical antecedents in racialized institution-building via HBCUs and land-grant historically white universities. “New” describes not a temporal but an organizational shift, in which a median group of

underfunded public universities (ranking in the top 200 of US institutions⁵⁷) have emerged as distinct from highly ranked flagship public universities, now exclusive and quasi-private based in their student enrolments, and from regional publics or community colleges. These institutions enroll students in their state with low-income backgrounds who are members of racially marginalized groups, exhibiting commitments to the local population while equally competing in national and global networks for research and private partnership funding.

Unlike US community colleges or Canada's colleges, an ethos of service to students is thus absent from these institutions, despite many being designated as minority-serving. Enrolling "too many" URS rather than a small but visible enrolment of special, "selective" minority students still poses a prestige and status threat to the institution (Hamilton and Nielsen 37), a systemic factor that helps to explain the alacrity with which FIU has adopted a global identity for its undergraduates. Hamilton and Nielsen explain this selectivity as the logic of racial capitalism in university reproduction:

elite organizations seek to achieve 'selective inclusion' by including high-performing students of color. Most of these students are affluent domestic students of color, Asian students who are not URS, international students coded as non-white in the US, or exceptional low-income students of color who matriculate from private high schools like Exeter and Andover. These students are expected to slide smoothly into the existing organizational infrastructure. They must be a small but visible portion of the overall student body, available to grace brochures, but not disruptive to the overall whiteness of the space. In fact, their visible presence, in a sea of white faces, can actually confirm a university's whiteness (37).

These median institutions thus make visible the "racialized exchange of labour and talent"

⁵⁷Examples include Arizona State University, arguably the progenitor institution of the form given President Michael Crow's 2015 coinage in *Designing the New American University*, and University of Central Florida, Georgia State University, University of Illinois-Chicago, University of Maryland-Baltimore County, University of Massachusetts-Boston, Rutgers University-Newark, University of Houston, and George Mason University (*Broke* pgs 5-6). Generally, these universities don't appear in the top 200 of global university rankings lists, although those operating this model at large scale do, such as in 2022's Times of Higher Ed World University Rankings where ASU ranks at 132 and Rutgers ranks at 190. See: https://www.timeshighereducation.com/world-univ%C3%A9rsity-rankings/2022#!page/5/length/25/sort_by/rank/sort_order/asc/cols/stats.

between universities and corporations (Hamilton and Nielsen 188). This results from interactions between corporate partnerships and campus programming dedicated to social and cultural affinity groups, sometimes including curriculum.

What links all these institutional variations on globalist practice is their reliance on what I am calling connectivity, which threads cosmopolitan imagery promoting personal and class mobility and networking as social and infrastructural goods across the stratification of university resources and class-stratified forms of skilling and student experience management in the administration of credentials. Connectivity thus enables the ongoing production of assemblages of individual and group desires, labour, consumption, intellection, sociability, extraction, skilling and credentialing among its institutional members that can also be rescaled according to the financial speculation, networked branding, and managerial modes of each institution. As an administrative infrastructure, connectivity relies on the persistence of logics of human capital development in US and Canadian educational programming and discourses, despite arguments advanced by many analysts of global capitalism and labour that the higher ed's claimed or ideal production of a social class of high-skill labourers or credentialed, professionalizing individuals no longer obtains at scale in the region.⁵⁸ Human capital discourse may be assumed to play out in national-scale conversations and policies, where it is often used to scapegoat higher ed for employment outcomes that more often reflect the shifting hiring, corporate and managerial practices of employers. Yet examining university globalism makes clear that discourses of

⁵⁸In "Universities after neoliberalism," Chris Newfield characterizes human capital theory (HCT) as an inheritance of mid-century neoliberal thinkers thusly: "HCT was a rationale of convenience that worked for higher education during a very specific time in history. It was never correct as a general theory for all graduates, and it is now serving mainly as a way for governments to shift blame for bad jobs and poor wages onto the backs of universities that are not in fact responsible for them" (85). See further discussion in a 2021 review of "*THE DEATH OF HUMAN CAPITAL?: Its Failed Promise and How to Renew It in an Age of Disruption*, by Phillip Brown, Hugh Lauder, and Sin Yi Cheung" by Newfield and Aashish Mehta for the Los Angeles Review of Books: <https://v2.lareviewofbooks.org/article/a-socialist-alternative-to-human-capital-theory/>.

human capital persist in institutional visions for learning, as the next chapter will track; in curricular programming at the level of the degree programme, major, or co-curricular experience and their planned institutional outcomes, as Chapter 3 studies; and in the self-discourses and self-management exhibited by students navigating a sedimentary mix of genres for educational experience alongside student debt as self-investment, as Chapters 4 and 5 examine. Also noted there is how human capital logics persist in the “real economies” of source countries of international student populations in the US and Canada, with an assist from Canada’s migration policies and the popularity of STEM degrees in both, which points to the reality of internal discontinuities and disjunctive mixtures in university globalist practices across its different social layers and scales of educational activity and marketing.

These mixtures are enabled by the terms in the mass cultural designation “global university,” which are often hollowed out of their presumed content, separately and together, in their practical manifestations. As Gert Biesta explains, “the idea of the global university is not based on a substantive set of values and principles but is articulated in terms of how one institution is positioned in relation to other institutions” (“How Useful” 38). While the century-old transition to the research university could present knowledge production as the central object to its reordered form, the global university presents learning work in service of the ongoing reproduction of globality and the institutions with resources to promote ongoing institutional management of global problems, rather than a certain kind of intellectual labour, productivity or public good, as its impetus for transformation. In keeping with the paradigm of educational “excellence” first outlined by Bill Readings in *The University in Ruins* (1996), universities oriented toward globalism prioritize the principles and rhetoric of global economic training in ways that now fuse with the research and teaching that once predominantly supported the

production of “national self-knowledge” (15) and liberal “citizen subjects” (14), as Chapters 3-5 will discuss. Readings argues that the discourse of excellence that now drives the terms for organizing nearly all university resources lubricates institutional processes by its “very lack of reference,” enabling it to function “as a principle of translatability between radically different idioms” (24) from discrepant communities of labour, scholarship and management. University globalism’s administrative and curricular expressions vary across domestic institutional contexts, but the principle of translatability that unites its competitive institutional landscape is the increasingly ubiquitous metric of assessed learning, “global competency.”

Definitions for global competency as a learning outcome and characteristic of students vary, but it solidifies across institutional usage as a genre describing a lifelong learning process that universities can help with by translating complex cultural experiences into an individual property of their pre-professional graduates. Most definitions invoke intercultural openness, effective communication skills and their leveraging in diverse work environments or situations, ideally supplemented by a knowledge base in world geography and cultures. Technological applications are also invoked as context – “especially as technology continues to make it easier to connect on a global scale” – and as sites for global participation, such as in the ability to “capitalize on inherently interconnected digital spaces” measured in students by PISA under the OECD (“PISA 2018 Global Competence”). The qualities invoked by global competency are also promoted as educational means to fulfill UN Sustainable Development Goals, which appear again in the site of McMaster University below. Thompson Rivers University in Canada, for example, touts their Global Competency distinction for degree candidates in these terms:

“The goal is to recognize international and intercultural learning experiences of our students in a concrete manner,” says Vera Wojna, interim associate vice-president with the school’s international division, TRU World. The fact that students can now quantify their international experience ‘will be something that

employers will value” (Armstrong).

This mixture of terms – intercultural, international, global – to verify the same experiential set as global reflects the scalar, networked nature of marketable globalist training, applicable for individuals or groups, between nations, and among global citizens and institutions.

University discourses of “internationalization” can also act as a screen for expansionary managerial infrastructures that globalist discourse naturalizes. Administrative documents often use an overarching banner of internationalization supported by descriptive references to the global that are not presented as distinct in their referent. By implication, the self-presentation of a university environment as “global” may in actuality make more rhetorical than material claims, invoking the currency of an institutionalized global consciousness for its stakeholders to denote the process of making the institution reflexive to a network of global investors and investments for its priorities of divining resources and fostering competitive excellence. For example, the ACE, which provides templates and strategies for university administrators and policymakers, offers two main definitions for internationalization: first, at the scale of an individual institution, as “the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions of the institution”; and second, at the scale of a global network of institutions, as “a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate international policies, programmes, and initiatives, and positions colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally connected”(“Internationalization in Action”). Thus the administrative emphasis on internationalization tends to encompass the “global” for its centering of the institution as a policy-driven actor in a global field of economic and trans-institutional projects or an interface with other institutions on a global scale. The global university has thus emerged with a relational coherence in an institutional field, if not as a form that lacks its own referent or direction, which relies on quality indicators and the aforementioned rhetoric of

excellence to adapt to whichever global economic, cultural or informational flows allow it to don prestige as such. Boston University's 2011 Global Strategy statement offers an example of this common circular logic: "The global connectivity of our research is a strength of Boston University that enhances our reputation and the quality and relevance of our educational programs" ("Global Strategy"); here, prestige is enhanced by global connectivity and global connectivity is enhanced by prestige, while the content of the research or its enabling relationships sit adjacent to or perhaps in complete excess of the project of excellence. This contemporary form of the university projects a global image via the mechanisms of its environmental and rhetorical production, or a kind of total branding through administration.

Inside of these general dynamics, I am interested in how these features of the global university produce and operate as a de facto context for undergraduate learning, and seek to flesh out how public and institutional pedagogies of globalism interact with classroom and interface varieties across the thesis's chapters. Pedagogy, I should note, has many definitions and among philosophers of education can be set against education, the former considered a narrower, more socially-charged form of instruction, more concerned with its own goals than with a broad exposure to a subject or context of knowledge. This latter ideal of education seems to operate in a school of disinterested worldliness, a form which our current system has never taken (as is often pointed out by skeptics of the "higher education crisis"⁵⁹) except perhaps as ecumenical study among its most elite and bourgeois beneficiaries. In the contemporary context where PSE is openly charged with the stakes of its own mutating utility, higher education resembles a managed apparatus designed to address as well as reproduce those stakes. Despite the mixed and sometimes contradictory purposes this generates for the content and experience of student

⁵⁹See, for example, Vineeta Singh's "'Never Waste a Good Crisis': Critical University Studies during and after a Pandemic," *American Quarterly* vol. 73 no. 1, 2021, 181-193 (Review).

learning, the term “pedagogy” reflects the reality of the labour of postsecondary instruction, which is always elaborated and aligned through particular narratives of informational goods and knowledge work in terms of skills, values, capacities, and characteristics, or works subversively toward the deconstruction of these.

Accordingly, both of the following general definitions of pedagogy are in play: "the mechanisms and interaction that enable an individual's capacity to learn" and more contextually, “an attempt to influence experience and its resulting forms of subjectivity" (Gaztambide-Fernández and Matute 56). The latter definition is introduced by Roger Simon in his 1992 monograph *Teaching Against The Grain*, and his emphasis there on the hierarchy surrounding any scene of instruction returns us to the fact that pedagogy is always inherently social, even in digital environments built to be andragogic. This observation is shared by Antonio Gramsci in his writings on education that consider all relations of hegemony⁶⁰ as pedagogical in nature, which syncs with the concerns of critical pedagogy and public pedagogy scholars alike. Accordingly, while the educationalist cultures of management, technophilia and innovation are a significant force for the mechanics of university classroom experience, pedagogy indicates a mixed instructional space of infrastructural relationships and encounters, both of which may be institutionalized yet also exceed the administrative contours of institutionality. Rubén A. Gaztambide-Fernández and Alexandra Arráiz Matute note how pedagogy always implies “a *relationship* that is driven by *intentions and desires* for particular kinds of shifts in subjectivity” (53, emphasis in original), a definition that also signals factors of embodiment, affect, and the discrete ontologies of subjective life that may meet in a pedagogical setting. This reading extends across pedagogical scales, from the intimate seminar room to public discourse and media:

⁶⁰“Every relationship of ‘hegemony’ is necessarily an educational relationship and occurs not only within a nation, between the various forces of which the nation is composed, but in the international and worldwide field, between complexes of national and continental civilisations” (Gramsci 666).

all pedagogy occurs within the context of some institutional form, since, as we will argue, it always involves relationships that are organized through the very institutionalized hierarchies that enable all pedagogical encounters to occur, even within spaces we might call “public.” (Gaztambide- Fernandez and Matute 55).

Inside of capitalist social relations, the pitfalls and possibilities of these relationships and encounters work to clarify the relative impossibility of a critical global pedagogy but also the occasion for its necessity in some form.

In the PSE context, pedagogies take highly visible as well as invisible forms, the details and contradictions of which organize this inquiry into the experiential modes of the global university. In this chapter, I rely on speeches, administrative and policy documents, reportage, budgets, and proprietary websites, all of which circulate as publicly available information, in rhetorical analysis of institutional discourse that signals institutional investments. I locate features of globalism with this array of indicators as “the perception of the world as a function or result of the processes of globalization upon local communities” (Ashcroft et al 127). In this context, where humanities and social sciences programming supports the institution's cosmopolitan horizons, the liberal humanist ideal of the “global citizen”⁶¹ emerges as the genre who aligns and organizes aspects of the university's publicized image and its curricular content. This formulation construes citizenship via a liberal institutional vision of “leadership” and “service,” providing “global solutions to global problems” (“Global Studies” *UMBC*), as Chapter 3 will unpack. A representative example describing the University of Delaware's Global Initiative invokes this posture of cosmopolitan access, savvy and largesse:

Our Global Initiative focuses on helping students to expand their awareness and knowledge of the economic, political, cultural and social issues facing the

⁶¹Mark Evans, Leigh Anne Ingram, Angela Macdonald and Nadya Weber's “Mapping the ‘global dimension’ of citizenship education in Canada” accounts for the global citizen's provenance across historical projects of civilization and citizenship management in the West, in name of the polis, imperium, and neoliberal governance. Source: *Canadian Perspectives on Democracy, Diversity and Citizenship Education*, spec. issue of *International Journal Citizenship Teaching and Learning* vol. 5 no. 2, 2009, pg 16-34.

world—and the skills to address them. This commitment to preparing students to be global citizens embraces diversity in all of its richness, on campus, across the U.S., and in countries and cultures worldwide (“25 Universities”).⁶²

Rhetorically, global citizenship serves as the default public-facing rationale for the internationalization strategies of a majority of university administrations in the US and Canada (and beyond). A 2014 survey by the International Association of Universities of 1,300 universities around the world saw over 75% of respondents identify internationalization as an integral and developing component of university policy, and North America as a regional site listed “academic goals”, “local and global responsibility” and “students’ increased international awareness” as the stated benefits and values motivating this orientation (Egroun-Polak and Hudson, 8, 9, 15). However, the report also states that “the most frequently assessed areas of internationalization are international student enrolment, outbound student mobility and partnerships”(Egroun-Polak and Hudson 8), which reflects a general trend to allow extracurricular indicators of quality or institutional standing to characterize the global university as such. This investment in globalist projection syncs with Robert Krabill's critical assessment of the platitudinous rhetoric of global citizenship, whose “practices in contemporary universities reflect the assumption that awareness of global problems is a sufficient goal in itself” (53).

These ideations of globalism – “global studies,” “global citizenship,” “global perspective,” “global leadership,” “global service,” et al – appear in administrative policy visions or plans alongside curricular materials and promotional literature intended for the student (and parent) consumer shopping for an undergraduate institution and/or its degree

⁶²For many universities, publications from university leadership announcing strategic frameworks and didactic commitments for university programming are a disappearing archive, while others provide a public online record of these evolving priorities over the years. In UD’s case, the original web page announcing UD’s Global Initiative from the President’s Office has been replaced with a summary page that archives a news story about the Initiative’s shift toward membership in the ACE Internationalization Laboratory, a consortium through which the ACE manages institutional internationalization processes: <https://sites.udel.edu/go-global/>. While the original publication I am citing from here was no longer locatable online at the time of writing, the quotation above from the original announcement has been archived in the source cited above, a list of global studies programming for high schoolers.

specializations. The publicizing intention of much of this usage manifests globalism's project of propagating global consciousness as such, as if the invocation of a relationship to globality manifests cosmopolitan cachet and world legibility. Consider how “global studies” has been touted as one of the top 10 majors for a “curriculum of the future,” the rise of which administrators at Hofstra University, for example, cite as “driven by student interest” (Gerone). While in many university environments engagement with explicitly globalist programming remains elective, affiliated and extracurricular pre-professional activities that students structure into their education are commonly characterized as global, alongside the increasing introduction of global learning requirements into degree programmes. So how, exactly, does the managerial backdrop of a globalist educational environment orient the learning process more generally? In consideration of how pedagogical tasks are being reshaped, I next examine evolving globalist forms within McMaster University, my home institution for this study.

Site: McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

As a Canadian globalist site for analysis, McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario features throughout the thesis in terms of its public profile, its curricular programming, accompanying organizational resources, and classroom dynamics in a global studies course. In this chapter's emphasis on infrastructural mapping at the institutional scale, university branding and administrative policy act as a managerial backdrop that organizes projects of disciplinary curricula into a national pedagogy of global educational capital. While its globalist practices are not extraordinary in any obvious sense, McMaster University serves as a site for analyzing an internationalization process currently underway in evolving administrative programmes. Established as a public research university in 1887, McMaster is globally ranked especially for

its innovative Health Sciences and Engineering research and programmes, which were also the two areas of “excellence” designated as the institution's focal points after Ontario's provincial government announced funding and research investment will be awarded in two high-performing faculties per public research university.⁶³ McMaster University is also globally recognized for innovation in teaching thanks to the medical school's development of problem-based learning in the 1960s, a “student-centred” approach to active learning that appropriates aspects of the collective, decentered epistemological process laid out by the minoritarian thought of critical pedagogy. Extending from this renown for its self-described “culture of innovation,” over the last decade the administration has undertaken initiatives into “internationalization at home” and global engagement, expanded diversity and student accessibility programming, and community engagement. This section focuses on three rebranding strategic initiatives: first, “Forward with Integrity” or FWI, operative from 2011-2017, when aspects of the strategy were carried forward into “The McMaster Model For Global Engagement” as a 2017 strategy document, which has been recently recast for McMaster’s “Brighter World” era, announced via an “Institutional Priorities and Strategic Framework” for 2021-2024.

FWI mission statements were presented and publicized to the university's members by former President Patrick Deane. His rhetoric of transformation carefully infuses the university's priorities with liberal and democratic values, and with a restatement of a social contract that names education as a public good. I quote at length from FWI’s 2011 strategy introduction:

One of the most significant effects of the digital revolution has been to facilitate—and by facilitating to increase the influence of—the network as a model for human interaction. And even if we cannot go along with those today who would redefine institutions like our own as “mobilizing networks,” it is obvious that to succeed in circumstances such as presently exist, universities will need to maximize their internal coherence; they will need to ensure not only that

⁶³See McMaster's Strategic Mandate Agreement for an outline of the germination of this process of institutional differentiation: <http://www.mcmaster.ca/vpacademic/documents/SMA-McMaster-March,2014.pdf>

their different constituencies are appropriately aligned, but also that the relationship of one part to the other is interactive, that internal boundaries are porous and a site for cooperation rather than separation. Moreover, and in a manner that leaves their autonomy uncompromised, universities will need to foster porousness on the border between themselves and the world that they exist to serve. Where the university reaches out into its surrounding community, integrity as an organizational characteristic, resulting from an effective and dynamic network of internal relationships, turns into integrity as an ethical position” (Deane 3-4).

This language of porousness, community, and cooperation is, of course, familiar to the ideals of higher education and successful corporate management alike, and bolstered in later iterations of this FWI document with the thematics of flexibility, potential, mentorship, and human capability. The titular “Integrity” here seems to mean whatever renews the university's publicized identity as a “student centered, research-intensive university” that “educates for capability” (“The Emerging Landscape” 4, 3). The principle of coherence for Integrity emerges in correspondence with the administration of pedagogical activity, in which inquiry and instruction must be conceived and professed through curricular “alignment.” Much like the curricular method of “backwards design” in primary and secondary level schooling, in which all classroom activity must be aligned with a course's actionable, essentialized learning outcomes, this logic of university alignment is in keeping with Gert Biesta's description of the global university's self-referentiality, in which “indicators of quality have turned into definitions of quality” (“How Useful” 38). Accordingly, President Deane emphasizes original thought, innovation, and multidisciplinary approaches, yet concludes by asserting the logic of metrics as the final indicator of quality: “Alignment—of academic activities, resources, goals and premises—is obviously critical if we are to maintain or increase our present level of research excellence” (10).

Although it is more or less unstated in these vision-based administrative documents, the principle of alignment seems to ultimately have consequences for budgetary integrity. Under

FWI, McMaster's Board of Governors published a list of three priorities for the university's realignment in their 2014-2015 Consolidated Budget report:

developing a distinct, effective and sustainable undergraduate experience, enhancing the way we see and build connections between McMaster and the community, and supporting continuing excellence in research that informs and integrates with a reconceived educational mission" (5).

In the same paragraph, the report propounds that this position "demand[s] that we approach internationalization ... not as a separate project, but as one aspect of those integrated three priorities" ("Consolidated Budget" 5). Despite this opening emphasis on "experience", "connections" and "excellence," undergraduate and international enrollees are referred to as "BIUs" or "basic income units" throughout the sustained financial calculus of the report. Reviewing the last decade, the report also marks a 27% increase in undergraduate enrolment, "disproportionately low increases in government funding per BIU," and an increase by 340% of "sponsored research," which earned the university the title of "Top Performer in Research Income Growth" in 2010 ("Consolidated Budget" 2). This clarifies internationalization in terms of priorities for research and enrolment-based revenues without accompanying resources for students. Bill Readings characterizes "excellence" as this foundational process of seeking equivalency between disparate quality assessment metrics, which "allows the combination on a single scale of such utterly heterogeneous features as finances and the make-up of the student body" (27). By implication, while McMaster celebrates undergraduate experience in its public profile, that campus-based experience is invisibly bounded by the logic of accounting and its primary unit, tuition revenue.

In more public meanings of "Integrity", McMaster's approach to internationalization has been a studied administrative project. Per FWI's 2011 introduction, President Deane called for institutional change with a cautionary tone and an explicitly anti-parochial framework for

university activity. He describes internationalization as “the transformation of the university on its own ground, whereby our academic orientation and breadth of knowledge embraces the globe, our approach to any problem is informed by a global awareness” (Deane 11). In its initial formulation here, President Deane warns against becoming a shallow form of the global university, in which international students are blithely recruited and westernized via unreflexive programming (a model Deane describes as more like “colonialism”), or students or satellite campuses are sent abroad as the culmination of “international academic experience” (11). FWI was responsive to a documented imbalance in Canadian PSE, which is home to a sizable population of international students across all levels yet considerably less invested in encouraging its own students to study in extranational contexts. McMaster's “transformational model” therefore emerges as a curricular platform for “radically re-think[ing] everything that makes up a course of study” (Deane 11). Following from FWI's preliminary statement, the administration established multi-disciplinary advisory groups to audit and develop university infrastructure according to his vision. This supplement was outlined in another document called “The Emerging Landscape” with the guiding phrase “educating for capability.” Capability here reflects an institutionalized version of Amartya Sen's globally influential approach to capability in the developmental terms of “the moral significance of individuals' capability of achieving the kind of lives they have reason to value” (Wells).

In a 2014 video bulletin called “Are We a Truly Global Institution?”, President Deane returns to reiterate his first formulation: that McMaster must not internationalize by merely marketing itself abroad, but rather by remapping its curriculum onto “global and international concerns” (00:01:05) and transforming itself by investing in the production of “not just exemplary Canadian citizens ... but outstanding members of a world community” (00:02:12 -

00:02:22). An interdisciplinary Internationalization Task Force set up in 2012 accordingly recommended that the university address its status quo of siloed projects and initiatives that are not registered under internationalization's unifying banner by instituting a Centre for Global Engagement, so "aligning the administrative and academic arms of internationalization" ("Position Paper" 17) with the creation of an administrative home. The faculty members of the Task Force saw a designated institutional home for global engagement as a way to ensure that global responsibility and an institutional commitment to "making space" are reflected and developed through interdisciplinarity, cooperative agreements and international partnerships. This recommendation, however, remains an outstanding pursuit by McMaster administrators.

Although the end goals of this recommended initiative echo those of the EGM, the authors also maintain an emphasis on "global citizenship" and, distinctively, on "critical social awareness." The global citizen figure will be mapped at length in Chapter 3, but its coupling here with critical social awareness suggests an institutionalization of critical pedagogy's goal of cultivating transformative social consciousness via a focus on power relations, yet in a neutered form that emphasizes social justice perspectives within institutional norms. Accordingly, the world challenges cited in their overview – "climate change, poverty, health crises, political unrest and social injustice" – position this internationalization initiative in alignment with the principles of integrity and engagement outlined by FWI, but also with McMaster's commitments "as a signatory to the United Nations Academic Impact" ("Position Paper" 9, 5).⁶⁴ The Task Force's global citizenship rhetoric does not evaluate relationships between the content that makes up the world concerns of the global citizen and the "competitive international research and project

⁶⁴Per their website, the "United Nations Academic Impact (UNAI) is an initiative that aligns institutions of higher education with the United Nations in supporting and contributing to the realization of United Nations goals and mandates, including the promotion and protection of human rights, access to education, sustainability and conflict resolution." Source: <https://www.un.org/en/academic-impact/page/about-unai>.

grants” (5) that might boost the institution's global stature, instead implying their compatibility or likely continuity under the paradigm of globalism. This reproduction of the global citizen figure, or the student whose debt and training in economic rationality likely funnels their enhanced awareness of global problems into other recognized or associated global institutions rather than toward a rejection of these, upholds the status quo of administering globalism as capital-building for both the institution and its affiliated members. It is possible to read the projected contours of McMaster's “transformational model” as capacious enough for a global orientation that sees connectivity as uneven, and its study shaped by an ethical charge – global citizenship plus critical social awareness, or as critical social awareness – but this depends on the kinds of hospitality borne out by the assets of the institution that condition its rhetoric.

Writing on undergraduate students specifically, the Task Force's faculty members present an ambitious list of global learning outcomes that a full-bodied internationalization effort would generate at McMaster, including critical thinking, cross-cultural knowledge, skills and sensitivity, global political literacy, and reflexivity, along with second language acquisition and “world class scholarship in a global environment” (“Position Paper” 13). How exactly the presence and knowledge of an undergraduate population that is made up of international students, promoted by both McMaster and CIBE on behalf of Canadian universities generally as part of PSE's global identity, figures into McMaster's “transformation” in name of the global is not articulated in any of these steering documents. The initiative produces an environment with an apparent richness of sites for engagement – i.e., the sheen of an effective product – that does not trickle down into the still requisite core space of the classroom. Instead, students are encouraged to volunteer their “spare time” and to rehearse the value of engagement by building an online learning portfolio, using media and description to document their education as experience as well as credentials (a

generic version of the institutional “passport” issued to incoming international students to track their linguistic and cultural progression at McMaster). Students are also invited to apply for FWI grants and to participate in the excellence-driven culture of competition and collaboration, especially via public projects that help to boost the university profile beyond its campus borders. FWI in the end funded mostly extracurricular and brand-based institutional shifts.

In a 2015 public video statement on McMaster's internationalization process, President Deane rightly emphasized the underdevelopment of a “global” culture on campus, and, alongside the university’s production of scarcity for the humanities and social sciences, presented an institutional strategy of “doing more with less” called “Internationalization without Mobility” (“This Month”). This austere vision of transformation can be tracked in the curricular developments that have followed FWI. An effort to develop an interdisciplinary global studies major under the Institute on Globalization and the Human Condition (IGHC), supported by the President's Office in competition with curricular offerings at other Ontario and major Canadian universities,⁶⁵ was abandoned after the administrative determination that it would be too resource-intensive (which largely refers to instruction, as the administrative and research home is already established) and would draw students away from other majors rather than attract new matriculants. According to IGHC leadership, the proposed degree programme would have maintained its self-declared critical orientation toward the study of globalization; their mission and vision statements highlight their work with “various critical perspectives” on the impact and tension globalization generates along with the “activist impact of globalization scholarship in the

⁶⁵For example, programming in Ontario includes a BA in Global Studies at Wilfrid Laurier University, with specializations in Comparative Development, Peace & Conflict, Globalization & Cultures; University of Western Ontario/Huron offers a BA in Globalization Studies, and the University of Toronto hosts an elite BA programme in Peace, Conflict and Justice. Other major universities offer degrees or certificates in Global Studies – Vancouver Island University, the University of Saskatoon, University of Alberta – or International Studies, such as University of Regina, University of Manitoba, UNBC, University of Calgary, and Simon Fraser University.

material world” (“About”). Instead, the IGHC agreed to supplement an existing default minor in global studies that is available to students at the end of their degree with one introductory-level and one core major-level course, which will be examined in Chapter 5.

A 2017 update to FWI appeared in the publication of “The McMaster Model for Global Engagement: A Strategy Document,” which carries its transformational goals forward with emphases on global engagement that exceeds internationalization and “an active orientation toward the challenges of the world” beyond a “passive [global] awareness” (2). Such activity was to be guided by “global citizenship among students, faculty, staff and administration” fostered through “international partnerships in support of research, academic excellence and value creation” and “global awareness in the students’ learning and co-curricular experiences, both on campus and through international mobility” (“The McMaster Model” 2). A survey of global programming across the university by the time of its “Brighter World” 2021-2024 strategic reorientation clarifies the preferred institutional forms developed for “active” global citizenship and awareness. The strategy document does not take up curricular programming within the faculties to explain its number one priority, “Developing A Distinctive, Personalized, Engaging, And Sustainable Student Experience” (“Institutional Priorities” 4), in part because global engagement is presented as just one scale of many for the university’s increasingly maximalist, expansionary priorities. Global programming commitments now include:

- ❖ the experiential McMaster Grand Challenges Scholars programme, administered by the Engineering school but open to all undergraduates, in which students earn extra credentials by developing competencies in five key areas, including entrepreneurship and social responsibility, framed by the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs);
- ❖ McMaster’s global “impact” rankings for programmes toward SDGs, “which are designed to address the most serious challenges facing our world,” including rankings for Decent Work and Economic Growth and Partnerships, and Good Health and Well-Being;

- ❖ an employee resource group launched for Black, Indigenous, and Racialized staff for social and professional networking and career and leadership development;
- ❖ McMaster's institutional membership in Universitas 21, via which 130 students participated in an online 2021 Global Citizenship course administered by UK-based leadership NGO Common Purpose;
- ❖ McMaster's "global experience" programming through its Student Success Centre, including partnerships with employers and international organizations to complete international work experience and gain intercultural competencies;
- ❖ annual event McMaster Global showcasing global engagement activities, including a Town Hall update, to highlight global engagement and global citizenship commitments via "workshops, seminars, lectures, academic and cultural events for students, faculty, staff, and alumni hosted and supported by 30 different campus wide stakeholders and community partners" ("Institutional Priorities" 13).

Alongside these extracurricular, professionalizing and identity-signalling sites for a global McMaster, commitments have been made by McMaster's 2021-2022 teaching and learning strategy to "define and expand experience-based learning, locally and globally, both curricular and co-curricular, through partnerships and interdisciplinarity, and provide innovative and varied approaches to inclusive and scholarly teaching that are focused on creativity, risk-taking, and reflection" (8). This includes plans to develop a Global Engagement foundation course any student could take and to increase engagement in "virtual global learning opportunities" ("Partnered in Teaching and Learning" 16). In this latest "refreshed" orientation, McMaster is led by a new president for whom the university's globality is assumed: the new vision statement, "Impact, Ambition and Transformation through Excellence, Inclusion and Community: Advancing Human and Societal Health and Well-being" is presented as capturing the university's "desire for impact, as well as our commitment to inclusive excellence and serving the global community in all that we do" ("Institutional Priorities" 3). The language of "critical social awareness" has dropped out, replaced with corporate discourses of insight and impact that

manifest through “critical thinking, personal growth and a passion for lifelong learning” (“Institutional Priorities” 4). Instead of the reflexive self-assessment of the FWI era that sought continual transformation, McMaster now appears to be secure in its globalism and inviting students to identify with it, claiming skilling and knowledge development as the institution’s collective capability, diversity as its strength, and its goal of ongoing excellence a force for student empowerment (4) via “Holistic, Transformational, and Personalized Student Experiences” (“Partnered in Teaching and Learning” 9). The Brighter World strategy’s foremost objective is thus

to continue building on the success of our most creative and innovative programmes, providing an enriching and transformative learning experience for all students with increased opportunities for experiential, work-integrated, self-directed, virtual learning, and learning through Micro-credentials (“Institutional Priorities” 4).

Characteristic as it is of university globalism’s mutating trajectory in the site of public-facing administrative strategy, the above programmes for student development will be examined in detail at other scales in the remaining chapters. Given this broad portrait of globalist evolution, we might return to Patrick Deane's formulation on the university's self-renewal, which invokes T.S. Eliot's *Four Quartets*: “the end of all our exploring/ Will be to arrive where we started/ And know the place for the first time” (“FWI: Reflections”). Here he suggests that transformational projects enable the university to better know and realize itself; it is through this “paradox” that the university's twinned investments in consolidation and expansion according to its existing foundations in settler-national and corporate forms of networking, innovation and administration are legible. Toward a concluding discussion of the global university orientations outlined in the site of McMaster and across the infrastructures above, we might ask: what does student participation look like within globalist university campuses, especially given, say, the

replacement of “critical social awareness” with public pedagogies of “student empowerment”?

The Global University Student Experience

While the next chapter will be focused on students navigating digitalized educational experiences and interfaces, this final section takes up the university campus as a site where university globalism’s material projects and their public pedagogies are registered by institutional members. Recent scholarship and reportage has attended extensively to the campus environment for its increasing adoption of corporate cultural and infrastructural forms, drawing from the corporation's expansion of leisure, welfare and digitally-enhanced facilities in its own labour campuses as part of its frontier of “humanization” and entrepreneurialism.⁶⁶ Campus environments are of course deeply various, reflective of their location, resources, development partnerships and land-based histories. Yet a general trend has been observed, especially among universities perceived to be offering mid-level credentials that are less organized around competitive high-level academic performance, of seeking to attract student enrolments via developing commercial, luxury and experiential amenities on campuses as part of a promised “excellence.”⁶⁷ These amenities for student consumption and living are typically funded by requisite student fees that are part of the tuition package, though it is also commonplace for universities to invest in high-end facilities with capital from private or industry partnerships in order to attract a higher-paying international, and in the US out-of-state, student body.

Consider one instance from Arizona's state university system, which was subject to the

⁶⁶See Reinhold Martin's 2003 monograph *The Organizational Complex: Architecture, Media, and Corporate Space*; as well as Rich Simpson's forthcoming manuscript *Reading For Class: The Pedagogies of Knowledge Economies on campus and educational environments and their material practices*, as outlined here: <http://www.rfsimpson.com/research/>.

⁶⁷For reporting on this phenomenon, see <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/09/opinion/trustees-tuition-lazy-rivers.html>. For an analysis of this practice among mid-ranking institutions, see <https://www.nber.org/papers/w18745>.

deepest cuts in public funding in the US as of 2015. Nevertheless, campus tours at the University of Arizona showcase its development of a state-of-the-art athletic and recreation center with a full-service spa, commercial food court and top-tier dorms intended for wealthier students. At the same time, rising food insecurity at UofA has rapidly increased the demand for access to campus food pantries amongst students and adjunct instructors alike (Goldberg, “This is”). Here we might also acknowledge the role that “invisible pedagogies”⁶⁸ play in student success, or the access to resources and knowledge sources outside of school that generate more or less facility with the norms of socialization and discourse internal to the university, as well as potentially offering protections from extramural labour, corporate welfare, and debt itself. Students have been organizing and pushing back against such campus development in recognition of this extractive arrangement that doesn’t fund learning or student resources by voting down and protesting against fee hikes for campus development projects.⁶⁹ It's clear that even as marketing for defunded public universities has swerved toward promised access to experiences and away from education as such, exposure to the infrastructural inequalities and financial strain produced by the tuition-driven university is perceptible in situ. This uneven geography is increasingly made literal for commuting students and around urban campuses, where alongside long histories of community dispossession, property development and gentrification, university real estate comes to dominate infrastructurally thanks to the non-profit status of institutions. This is

⁶⁸For an extended synopsis of this concept and its relationship to both formal and public pedagogies, see Peter Mayo's article “Gramsci and the politics of education,” *Capital & Class* vol. 38 no. 2, 2014, pg 385–398.

⁶⁹A US overview is reported here:

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelnietzel/2018/11/05/students-begin-to-tap-the-brakes-on-the-campus-amenities-arms-race/?sh=6a70a23d1bcc>; in Canadian campus settings, where most students commute rather than reside on campus, student experience has been comparatively characterized as “bureaucratic non-experience” (Srebrnik 75). Instead of facilities dedicated to socialization and recreation on campus, competitive dynamics around Canadian campus amenities more readily express in campus innovation parks and “UniverCity” property developments that extend industry presence directly into campus landholdings for enhanced experiential learning programming or environments for students. See an overview here: <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/business/industry-news/property-report/article-big-plan-on-campus-canadian-universities-commercialize-their-land/>.

especially visible in the recent corporate economic trend toward mergers and acquisitions that has generated a institutional landscape of “meds and eds”⁷⁰ combining university education and medical campuses as the “anchor institutions”⁷¹ in a locale’s broader political economy.

Both FIU and McMaster as sites featured in this chapter have hung their globalist programming on the UN’s SDGs and their globalist presupposition that a sustainability transformation for the globe must be marshalled and led by social institutions like Global North universities. Yet student activists and organizations in the contemporary university draw upon a long tradition of disruptive resistance to and intervention in the university's geography, functioning and appropriations, and waves of protest since the 2008 global financial crisis are doing so to target the university's “global footprint.” This term is in use in corporate literature that counsels universities on the most successful strategies for expanding their global presence,⁷² yet students take it up with “critical social awareness.” In its critical bearing, “footprint” connotes the excesses and dangerous force of capitalist development, especially as part of the phrase “carbon footprint” that indexes human contributions to global climate change. In the case of universities, this term is deployed in critiques and protests of the fossil fuel investments and extra-national land holdings servicing university endowment growth that have escalated in the post 2008 period. Since 2014, there have been 300+ student-led fossil-fuel divestment groups across North America, appearing first in Australia National University followed by Harvard

⁷⁰See Carolyn Adams, “The Meds and Eds in Urban Economic Development,” *Journal of Urban Affairs* 25, no. 5 (2003).

⁷¹See Chapter 1 of Davarian Baldwin’s *In The Shadow of the Ivory Tower: How Universities Are Plundering Our Cities*, New York: Boldtype Books (2021) for an exposition of this popularly used concept in urban geography.

⁷²See Ed Cohen's related chapter on “Global Considerations for Corporate Universities” in *The Next Generation of Corporate Universities: Innovative Approaches for Developing People*, ed. Mark Allen, San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, 2007. Notably, this piece of advisory literature also draws upon “leadership” rhetoric from the writings of Mahatma Gandhi; the citation reproduced here is there completely recontextualized in service of corporate humanist values: “Consciously or unconsciously, every one of us does render some service or another. If we cultivate the habit of doing this service deliberately, our desire for service will steadily grow stronger, and it will make not only for our happiness, but that of the world at large” (186).

University and then throughout the US and Canada (Peters). This knowledge flow across contexts and sites of action is often unified by systemic anti-capitalist critique as well as a concern with environmental racism and injustice that has engendered solidaristic networks within and beyond university-based organizing.

Similarly, a wave of student protests have targeted “land grabs” by certain universities, with particular vigor at Vanderbilt University and Harvard University for their investments in an African land acquisition fund run by British and European financial managers. Although both universities claimed their ownership of mostly agricultural land has been responsible and aboveboard, protesters wielded independent analysis that “the deals will provide few jobs and will force many thousands of people off the land”, especially those using the land as “squatters” and not proprietors (Vidal and Provost). Similar campaigns have exposed Harvard's expansive “alternative assets,” particular its timber holdings or “plantations” in Brazil, Romania, Argentina, Chile, Ecuador, Uruguay and New Zealand; Harvard's natural resource holdings make up 10% of its \$36.4 billion endowment (Korn, “Harvard's Timber Empire”). These material forms of expansion also recall the land rush and settlement histories of both the US and Canada, in which Indigenous peoples were dispossessed via the 'tabula rasa' imposition of property law in favor of the capitalist colonial frontier. Relatedly, student protest movements have also taken up the global university's perpetuation of structural racism through occupations and calls for translocal and transcolonial solidarity. In addition to the long-brewing Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement that targets Israel's settler colonial occupation of Palestine, a global campaign with many advocates and dedicated groups in both Canadian and American academia, student-led campaigns #RhodesMustFall and #FeesMustFall in the South African university system alongside movements against anti-Black racism, police violence, and campus

militarization via policing have amplified ongoing campus anti-racism and anti-austerity student activism in the US and Canada over the last decade. The demands presented in protests and occupations are historical and institutional, explicitly condemning the ongoing life of white supremacy and colonialism in “the global university” while also pushing for changes to hiring and diversity policies, curriculum reform, representation and equity at all levels, and public condemnations of racist symbols and bigotry within spaces of institutionalized life and learning. By extension, students are increasingly unionizing and allying with living wage and labour rights campaigns to address the precarious conditions of adjunct and student labour alongside university staff and facilities workers, whose labour is often managed by subcontractors and recruited from immigrant, Black, Latinx, low-income or “offshore” populations. Anti-racism and anti-policing activism within universities also invokes their relationships to militarism and ongoing colonialism as linked institutional practices around the globe. In sum, anti-austerity and anti-imperialist platforms are integrated in student resistance to the university's role in “Empire in its extended crisis” (Park), and their activism makes clear that the global university's “footprint” also vividly traces its intensifying role in reproducing global injustice.

To what degree is this decolonial critique of globalism an infrastructural byproduct of the pedagogies of the global university – in other words, a language available to students from within the university's campus, curricular, classroom and networked spaces? The university's expanding role in the “experience economy,” its critics have argued, mark its amplifying contradictions and attempts to persist through “false remediation” of anti-social conditions for learning, labour and living in university settings, as suggested by its sentimental turns to the personal and transformative mapped above (Moten and Harney, “the university”). In *The Reorder of Things*, Roderick Ferguson makes an extensive critique of the institutionalization of minority

interdisciplines such critical race studies, gender studies, queer studies, and ethnic studies for its appropriation from the language and practices of protest movements in the 1960s and 1970s to end racism, imperialism and militarism, and gender inequality on university campuses, particularly to subordinate difference to the university's infrastructural power and marshal it for institutional durability. Of the contemporary university's racial capitalist practice, he writes, "In this new strategic situation, hegemonic power denotes the disembodied and abstract promotion of minority representation without fully satisfying the material and social redistribution of minoritized subjects" (Ferguson *The Reorder* 8). How, in context with university globalism, might we connect the institutionalized projects and effects of public and classroom pedagogies to counter-pedagogies of student and labour resistance and occupation, or what Achille Mbembe terms "pedagogies of presence" ("Decolonizing Knowledge")?

Bearing these questions, my subsequent chapters will attend to "student experience" within globalist pedagogies. I will expand on the implications of student resistance above in my fourth and fifth chapters, which document and theorize the student situation in political economic and ethnographic detail, after mapping global citizenship and "inclusive excellence" programmes in my third chapter. But first, my inquiry will linger in another layer of the global university, its digitalized infrastructure with accompanying administrative paradigms for learning and informational goods. Per Gaztambide-Fernández and Matute's observation that curriculum is "defined expansively as having to do with education experience" or theorizing experiences of the learner (57), I next take up interfaces and digital connectivity to examine their mediation of globalist pedagogies through data platforms, instructional delivery and information management.

CHAPTER 2: THE GLOBAL LEARNING INTERFACE

Undergraduate curriculum continues to be understood as a relatively stable, if potentially diminishing, site of faculty autonomy. This site is also mediated by various administrative processes and instruments that work to manage curricular forms in terms of efficiency, information, labour or skills production. We could summarize this institutional process in which departmental or faculty curricular development is embedded as information management, an ongoing audit-based organizational strategy to govern the university according to administrative priorities increasingly geared toward market instrumentality. General effects of this kind of managerial revaluation have been widely reported in the fraught conditions of instructional labour and shared governance, development projects and cuts within academic and research infrastructures, and university wealth management practices, but less so within the development of curriculum and its delivery. As part of this managerial infrastructure, information technologies and the global pursuit of new educational services markets have prompted many actors in the education industry (most of whom are not classroom practitioners) to continually reformulate both the content and delivery mechanisms for classroom instruction, generating a climate of innovation lauded by administrators invested in the global currency of their educational products. These changes could be summarized as an infrastructural transformation in process via the digitalization of higher education. Though accompanied by celebratory claims and discrete cases of expanding educational access, this general trend is just as shaped by austerity logic as, perversely, is the broader climate of innovation of which it is part, a logic which “intensifies the need for labour-saving forms of technology to remake the university” (Fabricant & Brier 222).

Theories of technological innovation for education practices have developed to shore up

the market mechanisms of digitalization, and these have corresponded to a proliferation of new theories of learning for the digital and postindustrial information age. While universities may be protecting and expanding their capacity to build capital and prestige in a global arena, and students must cultivate their “value proposition” as the “return on investment” of their student debt, other discourses circulate within the campus space or learning context to mediate this transaction in educational terms. The primary reproductive process underway in the institutions of 21st-century Canadian and US higher education, I would argue, is the administration of student development as flexible human capital (inclusive of HCT’s fallacies and harms), increasingly presented in terms of “student experience.” Because “experience” is also the main framing for theorizing curriculum amongst philosophers of education, as first postulated by John Dewey, this chapter surveys digital infrastructures to examine how learning experience has been constructed via new learning forms, genres and environments produced by the drive for educational and technological innovation. Their expanding presence in the structures that organize classroom spaces is increasingly visible in curricular content as well. Curriculum makes visible a specific landscape of student experience: I read it as a locus of multiple globalist projects, in particular the dual inputs of global cultural content – our objects of study and accompanying methods – and the institutional infrastructure organizing curricular delivery and education technologies. While the next chapter focuses on the genres of programming that accordingly accrue to the modifier “global” in global study and therefore to formalized global “experience,” the learning interface must first be examined to identify the less overt but fundamental role it plays in shaping classroom activity.

In 1995, education theorists Robert Tarr and John Tagg observed a transformational shift in undergraduate education from “the *instructional paradigm* to...the *learning paradigm*”

(Diamond vii), which elaborated a focus on students and their learning experiences rather than on knowledge dissemination by instructors. This transformation is still underway and unevenly developing, often shaped by contradictory institutional directives. This chapter and the next will trace out the forms generated by some of those directives in the arena of curriculum and its delivery. In particular, this section of the thesis, with a focus on how global studies is organized and rendered, aims to map material and discursive phenomena related to the informational and knowledge goods generated by these infrastructural shifts. My reading of curriculum and technology helps to identify evolving pedagogical and globalist forms, as well as to examine the effects they have on formalized learning experiences, access to global knowledge, and the frameworks developed to represent or exercise it.

What follows will take up the infrastructure of institutional and instructional delivery systems for curriculum, rather than pedagogical praxis or epistemological frameworks for subject-area knowledge. In this infrastructural domain I primarily examine three interrelated sites: curriculum considered as a globalist form; educational technology and its interfaces; and knowledge in a globalized landscape of management and valuation. Globalist practices can be read in each as driving a particular shift, tension, or effect underway in how learning is being conceived. While a discussion of what Tarr and Tagg call “the learning paradigm” (13) could encompass nearly all aspects of curricular production and delivery, it is an especially useful index of more macro-level processes that are shaping contemporary higher ed, namely its production of particular forms of informational goods, its reification of knowledge as property of the global market, and its overdetermination of learning as an inherently measurable, instrumentalizable effect. Accordingly, the first section of this chapter examines institutionalized expressions of “learning” in more detail, in terms of the curricular and pedagogical theory that

has elaborated its definitions and identifiable forms as well as in the wider global context of what Gert Biesta has called the “learning economy” (“What’s the Point” 169).

Curriculum in the Learning Paradigm

What exactly is the “learning paradigm,” and in what ways might we understand it as globalist in character? And, why conduct this extended parsing of this seemingly axiomatic component of contemporary higher education? This chapter focuses on the contours of the double binds generated by the administrative production of learning environments and delivery of curriculum. “Learning,” of course, presents one such bind, as it serves as a shorthand for ideological projects of all kinds yet remains an accessible concept through which to communicate and invest in relational and collective inquiry. Alongside the institutional projects and pedagogies accompanying the shift to a learner-focused environment, “learning” as a practical framework is still a functional ground from which to invite experiences of student agency in the uneven knowledge space of the classroom for the aims of realist critique. As their term implies, Tagg and Tarr name a broad, multi-faceted project that aims to reform education at every scale. We might start considering its manifestations by marking the significance of the linguistic shift that centers learning and the learner, which replaces the relational concept of education that most often refers to an interactive exchange between an instructor and a student.⁷³ This may be a welcome change in some classrooms – an update on the passive reproduction of ossified, alienating, or in some cases abusive educational practices, which is often grounded in the arrogation of authority to those with seniority, prestige or other forms of recognizable status in a hierarchical setting dominated by patriarchal and white supremacist structures. The

⁷³For further discussion of institutional and governmental rhetorical shifts around learning, see Biesta, “Against Learning: reclaiming a language for education in an age of learning,” *Nordisk Pedagogik* vol. 23, 2004, pg. 70-82.

democratizing claims of this revision are reflected in the rhetorical elevation of the student from their subordinate, passive classroom position and signalled by now common experimental and specialized instructional methods for learning, such as active, student-centered, peer, problem-based or team-based learning.

Yet a rhetorical shift away from a relational conception of educational delivery has also enabled other, market-oriented processes, effectively devaluing the labour and expertise of instructors and creating the conditions for their labour to be automated or replaced by digital platforms that, while curating the experience of the learner, deliver content using engagement rubrics concerned with standardized and individualized performance outcomes rather than the group generativity of a relational dynamic. A reliance on adjunct and casualized labour for instruction presents no conflict with a learner-focused model, as the instructional delivery upon which this learning depends does not necessarily require investment in the instructor and their resources when opportunities to invest in technological, environmental, and managerial enhancement are also justified under these terms. While “learning”’s definition in education scholarship as a process that is ultimately in excess of the instructor is largely defensible, it is perversely ironic that its application in this paradigm – an increased investment in the experience of the student – has coincided with the “de-professionalization of the work of teaching,” through which “over-enrolled classes taught by part-time, adjunct teachers who receive poverty wages and no benefits” and “governed by an army of bureaucrats” (Doyle 96) have become the relative norm. This norm is in keeping with labour outcomes of “high-skill low-wage jobs” for a globally expanding class of knowledge workers, a global trend developing since the mid-1970s after universities pioneered this labour model by converting permanent faculty jobs into adjunct and casual positions (Newfield, *The Great Mistake* 293).

Although such a change in the organization of labour is not explicitly prescribed as part of its original formulation by Tagg, Tarr and others, it is already clear that the learning paradigm presents contradictions for education workers invested in the social labour of producing forms of critical inquiry and intellection through pedagogy, as the figures that the paradigm decentres. The situation for learners and their labour is more mixed. In addition to a shift that positions the learner as the central agent of the learning process, Tagg and Tarr identify a broader reconstitution of the environment that hosts this process. Their definition already expands the terms of the university to posit a terrain of learning in which the curriculum or the classroom in their traditional forms are so deconstructed as to appear optional. Instead, in the learning paradigm “a college's purpose is not to transfer knowledge but to create environments and experiences that bring students to discover and construct knowledge for themselves, to make students members of communities of learners that make discoveries and solve problems” (Tagg & Tarr 15). This shift in how the functionality of the campus environment is conceived is a manifestation of the experiential emphasis introduced in Chapter 1, kindred to the corporate humanist campuses of Google or Facebook that are designed as complete worlds in which workers can move seamlessly between states of labour, leisure, and sociability in order to maximize their productivity and identification with the workplace. By this logic, the auxiliary campus provisions discussed as experiential amenities in the previous chapter can all be administratively rationalized for playing adjacent roles in fostering “communities of learners.” Students are encouraged to identify with the institutional environment as a site of connection to the experience of learning, a posture that reinforces both the normative institutionalism of student members of a campus as well as the exclusivity of the space maintained by admissions offices and the security apparatus in place to protect the university from risk.

While the broad goal of “learning” appears to present a form with fungible content to which a range of extracurricular projects could be attached, its instructional aims represent the mixed terms of globalist pedagogy. To define the learning paradigm more practically, consider the contradictory projects that become visible in the charts in Appendix A, compiled by Tagg and Tarr to outline the commitments of the new paradigm. The first has an administrative focus, reflecting this domain’s emphasis on curricular alignment with institutional directives and allocation of resources. In “Chart 1,” learning appears as a product or an effect, almost a passive voice construction that absents an instructor as its causal agent. Other key shifts occur in curricular programming, which appears under “Mission and Purposes” as “Offer courses and programs” and has been replaced by “environments”, and “curriculum development” under “Criteria for Success” becomes “learning technologies development.” The teaching-focused category of resources, appearing under “Criteria for Success” as “inputs” in terms of their quantity and quality, has been replaced by “outcomes” – the language of resource dropping out entirely – and requisite study material (appearing under Teaching/Learning Resources as “Covering material”) designated for a course topic becomes “results.” These guidelines map the paradigm’s manifestation via a collection of tools and measurement systems -- environments, technologies, and outputs -- produced to organize an underlying infrastructure⁷⁴ that has come to correspond with university operations as predominantly a site for extracting, managing, and speculating on knowledge-based value and use, yet containing an auxiliary structure that administers both generalist and specialist education via disciplinary knowledge.

⁷⁴Tagg and Tarr provide a definition of how they are analyzing institutional infrastructure that shares aspects with my wider methodology in the thesis, although the absence of attention to the actual social relations and actors who reproduce the structures they name limits their institutionalist call for transformation (note that they do not use the word ‘infrastructure’ per se): “By structures we mean those features of an organization that are stable over time and that form the framework within which activities and processes occur and through which the purposes of the organization are achieved. Structure includes the organization chart, role and reward systems, technologies and methods, facilities and equipment, decision-making customs, communication channels, feedback loops, financial arrangements, and funding streams” (18).

These descriptions represent the administration of particular divestments, from student exposure to the breadth and depth of a field, archive or methodological training, and faculty autonomy. The objects suggested to act as their replacements could also have affordances for a dynamic educational project, if conceived to be less relational, such as the learning paradigm's emphasis on "quality of exiting students" rather than entering students, as well the centrality of "aggregate learning growth, efficiency" over enrolment and revenue growth. "Learning" could be tweaked toward the vision of renewed educational approaches derived from CUNY's open-admission community college model proposed by Cathy Davidson in *The New Education: How to Revolutionize the University and Prepare Students for a World in Flux*, for example. She argues that institutional practice should start from the goal that "student needs are addressed from every perspective" (68) with a central skill to "learn how to learn" (81). The learning paradigm's application in universities of course remains driven by global capital's needs via competitive excellence and tuition markets, but the apparent value of "efficiency" here suggests students should be accessing a maximally effective learning process. The next section in Tagg & Tarr's chart in Appendix A, "Teaching/Learning Structures," highlights a "holistic" approach, its "whole prior to part" an indicator of a shift away from a mastery and metrics approach to specialized knowledge items. This is echoed under the final "Mission and Purposes" shifts from student access to student success, although only potentially, given the debt-fueled expansionary vision of access to higher education we currently see coupled with extremely narrow definitions of success. Furthermore, the combination of an interdisciplinary and collaborative model ("Cross discipline/department collaboration") with formative assessment rather than summative assessment ("pre/during/post assessment" vs. "end-of-course assessment") and the "whatever learning experience works" approach to student readiness all indicates an appropriate centering

of the student and a grounding of pedagogy in the student context. The 'public' approach to assessment may also indicate accountability for learning standards and greater transparency or involvement from all classroom parties; however, "external evaluations of learning" as a replacement for instructor evaluations imply the involvement of an outside party with powers of appraisal independent of familiarity with the classroom's work, such as an administrator, who would overwrite the collective production of a public assessment process in the class.

This mixture continues in their elaboration of learning theories, funding and roles. Consider Tagg and Tarr's more granular chart in page 2 of Appendix A. Under "Learning Theory", we can see one set of commitments that maps neatly onto constructivist theories of learning, in which learning resides in individuals and their active creation of knowledge as they attempt to understand their respective experiences and select and pursue their own learning⁷⁵: "knowledge exists in each person's mind and is shaped by individual experience," is "constructed, created and 'gotten'," and results from the "nesting and interacting of frameworks." This formulation is also amenable to social constructivist theories of learning, which sees the heterogeneous labour of sociability as the basis for diverse frameworks mobilized in the classroom space along with curriculum. The metaphor for mastery represented by "learning how to ride a bicycle" highlights a substitution of learning *how* for learning *what*, which is here indicative of the ongoing recession of disciplinarity's institutional power, the intellectual density and range implied by its genealogies, traditions and field coverage replaced by an investment in skills and process. This shift in emphasis has continued in correspondence with explicitly market-based rationales for "just-in-time" credentialing and skilling, but its formulation here potentially promotes a more accessible classroom environment that focuses on

⁷⁵For more on constructivism as a theory of learning, see, for example, Driscoll, M. (2000). *Psychology of Learning for Instruction*. Needham Heights, MA, Allyn & Bacon.

student agency and success through demonstrated applications of their learning instead of rote mastery or content reproduction. The chart's section on "Roles" implies democratized participation, albeit through what has since become corporate parlance *au courant*, a teamwork model that promotes shared governance within the prescribed limits of curricular design. The inclusive emphases on the engagement of "every student's competencies and talents" and "all staff [as] educators" potentially elevate all relations that go into the production of learning into a shared "team" arrangement of their labour, while also leaving room for administrators to be given more power as "staff" whose work "produce[s] student learning and success." Finally, the suggestion that "empowering learning is challenging and complex" takes up student empowerment discourse by elevating pedagogical expertise as such, promoting the status of instructional skills and knowledge (over disciplinary expertise, say) in the learning equation, too.

In their mixture, these minutiae also reflect a wider economic logic shaped by global processes. In the administrative terms of a budgetary logic, the "unit of learning" replacing the default instructional unit (which was itself already a gross under-measurement of labour time) signals a heavy measurement regime reliant on learning outcomes and assessment to generate metrics for microadjustment in resource allocation, implemented with various packaging from "restructuring" to "innovation." Tagg & Tarr do not put this revaluation in context with any explicit economic rationales for the shift to the learning paradigm. Instead, they cite more euphemistic institutional issues such as the "serious design flaw" through which quality is tied to indicators such as the faculty-to-student ratio, such that instructors "cannot increase their productivity without diminishing the quality of their product" (23). The year prior, in a two-part article published in the same higher education journal *Change* as Tagg & Tarr's progenitor text for the learning paradigm, Alan Guskin announced a doing-more-with-less imperative facing

institutions at that historical juncture: “Reducing Student Costs and Enhancing Student Learning: The University Challenge of the 1990s.” A few economic facts are provided as his opening rationale – declining public funding, overwhelming tuition rates, stagnant faculty salaries, and downsizing – as the institutional conditions prompting the need for this widespread revamp of higher ed. Additionally, three future conditions are suggested to augur the shift to a learning focus that reveals the imaginative constraints within which it was produced:

- 1) The high costs associated with undergraduate education in the public and private sectors will give rise to overwhelming pressures to cut back expenses rather than increase tuition.
- 2) There will be an ever-growing demand from many sectors of society that we document and improve student learning outcomes.
- 3) Soon the new information technologies will provide the capability to alter how students learn and how faculty teach (Guskin [Part I] 24).

While the first prediction did not come to pass, with university administrations instead shifting revenue generation for operational costs heavily onto students,⁷⁶ all three help to frame the globalism embedded in the celebratory mode of the learning paradigm. Notably, Tagg, Tarr and Ruskin all operate with the assumption that student markets would not endure significant increases in tuition, and therefore the only option for universities is austerity, meaning this paradigm functions as an institutional mechanism for enforcing the consolidating policies of information management. Of course, the tuition story since the 90s unfolded otherwise. Christopher Newfield’s extensive research on the unravelling of the public university system in the US points to particular effects of the progressive defunding of public higher education underway since the mid 1970s. Although most accounts of tuition hikes in the US public system attribute them to a financial impasse facing universities from state funding cuts, especially severe after the 2008 financial crisis, Newfield outlines how they are in fact a long-standing

⁷⁶The call to cut education resources due to their high costs is being made at the time of writing but in libertarian terms, such as in Bryan Caplan’s *The Case Against Education: Why the Education System Is a Waste of Time and Money*, Princeton UP (2017), arguing for the dismantling of the entire education system and a vocational education system in its stead.

administrative measure to plug budget gaps in order to preserve “high-status activities,” such as sponsored research, that incur a loss to universities as part of their cost-sharing arrangement with private industry sponsors (*The Great Mistake* 41). Tuition increases enacted over the 1990s also coincided with a shift in federal student loan policy, which saw grants-in-aid replaced steadily by loans (alongside the private sector loans industry’s expansion) (Newfield *The Great Mistake* 42-45). It is in this period of deepening privatization and risk-shifting policy that the learning paradigm appeared: its actual budgetary priorities supported the competitive global prestige race and actively divested from teaching and learning labour and resources (i.e. teachers and students), but a performative recuperation of the teaching mission of the university was staged.

Hence the proposition throughout the learning paradigm’s exposition that teachers are too resource-intensive (which is still leveraged at products of the demands for innovation made of faculty like interdisciplinary and team-taught faculty-led courses), or that pegging instructional quality to faculty-student ratio could no longer be (and perhaps never was) a viable model of learning experience at scale. The paradigm’s effective institutional function is further delineated by the recommendation that institutions should reflexively seek realignment and rationalization based on results from the constant measurement of learning outcomes. Tagg and Tarr argue that institutions should also see themselves as learners according to the paradigm’s principles in order to efficiently instrumentalize themselves: “the Learning Paradigm envisions the institution itself as a learner – over time, it continuously learns how to produce more learning with each graduating class, each entering student” (14). There is a kind of metonymic logic at play here: in fully aligning the learner’s learning with the institution’s learning, the learner is an institutionalist, oriented toward the institution’s priorities, and the institution’s priorities are merely the learner’s in aggregate. Institutionalism will appear across the thesis’s chapters as a

normative orientation promoted by university globalism, in which participatory maintenance and reproduction of institutional infrastructures are seen as essential to cooperative sociability and development for humanity more broadly. Thus, in a move similar to the sincerity of contemporary corporate social responsibility branding, the learning paradigm's professed commitment to learning assumes that student interests are aligned with the institution's, acting as a banner for institutional morality that also enlists instructors by constraining their autonomy.

Though operating under different public funding conditions, including periodic domestic tuition caps imposed to squeeze universities under the guise of helping students as in Ontario, Canadian PSE also has been institutionally reflexive to opportunities for rationalization that the learning paradigm affords since the 90s. This is in part due to the involvement of Canadian scholars and teachers in the emergence and development of its accompanying research field, the scholarship of teaching and learning. The 2010 inaugural issue of the *Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* dates this research field's beginnings to 1990, and its formalization in the US a decade later via the founding of the *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, which staged international conversation including Canadian academics through the web (Schönwetter and Bateman 1).

The arc of this timeline also corresponds to the institutionalization of the learning paradigm in the form of the now common "Teaching and Learning Centre," which first appeared in Canada in the 1970s and 1980s "driven by the perceived need to enhance the quality of teaching in order to attract students to the expanded universities"⁷⁷ (Dawson). Until the 1990s,

⁷⁷In literature on the history of Canadian PSE, the post-war period is cited as a time of massive development for its PSE system based on similar rationales to those in the US: the human capital promise of national economic growth coupled with the complementary economic and social project of institutionalized diversity. Following a charter to create federal funding for expanding the university system in 1956, the 60s and 70s are cited as the period of most rapid expansion, and also the beginning of Canada's commitment to "global education," then through the state multiculturalism project of "ethical liberalism." Source: <https://ocufa.on.ca/decades/1960s/>. For more on the history of global education in Canadian schooling, see Karen Mundy et al's "History of Global Education in Canada," *Charting Global Education History in Canada's Elementary Schools*, 2007

these centres largely functioned as clearinghouses for research on teaching, pedagogical exchange, and recognition of teaching excellence, alongside their development of tools for measuring teaching such as the student evaluation and the teaching dossier (Dawson). The late 90s marked the beginning of a shift in their instrumentality concomitant with an increasing institutional interest in internationalization and global student markets that continues into the present. Despite the gradualism of the learning paradigm's implementation in curricular practice and the slower rates of marketization in Canadian PSE more generally, two thirds of Canada's universities now host a Teaching and Learning Centre, according to national organization the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE; founded in 1984)⁷⁸.

Why might it be the case that institutionalization of research production on teaching and learning coincided with the introduction of the learning paradigm and the growth of internationalization strategies? Given the prehistories of each of these developments in the 1970s, it is useful to consider the assessment movement, a corollary phenomenon at play in each of these institutional initiatives that also originates from this period. In the late 1970s, assessment emerged as a tool for grappling with external demands upon an expanded higher education system in both national contexts, as the concept of "value-added" became more mainstream in studies on higher education's net effects, along with public policy concern for determining societal returns on investment from higher ed. Institutions produced methods for holistically evaluating the outcomes of the college experience (including environmental and behavioral factors), such as "taxonomies of outcomes, models of student growth and development, and tools for research like cognitive examinations, longitudinal and cross-sectional surveys, and quasi-experimental designs" (Ewell 2). Like the others, this movement gradually became

https://www.oise.utoronto.ca/cidec/UserFiles/File/Research/UNICEF_Study/UNICEF_chap3.pdf

⁷⁸A list of relevant centres is kept on their website, which was last updated in Dec 2017 at the time of this writing: <https://www.stlhe.ca/affiliated-groups/educational-developers-caucus/resources/tl-centres-list/>

integrated into the infrastructure of university administration, and is now so fundamental to basic operations under a scarcity logic that what Simon During has called “audit administration” relies on the assessment of educational outcomes (and outputs) almost transitively, such that “measurements of ‘performance’ [become] rules guiding performance” (“Postdisciplinarity” 10).

We can locate this assessment mechanism in contemporary iterations of the teaching and learning centre itself because they often take the form of “the entrepreneurial ‘centre’ model” (During), which, characteristic of a postdisciplinary mode, typically operates under direct administrative management uninformed by disciplinary expertise and receives contracted, project-based funding. McMaster, for example, now operates the MacPherson Institute for Leadership, Innovation and Excellence in Teaching, or MacPherson Institute in common public usage, which was originally the Centre for Leadership in Learning and first rebranded as the McMaster Institute for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching and Learning to better reflect institutional priorities before its current name was established through an institutional gift. Across these shifting terms were shifting practices, including a mission shift toward research on pedagogy that divested from practical assistance to instructors, and its reconfiguration toward its present form by a major donation from businessman Paul MacPherson, an “outstanding corporate citizen” (“Tribute”) now funding the propagation of such citizens through innovative pedagogical forms derived from corporate practice. While its research projects and initiatives on campus are wide-ranging, the Institute’s primary tether to instructors in campus classrooms appears as advocacy for and administration of tools for learning and its assessment, such as the learning portfolio, “clickers” (which amass real-time student engagement data), and a range of online technologies for building ongoing learning “evidence” throughout a course.⁷⁹ It also offers

⁷⁹Of course, researchers at MacPherson are devoted to assessing their own performance outcomes and their contributions towards the institution’s ‘learning’; see, for example, Elizabeth Marquis and Arshad Ahmad’s report on integrating SoTL into McMaster’s institutional culture in “Developing the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

professional development to faculty to expose them to the tools, online platforms, and approaches of the learning paradigm, which is elective and effectively extracurricular in relation to faculty labour. McMaster's investment in the centre inhabits the basic logic of a capital project in the institution's infrastructure, whereby the allocation of budgetary resources in what is largely extra-curricular knowledge production about teaching and learning sits transparently beside demands for restructuring being placed upon the humanities faculty based on enrolment numbers and internal debt, i.e. a divestment from existing practical instruction.

Additional consideration of the deployment of the rhetoric of "learning" in circulation beyond its default home in educational institutions helps to contextualize its relationship to a broader field of institutional globalism and its policy-based mediation of globalist pedagogies for today's students. The work of Gert Biesta on the emergence and nature of the "learning economy" provides a useful genealogical reading of "learning" as a figure for policy development in the institutional landscape of global governance, dominated by OECD countries. A 1972 UNESCO report called *Learning to Be: the world of education today and tomorrow* argued for an expanded conception of learning beyond core developmental phases of study like compulsory childhood schooling and higher education: "learning involves 'all of one's life, in the sense of both time-span and diversity, and all of society'" (Biesta "What's the Point" 171). In the context of evaluating the importance of "lifelong learning," a conception of ongoing adult education originally tied to democratic goods like personal growth and societal engagement, this report understands this learning in terms of solidarity, democracy, human fulfillment, and continually evolving human knowledge (Biesta "What's the Point" 172). However, a gradual shift toward an economic imperative for lifelong learning was crystallized in an OECD report

at the McMaster Institute for Innovation and Excellence in Teaching and Learning," *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* vol. 146, 2016, pg 47-54.

called *Lifelong Learning For All*, published in 1997. Here human capital discourse becomes dominant, citing rationales of skill adaptation and renewal necessary for the changing nature of work, information and technology in the global economy. This document sets a new agenda that thins those earlier democratic rationales, replacing “‘learning to be’ with ‘learning to be productive and employable’” or “‘learning for earning’” (Biesta “What’s the Point” 172), and shifts learning from a human right to an individual duty and responsibility, collapsing the manifold possible meanings of a life into its capacity for productivity and economic contribution. Through this shift, “learning” becomes a screen for neoliberal discourses of self-management, individual responsibility, and compulsory participation in the human marketplace, even while its invocation in PSE’s internal rhetorical production and external marketing strategies continue to rely on common-sense social associations between learning and democratic or personal goods.

This discussion of ideological accretion around the term “learning” (which is hardly exhaustive) does not mean to provide a direct cause-and-effect accounting of how and why “learning” registers in all projects of contemporary higher ed. Rather, I hope it has showcased shared historical layers shaping the range of agendas that are currently in play as it manifests as a characteristic discourse in institutional cultures. Tagg & Tarr’s proclaimed shift to the learning paradigm itself is still unfolding, unevenly, yet its expressions are arguably concentrated in two major domains that shape curriculum and classroom experience. The first is the role of the logic of human capital in positioning students in relation to the university and society noted above. Although there is nothing new about understanding university education or schooling more generally as a core institutional mechanism for social and class reproduction, the explicit alignment of job market skilling with higher educational credentialing is often criticized and bemoaned as a recent phenomenon coincident with neoliberal policy and rationality in the

literature and reporting on higher education's crisis.⁸⁰

Drawing on Wendy Brown's analysis of the contemporary university in terms of neoliberalism, Annie McClanahan offers a useful corrective here through a genealogy of human capital theory, which helps to characterize university globalism's strategic deployment of the rhetoric of "learning" as a good in and of itself. She dates the emergence of higher ed's human capital proposition to the 1940s and 1950s, wherein expanded access via the 1944 GI Bill helped to solidify the rise of a middle-class, white, male technocracy. As access to the university expanded to women, minority and international student populations in subsequent decades, the stability of the wage premium associated with an undergraduate degree made it so that economic rationales for pursuing higher education were assumed and implied rather than directly promoted in marketing and policy literature alongside its democratizing promise.⁸¹ McClanahan points out that human capital discourse has become dominant in response to the weakening of the university's underlying economic function, which I argue is especially visible in its global self-imagery: "human capital discourse has become more desperately loud not because the university is becoming more economic, but because it is becoming much less successful at guaranteeing positive economic outcomes for its graduates" ("Becoming Non-Economic" 517), as Chapter 4 on students as part of university globalism's infrastructure examines.

In context with contemporaneous shifts in global capitalism, the long-term convergence of de facto privatization and greater corporate and platform influence in university governance

⁸⁰See Brown's 2015 monograph *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*, Princeton UP, 2015, which contains an extended discussion of the university.

⁸¹This argument runs counter to common narratives of university "decline" that invoke its post-war version as a model to which it should return in funding and ethos, evident in Wendy Brown's text alongside others who call for reinvestment in the public university model of this period. McClanahan's primary critique of this exhortation is that it ignores the economic conditions that made the democratic expansion of the public university possible in the first place, as well as the conditions of crisis that underscore its current fragility. As she explains "When both the US productive economy and wages were growing, as they were during this post-war period, there was little need to emphasize the economic benefits of higher education precisely because they were guaranteed" (515).

and funding along with the student debt mechanism have solidified the aims and values of institutionalized “learning” into curricula infused with human capital logics. Learning becomes synonymous with standardized performance metrics, competitive individualism and institutionalized excellence, and external regimes of productivity. Perhaps this has become so pervasive as to seem an obvious observation to make, yet I parse learning’s mixture for the sake of developing heuristics that clarify the capture of student experience by globalist practices. The second site of the learning paradigm’s unfolding helps us to consider “learning” processually in the constraints of its institutional infrastructure: educational technologies. The next section will examine the curricular application of technology projects, seen as an essential component of the vision expressed in the “learning paradigm,” in part for its key role in transforming institutional infrastructure and in part as a reflexive response to global changes in the conditions of work and management. Indeed, though writing before most of the digital infrastructure currently organizing university environments appeared, Tagg & Tarr always envisioned information and technology to be central to the implementation of this paradigm shift:

The key structure for changing the rest of the system is an institution-wide assessment and information system - an essential structure in the Learning Paradigm, and a key means for getting there. It would provide constant, useful feedback on institutional performance (20).

This scalar vision of data collection in service of the “learning” institution already treats students interchangeably with information, as fodder for efficiency by constant audit. But it does not quite anticipate the manifold positionings and affects vis a vis their learning that ed-tech invites students to inhabit, and the institutional structures its restless and disruptive presence generates.

The Globalism of Ed-Tech

As the previous chapter glossed, there are multiple trends in recent years that have

evidenced a dominant corporate culture of innovation and managerialism in globally competing universities. In the realm of pedagogical theories and education reforms, initiatives for the development of ed-tech have been particularly dominant and unrelenting in administrative and public discourse about higher education since the “MOOC moment” of 2012.⁸² Their dominance is sufficient to normalize diagnoses in the higher ed press that the brick-and-mortar university is now a too-expensive and outdated model to be progressively replaced by virtual global classrooms, personalized learning platforms, and automated instruction. To begin mapping the relationship of ed-tech initiatives to undergraduate curriculum, we might consider how the prominence of this globalist project displaces other projects, as a structural inquiry into what Robert Meister calls the “organic composition of instructional capital,” or “the ratio of enrolment-generated income to instruction-related spending” (“Confronting”). Ed-tech has been expansionary in university infrastructures, especially via the rapid transition to online infrastructures catalyzed by the Covid-19 pandemic, but new system-wide studies have not been conducted yet in either national setting to reflect what has persisted from that period. However, 2016 data in both contexts identifies roughly a third of their respective total student populations as enrolled in at least one fully-online course, and per fall 2019 data,⁸³ 17.5% of US students were studying entirely online, after an enrolment increase of 32% between 2012-2019. These figures only address dedicated online curricula rather than hybrid or blended learning modes, so they provide a useful data point for considering the development of digitalized higher education as part of institutional initiatives to expand their stake in the global educational services export industry (which was the explicit rationale for Global Affairs Canada to commission the national

⁸²Though in general usage, this phrase is typically attributed to a New York Times article from November 2012: <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/04/education/edlife/massive-open-online-courses-are-multiplying-at-a-rapid-pace.html?>

⁸³Source: “Distance Education State Almanac 2019”, *Bayview Analytics*, <https://www.bayviewanalytics.com/distance.html>.

study these numbers are drawn from, the first of its kind⁸⁴). Regardless, the expanding presence of ed-tech initiatives in a range of sites is actively providing rationales for internal revenue extraction such as “the heightened exploitation of enrollment growth” (Meister), especially allocating resources and institutional capital for “unbundling” learning so that discrete “competencies” can be efficiently managed through digital tools like surveillance and data analytics, real time assessment or personalized content delivery, algorithm-based “adaptive” learning software and AI-based tutoring and coaching.

For example: a 2017 study of data from the Delta Cost Project, which tracks how US colleges spend money, shows how ed-tech is a beneficiary from austerity measures targeting instructional spending, such as demands for cost reduction, increased efficiency, heightened productivity and flexibility from faculty, and better delivery of educational goods. In the US, the purported savings afforded from reliance on adjunct instructional labour are actually being used to increase administrative spending, effectively divesting from and disempowering faculty in name of purported “economic concerns” (Jaschik). Spending on instruction (defined as “faculty salaries and benefits, office supplies, the administration of academic departments, and the proportion of faculty salaries going to departmental research and public service” (Jaschik) is classified as distinct from spending on student services and education-related spending on academic and institutional support, which encompasses the administration of student experience and the amenities investment and speculative innovation outlined in the previous chapter. It is in this latter domain -- the growth area of education-related spending on academic and institutional support -- that ed tech is operative and expansionary.

This hierarchy of investment has the effect of elevating ed-tech enterprises to a privileged

⁸⁴Source:

<https://www.tonybates.ca/2016/03/23/a-national-survey-of-university-online-and-distance-learning-in-canada/>.

financial category in the global political economy of higher ed, compatible with the increasingly dominant public-private partnership model in the university's organization. Its imported business norms include the development of "for-profit entities within the organizational structure explicitly designed to create products that will compete with market-based firms" (such as 'unbundled' educational services products unattached or invisibly attached to a traditional institution) and "incentives that motivate academic researchers to partner with firms in ways that seem to reinforce the idea that higher education cannot be trusted to 'innovate' without adopting corporate ideologies" (Cottom et al, "The Ties" 1-2); see, for example, McMaster's high-profile partnership with Microsoft to construct AR delivery systems for Health Sciences instruction. Compared to the synchronous experience of student instruction led by faculty whose labour, for the most part, is resource-intensive and variable according to context in its reproduction or massification,⁸⁵ ed-tech makes for a ready site for financialization as an arm of student services, for it is both rhetorically virtuous and materially labile by promising to serve student learning in more targeted ways and to scale that service. Its growth is presented in service of students— a term that does not fully register the status of worker or the posture of consumer, but some blend of the two that human capital discourse renders rhetorically stable for speculators and investors.

Given ed-tech's currently expanding position within institutional resource economies, its unique suitability for public-private partnerships, and the for-profit OPM and online university market that are organized by the capitalization opportunities financial speculation provides, Meister's summary of the US situation shows how this dynamic has developed:

Just as the era of tax-based federal funding erased the distinction between public

⁸⁵While not my discussion's main focus, it's important to attend to the labour effects of the administrative imposition of ed-tech for instructors. Marc Bousquet's *How the University Works* observes how "management dissemination of technology has been used to surveil, punish, regiment, censor, and control faculty; to direct how they allocate time and effort; to cement administrative control over the curriculum; and to impose supplemental duties, including technological self-education and continuous availability to students and administration via email" (59).

and private, now the era of financialization essentially erases the distinction between public, private, onsite for-profit and MOOC. Instead of the straightforward commodification of higher education, we got a financialized version of it in which, instead of becoming cheaper, the ability of elite universities to raise tuition created spreads that could be used for new financial products to fuel the global market in higher education credentials (“Confronting”).

While credentialing mechanisms have emerged as ed-tech’s most profitable site for innovation, the white collar knowledge work for which universities claim to credentialize students (again, “learning equals earning” (Newfield, *The Great Mistake* 292)) has been subject to a “global wage auction” (Newfield, *The Great Mistake* 295) due to globalized competition and digital Taylorism,⁸⁶ resulting in casualization for knowledge workers who, ironically, have been institutionally groomed for the global economy. Accordingly, amidst constant predictions⁸⁷ that by 2026 the higher education system will be stratified into a handful of elite, four-year institutions and a mass of unbundled online, blended, and short-term credentialing options, it is perhaps easier to explain the model of the Global Freshman Academy opened by Arizona State in 2015 – a freshman-year general education curriculum open to anyone that only charges tuition upon completion – or the April 2017 acquisition and rebranding of online for-profit Kaplan University by Purdue University. Ed-tech, promising widespread and fundamental reorganization of learning delivery systems, offers itself as the leading futurist domain in which to invest in ad-hoc forms of instruction and micro-credentialing that augur the changing landscape of work and its transitional skills for a global economy reliant on flexibilized labour.

In what Chris Newfield calls our “post-public” higher ed landscape, which is shaped by financialization as much as it is by the local and global marketing and revenue of the institutional

⁸⁶ Citing the work of Philip Brown, Hugh Lauder and David Ashton in *The Global Auction*, Newfield describes the 21st century’s digital Taylorism with features including “translating the knowledge work of managers, professionals, and technicians into working knowledge by capturing, codifying, and digitalizing their work in software packages, templates, and prescripts that can be transferred and manipulated by others regardless of location” (294).

⁸⁷ See Pew’s survey of experts on higher ed and the future of work that curates an extensive sampling of such predictions: <http://www.pewinternet.org/2017/05/03/the-future-of-jobs-and-jobs-training/> .

prestige economy, “the value of knowledge is its market value and can be measured as a return on investment...[so] higher education institutions have become reliant on return-on-investment arguments to recruit students” (“University Research”). Ed-tech accordingly provides the rhetorical and material means to claim a visionary promise of returns as itself a “value proposition” after which students as prospective employees should model their own. As this section aims to demonstrate, the framework of ed-tech’s grand reordering potential presented by its storytellers and bolstered by university vision documents is embraced by administrators of institutional austerity as the most attractive investment in globalist education at intimate, institutional, and para-institutional scales. This rhetoric is particularly effective because education reformers have been banking on public preoccupation with educational “choice” and PSE’s economic value while asserting that the traditional university’s bundled credentialing model is failing to prepare students for evolving labour needs and to deliver students a robust ROI for their time and money.⁸⁸ This premise reads the university primarily as a globalized institution looking to sell “information of various kinds” and presupposes the figure of the student consumer looking to access informational goods (such as particular skills, competencies or micro-credentials) for future employment.

Recalling what Paulo Freire termed the “banking model” of education in his foundational work *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (72), this presumption invokes the “instructional paradigm” by recentring content, but also invests less in disciplinary or general knowledge coverage (a common justification for the lecture format’s primacy) than it does in the “digital (and platform) imperatives of scale, efficiency and productivity” (Kim). David Theo Goldberg describes these priorities as evidence of the university’s “uberification” (“Coming to You”), reading the reliance

⁸⁸See the report from investment firm University Ventures on “The Great Unbundling” for an example of this prescriptive analysis: <http://universityventures.com/publications.php?title=the-great-unbundling>.

on data-driven managerial initiatives (in other words, curricula) as a generalizable progression for the university form. Yet these changes are visible as part of the learning paradigm through rhetorical and institutional investments in new evaluative instructional tools, such as learning analytics that constantly measure affective activity and efficiency of the learner's experience, and the morph toward corporate, experiential forms of student participation in online settings as well.⁸⁹ This scalable digital form of university education sustains the fantasy that "information delivery can only get more efficient - can be put on more screens and tracked by more analytics" (Kim), while considerations of curriculum in terms of epistemology, social equity and cultural responsiveness, or differentiated instructional needs rarely feature in this discourse..

Yet another trend in ed-tech follows directly from this logic, which is the Silicon Valley ideology of "personalization" now domesticated in university programmes. This initiative for learning relies on the platform model of education, which hosts educational services products in interface formats ranging from the omnipresent LMS to embedded plagiarism-tracking products like TurnItIn or SafeAssign to comprehensive online course environment software such as via OPMs. This model intensively monitors user activity and proactively shapes digital learning and knowledge forms in order to maintain its innovative edge, per the rationale that

through technology, teaching will become radically individualized as learners' lessons are reduced to the smallest possible piece of content, then presented to them algorithmically. Moreover, per this ideology, without the aid of algorithms and "personalization" technology, human educators and traditional institutions have historically failed to meet the needs of individuals as individuals. The responsibility for education therefore must shift to technology, away from the institution, to the individual, away from the public or civic (Watters).

Personalization, then, not only privileges the individual learner at the expense of a place-based mode of collective learning embodied by the 'brick-and-mortar' tradition of schooling – in its

⁸⁹See, for example, FIU's Global Learning Office's web page providing instructional strategies for applying its GLOs in online contexts, emphasizing connection-making, collaborative teams, and culture-based student representation in classwork. <https://goglobal.fiu.edu/students/online-global-learning/index.html>.

classrooms, seminar rooms, lecture halls – but it also sells this programming in the “moral because marketable” terms of “responsibility” to our new economy. Ed-tech platforms provide curricular “playlists” that minimize specialized instructional labour costs as well as standardize knowledge content, rendering it at times indistinguishable from information and rote interface participation. Per Watters’s summary throughout her work on this movement,⁹⁰ we can trace the turn toward personalization, which has sustained a major discursive uptick since 1995, as performing a salve for the consumer psyche in a time of standardization and mass production.

The shift to technology as guarantor of higher ed named above is also consistent with the “hype cycle” around technology, summarized by Larry Cuban as a “pattern of extreme claims for transformation, and then a kind of bumpy landing and disappointment” (Sax), and bolstered by common sense associations between technological innovation and social goods. This investment in the virtue of technological innovation mirrors how education itself is typically upheld, per the “education gospel” that has enabled globalist institutional projects like ed-tech. This educational genre is aided by online education providers’ micro-targeting practices now common in data-driven digital marketing, and shored up by the entanglement of human capital rationales for higher ed with identity formation (*Lower Ed* 11) therein, as the next chapter maps. The entanglement of these infrastructural features – techno-social innovation, higher ed’s moral standing as ostensible job creator for the global economy, and “personalized” market capture – comprise one of university globalism’s sites as a public pedagogy of connectivity.

In the increasingly techno-pessimistic present at the time of writing, empirical data has emerged to counter ed-tech’s claims about the potential of its initiatives to expand educational access, measurably improve learning, and cut costs in the practical context of their operation.

⁹⁰See “Teaching Machines, or How the Automation of Education Became ‘Personalized Learning’”, which includes a chart containing the NGram data on the timeline of this discourse’s prevalence: <http://hackededucation.com/2018/04/26/cuny-gc>.

There are some significant limitations in these data, such as ed-tech platforms collecting their own data, or failing to, especially race and ethnicity information about their matriculants (Newfield *The Great Mistake* 246). Nevertheless it has become clear that the transformational promise of digitalized PSE, from the scalar form of the MOOC to the algorithmic personalization of curriculum for the individual learner, has so far failed to substantially materialize for students. This impact has been particularly lacking for the goal of serving socioeconomically diverse students,⁹¹ or those most in need of access and success – arguably the ideal subjects for the utopian vision of free mass education through which MOOCs secured their original venture capital and institutional backing. Newfield's *The Great Mistake*, among other studies, outlines discouraging or mixed aggregate results for MOOCs for each of its promised improvements, with the exception of learning scenarios that follow the “blended” model: “blending online technology with personal contact was, ironically, the only real source of online advantage” (243). This model heavily involves relationship-based embodied instructional support of the online content delivery, so requires both the high start-up costs of embedding instructional technology as well as the ongoing costs of paying for faculty labour and facilities maintenance, or an investment in labour and resource intensity that runs counter to university globalism.

Instead, degraded versions of blended learning are now in popular use as digital infrastructures for coursework have become more widely instituted. Common forms include the combined synchronous and asynchronous course model where class meetings are optional and engagement is relegated to mandatory discussion board posts, or an andragogic model via LMSs that host canned lecture content from faculty and optional online or in-person coaching from a non-instructor for assessments. These instructional forms reflect the political economy of

⁹¹For demographic analysis of this data, see Chris Newfield's close reading of online learning in the UC and CSU system from 2018 here: <http://utotherescue.blogspot.com/2018/01/online-and-color-line.html>.

privatization at work, in which “university administrations that would not spend money on face-to-face improvements like small discussion sections *would* spend money for access to technology from a prestigious outside vendor” (Newfield *The Great Mistake* 245). Experiences of and literacy in the data extraction and management built into ed-tech have thus become more widespread among instructors and students, as “Big Tech”’s capitalist practices. These forms of student experience management visibly rely on surveillance-based evaluation and optimization of student affect and activity while in course platforms, or what ed-tech critics refer to as “cop shit” (Moro) in online classwork. These aspects of ed-tech represent student encounters with and management by the logic of datafication, in which their experiences in class become behaviorist metrics for institutional information management. The forcible transition to online learning as part of pandemic operational continuity also prompted widespread awareness of the limits of a student engagement model in digital environments, especially when not accompanied by resources toward equitable access or less standardized instructional delivery at scale.

Despite this, ed-tech ventures continue to rely on globalist discourses that center the affordances of an educational mode based in figures and experiences of connectivity. Consider again the Coursera webcast on online critical thinking instruction “beyond content delivery” that opened the previous chapter. Beyond his more general characterization of instruction in a MOOC as “giving [students] the opportunity to upload their experience in a context of learning” (00:35:29 - 00:35:33), Roth cites a discussion board comment from a student – “this course is opening the world to me” (00:37:05 - 00:37:07) – as validation for his belief that MOOCs can (and should) teach “absorptive thinking in things that set you free” (00:37:56 - 00:38:00). Transparently, this student feedback and Roth’s interpretation of it represent a globalist desire for expanding, unbridled connection. This pro-social expression of enthusiastic student engagement

is often seen to be lacking in anecdotal data from face-to-face classroom practitioners. Yet his summary description that “students demand a context in which to experience the joy of thinking otherwise in the company of others” (00:40:56 - 00:41:04) clarifies the romantic terms applied here to the online learning experience. These terms echo a manufactured common sense about interfaces as “autonomous zones of activity” (Galloway vii) and a site of “ludic capitalism,” “in which flexibility, play, creativity, and immaterial labour ... have taken over from the old concepts of discipline, hierarchy, bureaucracy, and muscle” (Galloway 27). A version of this “play” is invoked in LMSs as social and informational learning apparatuses, such as in the exhortations for students to explore themselves and self-document through the learning portfolio interface PebblePad integrated into McMaster’s LMS Avenue to Learn. Here the classroom is cast as an interface for the capture of student desire rather than student data, labour and management, reflecting the wider infrastructure of successful social capture by digital platforms. Such platform infrastructures remain socially durable despite increasing disaffection with their utility: as McMillan Cottom outlines,

Platform capitalism owes much of its dominance to how good it feels to be captured by the platform. ... The desire for status, belonging, sexual satisfaction — platform capitalism has efficiently monetized all of our basic human desires by capturing both space and place. ... ideologies like “hustling” and “entrepreneur” mobilize our libidinal energy. In schooling, “personalized learning” and “fast degrees” animate our desire for social status while obscuring the risk of pursuing it (“Where Platform Capitalism” 6).

The figure of the interface helps to query the relationship between the idea of “uploading experience” in an online, disembodied learning environment and the effect of curriculum — that Deweyan site of “experience” — in embodied participation in a classroom environment. Benjamin Bratton’s *The Stack* defines interfaces with a social infrastructural lens, highlighting how “an interface necessarily limits the full range of possible interactions in a specific and arbitrary way”

(221). This coercive quality of the interface, which Bratton argues “must eliminate or make invisible a whole range of other equally valid possible interactions,” is also what makes it possible for the user to “narrativize the meaning of possible actions” (219) they might take. When applied in PSE settings, this understanding of interface agency suggests a kind of micro-*Bildung* mode of learning miniaturizing what was associated with the cosmopolitan vision of the 19th-century Humboldtian university. Students in Michael Roth’s MOOC, for e.g., clearly did have individual desires to find an interface in which to upload their mediated experience, a desire shaped by the identification with an educational environment that is encouraged by institutional branding and affiliation with prestige. Their social positioning perhaps overlaps with the interface’s social design, as instances of the subject of ed-tech and alternative credentialing literature who McMillan Cottom has characterized as the “roaming autodidact”:

a self-motivated, able learner that is simultaneously embedded in technocratic futures and disembedded from place, culture, history, and markets. The roaming autodidact is almost always conceived as western, white, educated and male. As a result of designing for the roaming autodidact, we end up with a platform that understands learners as white and male, measuring learners’ task efficiencies against an unarticulated norm of western male whiteness. It is not an affirmative exclusion of poor students or bilingual learners or black students or older students, but it need not be affirmative to be effective (“Intersectionality” 8).

The roaming autodidact ideal clarifies how these characterizations of the ed-tech interface assume a facile contiguity between the modes of digital sociability in everyday internet use and the social orientation and relationship to digital objects undertaken by the student qua student within a system of formal assessment. Ed-tech also exhibits a tendency to assume a generalization of digital literacies,⁹² which are in fact still patterned by the institutional bigotry, exclusions and uneven development structured into global capitalism. Further, this discourse also

⁹²Digital education specialists have suggested “digital literacy”’s definition as “the capabilities which fit someone for living, learning and working in a digital society.” Source: <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/guides/developing-students-digital-literacy>.

ignores the implications of equating learning experience with personal exploration in the wider infrastructure of marketized information that constantly mines psychometric, consumer choice and usage data to seek opportunities to extract value and revenue. Chris Gilliard, who suggests that the only internet most students know is the marketized web of platforms, algorithmic personalization, clickbait and filter bubbles, argues that ed-tech infrastructure uses strategies consistent with the phenomenon of digital redlining, or “the creation and maintenance of technological policies, practices, pedagogy, and investment decisions that enforce class boundaries and discriminate against specific groups” (64). These include surveillance, data mining, tracking, browser fingerprinting, and data monetization as the strategies of surveillance capitalism that “colleges and universities rush to mimic...in order to improve retention” (Gilliard 64). Student experience thus may be already structured by the racism of algorithms (when, say, the use of a particular, situated machine might affect Google results) or by differential institutional access to academic research, rather than by a “libertarian mode of critical thinking” (la paperson 36) and professional desire that an interface’s promotion and design may advertise.

Accordingly, the student imagined as the user of these interfaces is shaped by, I argue, a kind of cosmopolitan assumption embedded into ed-tech expansionism that also hollows out instructional investments in critical and contextual forms of learning and knowing. This assumption can be traced back to the learning theory out of which MOOCs originated, connectivism, as founded in 2004 by Canadian ed-technologists George Siemens and Stephen Downes alongside their 2008 experimental “cMOOC.” Privileging a decentralized, distributed model of knowledge work, connectivism rejects the adequacy of behaviorist, cognitivist and constructivist theories of learning as too formalized and individualized for the speed and shelflife of knowledge mediated by information technologies. Instead, they argue that knowledge resides

in its circulation in a social-informational field and its manipulation by “non-human appliances” (Siemens), and that learning transpires by navigating connections:

Learning occurs through the construction and traversing of networks. Participation in network activities results in the creation, removal or adjustment in strength of connections. It is recognition of the salience of patterns by perceivers in the network which constitutes learning. These connections emerge collectively outside the brain through interaction and within the brains of individuals...In connectivism there is no real concept of transferring knowledge, making knowledge, or building knowledge. Instead it emerges from the connections that are formed during network activity (Goldie 1065).

The appropriation of this experimental model for learning by platform capitalism makes some sense, as it reproduces functional social proximity across social contexts by interlacing the paradigm of experience with globalist information management, instead of through place-based institutionality. Institutionalized connectivism thus relies on globalism’s “tighter integration of social institutions” (with platforms or interfaces as examples of this) alongside “the integration of individual and collective actions into the way that institutions actually work” (Tomlinson 24). As envisioned in the learning paradigm decades ago, the learner is therefore positioned as institutionalist, skilled in pragmatic flexibility, navigation, rapid adaptation or epistemological adjustment, and poised for success in the corporate paradigm of just-in-time skilling, lifelong learning, micro-credentialing and “badging” that reconfigures and casualizes knowledge work in keeping with the labour needs and microdynamics of the global knowledge economy. In its prescription of learning, platform-based connectivism presents a *Bildung* for the fungible cosmopolitan knowledge worker who can scavenge for and evaluate information in the technologized landscape of global capitalism while also reifying its infrastructure.

Implicit in this portrait of the online student are shared norms with the traditional student marketed to by higher education more generally, the recent high school graduate who has been competitively preparing for college-level coursework through their well-resourced K-12

schooling alongside extramural training via private tutors, test prep, and college application consultants. Or, with the international student equivalent built upon the imported curricula of local international schools, bespoke private education, skilling in multicultural teamwork and normative participation alongside ESL, etc. These norms reflect what McMillan Cottom calls the material and cultural resources that provide students with “a fairly good cognitive map of the institutional prestige that defines U.S. higher education” (“Intersectionality” 22) and the upper echelon of the Canadian university system as well. Thus, as descriptive lens for ed-tech infrastructures, connectivist interfaces reveal how, as critical digital pedagogy scholars aver, “digital education oftentimes reproduces neoliberal citizen subjectivities that are functionally aligned with the requirements of digital capitalism” (Emejulu and McGregor 8).

This “roaming autodidact” or lifelong online learner also reflects a false normative assumption about the generalization and globalization of personalized computing tech that elides questions of class, race, and uneven access and literacy (re)produced by algorithms as well as by historical structural inequalities. It also does not much account for the mature student who already has a BA and has enrolled for personal rather than career development or for a mid-career skills upgrade sought during their unwaged hours (the most common type of student enrolled in MOOCs (Sparke)). Neither does this ideal account for the under-resourced student who most often ends up in for-profit online courses and with their accompanying student debt, seeking the most expedient path to employability among bad options while typically impaired by a lower level of institutional literacy. A June 2017 report by the Brookings Institute on online learning outcomes at for-profit DeVry University (the first study of its kind) found that online learning particularly disadvantages low-performing students who are considered “at-risk” and “underprepared” for higher education (Bettinger and Loeb), a structural condition McMillan

Cottom documents throughout *Lower Ed* as a product of lack of mobility, impoverished or absent institutional and social resources, and other effects of race, class, gender and work conditions in American society. Nor does the rural student for whom online courses are an educational lifeline figure into this image, who may also necessitate an equity framework for online instructional resources, such as with many “distance-education” webcast courses in Canadian PSE accessed by youth who may be Indigenous, working-class, and/or situated in sparsely populated areas.

These distinctions between the situation of possible users of digital education environments matter because online learning interfaces are largely not tailored according to learning needs or equity and relational support based on social facts about student users, but are generally standardized in their design and local implementation.⁹³ Yet the assumed form of the “roaming auto-didact” and its prescriptive relation to technologized knowledge does map onto another observed phenomenon in the sociality and new media literacies of students, who harvest information from their social networks as regularly, if not more so, than they do resources considered to be proper objects of knowledge in an academic or intellectual property paradigm. Absent from this reflex to seek information from a known social field is an awareness of the expectation that knowledge applied in an educational setting should be individual and proprietary, or an instinct for archival or scholarly inquiry and citation-based research unless specified as a course requirement. Some students appear to assume surface contiguity between the content of their curricular environments and their immediate, networked social field, a field that is most likely to algorithmically reinforce existing social arrangements rather than reorder or expand them. Yet this student behavior also displays a functionalist approach to learning, as if it

⁹³Although there is potential for the design and use of learning interfaces to integrate differentiation into their infrastructures (a praxis that a small network of critical digital pedagogy scholars and practitioners are working to develop and promote), the only considerations of differentiation currently pursued at any scale work through algorithm-based real-time curricular adjustment, which does little to address any of the structural issues raised here.

only makes sense to inhabit curricular experience with the efficacy of an institutionalist, without expectation that it might be individually personalized, sentimental or deeply determining for one's epistemic positioning, potential pedagogical relationships, or projects of critique. This comparatively unromantic relationship to the educational affordances of the connective interface suggests a different posture than the desirous subject who realized they'd been isolated from the world without the context of online educational experience. Both postures toward interfaces in a setting of educational engagement suggest subjectivities knowingly mobilized in alignment with and/or with canny perception of ed-tech's projects rather than in excess of or resistance to them, which helps to reproduce the industry's self-reinforcing positions of "better serving student needs" through disruption of traditional learning approaches and data marketization.

What emerges from these various expressions of the globalism of ed-tech is a context – which may be functionalist in navigating connectivity, or shaped by individual desires for a concerted project of global connection, or neither – in which to understand the digital elements now commonly present in syllabi and curriculum. This reading of digitalized mechanisms for learning does not mean to presuppose their effective function in the syllabus or the sociality of the classroom. Instead, I aim to acknowledge their material effects and the ideological aura that surrounds them institutionally in order to consider how their presence might impact embodied classroom experience and the production of knowledge under a global frame therein.

Knowledge in a Marketized Global Landscape

In his work on media and infrastructure theory *The Marvellous Clouds*, John Durham Peters opens with the suggestion that "ubiquitous computing invites us to turn from the urgency of the message to the nature of media" (8). Curriculum delivery is a particularly rich mediating

site for tracing the effects of university globalism as an assemblage of marketized forms of knowledge. It exhibits the tendencies Caroline Levine invites formalist readers of infrastructure to consider, wherein “different arrangements can collide to strange effect, with minor forms sometimes disrupting or rerouting major ones” (*Forms* 17). Curriculum’s organization of knowledge also marks what I would argue is one major effect of globalist pedagogy in undergraduate curricula, that I will be turning to in the remaining chapters, in which the disciplinary cultivation of ideology critique becomes absorbed into a wider institutional culture of entrepreneurial self-management, particularly in the figure of the global citizen. Yet at the same time as global knowledge is shaped by intellectual property regimes, by institutionalized archives of history and thought, and by the administrative curation of both into curricular forms, what is understood and accessed as “global” in the wider public sphere is continually reshaped by the politics of media and informatic personhood, as well as by platform infrastructures in which information encounters are personalized and marketized to prey upon the sets of feelings and social presuppositions that might maximize affective activity and platform use. The student, we might generally assume, relies on the contemporary utility that is digital and networked life (at the least as a necessary component of study) and therefore is a participant in this new hermeneutical circle, as circumscribed by the collection of psychometric data under platform capitalism. Accordingly, it is useful to consider how digitalized experience and the “attention economy” potentially skew global knowledge in a way that may be against the public globalist projects of the university or the countercultural projects of its particular disciplines. These ambient encounters with global knowledge in a variety of online social interfaces may shape how students enter and experience a global curricular framework, which should therefore necessitate a reflexive approach to any global knowledge framework that a syllabus might pursue.

Additionally, as the financial sector has replaced traditional production as the primary site of global capital extraction, Chris Nealon and Joshua Clover argue the production of “social” value has been recharacterized as well,

given that finance made profits... via a series of enchained beliefs about the future value of commodities, beliefs themselves produced and propagated by communicative or discursive practices, emphasizing the idea that information itself was able to generate new value (10).

Attendant upon this globalized extraction of value from information and the social practices producing and reproducing it has been a kind of knowledge inundation that dramatically shortens the life of knowledge, subsequently giving rise to the constant evaluation and management of knowledge by institutions, platforms, and financial managers, including in the domain of education. This curricular entanglement helps to fuel the administrative literature in which liberal humanist reform is sincerely contiguous with capitalist management and innovation. Surveys of employers accordingly reveal that the most essential skills new employees could bring to the workplace are not STEM training in quantitative literacy or computing (though these remain valuable), but those social qualities that are cultivated in the humanities and social sciences: communication skills, cultural fluency, critical thinking, imaginative and ‘out-of-the-box’ innovation, etc. Not incidentally, these are also frequently cited as core skills for global learning in the US and Canada, as the next chapter will demonstrate.

How embedded are these assumptions about the value of knowledge in a globalist framework for teaching and learning, and how does marketized knowledge recharacterize the potential for critical global pedagogy? And, how might knowledge objects circulate in this marketized framework in ways that are at odds with or threatening to the cultural and political projects of the disciplines, or even those of the university itself, given the postdisciplinary environment institutions are developing? In “The Interdisciplinary Fallacy”, Jonathan Kramnick

outlines this tendency as one in which “flexible, open-ended gatherings [are] defined in relation to an evolving market: students and the problem-having, challenge-posing world in which they live. The interdisciplinary ideal is of a cluster that might take shape on a given problem or challenge while sharing temporary space on a hiring plan...and eventually disappear” (73-4).

This is certainly one way to describe the coincidence between the rise of interdisciplinary studies forms, such as the research centre or cluster, the working group, the new undergraduate major or minor, and the globalist branding of the value of particular educational projects. The degree to which the knowledge situated in global studies programming represents “hybridizations of pure academic disciplinarity and vocational knowledges,” as Simon During defines the postdiscipline (“Postdisciplinarity”), will be a primary concern in the next chapter on the programming of global experience through curriculum. This discussion will proceed through a survey of global education policy and common forms of global programming at the bachelors degree level in both national contexts. The above discussions of global learning, interfaces, and knowledge will extend throughout this next section on the narrative information global education encompasses and reproduces, tracing their mixture and entanglement and considering the ways in which curricula can be read in analogy with interfaces as “tools for remapping what they map,... their alternate geographies overlap[ping] and juxtapose[d]” (Bratton 219).

CHAPTER 3: PROGRAMMING GLOBAL EXPERIENCE

In a conversation between theorists of cosmopolitanism and postcoloniality Kwame Anthony Appiah and Homi Bhabha published in Spring 2018, Bhabha asks, “What are the theoretical concerns or programmatic requirements that have to be met in titling a course ‘global?’ What is the frame of reference that achieves the global gold standard? Is the ‘global’ a means to knowledge or a measure of its scale?” (184). These queries are part of a discussion about a course that Appiah is teaching on “comparative normative traditions— Confucian, Muslim, liberal.” Appiah’s response is to immediately distinguish his course’s comparative, dialogic mode from the aims of one with a “global” framework:

You might think that if you start talking about the global, it is because you’re looking for a consensus, or a solution, or a shared something or other. This course is not about that; it’s saying, these are powerful ways of thinking about the world from different places, but you cannot turn them into one picture (184).

The invocation of “global” here is characteristic for a discussion of global programming because it is prompted by the taxonomic habits of the contemporary university, as administrative impulses arguably shaped by the pseudo-universalism of a white-dominated world imaginary. Would Appiah’s be promoted as a global course? Is such a designation pedagogically desirable?

While university webpages with some loose definitions or association of concepts and objectives that delineate what makes their programming global in character are abundant, the fact that these questions are so readily generated without obvious answers indicates that the curricular usage of “global” remains glib, mutable, or ill-defined. Bhabha and Appiah’s ruminations above also present good substance with which to begin drawing out what curricular experiences a global banner assigns: the global understood as a set of theoretical concerns about lived worlds and their interconnection and interdependence; a particular aggregate of administrative units of

learning or skilling; a problem of scale; a means to a specific type of knowledge; a picture of the world; or a descriptor for something universally shared or experienced therein. All of these considerations are at play in what I've been calling global study as organized by PSE.

Accordingly, this chapter aims to extend and contextualize these possible indices while exploring global framing in broader, formal terms: if curriculum is generally defined as educational experience, what are the epistemological, affective, and managerial contours of “global” experience for undergraduates in the US and Canada?

What follows will focus on the form that globalism takes in the frameworks of knowledge in undergraduate curriculum, most easily (though not exclusively) located through its assignment to a “global” framing in curricular programming. The “global” modifier is invoked variously to recast and remix existing disciplinary projects, such as in global cultural studies, global literature, or in the multidisciplinary project of global studies itself. While these designations are not insignificant to how students might encounter or enter global study, this chapter aims to explore what kinds of narratives of cultural production and political economy are reproduced in the name of the global, as well as to collate the kinds of norms and skills that appear to name the cosmopolitan project of “global citizenship” that dominates the paradigm of global studies. Across curricular sites, variations on pedagogy that promotes globalism as connectivity, aspirationally and normatively aligned with technocratic institutionalism, take form in the terms of student transformation, “inclusive excellence,” and what I read as global functional literacy for the lifelong worker in training.

Much like the paradigm shift toward “learning” in Chapter 2 as the increasingly normative ground from which institutional discourse around instruction begins, the “global” label has become immeasurably integrated in the rhetoric of contemporary PSE. These diffuse

uses of “global” in marketing and programming materials map onto an assemblage of referents, some of which do not directly file under a “global” heading. This is particularly true within the study of cultural objects and processes, where alternate banners such as “world,” “postcolonial,” “transnational,” “diasporic,” “cosmopolitan,” “planetary,” “Anthropocene” and “decolonial” both collide with and potentially unfold from “global” in the narrative data of syllabi and its corresponding discourses in scholarly writing and research. “Global” is also operative in the broad absorption of interdisciplinary or postdisciplinary elements into disciplinary sites of study with a global backdrop. These elements are shared with the disciplinary mixture of sociology, anthropology, political theory and science, media and performance studies, public health, history, environmental studies, literature, economics, law and human geography that tends to comprise global studies when instituted as a dedicated major or a designation for course listings.

Accordingly, one project of this chapter is to parse how global study is shaped by university globalism in terms of what Christopher Leigh Connery has called a “field imaginary”:

the term field imaginary describes the ways in which a given discipline or scholarly field sets its own boundaries— boundaries which it frequently considers to be natural or self-evident. These boundaries are often geographical, but can also be temporal, generic, or conceptual (1).

Global study has multiple locations and potential genealogies in the curricular organization of US and Canadian PSE, some of which are more obviously market-based and others of which are sites of epistemological dissensus. So, analysis of its curriculum can’t be delimited to a single “field,” despite my focus on the study of cultural processes and objects. Because global study remains a partial, specialized emphasis within departments centered on the study of culture,⁹⁴ or globality a diffuse backdrop that informs more focused inquiries therein, such a field imaginary

⁹⁴The reverse is arguably true as well: the study of culture and cultural objects is a partial, specialized site within global studies curricula, such that aesthetics is largely unrecognized as a method required by comparative and cartographic modes of studying globality. This thesis hopes to provide a corrective to this thin site of overlap by elaborating global study in terms of aesthetic production, as posited by the methods of critical geography.

is perhaps best seen not as a form but a formation connecting disparate scenes of pedagogy in excess of disciplinary boundaries (and, in some cases, contesting their necessity).

In order to synthesize this loose imaginative framework, I attend to its manifestations across disciplinary sites, beginning with an overview of global studies as an interdisciplinary container for a range of globalist projects, visible in common programming genres. Following this, I examine global programming's culturalist strand and undergraduate cultural training in sentimental globalism that extends from the Cold War to the connectivity era via discussion of liberal education, institutional learning objectives and digital cultural infrastructure. Next, I diagram broader, supra-institutional frameworks for global citizenship education (GCE), and then map the pedagogical function of culture for the global knowledge economy as imagined by GCE programming. To locate global citizenship's curricular infrastructure in its institutionalist strand, I draw upon a selection of policy documents and education and cultural policy history in dialogue with university globalism. Finally, I consider the epistemic infrastructure for global study visible in disciplinary and cultural frameworks alongside institutional conditions for knowledge production. This exercise of surveying curriculum affords a range of observations on general trends and praxis but primarily organizes an archive of the institutional imaginary that "global" performs and the situation of critical pedagogy therein.

Curriculum's Globalist Framings

The "global turn" is the subject of a wide range of scholarly and pedagogical projects, so there are many possibilities for thinking about curriculum as global in some fundamental sense. For example, we might start by examining the tentacular effects of the aforementioned entrepreneurial centre model as a minor institutional form shaped by global markets. Take the

example of the University of Toronto's Munk School of Global Affairs and Public Policy. Via a cost-sharing arrangement with Ontario and federal governments, Canadian businessman Peter Munk's founding of the school with a \$35 million donation (or \$19 million per accompanying tax break) afforded him authority to withdraw funding support if he deems the school is not meeting donor-defined objectives (Brownlee 135-6). This oversight extends to undergraduate programming including the "Munk One" programme open to all undergraduates in UofT's Faculty of Arts & Sciences, involving seminars focused on case studies and a placement in a global affairs policy lab. Explicitly in its description,⁹⁵ the programme represents a curricular experience that does not differ much from work placement in a consultancy or a thinktank with their accompanying purposes of profit-seeking through innovation or advocacy. The School's framing of "global affairs" is thus consistent with John Patrick Leary's characterization of innovation as a replacement for the development paradigm, operating as "a pessimistic ideal of social change" and powered by a post-humanitarian "belief, not only in technology and its benevolence, but in a vision of the innovator: the autonomous visionary whose creativity allows him to anticipate and shape capitalist markets." This global development by innovation mode is generally programmed in universities via promoted "co-curricular" experiences. Such labels mask the character of work experiences as study for the benefit of individual students rather than as labour for the university and its partners. While entrepreneurial centres generally contain versions of this dynamic, university globalism registers as undergraduate pedagogy in Munk One's self-renewing terms for "tackling global problems" through "work[ing] in teams to solve

⁹⁵The full description from the School's undergraduate programming web page reads as follows: "Think big. Work in teams to solve real world problems. Innovate. Munk One provides students with a focus on innovation and global problem-solving. Through case studies of complex challenges worldwide, Munk One students identify innovations that succeed, how successful innovation can be fostered, and why innovative solutions sometimes fail to address global problems. Beyond the classroom, you are placed in cutting-edge global affairs policy labs that are tackling real-world problems." Source: <https://munkschool.utoronto.ca/student-programs/>.

real world problems” and identifying “how successful innovation can be fostered.”

Alternatively, we might locate globalist programming in a summer 2018 scandal involving Purdue University Global.⁹⁶ Mentioned in the previous chapter, the programme is the product of a merger between Indiana’s not-for-profit public research Purdue University and for-profit online ed giant Kaplan University, and represents an instance of the “mega-university” form that enabled an expansionary infrastructure for ed tech and Kaplan’s programmes to grow as Purdue’s “Global” territory. A non-disclosure agreement required of faculty per the merger was leaked online, exposing how the university had been designated as the arbiter of IP rights to course materials created by faculty for their online platform by citing their presence on their LMS as grounds for considering them “trade secrets” collectively produced by their employees. (Of course, nearly all curricular materials would be hosted through a designated interface for online degree programmes like this one.) Purdue rescinded the NDA policy after public backlash over faculty and curricular interference, stating it was inherited from Kaplan as common corporate practice. Such policies are presumably in place to ensure global competitiveness and profitability in an increasingly crowded global education services export industry. This incident represents one example of the risk to faculty autonomy over curriculum that is a product of PSE’s corporatization and the race for global market capture through online learning. Consistent with the projects of ed-tech, the “Global” in the Purdue programme signals an infrastructure for accelerating managerialism and the unbundling of curricular experience as readily as it does the marketed promise of virtual citizenship with a world reach or global base of students.

The interests and conflicts present in both of these examples represent curricular effects of a framework for knowledge that is global in the most presentist and instrumentalist sense.

⁹⁶See the following reporting on these developments in 2018:
<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/08/23/aaup-purdue-global-gets-decide-who-owns-faculty-work>
; <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/09/07/purdue-global-axes-faculty-confidentiality-agreement>.

From a more generalist perspective, literature on the histories of global rationales for curriculum varies widely, somewhat dependent on national context but especially dependent on which rhetorical indices (“international,” “intercultural,” “transnational,” “study abroad,” “world,” “postcolonial” &c) are taken as fundamental to the genealogy of contemporary global education. Accordingly, synoptic texts on global studies, such as Hilary Kahn’s *Framing the Global* (2014), Manfred Steger’s *The Global Studies Reader* (2014), and Eve Darian-Smith and Phillip McCarty’s *The Global Turn* (2017), begin with a characteristic disclaimer that there is no consensus definition or knowledge project that has organized institutionalized global study, before each providing their own. This muddled trajectory includes a wide range of formal elements through which curricular substance performs its globality in and across each national institutional context. These could be found: in the domains of disciplinary scholarship and, quite separately, education scholarship; in the policy literature on contemporary education produced by global governance institutions such as the UN or human rights advocacy organizations like Oxfam, as well as in reports produced by national education-focused associations or institutions; in the narrative data and frameworks of syllabi created and curated by instructor expertise and scholarship; and in the aesthetic and epistemological projects of the objects of study themselves. That it is difficult to hierarchize and consolidate these inputs into a clear narrative or genealogy, particularly in a time when the translation of pedagogical expertise into classroom instruction is continually eroded by casualized labour conditions, motivates this chapter’s effort to collate patterns in curricular materials, with each of these inputs in play.

Another motivation is an acknowledged gap in administrative knowledge and literature regarding what global study actually means in practice. Descriptions of commitments to global education tend to focus on the globalized context in which institutions must operate, and the

values and rationales that therefore undergird GL's importance. For example, the Canadian system initially "perceive[d] itself thrust into change", with the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada announcing systemic shifts toward internationalization in 1995 via an "unprecedented level and depth of global interaction in all domains -- economic, political, and cultural' that alters the way we do business in the 'new global context'" (Brigham). Though this posture evolved into more open reflexivity to global changes, particularly in terms of national economic interest, "conceptual confusion" persists due to "key gaps in Canadian research on internationalization [including]... little attention to curriculum; and almost none related to pedagogy" (Beck 136). The US context is similar in its confusion. Susan Albertine, for example, as a senior scholar in the Office of Integrative Liberal Learning and the Global Commons at the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U), stated in an opening address to the 2014 AAC&U Global Learning in College Conference, "We have raised the theme of global learning and devoted resources to this series of conferences not because we think we know so well what global learning in college means. We genuinely don't..." (Landorf et al, *Making Global Learning Universal*, 7). The AAC&U's 2018 issue of *Peer Review* focused on "Global Learning: Crossing Majors, Borders and Backyards" and featured an essay on the future of global learning by Larry Braskamp, President of the Global Perspective Institute, which authors an array of institutional assessment mechanisms to measure and informatize the global knowledge of undergraduates. With a distinctively more sinister imperative than the value-in-diversity rationale commonly cited in Canadian PSE, Braskamp reads the US PSE landscape from the premise that "many universities that began as land-grant universities are now world-grant universities" (31). As outlined in Chapter 1, this is an imperial posture toward a worldwide market, yet here also performs the kind of vaguely universalist "world" rendered by

the globalist connectivity that these institutions promote, enable and manage. Such granting of a world extending from a university charges an elite social sphere with uncontradictory prosocial assumptions— a cosmopolitanizing force, capable of swallowing all difference.

I rehearse this set of propositions from parainstitutions that act upon institutional cultures for its representivity: national professional associations that produce or sponsor periodic reports, policy briefs, assessment tools, and journal issues provide the basis for localized initiatives by driving the discursive parameters used in their rationales. These associations are entangled with administrative practice and in dialogue with education scholarship as well as governmental or supranational organizations, ensuring that normative and mimetic institutional isomorphism plays out in globalist discourse despite uneven access and resources across contexts. This relationship is well-established and studied in the fields of educational and cultural policy and curriculum studies, given the interplay between international governmental organizations, supranational organizations, and national administrative and lobbying associations that “foster[s] a world culture of education even while emphasizing its different aspects” (Lyons 98). Just as with the revaluation of learning in OECD and UNESCO’s serial publications on “lifelong learning,” UNESCO, UNICEF, and Oxfam are cited in this literature as leaders in establishing norms for PSE policy on global education (and all other levels of schooling that share networks with universities).⁹⁷ Their publications are also cited directly in government policy, university administration, and promotional literature about GL. To take a representative Canadian example, Ontario Ministry of Education’s 2018 report on its global education strategies establishes the centrality of priorities named by the UN’s SDG Framework (2015-2030) for conceptualizing this

⁹⁷See Guimaraes-Iosif, “Rethinking Citizenship Education in Higher Education Institutions,” *Global Citizenship Education in Postsecondary Institutions*, Peter Lang, 2011; and Martens, Rusconi & Leuze, *New Arenas of Education Governance: The Impact of International Organizations and Markets on Educational Policy Making*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

programming, citing “global citizenship education and sustainable development education” as also used interchangeably with global education (Manion and Weber 5).

Since 2012, UNESCO has promoted GCE in education systems around the world as a target for its SDGs, arguing their realization will be in part developed

through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development (target 4.7, cited Manion and Weber 5).

This chapter examines how this programme sets institutionalist terms for student development and moral sensibility that center culture. Shaping some of GL's field imaginary, UNESCO's conception of GCE is anti-political, defined against other pedagogical projects of “questioning the macro-social, structural or political contexts that frame an individual's ability to enjoy and exercise their rights” by instead “developing individuals' knowledge, skills, attitudes and values” (“Global Citizenship Education” 7).

Because a focus on individualized knowledge is the infrastructural default for administered learning, the diffusion of GCE into global programming in US and Canadian higher ed is widespread, yet mixed with other kinds of academic and critical knowledge projects. Beyond the two curricular sites discussed above, across most global programming, common core curriculum includes a combination of surveying approaches to major global themes via content-delivery pedagogy on the processes, problems and debates that attend upon a global framing, in tandem with learning-centric educational approaches, digital environments or applications, and individual or team projects. Substantively speaking, what is global education in academic programmes? While inclusive of GCE, discussed below as an updated form of sentimental globalism, a survey of global programming across university webpages reveals critical objectives and objectives of transformation for learning, overlapping with or recouped by

visions for graduates in terms of global citizenship. This admixture suggests moral dispositions for students in an inheritance from liberal arts education, as I will discuss. But genres for student learning in globalist academic programmes also appropriate critical pedagogy's imperatives of Freirian anti-oppression *conscientization* into institutional infrastructures oriented toward globalist reproduction. If we take critical pedagogy broadly to mean a social vision combined with instructional practices toward "dialogical pedagogy or liberatory learning" (Gore 43) and "transformative social justice learning" (Torres) that center relations of power in a settler context, then we can locate its mutation into institutionalist discourses of self-transformation, social awareness, multicultural dialogue and teamwork, and corporate humanitarianism.

Critical approaches to global study tend to focus on particular scales, sites or existing connections in our social infrastructure and aim to broaden, deepen or interrogate civic knowledge of geohistory and present-day global entanglements or conditions. For example, "grounded global studies" (5), as Hilary Kahn updates Anthropology, Sociology and Geography with a global framework, takes up the global's permissiveness toward an evaluative, ranging mode of reading across scales yet focuses in a particular region or set of local phenomena, suggesting continuities for the imperialist projects these disciplines have historically served. This "grounded" GL can take experiential forms, such as in the Border Studies programme at Indiana's Earlham College, which offers "immersion-based global studies" through an internalized study-abroad programme set in "the southern Arizona borderlands" rather than the far closer, albeit less racialized (thus, less global?) US-Canadian border. The study of borders, immigration, and citizenship is an instance of this "grounded" approach, versions of which exist at institutions located along national borders as well as at many that are not, and may or may not invoke globality.⁹⁸ For those with a global framework, the content knowledge of such

⁹⁸For example, Arizona State University houses a School of Transborder Studies that invokes a framework of

programmes could set up comparative cultural frameworks (like Appiah's) rather than a synthesis of variously scaled phenomena and universals, yet more common is the invocation of a backdrop of global processes that links a range of academic subjects in cross-disciplinary study. UToronto's Centre for Diaspora and Transnational Studies, for example, summons multiple, conflicting forms of institutional capital: the Centre is an "incubator" that is "speaking directly to students' experiences of migration and diaspora through an interdisciplinary lens" while also being "outward facing, with a global perspective," and providing a "hub for excellence" that is also "a connective tissue" for disparate parts of the university ("Centre for Diaspora"). Despite the cleaving heuristic of the border, "global" works to generate institutional imaginaries of synthesis, connection, and transcendence of difference at multiple scales.

Regionalized global studies offers similarly mixed terms in its programming for a more specifically scaled global framework, such as in Simon Fraser University's Global Asia minor or University of Toronto Scarborough's Global Asia studies programme. SFU's minor offers regional specialization via historical study, language training and analysis of Asian society through processes and transformations wrought by globalization, in sites of study such as

migration, imperialism and decolonization, cultural representation and exchange, racial formation, inequality, globalization, war, pandemic, identity, political activism, social transformation, and environmental change ("Global Asia Program").

UT Scarborough's programme also centres Asian cultures as the global object of study rather than globality or globalization itself, citing entanglements visible locally as its rationale:

Contacts and cultural exchanges between North America and Asia are increasing in scope in every sphere. The diverse student population of UTSC is a case in point. Global Asia Studies aims to meet the rising demand for knowledge about Asian societies, cultures, and contemporary politics while also working to meet the distinct needs and experiences of UTSC students (Global Asia Studies").

binational cooperation, reflecting an orientation toward the diversity, cultural exchange and local economy of the US-Mexico transborder region, i.e. at a particular scale: <https://sts.asu.edu/>.

These regionally specific versions of global studies programming suggest pedagogical occasions based as they are in local conditions for citizenship, cultural production and their intersections across geographies, which may allow for more direct study of student conditions within a university context that has been a site for curricular and pastoral reforms demanded by students. Yet they also extend the area studies infrastructure that global study inherits and reinforces with the visions of sociocultural training this chapter will go on to map, which demobilize situated and politicized forms of meaning-making by reducing “diaspora ... to its cultural aspects and... the question of origins [to] a question of culture” (Burden-Stelly 216). This begins to map one site of university globalism’s pedagogical uses for culture that will recur in this chapter, named by UNESCO above as “appreciation for cultural diversity.”

“Critical global studies” (also called critical globalization studies) is another cultural framework that emerges in US and Canadian programming, defined as “the interdisciplinary critique of global capitalism” (Hunter 366). Programmes with this emphasis focus less on globalization’s universals and neutral-to-celebratory metaphors of flows, hybridities, and interconnections, and more on its

common processes that are manifest in diverse local forms and which include dispossessions of various kinds, the commodification of national citizenship, the precariousness of life and labor, the financialization of the global economy, and the ‘slow violence’ of ecological catastrophe (Hunter 367).

McMaster’s IGHC can serve as a site showcasing this framework in the Canadian undergraduate context. Its globalization framing organizes a programming focus on “global processes,” and emphasis on “the human condition” affords a wide focus “on the relation between the local and the global” and “the impact of and tension created by the forces of globalization” (“Institute”). Foregrounding globalization’s content, rather than global as a characteristic or scale for other sites or fields of study, is common in Canadian programming alongside emphases on complexity

and appeals to peace, sustainability, and international awareness and cultural engagement.

While US public universities often cite “awareness”, “understanding” or “appreciation” as global study’s perspective-taking goal, a “critical” orientation is also incorporated as part of its basic literacy framework. We can draw out a triad of meanings for this element of the global studies imaginary: critical as expressing the negative posture of critique, critical as an academic description of cultural valuation (as in “critical acclaim”), and critical as the name for a condition of risk at the point of crisis; generally, these contribute to curricular programmes that do not go so far as an interdisciplinary critique of global capitalism. University of Washington Bothell cites the need to “develop the critical and analytical skills necessary to understand the forces that shape our world” alongside “critical research skills” as part of the programme’s LO for students: “learn to think critically about the history and practice of globalization” (“Global Studies (GST)”) through project-based learning. UNC Chapel Hill cites a “critical” need for students to “develop a fuller understanding of the variable nature of Earth’s people and nations” in an “increasingly globalized society,” which it characterizes without elaboration as “critical issues” (“Mission and Diversity”). At U of Delaware, the global substance of their Global Studies major is described as “critical issues that appear across national boundaries and cultural regions,” employing a variety of disciplines to “look critically at transnational trends, patterns and challenges” (“Global Studies”). Despite minor meaningful differences in these framings, they are generic enough in their scope (a range of disciplines, a range of issues, a cultural range) to suggest the fungibility of global as a referent for particular curricular content, and a default of (interdisciplinary) generalist or liberal-reformist literacy in global phenomena that is responsive to the memes of global discourse as they are mediated in the Canadian or US context. Most often, rather than taking up critique in the regional and geohistorical backdrop of the university’s

setting, or even the putative urgencies claimed by the “critical” orientation, global frameworks are narrowed for the learner through their chosen area of concentration or focus and through pre-professional “co-curricular” experiences.

Does the “critique” mode of critical global studies sync with a critical global pedagogy in these settings? In Canada, some programmes take up globalization as a shared context for social critique that exceeds national conversations, such as in Vancouver Island University’s global studies programme that trains students to “act responsibly in this new world[,]... to view it globally, and to develop knowledge and skills oriented toward ecological and social sustainability.” Programming elements are listed as encompassing sites for critique at every scale: “international flows of capital and labour, ... [and] transnational corporations and international economic organizations” alongside “social movements and community and international development alternatives,” “environmental change, sustainability and human impact” and “contemporary political systems, prospects for state sovereignty and political change [and] international conflict” (“Global Studies (BA)”). Despite this list’s potential for political education, the programme’s LO presents globality as a “new” set of historical conditions for Canada and the world that undergraduates must learn about in order to participate in and to then steer toward peace, sustainability, and coexistence across difference. Notably, the anticipated forms for student participation appear in the recommended career paths that a Global Studies BA will serve, which are fundamentally institutionalist (and so presumably prosocial and cosmopolitan) in character: NGOs or non-profits, government, international trade, business and marketing, policy development and consultancy, law, social or human rights work, foreign affairs and diplomacy, and journalism. These are identified as “global” careers, which emerge across examples as the circumscribing genres for student development in globalist institutional terms.⁹⁹

⁹⁹ The language on UNBC’s programme page provides a concise version of this characteristic career list: “We train

In the US, critical global studies as an interdisciplinary critique of global capitalism is relatively rare at the undergraduate level, and instead more common at the graduate level as pioneering fodder for research excellence. However, Pitzer College, one of California's seven small liberal-arts Claremont Colleges, offers a version of this, exemplifying how the radicalizing edge of curricular training in cultural critique is domesticated via its institutional setting and credential, which is especially common in elite, well-resourced private institutions. Pitzer's undergraduate major "Critical Global Studies" invokes "global" as a name for universal processes to explore "issues of power, difference, knowledge politics, and social justice concerns" through critical examination of "in depth cultures, indigenous communities, social movements and nations in ways that challenge modern discourse" ("Critical Global Studies"). Their "Critical" programme is presented as an epistemological project, taking up the frictive polysemy of globality, rather than one of building content knowledge in cultural complexity or developing networks and connectivity through institutional globalism:

'Critical' refers to various analytical tools and interdisciplinary theories students use to critique Eurocentric and other ethnocentric views, question universalist claims, and work effectively with multiple methodologies, practices, and epistemologies ("Critical Global Studies").

Their focus on "global inequalities" inclusive of "cultural domination and ongoing colonization" thus sees the programme as a transformative agent toward anti-oppression politics and "individual and collective emancipation" ("Critical Global Studies"). Relevant listed careers include forms of anti-capitalist activism like "labor organizing," "grassroots and community-based ...organizations" and "solidarity economics" ("Critical Global Studies") alongside graduate school or work in human rights, sustainable development and non-profits. Despite PSE's minor

students to be global citizens, global thinkers, and global problem-solvers, and prepare them for global careers in academia, business, government, and the nonprofit sector, among others." Source: "Global and International Studies", *UNBC*, <https://www2.unbc.ca/calendar/undergraduate/global-and-international-studies-ba-program>.

tradition of critical pedagogy, it is likely not surprising to note that explicitly liberatory pedagogy at the undergraduate level is highly rare, yet this example dramatizes the compatibility of politicized, leftist training in ideology critique with the credentialing promised by a private college nested in a historical frontier of imperial wealth, settler accumulation and libertarian connectivity. In this setting, “global” appears to be a sorting mechanism as well as a signalling mechanism: couldn't a Pitzer undergraduate fulfill these same LOs under a programme like “American studies”? Instead, “global” positions students in a scalar, cosmopolitan orientation toward the non-American world and away from the university's immediate setting and context.

We can locate some potential for critical global pedagogy in programming that takes up globalist institutions, global governance, and labour conditions as the substance for its global study, such as in programmes like University of Pittsburgh's Global Studies major or University of Virginia's concentration in Global Commerce and Culture in Society (GCCS) under their Global Studies major. UPitt's programme enjoins a basic institutional globalism through “interrogat[ing] the waning importance of regional borders and disciplinary boundaries in the world today” with a kind of analytical training in global social justice via a LO of a “deeper understanding of social and economic inequality in transnational context” (“Why Global Studies”). This mode of study is compatible with liberal-reformist management of inequality as well as with, potentially, ideology critique as political education and at the least generative for apprehending global crises and contradictions, as it encompasses study of “changes in the character and reach of capitalism” alongside phenomena in global health, ecologies, cultures, and (in)security. UVA's GCCS concentration extends the Global Studies programme's commitment to “questioning the ‘global’, particularly in relation to knowledge production, power and perspective” (“Global Studies”, *UVA*) by focusing on “the history and diversity of economic

institutions” (“Global Commerce”). This includes study of alternative commercial systems, the organization of work and its effects in societies, and the commercial forms that have shaped “modernity.” This programme makes a point of distinguishing itself from a Business degree while also requiring training in the methodologies that would be native to one — two courses in “Business and Professional Writing, Statistics, Accounting, Quantitative Analysis, or Computer Programming,” displaying critical intimacy around institutional literacy that may support heterodox situated study. This is perhaps our closest model yet of a Freirian literacy in oppressive conditions relevant to the US or Canadian student situation in universities as economic institutions of global modernity, although it does not take up relations of power within the classroom or created by the university itself, either locally or in a global institutional arena.

What emerges as the possibility of a critical global pedagogy in this constellation of undergraduate programmes? Critical pedagogy, combinative of a particular political and epistemological project as well as care for the politics in pedagogical practice, must be located across scales, in the relations between classroom practice and curricular programmes of all types, and in the semi-public and intimate dynamics between students, teachers and their environments. While I had originally conceived of surveying publicly available syllabi as a kind of archive of possibility, my research made clear that a) mass qualitative and discursive analysis of curricula would be better supported with the resources and tools of a team research and computational approach, and that b) such surveys inevitably require a reductive symbology and rely on taxonomic schemas that flatten the anarchic range of classroom or textual experience.¹⁰⁰ Yet the

¹⁰⁰One example is the Open Syllabus project, which scrapes the public internet for syllabi to aggregate publications used in teaching across educational contexts globally. Their tabulations merely reveal how frequently a text occurs on a syllabus by its metadata of Author, Title, Field, etc, with no information supplied about frameworks, types of assignment or assessment, thematic organization, course titles, the relationships between different texts assigned, etc. As they explain, the project’s focus is on the impacts of published scholarship on teaching: “We think syllabus counts are a useful addition because they privilege types of work that are commonly underrepresented in metrics derived from journal citation, including the more synthetic, accessible, and public-facing forms of work that often represent a large part of faculty labor.” (Global Studies was not a field included in their data collection at the time of

mixtures visible in this portrait of global studies programmes suggest that granular, particular coursework comes to be subsumed under the field imaginary of globalist institutional discourses when “aligned” with administrative programming objectives.

This default makes sense given the civic character arrogated to global study in university promotional programming literature, where civic is interpreted along the “moral because marketable” axis for the university credential as inclusive of leading “lives of impact, as well as the analytical tools and 21st century professional skills necessary to effectively navigate their future careers” (“Why Global Studies”). “Critical” too enfolds weakly into “civic” under the overdetermined conditions of political or social participation in institutional globalism, as criticality at scale can engender reformism, creative economism, social innovation, and techno-solutionism as part of the infrastructure of pessimistic institutional globalism. In other words, the global undergraduate transforms herself by becoming merely an active professional participant in global capitalism, unmarked by prior, potentially coercive conditions of participation via subjection or complicity as well as by the social location of the individual student in Empire. This, of course, is not what necessarily happens for a particular undergraduate or in the everyday knowledge work of undergraduate classrooms. But given the contemporary economic infrastructure of international “converging divergence” named in the Introduction, post-degree participation for global studies training typically includes international business and development alongside non-profit service or humanitarian industries. UNC Chapel Hill’s programme goes so far as to delineate the convergent and penetrative structures of global capital (which includes the university as a site and a vector for capital), such as privatized transnational social institutions, as directly beneficial for the professional prospects of its graduates:

The Curriculum in Global Studies lays the groundwork for successful careers with writing.) Source: “What is it?”, *Open Syllabus*, <https://blog.opensyllabus.org/about-the-open-syllabus-project/>.

an international dimension in a wide range of fields. Large corporations continue to expand their production and distribution systems to the most distant reaches of the globe. Professional groups and associations have expanded their connections with counterparts in other countries. As the line between public and private increasingly blurs, the opportunity increases for international service in a wide range of non-profit agencies, institutions and foundations, research centers, public interest groups, and non-governmental development agencies. There are today broader ranges of relevant opportunities both within government and within the expanding private and non-profit sectors (“Mission”).

A globalist imaginary emerges here via the credentialed graduate to claim the PMC’s service ethos for its institutional infrastructures, rather than to furnish other civic or social arenas.

Sentimental Globalism in Connectivity Infrastructures

Despite the mixed terms for global study surveyed above, global citizenship appears everywhere in the rhetorical shorthands used by universities when the curricular programme appears at the scale of the undergraduate credential, often as if axiomatic, and is typically conceived of as an institution-wide commitment that should express in its core functions like “research, teaching, service” (Schultz and Jorgenson). Accordingly, this chapter argues that global citizenship discourse provides a central heuristic through which to read the field imaginary of global study, as its vast, frequently recursive literature organizes most narrative data of syllabi and curricula. GCE literature spans all postures one might associate with university globalism as an ideology and a material project, including oppositional ones, and taxonomies of programming are prolifically produced alongside pedagogical emphases on individual reflection and group dialogue that often culminates in a project or “move to action” based on individual student passions.¹⁰¹ In their administrative register, these programmes are accompanied by sub-taxonomies summarizing the attributes, qualities and skills that a global citizen should

¹⁰¹This language is drawn from “U21 Global Citizens,” an online course offered by McMaster alongside other universities to grant students a badge that demonstrates their leadership toward realizing the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals; its pedagogy is exemplary of general GCE approaches. Source: “U21 Global Citizens”, *Universitas 21*, <https://universitas21.com/globalcitizens>.

manifest in the professional economy. These include certain socio-emotional characteristics, such as awareness, compassion, or a sense of social responsibility with a “global mindset,” and they typically take the ability to understand and take actions to tackle global problems as learning’s culmination, in an alignment with corporate cultural registers and metrics focused on “impact.”

Functionally, the global citizen figure is fodder for university globalism’s marketing imaginary, in which graduate attributes are typically promoted as “an articulation of the core learning outcomes of a university education” (Hughes and Barrie 325). It attempts to substantiate the credential—and in turn to orient students ideologically within university worlds—with a global image that is a mix of abstracted, universalized qualities and provincial norms local to the settler national cultures and economies of the US and Canada. Much of the explicitly social norms and postures in globalist curricula can be mapped in the culturalist¹⁰² strand of university globalism, an infrastructural inheritance from area studies in which individuals are determined by their cultures and cultures themselves are seen as organic wholes deserving of protections. This section will briefly discuss programming wherein culturalist frameworks are invoked as part of the field imaginary of global studies. However, rather than providing the frame for a range of social processes in their contexts, culturalism in global curricula seems to locate culture in individuals and their identities, or in “neutral” taxonomic global categories like the nation, an ethnicity, or present-day transnational difference, in ways that shore up institutionalism, too.

¹⁰² This term is common enough in critical theory across disciplines, but what it describes may apply to a range of epistemic or social orientations, as this chapter explores. Rey Chow parses critical cultural studies and multicultural projects of cultural study in her essay “Theory, Area Studies, Cultural Studies: Issues Of Pedagogy In Multiculturalism” in *Learning Places: The Afterlives of Area Studies* (2002), edited by Harry Harootunian and Masao Miyoshi. She locates culturalism’s dominance in area studies disciplines:

in the name of studying the West’s ‘others’ ... ‘culture’ returns to a coherent, idealist essence that is outside language and outside mediation. Pursued in a morally complacent, anti-theoretical mode, ‘culture’ now functions as a shield that hides the positivism, essentialism, and nativism — and with them the continual acts of hierarchization, subordination, and marginalization — that have persistently accompanied the pedagogical practices of area studies (111).

Arguably, since the essay’s publication, what persists is a more confusing mixture of these projects, in which study and reparative work on cultural politics threads in critique while still conditioned by acts of hierarchization, subordination and marginalization within academe, reflecting its own kind of institutional pessimism.

Consider the example of UBC's Coordinated Arts programme for first-year students, where their Global Citizens stream culminates in the creation of a collective digital "storymap" of the globe in which students each represent the topic of "belonging" and their relationship to a space in their home country in dialogue with social issues and community-based research relevant to that space ("Stories").¹⁰³ Here student participation occurs as cultural representivity, authentic per individual terms for belonging yet also transformed by global civic dialogue. This example begins to suggest possible definition for "appreciation ... of culture's contribution to sustainable development" as an element of UNESCO's transformative global citizenship vision that is reproduced in programming language and administrative rhetoric on global study and GCE in the US and Canada. While such transformative learning is not exclusive to these institutional settings, there is a genealogy specific to their geohistories that conditions their field imaginaries. Literature on GCE generally presents its promise of transformation as a process that will play out across an entire degree programme, asserting that associated skills and qualities will develop over time into a multi-dimensional global orientation for students. Lest this sound transcendental, this vision of learning mixes individualized skilling with institutional learning goals and newer "experiential", personalized and active learning educational approaches from the learning paradigm, exhibiting the expectation for self-governance expected of the "active subjects or enterprising selves" figured by the "post-social politics" interlinking education, employability and security that have been observed since policy shifts in the 1990s (Frauley 227). This project of subject formation is also a vision of how the undergraduate credential should be culturally understood (as a representational summary of "student experience", as my Introduction outlined) that is shared with liberal education as developed in American PSE and

¹⁰³N.B. As of the 2021/2022 academic year, UBC CAP has changed this stream's name to Globalization, Power and Society, presumably to signal a more critical orientation in the curriculum. Source: "Globalization, Power & Society", *UBC Coordinated Arts Program*, <https://cap.arts.ubc.ca/our-streams/globalization-power-society/>.

adopted in both national systems. The AAC&U's federally-funded 2002 initiative *Liberal Education and Global Citizenship: The arts of democracy* is commonly cited as the catalyst for GCE's institutionalization and elaboration in the US (Jorgenson and Shultz), and the Association now acts as a clearinghouse for administrative literature and resources on GL and GCE. In itself, this is telling, for the US system is also upheld as the progenitor and top site for access to a generalist liberal education model in the global PSE industry, although Canadian PSE has the second-highest percentage of liberal arts programmes as a national site within today's global marketplace and a shared historical genealogy for its liberal education traditions.¹⁰⁴

As Kara Godwin summarizes in her work on the intersections of liberal education and global education, liberal education in the US consists in multi-disciplinary study, general education requirements, and the promotion of a skill set including “critical thinking, problem-solving, analysis, communication, global citizenship, and/or a sense of social responsibility” (227). Of course, the contents of this list that names global citizenship as a skill overlap with lists of skills used to define GCE. This extension from liberal education to GCE helps to locate additional social infrastructural elements that are embedded in the connectivity paradigm in which GCE is nested. Specifically, I want to update previous work on the institutional legacies of the Cold War era in figuring liberal pedagogies and global identities as the democratic stuff of global education¹⁰⁵ to consider their enduring anti-politics, now locatable via global connectivity and its apparatuses as pessimistic “prosocial” infrastructure. By reading these infrastructures together in Canadian and US university globalism's culturalist strand, I see a renewed sentimentalist function for culture.

¹⁰⁴Historical analysis of liberal education's development in each national context reveals shared regional histories: see Kevin Brooks, “Liberal Education on the Great Plains American experiments Canadian Flirtations 1930-1950,” *Great Plains Quarterly*, 1997, pg 103-117.

¹⁰⁵For a detailed overview of this Cold War institutional history, starting from the post-war era and extending to the present-day global university, see pg. 2-4 of Michael Denning's “Lineaments and Contradictions.”

Consider, for example, the vision for global education developed and promoted by the Office of Global Learning Initiatives at FIU, helmed by Hilary Landorf and Stephanie Doscher. Writing on GL in the Winter 2018 special issue of the AAC&U's *Peer Review*, Doscher and Landorf use a global framing to explicitly pair and equate projects of excellence with those of diversity and inclusion, as the institutional definition for global learning itself:

Universal global learning propels inclusive excellence. It makes diversity essential to the achievement of higher greater purposes—all students' growth and engagement as people, learners, community members, and citizens of the world (4).

In this “inclusive excellence” model, diversity ensures GL's promise of transformation for the individual undergraduate, placing her in a dialogic learning scene (originally modeled by the UN's own university¹⁰⁶) and enabling problem framing and problem solving “for tackling complex problems, the causes and effects of which transcend *borders* of difference” (Doscher and Landorf 5, emphasis in original). In this scene of GL defined as “diverse people collaboratively analyzing and addressing complex problems that transcend borders” (Doscher and Landorf 4), we see the university asserting its globality and its access to excellence as the basic containers for and necessary ground of 21st-century citizenship with literacy in difference. Regardless of whether actual borders of difference, such as those evidenced by the university as gentrifying landlord and contributor to citizenship and carceral regimes of racialized social control, immobility and precarity in the putatively multicultural societies of the US and Canada, are transcendable beyond classroom discourse, this confers on global learning a kind of moral capital that extends from the Cold War-era projects of sentimental globalism.

¹⁰⁶Landorf and Doscher's definition of global learning was first developed by the UN: “The term *global learning* originated with the founding of the Global Learning Division of the United Nations University (UNU) in 1982. The division's mission was to develop educational practices that would enable people to understand and address persistent transnational challenges such as hunger, poverty, conflict, energy insecurity, and ethical dilemmas arising from advances in science and technology. Its name was a deliberate double entendre ‘meant to convey both the sense of learning as a global process that must include all levels of society, and the sense of learning to think globally, in the recognition that the world is a finite, closely interconnected, global system’” (“Universal Global Learning”).

In *Cold War Orientalism*, Christina Klein summarizes the American Cold-War-era project of global “containment” that cultivated “a global imaginary based on connection” (13) via promoting and exporting middlebrow culture (especially literature). This project predates contemporary connectivity infrastructure, yet provides terms that continue to be operative in the prosocial worldliness arrogated to the connectivity managed via PSE. The sentimental mode of globalism that Klein identifies relies on narratives that “tend to focus not on the lone individual but on the ‘self-in-relation’” (14) and uphold connection across difference as the highest ideal: “the sentimental is thus a universalizing mode that imagines the possibility of transcending particularity by recognizing a common and shared humanity” (13-14). It is easy to see echoes of this discourse in, say, the GL model promoted within and by FIU, where their figuration of difference as a global category has been scaled down from the nation and its citizenry as bloc to the individuated data points of diversity within a student population. It is only in being included (in the global marketplace, in university admissions) that the individual can access such cultural experience of connective transcendence toward a broader human category.

This latter figuration also maps onto the historical arc of Canadian multiculturalism, which remains figured by the state’s historical projects of cultural assimilationism and integrationism despite official shifts toward ethnocultural specificity, anti-racism and equity in educational settings since the 1990s. As a state project of capital accumulation, multiculturalism has allowed Canada to preserve the moral capital it built internationally as a peacekeeping nation prioritizing diplomacy and multilateralism after WWII and throughout the Cold War, despite complicity and unilateral participation in 21st-century American belligerence. Especially in the aftermath of 9/11, with its increased surveillance and securitization of Canada’s borders and citizenry, globalization has served as the occasion for renewed nationalist policy in Canada that

takes a two-pronged response to the question of citizenship: merit-based immigration for highly skilled and trained individuals alongside intensification of the nation's reliance on a flexible, cheap labour market via temporary migrant workers who are classified as non-citizen and non-immigrant, often effectively indentured with scant pathways to citizenship. This neat division of labour under globalization mirrors the global as well as domestic intellectual divisions of labour that express via Canada's universities.¹⁰⁷ Canada's sentimental strategy can also be located in its longer-term investments in "intercultural" education and the celebration of cultural diversity and particularity that have served federal projects of human capital building and settler nationalism for many decades. This persistent promotional image of Canada as multicultural mosaic dovetails with university globalism in its administrative cultures of corporate EDI that deploy a scalar kind of institutional identity politics to claim globality.¹⁰⁸

Such an emphasis on demographic diversity is characteristic of the "moral because marketable" subjectivity among US and Canadian public universities. Continuing with the site of FIU, their promotion of GL's universality elaborates this institutional posture with a scalar triad of "structural diversity, classroom diversity, and cognitive diversity" (Doscher and Landorf 6). These visions of diversity correspond respectively to student demographics, curricular content about "cultural practices and minority issues," and the use of a range of cognitive tools— perspectives, heuristics, interpretations and predictive models— based in student identities. Rather than emphasizing the content of cultural forms, processes and objects and their geohistories and transnational circulation, this schema bases its GL definition in the curricular experience of student diversity: "*creating more diversity to produce better responses to complex*

¹⁰⁷ For an extended discussion of this policy history in context with GCE in Canada, see Leslie Gail Roman, "States of Insecurity: Cold War memory, "global citizenship" and its discontents", *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education* vol. 25 no. 2, 2004, pg 231-259.

¹⁰⁸ See Rinaldo Walcott, "Against Social Justice and The Limits of Diversity" in *Toward What Justice?*, Eds. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, Routledge, 2018, pg 85-100 for an extensive critique of EDI in Canadian universities.

tasks...[which] is achieved through the *superadditivity of diverse tools*” (Doscher and Landorf 7). Coupled with curricular requirements for all undergraduates – the global awareness, perspective, and engagement GLOs – the outlines of a normative social training begin to appear. GL is here a broad project to cultivate an institutional culture of valuing diversity, as context and as method for the production and performance of complexity and social value, and the university provides the requisite infrastructure for connection, problem-solving and professional training. The FIU student thus accesses a global identity through a managed and incentivized cultural paradigm for sociability, and finds transformation as a producer of an institutional culture oriented toward “inclusive excellence” and a Nussbaumian cosmopolitanism of “human beings bound to all other human beings by ties of recognition and concern” (Doscher and Landorf 7).

While FIU’s image of GL certainly flatters the student-consumer seeking brand affiliation like most advertising would, of particular note is the focus on problems and problem-solving in its promotion. This focus allows the curriculum to retain its emphasis on technocratic application of the undergraduate credential, compatible with innovation, entrepreneurship, data optimization, design-thinking, and psychographic datafication of human experience, as common cultural modes in institutionalized connectivity infrastructure under platform capitalism. FIU’s approach enables the production of “more diversity [and] ... new knowledge” (Doscher and Landorf 5) as global engagement that, in absence of politics, history and ecology, elevates cultural facts about its students – identities, worldviews, differences – into a proprietary global interface for connection, collaboration, and identification, without compromising on an expansionary yet tightly managed and measured vision of human capital production.

FIU promotes its institution-wide approach to GL as “a replicable model” (Landorf et al, 10) fit for all universities. This is the express goal of the 2018 monograph *Making Global*

Learning Universal: Promoting Inclusion and Success for All Students by Landorf and colleagues that takes up FIU's legacy majority-minority population as the grounds for its authenticity as a model global institution, claiming its founding was "a response to globalization ... to address the issues faced by a rapidly growing and globalizing Miami in the mid-to-late 1960s and early 1970s" (10). Indeed, it is vastly more common in other institutional contexts to find less comprehensive and more streamlined GCE curricula than in FIU's model. These other contexts are the majority, historically white institutions, that associate their globalism with the more mainstream timeline of globalization as capitalism more deeply transnationalizing through technological, financial and developmental change from the 1990s onwards. In this more common curricular mode, instead of emphasizing bounded affiliation and civic identification with their local and national milieu, the student is transformed by identifying with sentiment beyond the nation as a kind of individualist cosmopolitan excess (a social posture which is also compatible with "personalized" connectivity infrastructure).

This identification is explicitly what is cultivated by the LO "global awareness" that is near-ubiquitous in GCE. Through qualitative research of a decade of U.S. college curricula (with detailed analysis at Texas A&M University), Stephen Reysen, Loretta W. Larey and Iva Katzarska-Miller find that the combination of a normative environment (which, I am arguing, is created by university globalism's social infrastructure) and the "global awareness" LO "predict[s] global citizenship identification, and global citizenship identification predicts endorsement of prosocial values, ...[which] mediates the relationship between antecedents and outcomes" (29). In other words, the normative horizon of transformation for students drawn to global study is a deeper identification with global citizenship as defined by institutional outcomes, networks and market entanglements. In the classroom context, the "transformation" is

from a student interested in global study toward global citizen as identity, or affiliation with “an abstract group that is psychological in nature” (Reysen et al 28). And in a global cultural field, this is often oriented by the individualized careerism of cosmopolitan affiliation and networking through the institution, formalizing a kind of identity politics of self-scaling.

While this finding does not specifically examine the contents of syllabi and their itemized or grouped potential to increase global citizenship identification, it does help to zero in on a curricular continuity between liberal education and university globalism. Liberal education conceives of learning through broad exposure that enhances individual perspective and expands one’s views of reality toward greater “complexity, diversity and change” (Godwin and Altbach 8); a global framing heightens this process because it presumes encounters across a greater degree or scale of difference. This situation of institutionalized GL as oriented toward complex global problems obscures the need to recognize the American or Canadian university itself as one such problem. The emphasis on expansion and scaling as beneficial to learning— via the “superadditivity” of diversity or the “greater degree or scale of difference”— syncs global education with progressive liberalism while reinforcing its sentimental disinterest in and economic maintenance of the widespread inequities and violences enabled by such exclusionary institutional social organization, at home and abroad. The scaling up of US or Canadian multicultural society into a global one also conflates domestic pluralism and GL, absolving both categories of their historical baggage and contemporary politics in a local context in the name of sociohistorical and political economic transcendence that perpetuates settler colonial “moves to innocence” (Tuck and Wang).¹⁰⁹ Finally, it corroborates the institution’s worldly turn toward

¹⁰⁹ Tuck and Wang’s now canonical article “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor” catalogs settler behaviors according to this term. “Moves to innocence” from settlers of all kinds include what they call “settler nativism, fantasizing adoption, colonial equivocation, conscientization, at risk-ing / asterisk-ing Indigenous peoples, re-occupation and urban homesteading” (4); especially relevant here is the critique of Freirian critical pedagogy for the insufficiency of the project of cultivating critical consciousness for disrupting settler national futurity or reorganizing its

cosmopolitan branding that accompanies shifting resource priorities toward global markets and professional training away from existing programming about intercultural and domestic pluralism, reinforcing the university's antisocial mode of developing connectivity infrastructures.

In the credential marketplace it remains true, in part due to their convergent corporate interests and management, that “liberal arts institutions are crucial to the corporate logics of the ‘global knowledge marketplace’” and “provide the corporate sector and the military-prison-industrial complex with ‘moral capital’ precisely because of their supposed liberalism” (Chatterjee and Maira 12). Such liberalism may have been updated in curricular genres with the managerial cosmopolitan corporate-ese such as global or intercultural competency, digital literacy, and cross-cultural communications and team-building, yet residual human capital discourses in universities still uphold the cultural content of study as a minor indicator of particular kinds of social and economic value. This instrumentalized cultural fluency is the professional outlet for intellectual tourism as civics. It acts as a kind of institutional identity politics that seeks to populate the global with images of prosocial Global North subjects ready to work and learn in complexity conditions (or international students already doing so, as Chapter 4 discusses)— as the beneficiaries of globalist institutions— unimpeded by situated critiques of complicity, gentrification, extraction, and carcerality in institutional infrastructure and its history.

We might synthesize these managerial civic modes that organize under GCE by tracing a renewed “global imaginary based in connection” visible in these sedimented institutional modes and tools. Returning briefly to the vision of UNESCO, as Sarah Brouillette has analyzed, culture functions for the rhetorical leadership pursued by the institution as a site of labile affective practice used to “emphasize,” “reaffirm,” and “recognize” ideal relationships to culture that are not actually realizable through a networked institution like UNESCO; this work is its globalist infrastructures toward material decolonization.

practice (*UNESCO* 109). By extension, in the field of GCE policy and branding, we can examine the work of cultural study in kind. Culture as a property of individual students or groups becomes useful to the project of global citizenship when it is transformed into a personal or institutional asset through globalist mediation (here via curriculum). Today's learning context organizes educational experience as a personal good within an increasingly technologized credential marketplace, as its prosocial marketized form into which students are enlisted. The global citizen imagined as this education's product can ideally draw upon any potential cultural framework translated in the terms of globalism to train for network-based and platform-managed labour. The "global imaginary based in connection" is preserved as a generic aesthetic layer lubricating a wide field of labour outcomes for students in deprofessionalizing conditions.

In this contemporary definition we can also locate the persistence of Cold War institutional practices in the kinds of institutional capital afforded both to globality and to culture, especially as sites for literacy in difference as a market-based imperative. Such an environment and its administrative logics affect instruction and students by rendering knowledge of cultural practices as a broad social credential, as Leslie Roman observes:

Framed as consumers of international and national difference, learners and educators become differentially entitled or disentitled citizen-consumers in a global marketplace in which cultural practices are mere commodities. As consumers of inter(national) difference in the purportedly "free" marketplace, learners and educators are taught that cultural and linguistic practices are to be played up or down, depending on the warrant for particular forms of cultural capital (245).

This echoes the so-called cultural diplomacy and promotion of US-led liberal democracies of the Cold War era, but is figured now as a property of the individual global citizen navigating multicultural and digital networks. Such cynical individualized calculations within racial capitalist dynamics are presented as the civic foundations for entrepreneurialism, and as practical reassurance that the self is diversely in relation as a site of personal developmental authenticity

as well as of possible protection against global precarity.

Global Citizenship Education's Institutional Strand

In the disciplinary conversations I was trained in under literary and cultural studies, a common lineage considers “global” as an ideological marker, indicating a shift in epistemic conditions with a genealogy from postcolonial studies and the broader coloniality/modernity capitalist nexus that became globally dominant by the end of the 20th century. This sets up “global” as a pseudo-universalism with unjust and extractive politics in the critical valence, or, in modes more neutral or celebratory, as a broad synthetic aesthetic that can take on anthropological particularities. While these definitions emerge from a specific set of questions and objects, these characterizations of the global as bad universalism vs aesthetic synthesis present a useful heuristic at the political economic scale as well. Political philosophers Olufemi Taiwo and Enzo Rossi have diagnosed contemporary global political economy in terms of the diversity-capitalism nexus, in which “the racial permeability of the upper classes is accompanied by an increased and inverse racial permeability of the underclass.” Diversity in this dialectic is so elite-driven that it can be readily characterized as an aesthetic project of capitalist institutions, “a focus on visible diversity as a broadly aesthetic quality” that “obscures the largely class-bound nature of the changes in racial hierarchies” (Rossi and Taiwo). Much like global’s institutional use, this aesthetic project allows a discrete social layer of diversity to visibly claim representation and institutional transformation even while its primary mechanism is to abstract from and obscure the exceptional nature of such inclusion. The means of obfuscation that Taiwo and Rossi identify are technocratic and “wokewashing” strategies, into which we can locate GCE as an exemplar of both in US and Canadian PSE as globally elite contexts.

In support of this broad assessment, technocratic discourses emphasize GCE's adoption into educational policy objectives as a 21st-century response to an external global market rather than part of longer traditions of international policy. This market responsiveness coincided with the elaboration of transnational neoimperial border regimes in Canada and the US post-9/11, with Canada "successfully [shifting] its immigration policy away from one of permanent (im)migrant settlement towards increased reliance on a highly vulnerable and flexible temporary workforce" (Roman 236), some of which was routed through its internationalizing universities as a site of national-global capital. In the U.S. context, as Isaac Kamola's *Making the World Global* outlines, internationalized education has morphed according to a range of 20th-century state ideological projects: from the post-WWI hospitality to foreign students displaced by war; to the Cold War era's state funding and promotion of foreign student exchanges at home and liberal capitalist culture abroad; to the post-9/11 expansion of satellite campuses and special economic zones (174-6); to today's all-inclusive cocktail that also integrates global frameworks into domestic university curricula and promotes digitalized education as a global interface. This layering of geohistorical with market-readiness rationales produces a contradictory mix of social and "moral because marketable" goods in US and Canadian GCE that, again, reveal and indict the expansionary yet extractive globalist character of institutional subjectivity in these contexts.

Thus in curricular taxonomies, a "global" experience carries a degree of abstraction that makes hospitality to, say, postcolonial theory or transcontextual Indigenous studies simultaneously possible alongside settler capitalist pedagogies of imperialist benevolence, entrepreneurialism and social innovation. William Guadelli's curricular research finds that of five heuristics for analyzing GCE, "neoliberalism and nationalism are the dominant, and indeed hegemonic, discursive categories...in any discussions of global citizenship...that are interrupted

at times by less recognized, minority discourses of Marxism, world governance and cosmopolitanism” (69). These two dominant heuristics focus around pedagogical rationales that invoke interconnection and connectivity as a premise, as well as the sentimental “self-in-relation” *Bildung* of globalism that persists in the university’s dominant citizenship registers.

While markets and nation-states act as the globe’s mainstream drivers of citizenship struggles, projects and imaginaries, the infrastructural influence of supra-governmental organizations is also relevant in PSE. Their policy development and accompanying material sponsorship of education and cultural production around the globe has done much to shape GCE and “global” terms within higher ed. Among the relevant institutions that assisted in cementing university globalism’s infrastructure is the World Trade Organization, whose establishment in 1995 is seen as a central culmination of the global institution-building and governance project promoted by the globalists of Quinn Slobodian’s account. The WTO’s originary General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) was extended to include higher education services in 2000 per the lobbying of the US, New Zealand, Australia and Japan, officially classifying it as a global export services industry and marking the WTO’s “self-proclaimed mission to construct ‘knowledge societies’ in debtor nations” (Lyons 136). This liberalization solidified higher education as a global commodity and a site of unprotected labour and uneven development rather than a human right supported by nation-states as a public good.¹¹⁰

That same year, UNESCO and the World Bank co-released a report that sought to promote PSE as an agent of economic development within “the global knowledge-based economy” (Task Force on Higher Education and Society 9).¹¹¹ This officially reversed their prior

¹¹⁰See Andrew Ross’s chapter “The Rise of the Global University” in *Nice Work if You Can Get It* for an extended description of these policy shifts and their consequences, especially on labour conditions.

¹¹¹Kemal Guruz’s *Higher Education and International Student Mobility in the Global Knowledge Economy* provides a helpful gloss on how the World Bank measures the goods and services of a global knowledge economy, via national innovation systems (NISs): “a web of: (i) knowledge producing organizations in the education and training

austerity position toward PSE as part of a general swerve toward emphasizing the centrality of culture in economic life, given its potential “to soothe many personal and social strains [and] provide a more successful environment for commerce” (Brouillette, *UNESCO* 17). This linkage of universities to developmentalism presented global markets as organized by knowledge that has been deterritorialized, mediated and made global in character and reach, rather than in fact administered by institutions in the Global North who regularly extract knowledge, resources and human capital from Global South contexts. The report emphasized the promotion of “world-class universities and the creation of global partnerships to link developing countries into an already global knowledge economy” and an existing context for knowledge in terms of “global competitiveness” (Kamola 136). It perhaps goes without saying, given the reproductive function of global rankings lists that by design feature Global North universities as the vast majority,¹¹² that this programme has enforced the epistemic primacy and technological and corporate power of elite institutional networks, especially within and extending from settings such as the US and Canada. That such supra-governmental bodies would shape the institutionalist strand of university globalism and its material expressions is no great surprise. Still, their capacity to synthesize disparately political and seemingly contradictory knowledge projects through the GCE marketplace exemplifies the glibly reflexive nature of institutionalized global study, in which any worldmaking within globalized conditions can be claimed as already global.

system; together with (ii) the appropriate macroeconomic and regulatory framework, including trade policies that affect technology diffusion; (iii) innovative firms and networks of enterprises; (iv) adequate communication infrastructures; and other selected factors, such as access to the global knowledge or certain market conditions that favor innovations;” a higher education system is one of “the components comprising a fully developed NIS as “advanced and specialized factors of production” (7).

¹¹²Per Hamilton and Nielsen, rankings emerged as a globalist institutional project per neoliberalism’s timeline as a commonsense political logic: “During the Cold War, the US invested in higher education in developing countries, but this came to an end in the 1970s and 1980s. Universities in other parts of the world have been forced into competition against the resource-rich universities of the global North. This inequality is reflected in international rankings systems, which Connell argues were *designed* to highlight the elite Anglo-American research universities’ and the growth of private higher education organizations in place of public colleges and universities” (191-2).

UNESCO, in particular, has serially published reports that seek to update and mobilize globalism's projects through an explicitly utopian humanism equated with global citizenship. UNESCO also is an exemplary site for macro-analysis given its "characteristic ambivalence" since 20th-century decolonization about the effects of capitalist modernization and development on localized cultural production and tradition, especially in the Global South, as well as its alliance with "the global world-literary milieu" in pursuing cultural policy-making and gatekeeping with this concern at the fore (Brouillette, *UNESCO* 14). Of its extensive "Global Reports" archive, two UNESCO publications are rich resources for understanding its GCE guidelines for heterogeneous undergraduate curricula. Both reports render a work of global synthesis that relies on a default universalist perspective of formal education's value as a social and moral good. Preceding the OECD's 1997 report on lifelong learning discussed in Chapter 2 for its pivot toward human capital as the express basis for education, a 1996 report entitled "Learning: The Treasure Within" emphasized global access and mutual understanding across contexts, proffering lifelong learning as holistic humanism in "the learning society" (Delors 38).¹¹³ The report's conception of lifelong learning promises to "reconcile three forces: competition, which provides incentives; co-operation, which gives strength; and solidarity, which unites" ("Learning" 16). This list is characteristic of the institutional figure of the global citizen and arguably consists of irreconcilable elements when implemented in any particular context.

A second UNESCO report, 2015's "Rethinking Education: Toward a Global Common Good?," aims to posit a definition of knowledge as a globally common good (contra national public goods) and to theorize post-basic education as its delivery mechanism, in keeping with

¹¹³For example, on page 34: "We must be guided by the Utopian aim of steering the world towards acceptance, greater mutual understanding, a greater sense of responsibility and greater solidarity, through all of our spiritual and cultural differences. Education, by providing access to knowledge for all, has precisely this universal task of helping people to understand the world and to understand others" (Delors).

UNESCO's self-definition of its "normative function" as "a global observatory of social transformation with the objective of stimulating public policy debate" ("Rethinking" 11; 9). To do so, it invokes a series of thinkers who have typically figured into cultural study as anti-colonial, anti-capitalist, or anti-institutional in some relative yet fundamental sense, and in most cases specific to global imperial history in which Global North actors have been the aggressors and/or oppressors. After recalling "as have thinkers Frantz Fanon, Aimé Césaire, Rabindranath Tagore, and others [that] when we privilege one form of knowledge, we in fact privilege a system of power," the report suggests that the Indigenous Quechua concept of "*buen vivir*, or good living" (already translated into colonial languages here) should replace dominant conceptions of global development alongside Mahatma Gandhi's thinking on "trusteeship" as a model of planetarity ("Rethinking" 31). This new global education as common good would be supported by the elevation of such alternative knowledge systems from their inferior status into relative parity, through which "the immense wealth that such diversity represents can enlighten us all in our collective quest for well-being" ("Rethinking" 33). The report then cites the ethical visions of Paulo Freire and Martin Buber and their "dialogical approach to learning" as fundamental to this global education project that will "go beyond the strictly utilitarian vision and the human capital approach that characterizes much of international development discourse" and reject learning systems that alienate and commodify individuals ("Rethinking" 38, 37, 38).

We can see that some version of cultural study and critical pedagogy figure centrally in this moral vision of "transformative"¹¹⁴ global higher education, itself representative of a type of

¹¹⁴Per its designation as a "global observatory of social transformation", UNESCO cites "transformative attitudes" as essential to the cultivation and promotion of humanistic values, as part of its prescription of "sustaining and enhancing the dignity, capacity and welfare of the human person in relation to others, and to nature [as] the fundamental purpose of education in the twenty-first century" ("Rethinking" 38). However, its list of key skills recommended to achieve this -- "critical thinking, independent judgment, problem-solving, and information and media literacy" -- could describe highly politically disparate yet still "transformative" students of the global, such as both Steve Bannon and Greta Thunberg.

liberal-reformist administrative subjectivity in the institutionalist strand of university globalism. Seemingly, they enable learning as the means for the individual transcendence of material conditions, historical difference and the international division of labour, rather than for the epistemic and material transformation of imperial modernity suggested by the political provenance of such critical “global” figures. The transformative promise of particular types of PSE has become a common conceptual frame in contemporary teaching and learning scholarship, not exclusive to global education, but characteristic of social innovation discourse’s compulsion to rebrand its claim to goodness and to seek a processual edge. So, in its role of promoting and steering the institutional infrastructure for globalism of which it is part, what is the function assigned to culture in UNESCO’s reparative project for knowledge, transformable via education toward a global common good? In her study of UNESCO as a global cultural policymaking actor, Sarah Brouillette distinguishes the period from the 1980s onward for the waning of UNESCO’s characteristic ambivalence about promoting capitalist development and modernization within the new postcolonial international system, instead replaced by a more straightforward boosterism of creative industries in an alignment of neoliberal economics with cultural promotion. While flattening its more differentiated policies into “our era of faith in the unique dynamism of the so-called creative economy” (Brouillette *UNESCO* 10), UNESCO instituted global practices of marketized governance including the now-classic combination of data-based performance metrics and austerity with emphasis on individual human rights and the issuance of non-performative frameworks and guidelines. Dovetailing with this, per Chapter 2’s discussion, connectivity infrastructure has helped to create an expansionary vector for global capital via knowledge as informatized into data and concretized via behaviorist applications in algorithmic governance and platform capitalism; this foundation undergirds creative, cultural and

social media industries while also organizing globalist ed tech and curricular administration in the American or Canadian university. We can summarize this infrastructure as what is meant by the global knowledge economy in which universities are agents of development.

This economic vector has been characterized as a “new mode of development, informationalism, of which networking is a critical attribute” (162) since it was introduced by Manuel Castells in 1996, constitutive of the global “network society” that has provided its social infrastructure. Within this mutating trajectory of development via globalist institutions, global knowledge bends toward a mutable melange of data, information and scientific, technological and cultural production entangled with market-determined skills and valuation. This mixture’s nature is captured by the 21st-century term “prosumer,” a portmanteau of producer and consumer that celebrates their simultaneity as a site of personalized agency in a given interface rather than of systemic extraction, surveillance and subsumption. Mark Duffield describes this development as post-social, producing “the scalable figure of the entrepreneur as a networker and celebrity — that is, a person able to bend to their advantage the spatial displacement and asymmetries of information and power inherent within the connectivity of network structures” (23-4).

While this informationalized vector has come to organize market-led rationalisms in PSE’s administrative cultures, normative institutional visions for education like UNESCO’s above still rely heavily on the pedagogical mediations of culture, history and language in their common figurations of cultivating global skills or citizens. This dynamic is in keeping with broader observations about casualized labour and heightened precarity that proceed from platform capitalist management, as personalization via algorithm and social and institutional networking act as experiential palliatives for the processes of human data extraction and valuation that they impose. This mixture of culturalist pedagogies with the institutional

rationalization of social desires and the behaviorist production of digital subjects also describes university globalism in the US and Canada. While the latter project has all but displaced civic participation into surveillance, the content of culture—its narratives and hermeneutics—becomes more minor in institutional globalism, as corporate or institutional diversity is the dominant cultural meme, and the global knowledge economy is dominated by its technological conditions that manage populations through algorithmic personalization and statistical individuation. At the same time as GCE brings students into the regional legacy of 20th-century sentimental globalism, they are positioned as individuals in the data and credential marketplace according to this “post-explanatory, post-discursive and in some respect, post-human” knowledge infrastructure (Barry 373) that extends the global maintenance of racial capitalist social relations while upholding diverse institutionalism as their cultural product.

This infrastructural condition clarifies the effects of a knowledge form that was previously “inseparable from the contested political commons producing it” (Duffield 9) but now organized for a globalized economy driven by financialization and platform capitalism. This decoupling is compatible with what has been legally and institutionally circumscribed as the global knowledge economy’s inputs: intellectual property, funded research, monopoly platforms for scholarly materials and digital communications, privatized publishing platforms, scientific, technological and managerial innovations, ed-tech, etcetera. Accordingly, the “invisible discipline” of ed tech and administrative software acts as another GCE heuristic, as it perpetuates the technopolitics of institutional globalism (which is to say, global capitalist practice):

What if the most important consequence of the university’s activities is not the actual content of knowledge being produced, taught, and learned, but the way it advances corporate technological power and intelligence by acculturating its student population to a certain status quo of technological exploitation and surveillance? (Glass 149).

Continuing with this infrastructuralist heuristic, privileging culture’s material form or structure

over content, we can read global knowledge as concrete technological media that determine the social institutions, concepts and practices of governance that count as “global”, and the cultural experience of it as reflected in the scalar nature of the global, its tendency toward abstraction, synthesis, deterritorialization or instantaneity. And PSE is a central site for its production, the “knowledge factory” that produces knowledge goods and data alongside the cumulative contributions made to globalization’s long history by academic mobility. Kemal Gürüz summarizes this entanglement of the economic aspects of globalism with cultural training:

the production of goods and services in global supply chains and the functioning of international capital markets clearly depend on people who can communicate with each other. This, in turn, requires a common language, a common base of skills, and the capacity to work in intercultural environments (19).

Thus we can read the function of culture in these globalist institutional visions for knowledge as a “common good” for its contribution to changes in class-based experience and their technocratic obfuscation as Taiwo and Enzo identified. Culture in this infrastructure obscures the merely elite increase in the racial permeability of the cosmopolitan, professional-managerial class understood to be produced by a university education. It also obscures higher ed’s current institutional cultures, including the fraying of the undergraduate credential in deprofessionalizing conditions, increasingly faith-based images of undergraduate education as class production for lower-value credentials, and the fundamentally anti-social premise of the educational institutions themselves.

Given this cumulative material and discursive context, we could consider GCE as a 21st-century updated programme of functional literacy, analogous to UNESCO’s experimental programme to promote development policy in the 1960s-1970s. Functional literacy was conceived at the time as “a complex process of technical advancement, scientific acculturation and social and cultural integration, constituting a global educational operation which contributes to changing and gaining mastery of the milieu” (qtd in Brouillette *UNESCO* 64). Per Sarah

Brouillette's critical assessment of UNESCO's functional literacy programming in its long-term ideological context, the listed objectives for this training curriculum describe a scheme of institutional rationalization to harmonize contexts of uneven development with the norms of a global economic whole, rather than to support local autonomy and holistic development. Such versions of a "humanistic rather than economistic world view," as UNESCO commits to, read as if vocational curriculum has received a socio-cultural expansion pack: in pursuing economic literacy, the programme concluded with acknowledgments of the need to stress "critical awareness of the producer-learner's problems and roles in society" and to incorporate "the social, cultural and political change" that attend economic development (Brouillette, *UNESCO* 65; 65; 66). In 21st-century contexts of overaccumulation, deindustrialization, precarious labour, and persistent settler amnesia of racial and settler capitalism in the US and Canada's historical present, such a literacy programme for today's undergraduates again treats the technological acculturation and prosocial orientation required to reproduce infrastructures of global capitalism as the frames that occasion cultural study and engagement. In curricular administration, culture often serves synonymously with the "humanity" that global citizenship promotes, as an experiential layer that lubricates institutional rationalization in university worlds as well as their capitalization of sociability via data capture and behaviorist application.

This assessment of culture as pedagogical lubricant for globalist management accords with Manuel Castells' broader observation about informationalism's reorganization of capital and struggle in 1996's *The Rise of the Network Society*, still persistent in 2010's 2nd edition:

Under the conditions of the network society, capital is globally coordinated, labor is individualized. The struggle between diverse capitalists and miscellaneous working classes is subsumed into the more fundamental opposition between the bare logic of capital flows and the cultural values of human experience (507).

Taking networks as cartographic terrain, Castells reads this material basis of global life as

“earmark[ing] dominant social processes [and] thus shaping social structure itself” (502). This heightened opposition between capital flows and cultural politics is suggestive as a pedagogical scene, in which the broad post-social strain produced by economic insecurity, climate disaster and financial and citizenship crises in the 21st century readily reveals geographies of racialization, exploitation, immiseration and neglect – in short, geographies of power – that are naturalized by institutions in our contemporary social infrastructure.

To situate this reading of culture in terms of institutional globalism, consider again the primary lesson that UNESCO’s “Rethinking Education” report wishes to mobilize from the anti-colonial figures it invokes: a warning about the nexus of knowledge with power (31). The report builds on this by proposing a kind of utopian institutionalism, proliferative of alternative education through renewed inclusionary approaches to commoning and “the immense wealth that such diversity represents” (“Rethinking” 33). Of course, this formulation refrains from naming the system of power privileged here, the one in which UNESCO represents, preserves and elaborates an institutional infrastructure of knowledge-based capitalism dominated by the Global North. Herein, as with the subjectivity of US and Canadian universities, diversity represents an unending fount of cultural wealth (often meant literally) within a universal global capitalism, rather than a coercive infrastructure of social differentiation and oppression and its contexts. And so, despite the sincerity of its “collective quest for well-being” (“Rethinking” 33) and sustainability, the report fails to address the realities of institutional rationalization that students are forced to navigate around the world, and its concomitant problems of education-based debt, the global expansion of crisis conditions for labour, social reproduction and ecology, and the epistemic dominance of the rationalism produced by institutional globalism.

Educational institutions are instead imagined to serve as a kind of background social

utility or good, including UNESCO itself, who acknowledges significant problems of equity, access, and privatization in education systems around the world yet suggests mitigating measures that would reproduce more of the same —historical and ongoing crises of debt and social reproduction for (geo)politically dispossessed and minoritized groups and populations. I.e.: “Loan programs are attractive” but merely not widespread enough to remediate issues of student access; universities should expand community and nonprofit partnerships to balance against privatization but should also centrally rely on corporate social responsibility funding to address the “social and educational needs of underprivileged communities”; minoritized knowledge should be elevated in curriculum around the world, but UNESCO is also working on instituting centralized metrics to assess and credentialize “knowledge and competencies at the global level,” alongside a global convention on higher ed (“Rethinking” 45; 81; 65). And finally, UNESCO acknowledges the problem of PSE’s conversion to employment around the world (alternatively diagnosed as a crisis in global capital’s absorption of labour¹¹⁵), and the incompatibility of economic development with education’s charge to improve quality of life globally. Yet such forces are ultimately not reconciled with the vision for globalist institutionalism beyond the suggestion that more educational approaches should be developed that will “capitalize on the full potential of all learning settings” (“Rethinking” 61). Thus this 21st-century update to the institutional trusteeship of and vision for global education is premised in a pessimistic globalism that is reflexive to its own contradictions yet reproductive of its infrastructure nonetheless.

The swerve toward such pessimism reflects a longer-term history of incorporative institutionalism, and is consistent with the 21st-century character of UNESCO as a driver of educational and cultural policy, in which “economic development is itself positioned as the

¹¹⁵For discussion of this analytic debate within the scholarship of global capitalism, see Joshua Clover, “Transition: End of Debate”, *Amerikastudien/American Studies* vol. 62 no. 4, 2017, pg 539-550.

ultimate humanism” and “developing economically dynamic cultural industries is the organization’s core work” (Brouillette, *UNESCO*, 141). And this nests UNESCO’s policy vision for contemporary global education comfortably within the World Bank’s programme in its 2015 report *Mind, Society and Behavior*: that global precarity and poverty incur a kind of cognitive tax, and therefore that programming promoting cognitive development ascends to the status of a humanitarian or development frame without requiring any commitment to material redistribution or reparation (Duffield 178-82). I suggest via this extended treatment of UNESCO’s globalist policy writing that we should treat PSE as one of such economically dynamic cultural industries, where culture appears in the space of study to mediate economic development and social reproduction. At this scale, a near-fungibility of the social goods proffered in educational policy is apparent, promoting culture as humanity, knowledge as humanity, global citizenship as humanity, and culture and knowledge as the currency by which to connect to humanity more globally. With this summary position, I do not mean to overdetermine culture itself, as I maintain due respect for the aesthetic and pedagogical autonomy of cultural objects, however limited by cultural processes that shape their production and consumption.

Yet in discussing the function of culture for institutional globalism, I invoke a theoretical consensus among globalization scholars that emerged by the 2000s to acknowledge the collapse of previously separable realms of human experience into the cultural realm caused by globalization. As John Tomlinson suggests via his term “complex connectivity” (1-2) that describes how global connectivity also transforms the local, culture defined broadly as “the order of life in which human beings construct meaning through practices of symbolic representation” (18) becomes the point of articulation for the range of aspects of human life – the political, the economic, the social, the technological – and “the key register within which globalization is both

experienced and understood” (Szeman 99). Further, Fredric Jameson’s observation of the postmodern condition as one which integrates “aesthetic production...into commodity production generally” (*Postmodernism* 4) helps to characterize the cultural training envisioned via global citizenship. The next chapter on self-commodification echoes Jameson’s observation.

Epistemic Infrastructures for Global Study

Today’s digital context of mediation assigns value to identity, microcultural networks and affect as much as it may to entrepreneurialism or market disruption through a range of innovative cultures and aesthetics. Examining the disciplines as containers for global study, we might consider the broad question of how it’s become normal for universities to host such a wide range of knowledge projects that are anti-institutional or invested in anti-capitalist, anti-racist, anti-patriarchal, anticolonial and ideology critique and how they relate to institutionalized diversity or the connective self-in-relation. Bhakti Shringarpure’s 2019 monograph *Cold War Assemblages: Decolonization to Digital* outlines the persistent features of Cold War cultural infrastructures in today’s universities, examining the evolution of academic disciplines in the US alongside global developments in empire’s morphology, the publishing and cultural industries, and technopolitics.¹¹⁶ Unlike globalization’s originary discourses of connective rupture, deterritorializing as well as universalizing contemporaneous processes while transforming 20th-century political systems, the global in Shringarpure’s account does not merely narrate postcolonialism’s morph into technopolitics or the subsumption of postcolonial politics into

¹¹⁶Shringarpure relies on technopolitics as a core analytic, derived from the work of Gabrielle Hecht and Paul Edwards: “In sociotechnical systems, power derives from the control of knowledge, artifacts, and practices. This hybrid form of power has cultural, institutional, and technological dimensions. We call it ‘technopolitics.’ Technopolitics is the strategic practice of designing or using technology to enact political goals. Such practices are not simply politics by another name. They produce artifacts whose design features matter fundamentally to their success, and to the ways in which they act upon the world” (241).

“global” aesthetics. Instead she focuses on how via the university, its knowledge infrastructures, and Global North cultural industries more broadly, global as a category has been incorporative of institutionalized postcolonialism as well as the early euphoria surrounding computers and digital experience, while shedding their foundational ambivalences. Both represent epistemic infrastructures and their supporting organizational resources for university globalism.

While Shringarpure's focus is literary, the mutation of area studies into today's data science institutes provides a key node for her argument. The US Department of Defense project DARPA has funded computing R&D in universities in an overlapping timeline with area studies, yet took over after 2008 as the funded university infrastructure for population hermeneutics as a technology of power. Much of their means overlap, including “deploying a mathematical science in order to predict data [and] oscillating between an idealized social science or civilizational theoretical models and user-generated data” (Asif 10), yet this historical and present infrastructure is absented from the celebratory or minoritarian modes of cultural and archival knowledge projects and curricula in the digital humanities, for example. What affords the continuities across these periods is the ideological and practical assemblage that is Shringarpure's “Cold War paradigm” (26). This assemblage originally formed via US-led global programmes of cultural platforming and promotion of creative works, with aesthetic qualities that are non-dissenting, apolitical and reflective of American self-images of “openness” and inclusion, and is now mimicked by global publishing platforms like Google and Amazon.

It is those institutionally abandoned ambivalences that most clarify the sociocultural programming carried out by global study, especially in the US and Canada as settler colonial contexts that constantly tend to their own origin myths in regulation of the demos and critical resistance to state oppression and control. Shringarpure takes up the epistemic conditions in

English departments in US universities, reinforced by institutional “over-disciplinarity” that siloed minority cultural and epistemic frameworks into separate departments in the aftermath of the institutional reforms militantly sought by minority students in the 1960s and 70s. There she names the commonly narrated narrowing of postcolonial studies, housed within the English discipline, toward postmodern aesthetics, theory, and cultural hybridities as an epistemic malformation that is an effect of the institution’s broader regulation toward manageable difference (such that today, global studies is dominated by English language as its medium and by Anglospheric administration as its most robust institutional home). Postcolonialism as a temporalizing conceit was defined by the tension between unfinished anticolonial resistance and official postcoloniality in the international nation-state system, and so, postcolonial studies arguably attended too much to cultural matters and too little to these aftermaths of colonialism, neocolonialism, and internecine conflicts in postcolonial places as Cold War (and thus, in a political sense, global) conditions. Its institutional role solidified within an Anglocentric milieu, in contest of and in relation to English literary and cultural study as an epistemic project, after the Cold War’s strengthening of area studies programming had “weakened what could be a strong push towards a complete overhaul of existing humanities fields” (Shringarpure 155).

Thus Shringarpure deconstructs curricular multiculturalism’s formation:

with its focus on non-Western, world and ‘other’ literatures, [postcolonial studies] functioned as the English department’s international branch and filled out the discourses on race, gender, marginalization and nation that were at the core of the emerging new curricula but yet were primarily Western in nature (159-60).

Such an arrangement as a field imaginary, replicated in Canada’s English departments where literary study has been a more direct project of postimperial Commonwealth cultural preservation, exemplifies the cosmopolitanism of studying difference in a settler colonial institution that absorbs sentimental cultural registers (including oppositional) without their

unresolved situated politics. This is an effect of its claims to territoriality and futurity through cultural replacement, as Eve Tuck and Rubén A. Gaztambide- Fernández insist: “settler colonialism requires more than a postcolonial theory of decolonization” (75). English departments became the conservative infrastructure for the study of colonial difference in globalized rather than colonial and anti-colonial terms.

Zooming out to consider global study as a social site with its political history, anomie, interdependence and struggle filtered out by economic and governance abstractions, a sentimental orientation is thus set up for individual connectivity as pro-social that does not require projects of unlearning, historical redress, collectivity, or care. This work of accounting that reads the premises and programmes nested within “global” as world-swallowing is hardly new to critical discourses about contemporary globalization. Updating Said’s *Orientalism*, Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc Wacquant’s 1999 article “On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason” takes up multiculturalism and neoliberalism as interdependent global projects of imperial statecraft, which submerge “the effects of imperialism in cultural ecumenism or economic fatalism and of making transnational relationships of power appear as a neutral necessity” (42). Their observation syncs with university globalism in the US and Canada, in which “global” attaches prescriptively and promotionally to globalism’s programmes despite their pessimistic worlding infrastructures.¹¹⁷

We can update this definition with the role played by digital infrastructures in extending the

¹¹⁷Pessimism is deployed as an institutional affect or infrastructural byproduct of university globalism throughout the thesis in keeping with the connectivity era’s “political pessimism” in the aftermath of 20th-century decolonization as outlined in the Introduction. Twenty-first century pessimism has been registered in and among a wide range of social institutions, including in the effects of technological infrastructures on functional governance and policy-making by governments, in heterosexual social and reproductive institutions (heteropessimism), in financial speculation’s scenario planning and investment in pessimistic futurities, in ecological and apocalyptic discourses following from anthropogenic climate breakdown, in the institutional administration of jurisprudence, policing and so-called public safety, in representative politics or democracy, and in the maintenance and repair of infrastructures themselves, especially for resources basic to survival and climate transformation. I describe university globalism’s infrastructures as pessimistic to convey the open narrowness of its transformative terms based in individualism, innovation, and institutional capital’s mutations away from social protections and resourcing as the determinants of conditions of mediation and alienation.

global's prestidigitation and social force, via its own foundational yet discarded ambivalence: computing technologies were originally co-developed with military technological and nuclear power, but these violent purposes were successfully disappeared through the advent of personal computing products and the early consumerist euphoria around digital experience in the 1980s. Discourse about digital cultures and algorithmic governance has become more disappointed and negative by the 21st-century's third decade, with common critiques addressing "Big Tech"'s techno-economic monopoly power, algorithmic bias, surveillance capitalism, and behaviorist interfaces as catalysts of epidemics of discrimination, mental illness, disinformation and addiction. Along the way from early utopic libertarianism to today's algorithmically degraded connectivity, a durable kind of infrastructure has emerged for individualized social processes that equates personalized connection and disconnection with digital culture and therefore a good or utility in the world (if not a world in itself), despite its formation and operation in binary forms of valuation and disposability. As Seb Franklin explains in *The Digitally Disposed*,

digitality¹¹⁸ as a cultural logic both produces and is produced by users who experience their devices as media of frictionless connection. In the present, that experience both requires and invisibilizes a massive carbon footprint, vast amounts of waste, and myriad forms of disposable labor (3).

Digital experience today is thus more readily named as part of a post-social or anti-social global infrastructure, even while it remains a compensatory prosthetic for individuals under platform capitalism—another "neutral necessity."

Given that Canadian and US PSE are sites invoking digitality as well as cultural diversity as global programming, we can read this genealogy of discarded ambivalences into their social

¹¹⁸Franklin defines digitality as central to the operations of global capitalism: "By 'digitality' I do not mean discrete representation in general but rather the complex of technologies, concepts, imaginaries, metaphors, and fantasies that today bear on social life from the Googleplex to the app-mediated service economy, from national and local governments to hospitals, prisons, schools, and universities, and from extraction sites to the factories in which electronic devices are assembled. The latter definition constitutes what might be called the cultural logic of contemporary capitalism" (2-3).

infrastructures. As this section has parsed, culture appears there in service of conceptual framing and market strategy for student development at every scale, creating a relational patina, site of potential transformation and thus a kind of authenticity for education consumers. The US or Canadian university promises access to knowledge that is sufficiently global but also personalizable, skipping over its socio-historical production, with reinforcement from capitalist mediation's marketization of cultural categories for profit-seeking and institutional legitimacy. Shringarpure's assemblages remind us to read geohistories into global programming, as it is especially in the context of global digital infrastructure that the Cold War can be read as an "afterlife of colonialism precisely because it allowed the US to further frameworks of governance, militarization and culture as well as language" (157) that remain robust and operative around the globe. Despite its increasingly pessimistic infrastructure, digital connectivity is still associated with personal, social and material transformation, to the degree that Google's newest subsea internet cable laid in 2019 from Portugal to South Africa was named after 18th-century writer and abolitionist Olaudah Equiano, associating increased data transmission capacity with the spread of freedom and liberal personhood by a Global North private corporation (and, by extension, with slavery as their opposite) (Franklin 1-2).

Of course, the main contradiction for considerations of undergraduate pedagogy in Canada and the US is that such global affordances are institutionally real, if brittle, and in many public universities necessary for economic survival and mobility. While GL via diversity policies at scale tends to reproduce "white people as the true diverse subjects, the new natives, and protectors of the value of human difference" (Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández 82) given the reality of who administers social institutions and their wealth, studying global cultures or with specific globe-spanning cultural frameworks can be socially affirming or reparative for

minoritized, diasporic, first generation, and international student populations, or for white and elite Americans or Canadians who are committed to unlearning and critique. By socially affirming or reparative I mean learning work that may be meaningfully experienced as personal, identity-based, communal and substantively epistemic. Pedagogical globalism's promiscuity has meant that culturally specific frameworks that socially provision educational experiences for minoritized students are also often marked as global, inviting in instrumentalized and scalar modes of study that affirm imperial modernity as the epistemic as well as historical- institutional condition of minoritarian study. In this context, critical interventions from teacher-scholars since the 1990s have produced theories and practices of culturally-relevant and culturally-responsive pedagogy (CRP), defined as a "pedagogy of opposition ... specifically committed to collective, not merely individual, empowerment' [that] promotes marginalized students' cultural integrity, language maintenance, and critical sociopolitical consciousness" (Liu 1, quoting Gloria Ladson-Billings). This practice maintains marginalized students' cultural repertoires and linguistic range to enable their navigation of institutions, professions and social access broadly speaking in contemporary domestic and global contexts (Liu 3), bringing a kind of harm reduction approach to credentialing those students.

These rich theorizations of curriculum frameworks couched in and limned by a particular culture's collective social consciousness rather than via the group-level corporate awareness of multicultural education have typically not been examined in classroom practice nor assessed from the perspective of students (and their parents). When considered in practical settings, it becomes clearer that nesting an oppositional, collectivizing cultural framework into Canada or the US's PSE infrastructure heightens the contradictions of learning conditions for the students marked as its beneficiaries. Much like the commodification of multicultural experience for the

labour market vicissitudes of global capitalism, CRP is experienced as part of the university's promised access to positional advantage at least as much as a social justice politic or an occasion for collective affirmation. This is commonsensical given how political economic conditions have rendered education as a personal or private good, and thus CRP in practice serves as a potential enhancement criterion for the credential, perhaps like FIU's Global Learning Medallion for whom it deems especially global students. While a CRP approach is susceptible to translation loss in practice, as surveys of student and parent experiences of CRP find,

even when CRP is implemented with fidelity and thoughtfulness, it is still subject to commodification because of a changing economy that rewards workers who exhibit cosmopolitan traits—traits such as “openness toward divergent cultural experiences (Liu 2).

Perhaps more clearly than any other curricular element, CRP names cultural repertoires and cultural identities as assets that individual students can possess and cultivate (countering theories of historical minorities based in educational lack or deficit) in institutional and professional settings and thus sets up self-commodification as central aspect of “lifelong learning” for the global knowledge economy. This self-commodifying mode that leverages identities and cultural fluencies is also compatible with debt as an economic relation to the university, as the next chapter will discuss. Despite its micro-possibilities for pedagogy, culture thus deployed shores up the competition of student consumers within any possible global problem mix scenario that has been made to seem personalized through cultural authenticity, whether in the diverse cosmopolitan mode of the imperial beneficiary, toward an alternative minoritarian representationalism, or some self-commodified combination.

In summary, today's visions for learning globality via culture itemize and stage the social characteristics a global citizen will be able to exhibit. GCE, and global study itself, often invokes the promise of greater identification with others as the moral imperative of the infrastructure of

connectivity that institutionalized global study represents and sponsors. While “human solidarity” is scarcely invoked in programming objectives, formulations like a “sense of social responsibility,” “the values associated with social justice and equity,” and “intergroup empathy” are common in examples where the sentimental goals of GCE are elaborated. Yet, across the sites presented in this chapter, we can observe the normative social training for the undergraduate in these settings as two-pronged: for the individual, literacy in difference, complexity and global problems allows for the transcendence of one’s social location toward whatever orientations are beneficial for the undergraduate pipeline’s contexts of neoliberal socioeconomic positioning and corporate cultures; for the group, a balance of positions is sought as a valorized multicultural form, negotiated via diverse perspectives. That this sounds close to how we might define human solidarity in general terms – working across difference to find group solutions to complex social problems – is no accident, but rather the prosocial norm itself that casts the university’s others as anti-social or less social, sub-civic for their lack of institutionalism, even while it is in reality far closer to a historically and regionally specific corporate stakeholder mode of sociability.

The AAC&U’s Global Engagement Survey for measuring global citizenship attributes in graduates includes cultural humility, or self-reported openness to diversity and to others, as one of three core categories alongside critical reflection and global citizenship (“Global Engagement Survey”). It is no accident that assessments of student performance reveal how

SOC [students of color] begin and complete global learning programs with greater self-reported openness to diversity than white students report possessing even at the completion of global learning programs (Hartman et al 46).

This contradiction – that one’s culture can be oppressed within mainstream civic infrastructures yet also an asset for one’s positional advantage professionally – is a core example of the institutional pessimism that this thesis observes in global capitalism’s connectivity era. As a

feature of elite diversification in Taiwo and Rossi's aforementioned theory of "woke capitalism," fluency in cultural frameworks transforms into positional advantage, a kind of cosmopolitanism reflexive to flux in labour conditions that reflects university globalism's social organization and epistemic conditions at scale. Hence we end up with pseudo-humanist interventions like "personalizing" curriculum and digital networks as sentimental culture and social innovation on one hand, and culturally-responsive pedagogy trapped within a pessimistic social infrastructure on the other, revealing a site of contradiction more than transformation or reparation.

This chapter began with the task of defining the "field imaginary" of global studies across its multi-dimensional programming and its role in policy promotion and marketing. Across the sites and scales of higher education's world culture discussed above, we might summarize this field imaginary as a promotional vision of global civic culture, based in an understanding of the US or Canadian university as "a form of global mass culture" and "an extraordinarily successful cultural form, implanted across the globe through colonization and the destruction of competing models of higher education" (Denning 1). The emphasis of this definitional labour has been on the university as a site for the production of semi-privatized yet semi-nationalized modes of citizenship that are shaped by the ideologemes of settler nationalism and racial capitalism in these national settings, exemplified by GCE as "an ethnocentric, global capitalist understanding of cross-cultural relationships" (Barbour 73). Perhaps the universalism of global learning within an US or Canadian institutional world is simply functional literacy + cultural complexity = transformation of the student into flexible human capital; minus the institutional, geographic and moral facts of exclusion, oppression, exploitation, struggle, and solidarity.

CHAPTER 4: THE GLOBAL STUDENT

Students have figured across all of the thesis's chapters, as the subjects of a range of globalist projects. They appear within the "moral because marketable" logic of globalist credential administration (Introduction), as "basic income units" for university budgets as well as educational services consumers sourced from domestic and global markets (Chapter 1), as learners or "roaming autodidacts" who serve globalist interfaces as both information producer and "personalized" data user (Chapter 2), and as self-commodifying workers in lifelong training, self-scaling through digital and multicultural networks and trained to be the beneficiaries of globalist institutions under global racial capitalism (Chapter 3). Examining undergraduates under university globalism, this chapter locates them in institutional infrastructures for multi-scalar social reproduction. My analysis at this scale distills the shared situation of students in and as globalist infrastructure for these public university systems, per their institutionally produced material conditions and cultural positioning. By reading the relationships constitutive of infrastructure as an index of material and social reproduction, this chapter aims to make visible lived contradictions and organic intellectualism among university globalism's subjects. Together with the next chapter, focused on student narratives as registers of their self-development through curriculum, I aim to evaluate the critical pedagogical possibilities for classroom work responsive to the global contemporary and its local and regional urgencies.

Student Genres

As a mass cultural genre, the undergraduate student figure has long been symbolically loaded in both the US and Canada, where the outdated archetype of the "traditional student"

persists as a unit of policy analysis and in social and critical imaginaries of university life. Originally white and male, this student is the 18-24-year-old youth subject of a highly resourced period of relatively protected and full-time social and academic exploration, based in residence and pastoral care in an elite or exclusive environment dedicated to *Bildung*. This cultural imagery of campus privilege and protection also persists to market a more maximalist university as a place-based cultural experience, so it is also where “global” students are figured as evidence of this experiential prestige. Yet this archetype applies to less than one-third of US undergraduates¹¹⁹ and the roughly 12% of Canadian undergraduates in the campus residential model alongside a fraction of international students.¹²⁰ The “nontraditional” majority (who are also women) are enrolled in defunded public universities, community or technical colleges, online university programs, and for-profit universities, while also working full- or part-time, living and commuting from off-campus and often with parents, studying online and/or returning for schooling later in life, caring for dependents, and navigating debt and precarious conditions for reproducing themselves. International students are also not especially figured by dominant discourses about PSE, despite the intense, unique effects of border, labour and other social policies on their experiences in Canada or the US, as this chapter will discuss.

This durable student archetype also assumes (and sometimes is wielded by PSE’s critics to undermine) the reproductive futurity of the current institutional and professional landscape for cultural and economic elites, mobilized in part to project global influence and institutional power. The “global student” figures in this imagery as one kind of prominent and normative

¹¹⁹This figure, a 32% average across institutional types, is based in 2016 data, per the Urban Institute: http://collegeaffordability.urban.org/prices-and-expenses/room-and-board/#/room_and_board_by_type_of_institution. It is likely that the coronavirus pandemic underway since 2019 has dramatically reduced this percentage, although its conditions also likely distorted the US’s 2020 Census data collection.

¹²⁰Data regarding on-campus student residence rates is not systematically collected in Canadian higher ed, although some individual universities do publish this information. An industry report on purpose-built student housing on and off campus provides a partial analysis of these trends; see pages 20-21 for more detailed data: https://assets.alignvest.com/f/86523/x/cf825b678e/student-housing-market-report-canada_final.pdf.

beneficiary of institutional capital, although reliance on this latter figure tends to cluster in selective institutions who are competing for prestige, donors and alumni shareholders, rankings, corporate partnerships, research funding and international networks to maintain “excellence.” Still, “student” tends to invite generic moralizing about the social character of young people as inheritors of the anxious capitalist and settler national status quo. Such discourse occurs in lieu of recognition of core facts about their futures based in present and predicted ecological, resource and infrastructure crises that should alter the basic premises of PSE as well, as they have for some young people who are currently experiencing infrastructural breakdown, protesting climate and other forms of global injustice, and abandoning higher ed or student debt repayment as an economic imperative.¹²¹ This inherited student imagery organizes some of the ambivalence this thesis explores as an institutional affect produced by contemporary PSE’s contradictions, and suggests a place to begin for apprehending students themselves as part of globalist infrastructure.

In the US, this rhetorical production of the student genre has conjoined critical diagnoses of the Millennial and Gen Z generations (the main groups of undergraduates in this thesis’s period) as narcissistic, hyper-sensitive or excessively demanding of institutional provisioning with the dismissal that the student debt crisis, a total figure approaching 1.8 trillion USD at the time of writing and affecting 44 million,¹²² is merely a middle-class concern, or its abolishment a demand that will mostly benefit the professional and managerial classes (PMC) who are more

¹²¹Per February 2020, pre-pandemic payment suspensions, US student loan default rates were estimated to be around 20%, affecting 9 million borrowers and their families. This number is predicted to increase once payments resume due to economic strain caused by the pandemic and its policies. Sources: <https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/fact-sheets/2020/04/student-loan-default-has-serious-financial-consequences>; <https://educationdata.org/student-loan-default-rate>. These effects are also visible in student enrolment declines in the US, which have fallen by 12% between 2010 and 2020 and during the pandemic, an additional 6.6%. More info here: <https://nscresearchcenter.org/current-term-enrollment-estimates/> and <https://www.insidehighered.com/admissions/views/2022/02/28/enrollment-changes-colleges-are-feeling-are-much-more-covid-19>. In Canada, federal student loan payments and interest have been paused due to the pandemic, but prior to 2020 students were exhibiting an estimated national default rate of 1 in 6, or 17.6%, which is around 22,000 ex-students (2018 data, sourced from here: <https://www.hoyes.com/press/joe-debtor/the-student-debtor/>).

¹²²Source: <https://educationdata.org/student-loan-debt-statistics>.

able to carry their debt with high wages. Students who already feel the logics of global capitalist, heteropatriarchal and settler national futurity upheld by the higher educational credential slipping away or absent from their learning conditions are barely figured, except in rationalizing administrative discourses and speculative market frameworks such as “demographic realism.”¹²³ Higher ed scholars and activists today thus constantly raise the social facts of inequality within and produced by universities, highlighting high rates of food insecurity, homelessness, mental illness, insecure citizenship, the amount of time students spend commuting and parking, and precarious and heavy workloads alongside consumer and student debt that together prevent the kinds of social connection and self-development conceived of by educators or advertised by administrators. These student realities overlap with “global” student experiences, including within impoverished, underresourced institutions, as this chapter narrates.

The relatively high public institutional resourcing for Canadian undergraduates has engendered a less stark or pessimistic version of this social dynamic in support of human capital and national development, in which gradual tuition raises have largely been seen as acceptable to the populace since the 1970s, while total student debt has climbed to 18 billion CAD and affects 1.7 million students.¹²⁴ Given how few students study outside their province of residence, uneven geographies of population density in Canada shape its social imagery of the university student, with urban campus-based students dominant and students based in more rural university settings with less capital intensity less figured. Higher ed discourses are inflected by institutional assimilation of immigrant populations and their national promise of economic productivity as well, generating a politicized milieu that is separated from international student populations whose tuition revenue has been disproportionately financing Canadian PSE over the last decade.

¹²³For an expanded discussion of this administrative logic and its use to speculate about higher ed's crises of future market capture, see <https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/demographic-realism-and-the-crisis-of-higher-education/>.

¹²⁴Source: <https://reviewlution.ca/resources/student-debt-in-canada-statistics/>.

The national celebration of international students for their market contributions downplays their difficult living and learning conditions, characterized by isolation, high costs and vulnerability to racialized and gendered labour exploitation; during pandemic conditions, international student suicide deaths have been reported to be a growing phenomenon.¹²⁵ These dynamics are further complicated by the politics of institutionalization and reputation management surrounding First Nations peoples in Canada: intensifying efforts at Indigenous programming and student and faculty inclusion in settler universities are set against the largely non-performative reparation undertaken thus far in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, while settler colonialism continues to organize social relations and uneven resource infrastructures including in PSE.¹²⁶ Nevertheless, student debt and mental health crises have not widely been seen as prominent products of a university education in Canada, despite over 54% of the student population carrying student loan debt at the time of graduation¹²⁷, over 50% working to live during study, and 70% of students surveyed by the National Collegiate Health Assessment in 2019 experiencing “overwhelming anxiety” and over 50% “living with debilitating depression.”¹²⁸

Students are thus positioned in another cultural dynamic recently explored in critical scholarship on settler colonialism and neoliberalism in a time of waning institutional legitimacy

¹²⁵Source:

<https://newcanadianmedia.ca/recent-deaths-by-suicide-of-indian-international-students-point-to-disturbing-trend/>.

¹²⁶The TRC is a state institutional project to reckon with settler colonial and cultural genocide of First Nations peoples via Canadian schooling and dispossessive, biopolitical and carceral policies. A 2021 accountability analysis conducted by Toronto Metropolitan University’s First Nations-led Yellowhead Institute notes how “Canada is choosing to complete the symbolic calls with expediency while neglecting the structural changes called for by the TRC,” operating like “a crude colonial balance sheet: once a Call to Action is complete, Canadians can then forget about it and feel better about themselves” (“Executive Summary” 2). Source: <https://yellowheadinstitute.org/trc/>.

¹²⁷Source: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=3710003601>.

¹²⁸See a 2009 report inclusive of data up until that point for more information on this estimate:

https://library.carleton.ca/sites/default/files/find/data/surveys/pdf_files/millennium_2009-04-15_rn-9_en.pdf; a 2011 estimate based in a sample survey also cites a roughly 56% rate of undergraduates working during their degrees, with an average of 18 hours per week and more than 40% working more than 20 hours per week:

<https://www.macleans.ca/work/jobs/more-students-balancing-school-and-part-time-jobs>. A 2021 Maclean’s article covers the crisis of mental health among Canada’s undergraduates, including this 2019 survey’s finding: <https://thewalrus.ca/inside-the-mental-health-crisis-facing-college-and-university-students/>.

and resources, which is a sentimental longing for stronger institutions and administration of social life. This posture accepts “strategies of rest and repair ... not as tools to continue the work of challenging empire, but rather as adequate forms of social change in and of themselves” (Stuelke “Books”), as explored in Patricia Stuelke’s *The Ruse of Repair: US Neoliberal Empire and the Turn from Critique*. Compatible with other university infrastructures for connection and personalization, this desire for sentimental repair is visible among student and institutional cultures via corporate-friendly practices of self-care and emotional management, pedagogies of post-critical global study,¹²⁹ surface reading and culturalist representation, and digital performance and popular literary cultures based in aesthetic pleasure and identity-based authenticity and consumption as regenerative modes of living under Empire. Stuelke identifies this practice as a long-term effect of the university’s institutionalization of critique and minority politics birthed by militant student activism. This institutional orientation is not the same as the also-present process of elite capture, or “when the advantaged few steer resources and institutions that could serve the many toward their own narrower interests and aims,” thereby “forcing people to coordinate on a narrower social project that disproportionately represents elite interests” (Taiwo, *Elite Capture* 22, 32). Rather, this recent sentimentality reflects the double binds created by the pessimistic infrastructure that university worlds are sustaining. Such institutional identification based in ambivalence trades the difficult collective politics of anti-institutionality for group aesthetics and reformist innovations, appearing in scholarly, instructional and student cultural production.

Mixed social forms are abundant in the institutional positioning and activity of today’s students. The participatory nature of university infrastructure tracks some students into service

¹²⁹See pages 156-157 in Pashby et al, “A meta-review of typologies of global citizenship education” for discussion of postcritical forms of GCE.

work for the university, such as for participants in student government or culture or ethnicity based leadership and networking organizations, which can literalize student and institutional alignment under a service ethos that positions students as peer and self-managers to shore up the institution. Their organizing work toward social justice reforms can also perform a regenerative function for university globalism. As an infrastructural element in both PSE contexts, student activism takes on projects at a range of scales, from politics of the local or institutional to the national, international, and transcolonial. In the US student protests often address labour and equity conditions and institutional abuses, with piecemeal successes, but are dismissed in popular media as merely cultural politics representing “attitudes, norms, outlook and discourse within the ‘culture industry’” (Mintz). Canada’s undergraduates have a relatively successful advocacy culture, often winning demands for reformed learning conditions due to national advocacy organizations like the Canadian Federation of Students, union presence on campuses, and institutional commitments to equity, however short term such gains may be.¹³⁰ Across these student organizing cultures, university labourer or participatory manager is recently emerging as an undergraduate student form wielded by activist discourse. By aligning with the broader labour ecosystem that serves the university’s social reproduction and capital management rather than with its default conditions of “overwork, debt, precariousness, and alienation ...[as] the necessary requirements for participating” (Kamola and Meyerhoff 17) in university life, students as organizers around labour and debt exhibit recognition of institutionalism as a logic of methodological individualism. Such redefinition of the credential deepens ambivalence as a realist institutional affect, thanks to ongoing coalitional unionization efforts across higher ed labour sectors. It also suggests a unified student situation, in which the muddled class category of

¹³⁰See <https://www.universityaffairs.ca/features/feature-article/the-hot-mess-of-student-activism/> for a brief overview of this history.

knowledge worker, inclusive of both the PMC and serf-like service or digital labourers for tech platforms, can be recognized as the product of higher ed for today's global knowledge economy.

Students in and as Globalist Infrastructure

Proponents of infrastructuralism as a method offer it as an analytic shortcut to questions of political economy and social reproduction. Consider a general assumption in infrastructural analysis, or what Caroline Levine calls “attending closely to the jostling, colliding, and overlapping of social, cultural, technological, and natural forms” (“Infrastructuralism” 65): that reading for infrastructure, perhaps especially in institutional inertia and practice, makes clear that such a “relational and ecological process of sustaining worlds ... is mostly visible in its failure” (Berlant, “Commons” 402). Put another way, infrastructure is ideology's environmental sidekick that “aims for the invisible, taken-for-granted status of the best ideology: when infrastructure works as it should, we often stop seeing it” (Wilson 248). While university infrastructure is fundamentally limited as a site of capitalist social reproduction, its obvious role in sorting and creating class formations and a kind of accredited personhood against a wider backdrop of inequality, precariousness, surveillance and carceral infrastructures stages the undergraduate student as a public cultural object and the subject of moral concern in domestic and international citizenship imaginaries. If we can take university environments to be composed of mostly semi-private spaces, conditioned by certain social exclusions and thus engendering impersonal intimacies, as Ellen Rooney has written about university classrooms,¹³¹ then it also makes sense

¹³¹Rooney explains her neologism: “the semiprivate room shelters strangers who have in common the quite particular neediness that brings them there, in close proximity to each other, and crucially, available to a host of other people, most of them strangers as well. ... The semiprivate is in this respect a structure that regulates and facilitates a certain mode of attention. It is a discipline and, as such, it entails a mode of address. The particular quality of this disciplined or disciplinary address also marks the semiprivate of the classroom. ... a certain discourse or contract of cooperation and compromise reigns, although it is always and everywhere vulnerable to renegotiation, even as coercion, legal and physical, remains a real possibility” (131).

to read such an infrastructure contextually in terms of its inequality and unevenness or as a discrete, partial social layer. Defining the global student as both broadly and intimately infrastructural, then, requires clarity about what it is that students service in the reproduction of university globalism, both for the university and beyond it in global capitalist formations.

As summarized in Chapters 2 and 3, despite its pessimistic operations via appropriated and managed discourses of social or individualized transformation, the global university's *Bildung*, expressed by the "inclusive excellence," global citizen and connectivity narratives of capitalist development that the institution presumes students desire upon entry, acts as a projected human capital telos for higher education itself in a global paradigm dominated by university forms and entangled tech platforms in the US and Canada. Likewise, with these narratives students are marketed to and sourced from around the globe. This locates students in these settings of post-basic, elite education in a domain of global mass culture that spans the Cold War university, internationally exported as an institutional model during 20th-century decolonization, to the globalist university with its mutations toward private finance, the service economy and cosmopolitan capture of digital, cultural and human capital from a world market.¹³² The visibility of students as infrastructure thus is a product of increasing dysfunction in the institution's sentimental and economic social capture of its membership, due to openly degraded and deprofessionalizing learning and labour conditions, with features unique to the connectivity era of the 1990s to the present. These glitches are also in the contemporary reproduction of globalism itself as the legal-institutional, anti-democratic project of transnational capital's managers in conjunction with states and associated institutions, as informal categories of labour and management become increasingly common and legible against waning institutional

¹³²See pages 3-6 of Michael Denning's "Lineaments and Contradictions of the Neoliberal University System" for analysis in support of this claim about universities in the US or Canada as an agent and a site of global mass culture.

legitimacy and crises of social reproduction and ecology across the world system.

However, students have been canny about their symbolic and political economic functions for nationalism and imperialism via higher education's evolving programmes since the post-WWII state effort to achieve domestic social justice and protect national security simultaneously through the expansion of the public university system and its enrolments to historically marginalized groups. Students in both national contexts agitated throughout the 1960s and 70s on behalf of minority personhood, affirmative action, inclusive curriculum and governance structures, and academic freedom, and against anticommunism, imperialist warfare and university research for military application and environmental destruction. Their political demands often appealed to the institution for rights as though it was a state, and critiqued the public research university as a government entity directly contributing to American imperialism (inclusive of Canada's alliance and provision of arms, napalm, etc). As Melinda Cooper narrates regarding this period's human capital policy, the political rise of Ronald Reagan also revived the logic of *in loco parentis*, a mode of discipline that gave university campuses and administrators the powers of guardianship *in situ* as a tool for suppressing social, sexual and political activity among students, which arguably persists in contemporary moral panics about universities that have propelled expulsions of individual instructors, staff and students who are disruptive or exposing of institutional bigotry, hypocrisy, neglect or mismanagement. Students protested *in loco parentis* as a project to institutionalize the racial and sexual normativity of the Fordist family in the university as the nation's new "knowledge factory" (Cooper 229) at a time when newly included student populations, especially feminist, Indigenous, Black and Latinx students, sought to transform the university precisely away from those mythic norms and their episteme. As part of this long-term backlash, outlined in Roderick Ferguson's historical accounting of

student protest in US universities, such insurgent intellectual visions for the university were progressively rationalized (including symbolically, i.e., made to seem irrational) by institutional counterinsurgencies. These have included the emergence of the campus police force to replace *in loco parentis*, the rise of corporate personhood and power based in an appropriation of collectivist minority politics into the grievance politics of individual legal entities, and the further fragmentation of students via reduction of the social sphere to entrepreneurialism, consumerism and self-investment through neoliberal-era policies that are legally and morally couched in the private individual or the family as the only effective economic institutions for self-provisioning.

These evolving managerial practices in university worlds function by masking student work as instead a form of consumption, while the social fact remains that “in the twenty-first century, ‘being a student’ names a way of work” that conditions and colonizes the experience of youth in terms of flex labour capacity rather than leisure and *Bildung*, even while “student” often designates one type of a “worker which is not one” (Bousquet 44; 27-8). Universities now sustain this “pedagogical masking”¹³³ by referring to students as “stakeholders.” This term originates in gambling and financial speculation but is now “a term of organizational ethics” (Leary 163) that performs democratic, participatory cooperation across disparately interested individuals or bodies in managerial terms, which is also compatible with a consumerist framework for university student behaviors. While students are incentivized by debt to maximize their credential and navigate programming like a consumer, universities rely on tuition revenues as bonds to leverage their construction and capital projects for ongoing market capture; student

¹³³This concept originates in sociology of childhood and schooling to describe how child labour has been rendered as “learning” through pedagogical ideology. Per Jurgen Zinnecker, “The working activities during childhood moratorium are disguised by pedagogical ideologies Learning is not understood as a type of work, whereby children contribute productively to the future social and economic development of the society. Only the adult work of teachers is emphasized as productive contribution to the development of human capital. The corresponding learning activities of pupils are thus defined, not as work but as a form of intellectual consumption” (45).

“stake” is not theirs to shape beyond self-investment through learning experiences as a rationalized, economic form of self-development. Thus, the insurgent institutional imaginaries inherited from the 20th century have sedimented into a new post-rights form of unequal membership that sells an image of PSE as variously personalizable yet prosocial self-investment or intergenerational investment. John Patrick Leary names this managerial turn to stakeholder discourses a conflation of “access with rights, obscuring hierarchies of power under the veneer of collaboration” (164). We can consider it as another of university globalism’s anti-social forms, representing a financialized, individualized norm of self-interest and risk management in the pro-social institutionalist terms of “participatory management” (Kamola and Meyerhoff 6).

The global student emerges from this contemporary site of informalized work and management in service of PSE’s administration of debt and credit. As aforementioned, students now finance the university’s own risk management and reproduction as an increasingly leveraged enterprise, due to progressive institutional defunding by federal and state or provincial governments in their respective contexts, global financial and educational services deregulation, and international competition and expansion among individual universities since the 1990s. The scale of this infrastructural service to institutional continuity by students and their families is disparate in each national system, yet true to and increasing in both more or less along the same timeline, from the 1960s to the present and most intense since 2008’s Great Recession. With a new funding model tabulated per enrolments rather than robust public resourcing, both Canadian and American public higher ed underwent major expansion in the decades after WWII, democratizing and funding access throughout the 1960s-70s via federal cash transfers and their respective provincial and state tax bases in what is now harkened back to, particularly nostalgically in the US, as the “public good” higher education model. As antecedent to the

connectivity infrastructures of the 1990s onwards, the Cold War university required a fragile compromise between its projects of state-sponsored research and development, ideological training for high and mid-level managers and professionals (including elite postcolonial students), and greater access to PSE funded by the Cold War state's R&D resources (Denning 2-4). Rather than congealing into a public good, these features were openly contradictory to students of that era, juxtaposed with local and international political conditions of militarist, colonial, racist and sexual violence and the contemporaneous decolonization movement across the Global South, prompting a wide landscape of student protest and demands for alternative forms and politics of institutionality in both countries.

Between the '70s and the '90s, the domestication of these student movement politics into university programming and austerity policies responding to economic recession led to waning state support and the emergence of the research-intensive university as the dominant binational model for public universities, now organized by the global prestige trade in "excellence." This period also saw the emergence of the administrative university and the entrepreneurial university as common institutional forms overseeing profitable technology transfer and industry partnerships, as IP and patent development became key sites of commercialization for both PSE systems following the US's 1980 Bayh-Dole Act that granted universities ownership of patents resulting from publicly-funded research (Denning 6). Simultaneously, students were rationalized as the new underwriters of institutional reproduction in the US, if not physical and capital expansion, as affirmative action as a social-institutional commitment to redressing structural racism unravelled into a per-individual logic of diversity and inclusion after 1978's University of California v Bakke case on "reverse discrimination."¹³⁴ US students were sorted into "selective"

¹³⁴*Broke* outlines this historical shift that now underlies all diversity management at public universities as benefiting the corporate institution, rather than for the benefit of individuals themselves: "The court ruled that quotas or set-aside spots were unconstitutional. The only 'compelling government interest' that allowed a public university to explicitly consider

and “nonselective” sectors, with the latter being much larger and mostly public, including more underfunded institutions and lower graduation rates, and accommodating the for-profit college industry and its massive growth since the mid 1990s (McMillan Cottom and Tuchman 3).

As of the early 70s, US-based students also became an ongoing site for “new experiments in the financial management and control of life through debt,” a project that was government insured to protect the interests of banks and the international credit system from an “otherwise risky population” (Adamson 100). This development generated on-campus infrastructures for predatory lending and financial control of students that continue to mediate between US students, banks and the global financial sector today; hence the relative spread of their infrastructural service is deeper, more extreme and more long term. For Canadian students, alongside growing enrolments throughout this period of provincial PSE development, institutional resources for students diminished as faculty were employed less in pastoral care and teaching and incentivized to serve the research paradigm (catalyzing the eventual unionization of most of the university sector), and governments cut student aid, causing debt rates to double in the decade following student loan limit liberalization in 1994.¹³⁵ In today’s universities, as Chris Newfield’s work on the arc of public institutional devolution has made clear, “the only reliable net positive private revenue is student tuition” (“Universities After Neoliberalism” 81).

In this period of development that led to university globalism’s solidification, educational policy and institutional funding and management were centralized under provincial and state governments, shaping the uneven rates of capitalization per regional political, demographic and development ecologies that we continue to see in both countries today. This is germane to

race was ‘diversity.’ This shift was deeply consequential. The US moved from recognizing URS as deserving of ‘educational compensation’ for structural racism, to seeing student race as but one of many individual identities that comprise a diverse college campus” (11).

¹³⁵Source: <https://higheredstrategy.com/happy-birthday-canada-student-loans-program-part-the-last/>.

students as infrastructure given that only 1 in 10 Canadian students leave their home province for PSE,¹³⁶ and 43% of US students move out of state for undergraduate study with 39 out of 50 states hosting majority in-state enrolments¹³⁷, clarifying the profound roles played by location, mobility and geography in student experience. While federal governments continue to fund some student aid and research in both contexts, in the US the majority of research funding for public higher ed goes to the most elite and wealthy public research universities that readily claim globality.¹³⁸ Canada's competitive federal system for research funding is egalitarian across provinces yet also supports the overaccumulation of globalist prestige and resourcing, due to local deregulation and individual institutional autonomy that enhances competitive behaviors. Ontario historically has been and presently is a national outlier in its high degree of PSE marketization, yet drives up funding and expense rates across national averages. It has also played a norm-setting role for profit-seeking practices such as maximizing international tuition revenue or rents on purpose-built student housing, or employing the performance-based funding model pioneered in the US (which Alberta has also adopted as of 2020¹³⁹). Among Canada's universities, which excepting Ontario still receive provincial funds for expenditures and operations at comparatively high rates next to US state universities, highest tuition rates occur in major city settings, reflecting "anchor" institutional logics. Alongside competitive scholarship funding, both PSE systems include lowest tuition rates for provincial or in-state residents, mostly

¹³⁶This is according to 2012 data, as outlined here: <https://www.univcan.ca/universities/facts-and-stats/>.

¹³⁷Source:

<https://poetsandquantsforundergrads.com/news/on-the-move-new-study-shows-more-students-leaving-home-for-college/>.

¹³⁸Per NSF: "Although only about one-third of doctoral-granting institutions are public universities, they performed two-thirds (\$52.1 billion) of academic R&D in 2018. Additionally, more public universities than private universities report R&D expenditures. The top 25 public universities performed \$23.8 billion in R&D, around 46% of the public university total"; source: <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsb20202/academic-r-d-in-the-united-states>.

¹³⁹For information on this provincial development, see

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/edmonton/performance-based-funding-post-secondary-education-reactions-1.5434081>.

higher tuition rates for domestic students out of province or state, and highest tuition rates for international noncitizen students; tuition rates also vary by degree program. While more extreme in the US, stratification of student experience in both systems is largely organized by institution, location, inherited wealth or credentials, and citizenship status extending into a global market.

So what have been the effects on students in the neoliberal period of university globalism? Given how overdetermined common student imagery in national discourses can be, it's important to be clear about the material reality of the undergraduate student situation, which in some ways represents the most stable, extractive human infrastructure for social reproduction at the level of individual institutions (while graduate study more directly represents the crises in academia's reproduction). Some quantitative metrics for purposes of definition and comparison, at the time of writing: Ontario's University of Toronto's domestic tuition rate is Canada's highest at 11,500 CAD per year, and British Columbia's Royal Roads University is second highest at 10,100 CAD per year, compared to a national mean tuition of 6,693 CAD per year and lowest domestic rates in Newfoundland & Labrador at 2,500 CAD per year and Quebec at around 2,700 CAD per year.¹⁴⁰ The average cost per year of university education is consistently underestimated in higher ed reportage, though the Royal Bank of Canada reports its increase by 2.5 times in real terms between 1990 and 2018.¹⁴¹ In US public universities, the highest domestic tuition rate is

¹⁴⁰PSE conditions are uneven across Canada's provinces per political ecologies and capital accumulation in those locales. Both Quebec and Newfoundland & Labrador have particular histories of successful student activism toward lower and stabilized tuition fees (such as 2012's Maple Spring uprising resisting raised tuition in Quebec) as well as social resourcing of provincial education by their governments that have fixed their provincial and domestic tuition rates at low, more accessible levels for the populace. However, Memorial University Newfoundland, the province's lone university, just doubled tuition in 2022, raising it for the first time since 1997 in response to a new provincial budget auguring progressive defunding. For more on tuition history in N&L, see: <https://www.saltwire.com/newfoundland-labrador/news/tuition-more-than-doubling-at-newfoundland-and-labradors-memorial-university-100609842/>; and an overview of policy history here: <https://inequalitygaps.org/case-studies/our-most-recent-crop/government-funding-and-equitable-access-to-university-education-in-newfoundland-and-labrador-1949-2014/>.

¹⁴¹Sources: <https://www.macleans.ca/education/the-cost-of-a-canadian-university-education-in-six-charts/>; and http://www.rbc.com/economics/economic-reports/pdf/other-reports/Tuition_June2018.pdf.

William and Mary College's 23,812 USD per year¹⁴², and lowest rates appear in Massachusetts state universities, at 970 USD per year.¹⁴³ The average annual cost of US public university education more than doubled in the 21st century, with an annual growth rate of 6.8%.¹⁴⁴

All students service infrastructural continuity from across the spectrum of PSE conditions and learning modes. In the US, net student tuition revenue contributes 44% to university budgets on average, and up to 75% of operating budgets¹⁴⁵ for over a third of state systems. In Canada, tuition revenue comprises on average 31.6% of university budgets (per 2019/2020 data)¹⁴⁶ and often a majority fraction of operating budgets, such as McMaster's 62% at the time of writing.¹⁴⁷ International student tuition disproportionately contributes to revenues in both countries, but especially in Canada and the province of Ontario. In the US, per 2016 data, international students contributed on average 12% of total tuition revenue to public universities (net institutional aid) and more than 30% for some,¹⁴⁸ and in Canada per 2020 data, 12% of operating revenue and 35% of all revenue. In Ontario, the figure is 68% across operating budgets for the province's 24 universities,¹⁴⁹ and University of Toronto has since 2019 relied on international student tuition specifically as its largest source of general revenue, 30%, next to provincial funding's 25% and

¹⁴²Source:

<https://www.usnews.com/education/best-colleges/the-short-list-college/articles/colleges-with-the-highest-in-state-tuition>.

¹⁴³Source: <https://www.collegecalc.org/lists/america/most-affordable-in-state-tuition/>.

¹⁴⁴Source: <https://educationdata.org/average-cost-of-college>.

¹⁴⁵Source: <https://shef.sheeo.org/report/>.

¹⁴⁶Source: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/220120/cg-c003-eng.htm>.

¹⁴⁷Source: <https://provost.mcmaster.ca/budget-planning/budget-details-overview/budget-details-components/>

¹⁴⁸Disaggregated data about international student tuition rates or revenues is not generally publicly available in the US context, in part because out-of-state students may pay the same high rates, generating more of a chasm between resident and nonresident students than domestic and international (although this is offset by student aid for domestic students somewhat). 2003-2016 data is the most recent publicly available, as aggregated by Mingyu Chen in her self-published research paper "The Impact of International Students on US Colleges: Higher Education as a Service Export," from which this data is cited (pg 1); Chen's data analysis and design has also provided the basis for Princeton University's Project ADVISE, a "data visualization tool to make estimates of international students' financial contributions available to the general public" (1). Sources: <https://ers.princeton.edu/project-advise-about> and https://edworkingpapers.com/sites/default/files/Chen_EdExports_EdWorkingPaper%20v3.pdf.

¹⁴⁹Source:

<https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/article-bulk-of-college-tuition-in-ontario-comes-from-international-students/>.

domestic tuition's 24%.¹⁵⁰ Neither setting collates private student loan debt data or debt carried by international graduates, which would likely raise student debt load figures. Per available domestic data, debt loads are comparable among public university graduates at the time of degree completion: an average of \$30,030 in the US¹⁵¹ and a median of \$25,000¹⁵²; and in Canada, average loads are \$28,000¹⁵³ and median loads between \$11,500 to \$13,300.¹⁵⁴

Given this basic transactional reproduction between students and their universities, alongside undergraduate study's necessity for the continuity of basic university functions, the exchange of student labour and funds (qua affiliated "learning") for institutional credit and credential represents a core site of risk and performance management through which university globalism is routed and reproduced. This is the case despite high attrition rates for university enrolments, as "risky" students who become debt-holders but not degree holders are often more lucrative for bundled financial securities speculation. In the US, almost 40% of student debtors never completed their degrees (Seamster), while there is an overall average retention rate of 81% at more selective publics and a 61% retention rate at open-access publics¹⁵⁵; and in Canada, the average graduation rate across its universities is 71%.¹⁵⁶ That one in six declarations of insolvency in Ontario in 2018 came from a student debtor provides another indicator.¹⁵⁷ Particularly in the US where student debt may be lifelong, a large population is permanently

¹⁵⁰Source:

<https://thevarsity.ca/2019/02/24/u-of-t-receives-more-money-from-international-students-than-from-ontario-government/>.

¹⁵¹Source: <https://educationdata.org/student-loan-debt-statistics>.

¹⁵²<https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/08/13/facts-about-student-loans/>.

¹⁵³Based on pre-pandemic data; source: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tb11/en/tv.action?pid=3710003601>.

¹⁵⁴Source: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/75-006-x/2020001/article/00005-eng.htm>.

¹⁵⁵Per 2018-2019 data; source:

<https://www.studentclearinghouse.org/nsblog/research-center-releases-2020-persistence-and-retention-report/>.

¹⁵⁶Based on 2018 figures:

<https://www.macleans.ca/education/canadian-universities-with-the-highest-and-lowest-graduation-rates/>.

¹⁵⁷Source: <https://reviewlution.ca/resources/student-debt-in-canada-statistics/>.

controlled by but not benefiting from its contingent logic of credit.¹⁵⁸

It is also the case that as institutions have become increasingly reflexive to market flux and demographic change in flexibilizing their programming and its resource infrastructures, the reported ROI for undergraduate study has diminishing stability while producing increasingly mixed results. Corresponding to public discourses of the settler nation-state as a co-beneficiary of globalist PSE, the ROI for domestic undergraduate study is more straightforward in Canada: a 10% wage increase per year of study, or a 40% lifetime overall ROI is reported for bachelors degrees, according to the nation's union for higher ed workers CUPE.¹⁵⁹ In the US the picture is more mixed, due to social inequity and the wide range of costs, with only around two-thirds of undergraduate degree programmes presenting a positive ROI; the bachelors degree has the lowest ROI of all postsecondary degrees due to credential and cost stratification. The average ROI for the first 10 years after graduation is actually negative for US undergraduates, albeit the median lifetime ROI for on-time domestic graduates is \$306,000.¹⁶⁰

The ROI as a metric has become part of essential commonplace understandings of university education as civic-economic infrastructure in its “moral because marketable” neoliberal iteration, although it does not make particularly visible the unequal and racialized structuring conditions of this credential-to-income spread. Nor does it disarticulate the relative

¹⁵⁸N.B. While finalizing this thesis for submission, the Biden Administration announced an Executive Order on August 24, 2022 that would cancel student debt for up to \$10,000 for debtholders earning up to \$125,000 per year and up to \$20,000 for borrowers who received Pell Grants. According to the HERE Lab at UC Merced, the policy would benefit 92% of borrowers, or 41 million out of 45 million total debtholders, and around 20 million borrowers will have their entire federal loan debt reduced to zero. The policy draws upon the sociology of racialized debt cited here, especially the scholarship of Louise Seamster, to address the compounded effects of the racial wealth gap by eliminating debt for 3.8 million of the 8.5 million Black borrowers. However, the policy may still be disrupted by legal challenges from its conservative objectors, includes filing requirements that could make access difficult for 8 million, and of course does not address the tuition practices of universities. If the policy goes forward as announced, 21 million borrowers in the US will still owe some portion of their existing debt. See the full analysis here: <https://protectborrowers.org/analysis-of-president-bidens-announced-executive-order-to-cancel-student-debt/>.

¹⁵⁹Source: <https://cupe.ca/returns-investment-education>.

¹⁶⁰Source:

<https://educationdata.org/college-degree-roi#:~:text=The%20lifetime%20median%20return%20on,full%2Dtime%20for%2015%20years>.

burdens of debt-holding, such as the fact that default rates in the US are highest among “people who were already suffering from inequalities in wealth, income, and resources ... [with] student loans that, by objective measures, are quite small” (McMillan Cottom, *Lower Ed* 92). Nor does it acknowledge the carceral infrastructures that have co-developed alongside university expansion in this thesis’s period of study, with the prison-industrial complex as the infrastructural partner designed to provide social legitimacy to and maintenance for higher ed’s foundational anti-sociality. As Jackie Wang outlines in *Carceral Capitalism*, predatory and parasitic governance modes conjoin the university’s sale of indebtedness to students as a practice of social control to the surrounding penal landscape co-developed in this period. As acknowledged by the US Department of Education, “from 1989–90 to 2012–13, state and local spending on corrections rose by 89 percent while state and local appropriations for higher education remained flat” (Wang 28). In his study of human capital and the Millennial generation’s development, Malcolm Harris calls this institutional landscape the “youth control complex” that materializes the “dignity work” observed by sociologist Victor Rios in a 2011 ethnography of racialized youth in Oakland, California: remaining eligible for success, and staying sane and out of jail as part of free society in order to competitively develop their human capital (Harris 125-127). In this wider institutional milieu, the university student thus also emerges as a participatory risk manager in institutional maintenance and futurity for the university and the prison system alike.

This situation of students as revenue for operating budgets and risk managers of their own credential thus conflates a number of their functions within the social reproduction and political economy of universities, variously assigning students to the positions of consumer, worker, youth (neither adult nor child), pre-professional in training, stakeholder or participatory risk manager, and debtor to state and transnational capital. This mix of student roles and

identities is an outgrowth of deregulatory policy and social management via fiscal austerity that originates in the politics of the 1980s and 1990s, which cast the expansion and financialization of student loans as a solution to declining public spending that “democratizes” finance and credit for the populace with no specificity responsive to the open racialization of creditworthiness.¹⁶¹ Such government and consumer lending was presented as good-faith, enabling borrowers to accumulate skills, knowledge, credentials and eventually wealth,¹⁶² even while it was coupled with the expansion of bad-faith and predatory lending that “uses the extension of credit as a method of dispossession” (Wang 69).¹⁶³ The US government removed restrictions on types of available loans and exempted all student debt from state usury laws, such that both private and federal student loans are relatively unlimited yet ineligible for discharge via the right to bankruptcy. In addition to near-doubling of Canadian student debt over the early 1990s to 2000s (not including private loans, which go uncounted) overseen by provincial policies,¹⁶⁴ Ontario initiated the international student conditions extant today by removing them from its health care coverage in 1994 and deregulating fees in 1996 so that institutions could set desired tuition rates.

In the decades since, US federal student loans were converted into asset-backed securities for global financial speculation given their lifetime stability, and in Canada, where federal student loans cannot be discharged or renegotiated until seven years after completion of the degree, similar corporate debt speculation was enabled on a smaller, more finite scale.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶¹See Chapter 6, “In Loco Parentis”, in Melinda Cooper’s *Family Values* on this history of “democratizing” credit; see also page 149 of Jackie Wang’s *Carceral Capitalism* for an extended discussion of racialized creditworthiness.

¹⁶²Malcolm Harris cites this logic of contemporary schooling as “grades, eventually, turn into money” (21).

¹⁶³Jackie Wang explains in *Carceral Capitalism*: “As predatory lending systematically prevents mostly poor black Americans from accumulating wealth or private property, it is a form of social exclusion that operates via the inclusion of marginalized populations as borrowers. For it is as borrowers that they are eventually marked for further social exclusion (through credit and e-scores)” (70). Wang cites citizen debtors’ subjectivation and incorporation via the extension of credit as examples of parasitic governance that exemplify carceral capitalist practice.

¹⁶⁴Source:

<https://www.postsecondarybc.ca/knowledgebase/the-history-of-post-secondary-education-in-canada-part-vi-1993-to-2003/>.

¹⁶⁵While empirical accounting of such financial speculation on student loan debt in Canada is minimal, a 2009 Bank of Canada report on securitization describes this practice associated with US student loan debt as a trend observed in

Students today are thus valued in terms of potential credit and risk, while also continually positioned by unequal learning conditions that reinforce and compound cross-racial, cross-class and citizenship inequalities. This reinforcement has been concerted. In the US, after eligibility for Title IV funding expanded in 1996 to include all 2-year and 4-year degree programs, the for-profit college sector's enrolments ballooned by 200% in the decade between 2000-2010 to include who is now the country's "numerically typical student and the projected likely student": a woman, likely Black or Latina, attending college later in life, probably working outside of school, responsible for a family and lacking institutional connections (McMillan Cottom and Tuchman 10). As Tressie McMillan Cottom's work has documented, the for-profit sector's reliance on maximum enrolments coupled with private market ethos supplied a model of a fully rationalized educational structure that became increasingly attractive to selective and non-selective institutions alike in the not-for-profit sector. This sector now manages students via borrowed innovations in mass online learning, "flexible" labour practices sans shared governance, corporate-approved curricula or centralized curricula control, and public-private partnerships funding research and the prestige trade (McMillan Cottom and Tuchman 6-7).

Given neoliberal globalism's historical antecedent in Cold War era institution-building around the globe, these mutations in the American or Canadian university also inherit practices developed for higher education as an "international commodity chain" in the Global South, including dominant models in distance and for-profit education and public-private partnerships in use as part of nation-building since 1978 (Denning 4-5). Institutional shifts toward leaner, more centralized and more punitive management and extraction of academic work coupled with profit maximization thus accord with scholarship of capital and empire's finding that through globalist

Canada as well, in which "outstanding asset-backed corporate debt was 6 percent of all corporate debt in 1993 but 18 percent in 2007" (33-34); Source: <https://www.bankofcanada.ca/wp-content/uploads/2010/06/paligorova.pdf>.

institutions, colonial and neoimperial practices of institutional containment and policing abroad are imported back home for anti-democratic management of domestic and diasporic populations. Wendy Brown calls this mode of social control a “global race to the bottom” expressly designed by neoliberal globalists and their global capital chase to

inevitably generate lower standards of living for working-class and middle-class populations in the Global North and continued exploitation and limited sovereignty, accompanied by (uneven) development, in the Global South (19).

Likewise, Nancy Fraser observes how financialized capitalism as our “present regime of racialized accumulation” has reordered the international division of labour via debt:

Much large-scale industrial exploitation now occurs outside the historic core, in the BRICS countries of the semi-periphery. And expropriation has become ubiquitous, afflicting not only its traditional subjects but also those who were previously shielded by their status as citizen-workers. In these developments, debt plays a major role, as global financial institutions pressure states to collude with investors in extracting value from defenseless populations (136).

This accords with general contemporary conditions of informalization observed by analysts of global capitalism, suggesting the waning inclusion of credentialed graduates in the labour economy as their expanding crisis conditions of undergraduate study.¹⁶⁶

These conditions include the higher price and steeper timeline of credit accessed through PSE for groups of graduates who are historically marginalized and racially excluded from wealth accumulation. Indeed, “the generalization of student loans acts as a form of regressive taxation” (Cooper 247) that reproduces and expands the historical racial and colonial wealth gap, despite the banner of institutional inclusion and self-transformation that markets university programmes. This has been particularly stark for Black Americans, where a “10 to 1 racial wealth gap for the

¹⁶⁶See, for example, Joshua Clover’s “Fanon: Absorption and Coloniality” *College Literature: A Journal Of Critical Literary Studies* vol. 45 no. 1, 2020, pg 39-45; there he claims, “the developed nations have become overdeveloped in ways that have effectively moved them not forward but back toward a political economy which is, if not properly colonial (whatever that might mean), is non-absorptive in a way that functionally replicates coloniality. ... The informal class has not vanished but grown. And more decisively for our analysis, it has ceased to operate as a source of competition for the working classes; it is simply excluded, and excluded along racialized lines (41-2).

median household expands to 20 to 1 wealth gap for Black and white households who carry student debt” (Seamster). A private debt model has also reinforced the role of family wealth and the economic obligations of family in determining “the price of inclusion” (Cooper 248), which potentially binds students (who are legal adults) to their families as collateral along relational axes and ideological inheritances such as heteronormativity, patriarchy, white supremacy, nationalism, or generic, normative capitalist chauvinism in spite of their own possible learning or unlearning. It can also bind international students to citizen guarantors with whom they are otherwise unrelated as a strategy for accessing loans. This binding is reinforced by family-based tuition payment mechanisms organized by both federal governments, such as RESP, a child investment grant co-funded by the Canadian government and parents to be paid out for higher education costs. Relevant US programmes are the Pell Grant, which at the time of writing awards annual tuition funding for students with low-income backgrounds up to 6500 USD to be matched by parents in an Expected Family Contribution, or the PLUS Direct Loan for parents to cover up to full university costs for each year of the degree. These forms of financial assistance are unevenly employed and have mixed social effects: two-thirds of students don’t have an RESP in Canada, yet the same proportion of students reports money from parents or guardians pays for at least some or much of their tuition¹⁶⁷; the Pell Grant has failed to keep pace with inflation and rising college costs, covering only 26% of 2020-21’s average cost for attending a public institution compared to 1975-6’s 75%¹⁶⁸; and the Parent PLUS loan program, sent out with every student aid package, has caused an extended secondary student loan debt crisis for parents while the federal government profits on their loan interest.¹⁶⁹ The coincidence of intergenerational debt

¹⁶⁷Source: <https://www.macleans.ca/education/the-cost-of-a-canadian-university-education-in-six-charts/>.

¹⁶⁸Source: https://www.nasfaa.org/issue_brief_double_pell.

¹⁶⁹For more on the scale of this extended debt load for older generations as parents of today’s undergraduates, see <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/education/parent-plus-loans-are-burying-families-college-debt-n1125391>.

and sentimental belief in the value of higher education produced by this economic-institutional arrangement also acts as a site of social control by determining the imperative for students to invest in self-management and self-commodify into a future-shaping “value proposition.”

Social Citizenship and Diversity Transactions

Sociologists of higher ed and racialization in the US have been documenting new civic orientations and social forms generated by debt as a durable economic-institutional relation, especially as predatory inclusion became normalized as corporate practice rather than market failure following 2008-9's Great Recession. Debt-holding has replaced taxation as the practice of good citizenship (Seamster), rendering citizenship a far more abstract, shame-ridden and conceptually patchwork form of duty and its rights as something to earn through indebted participation. This logic is canny, since the US federal government owns and insures the great majority (91%) of student loan debt carried by its citizens.¹⁷⁰ US students cite their debt loads as evidence of the value of their degrees, consuming debt as a mode of investment and “symbol of quality” (McMillan Cottom, *Lower Ed* 140) and even worrying that a student debt cancellation policy could cause their credential to crater. In for-profit university settings, McMillan Cottom found that indebted students, in particular Black women, actively sought out more loans and higher debt loads as a way to signal professionalism and a kind of virtuous, maximal self-investment for their economic futures (*Lower Ed* 132-140). The credentials marketed to students by for-profit universities aren't pitched in especially global terms except in how market-ready skills are programmed therein as the rational and superior private-sector response to global capitalism's just-in-time labour needs. Yet the for-profit sector's development

¹⁷⁰Source:

<https://educationdata.org/student-loan-debt-statistics#:~:text=The%20outstanding%20Federal%20Loan%20Portfolio,have%20federal%20student%20loan%20debt.>

crystalizes what McMillan Cottom has called “the new credentialism” as a logic organizing the whole higher ed sector across its privatizing spectrum, in which ever-increasing credentials have been made possible and encouraged by their new market locations, while institutions profit from “status-group inequalities” and further abandon the public good (*Lower Ed* 179-180).

Indeed, the cosmopolitan boosterism signalled by a global credential is also a kind of regressive infrastructure diffused across resource inequalities of credentialing institutions. Yet there are students in the vast majority of institutional settings who must access higher ed as a personal good through debt, and so respond with consumerist, credential-seeking behavior to maximize their debt as personal human capital investment. Whether these student strategies work to signal global competency as diverse cultural fluency or as diverse corporate work readiness (or fail to), students are navigating their mixed institutional functions for university globalism with a combination of self-management and self-commodification, which buries their primary occupation of trading their work for the university *qua workers* for debt. In the US, the great majority of students have difficulty paying off their debt once it has supposedly repositioned them as workers with enhanced income and professional access, with compounded difficulties for graduates among URS. Across both settings, students, graduates and debtors who are neither are navigating degraded labour conditions of increasing job insecurity and underemployment, stagnant wages, lack of social welfare and inflating costs of living. Scholarship on 21st-century student debt has therefore characterized this institutional product of indebted personhood as a process of proletarianization, in which the student population has been a “testing ground for new technologies of financial control at the centers of capitalist accumulation” and a singularly vulnerable form of legal exclusion from the right to bankruptcy in the US, marking the student as “an important figure for understanding the manner in which accumulation by dispossession

functions within consumer markets” (Adamson 102). Others, including radical student activists, claim students as a “class fraction”¹⁷¹ undergoing downward mobility toward the working class and its antagonisms, as corporate firms divest from their organization of middle class life in the name of private finance and the asset economy’s indefinite, fictitious investment capital. Thus debt is functioning as another kind of institutional counterinsurgency strategy, as

the temporality of student debt preemptively disciplines students: by deferring the moment at which students will have to pay the cost of their education, credit threatens to suck the urgency from student movements against higher tuition. It discourages the ‘impractical’ major, the exploratory year off, the radicalism that can lead students to be antagonists of the very authorities who require them to take out ever-larger loans (McClanahan “The Living Indebted” 62).

This logic becomes more stark when we examine modes of rationalization administered by “new universities” as introduced in Chapter 1. The primary practice named by Kelly Nielsen and Laura Hamilton’s study through which we can locate students in a globalist infrastructure is the “diversity transaction,” or the “exchange [of] a predominately [sic] non-white student body for attention, respect, and funding by offering white-dominated organizations racial heterogeneity and/or the appearance of commitment to diversity” (Hamilton and Nielsen 174). This administrative strategy to “capitalize on the ability to help other organizations produce racial diversity” (Hamilton and Nielsen 174) is not entirely new, as universities have long maintained practices of “selling students” in prestige transactions with elite corporate firms, think tanks, government institutions, et al (arguably, satellite campuses are also a globalist example of this).¹⁷² But in this institutional milieu the trade works to “commodify social

¹⁷¹For more on this discussion, see “Our Consciousness and Theirs: Further Thoughts on the Class Character of University Worker Activism” by Aimée Lê and Jordan Osserman, *Viewpoint Magazine*, January 18 2022, <https://viewpointmag.com/2022/01/18/our-consciousness-and-theirs-further-thoughts-on-the-class-character-of-university-worker-activism/>.

¹⁷²On this contemporary practice, see Daniel Davis and Amy Binder’s “Selling Students: The Rise of Corporate Partnership Programs in University Career Centers,” Special Issue: The University under Pressure, *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* vol. 46, 2016, pg 395- 422. For an example of this historic practice in the mid 20th-century’s neoimperial system, see Tarradellas, Anton, “Pan-African Networks, Cold War Politics, and Postcolonial Opportunities: The African Scholarship Program of American Universities, 1961–75,” *The Journal of*

inequalities” (Hamilton and Nielsen 188) as a way to garner organizational resources necessary for the underfunded university to reproduce itself in a global and local field alike. This practice takes forms that signal racially marginalized students as its most abundant institutional resource: cultural resource centers for students that facilitate student retention and further university market capture that are programmed by students; co-curricular programmes, including placement and recruitment, for corporate lower management “field positions” that target consumers based on their minority cultural characteristics (their example here is a partnership between UC Riverside and Pepsi-Co); collaboration with race-based and culture-based “employee resource groups” at corporations regarding cultural resourcing and best management practices, often facilitated via alumni employee liaisons;¹⁷³ and trading in reputational capital via media coverage, such as the *New York Times* reporting on particular campuses as hospitable to featured student DREAMers, fulfilling DACA path-to-citizenship requirements through university enrolment, during the Trump presidency despite the risk publicity brings to those students.

These exchanges tend to bring some economic benefit for everyone involved, including students, but require them to participate in “racialized equity labour,” or “the struggle of organizational actors, typically from racially marginalized groups, to address race-based marginalization and inequality” (Hamilton and Nielsen 183). This labour creates a continuum between studentdom, corporate identity politics, pre-professional training and employment, and social citizenship, positioning the lateral work of cultural and social affinity among students as rationalizable, commodifiable, and part of professionalization, and its absence a kind of anti-sociality. Such managerial positioning of students echoes feminist and Black studies scholar

African History vol. 63 no. 1, 2022, pg. 75–90.

¹⁷³McMaster hosts a similar “experiential learning” program in partnership with the learning interfaces platform Riipen Networks, in which students “created employee handbooks, new employee onboarding plans and employee engagement strategies for industry partners”:

<https://globalnews.ca/news/4087569/mcmaster-university-set-to-launch-new-experiential-learning-program/>.

Nick Mitchell's research about the history of student organizing of peer instruction around their political and cultural interests, often upheld today as modes of radical political education, alternative worldmaking and "insurgent studying" within the university (Meyerhoff 203). Mitchell reveals how such student-to-student teaching labour initiated the university's cycle of labour casualization that eventually took form in the adjunct instructor, as with the example of the student-taught Experimental College of San Francisco instituted to accommodate an influx of Black student enrolments in the 1960s.¹⁷⁴ Hamilton and Nielsen also predict that increasing global inequality, racial demographic change, and declining fertility rates will prompt most universities to survive via this organizational model with fewer international students or affluent domestic white students to recruit (6), which may scramble university globalism's institutional infrastructure as well as deepen its extractive cultural essentialism through exercising diversity.

If we take increasingly for-profit higher education or Lower Ed as emblematic of the systemic shift toward a "post-public period of accumulation-by-education" (Boggs and Mitchell 453), in which people previously excluded from "public" institutions became institutionalized via profiteering predatory inclusion and debt-based credentials, then we can also locate a similar, more openly colonial process via the aggressive expansion of international student enrolments as another type and scale of "diversity transaction." In the US, which has been this century's top

¹⁷⁴Mitchell summarizes this trajectory in more detail (his book on this topic is forthcoming at the time of writing) in an interview with university labour historian Zach Schwartz-Weinstein: "... at San Francisco State, before the student strike where the Third World Liberation Front joined with the ... Black Student Union ... to demand a college of ethnic studies. The TWLF demanded 50 faculty positions. The Black Student Union demanded 20 faculty positions among other major demands. The BSU wanted across the board admission of all black students who applied to San Francisco State. But the forms of study that make that possible emerge through an experimental college at San Francisco state that was institutionalized partly because of the intensely exploitative labour conditions that existed for San Francisco state faculty. There were professors there who were teaching 5-5 loads. One of the ways the San Francisco state administration responded to this glut of students for whom they needed classes was to institute an experimental college in which students could teach their own classes. All of the sudden, the university is extracting teaching labour from student populations. All of the sudden you have students who are paying fees – not necessarily tuition, to provide teaching labour for the university. If we're thinking about the history of university casualization, this is a cycle that actually inaugurates it." Source: <https://undercommoning.org/nick-mitchell-interview/>.

receiving country for international enrolments, the number of international students doubled between 2005-2016 and reached over 1 million students per year from 2016-2019; recent averages show international students make up around 5% of the total PSE student population.¹⁷⁵ In Canada the international student population is at 621,600 total students per 2021 data, more than tripling between 2008-9 and 2018-19 and representing 57.2% of growth in all programme enrolments; their proportion of the overall student population grew from 6.4% to 16.2%. These populations have expanded in keeping with patterns of defunding and projected domestic “demographic cliffs” in each country that threaten the university as a risk management enterprise, administered to prevent interruptions to capital accumulation, to minimize the cost of risk, and to maintain its credit rating and standing among investors.

The scale of this infrastructural service varies across individual institutions as well as their types: for example, Canada’s colleges have been a major destination for reprofessionalizing noncitizen adults looking for a lower-cost path to immigration and work, including via for-profit private colleges partnering with public colleges for qualifying composite certificate programs. The US university as a global brand and mass cultural form may drive a similar skills-driven pattern of for-profit international enrolments, but for-profits don’t publish enrolment data. Mega-university programmes using similar business models such as University of Maryland Global Campus, one of the world’s largest distance and online ed providers with non-selective enrolments, do host small numbers of international undergraduates. On the whole, though, their much-touted contributions in the billions to these national PSE systems and economies mostly reflect undergraduate and graduate enrolments in public research universities: US public research universities attract over 70% of international undergraduates at public institutions¹⁷⁶, and

¹⁷⁵Source: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/237681/international-students-in-the-us/>.

¹⁷⁶Source: Mingyu Chen, “The Impact of International Students on US Colleges: Higher Education as a Service Export,” 2021, https://edworkingpapers.com/sites/default/files/Chen_EdExports_EdWorkingPaper%20v3.pdf.

Canadian public universities and colleges both host international students with a 61% majority enrolled in university programmes vs 36.9% in colleges.¹⁷⁷ International students also account for nearly all of the enrolment growth in Canadian universities between 2016-2019 as domestic enrolments stagnated or dropped.¹⁷⁸ In both contexts and especially in Canada, where domestic tuition is regulated, international students prop up a zero-sum growth model, as in-state or provincial enrolments and degree attainment would decline in their absence.

Examining international students as infrastructure positions these relations at a national-global scale, putting the focus on service to national economies and the reproduction of institutional globalism. In both countries, international education is upheld as a top export industry yet is not couched in any coordinated or regulatory federal education policy. This practice extends to the highly profitable, unregulated international student recruitment industry employed by universities and paid with a portion of student tuition in recruitment locales around the globe. In keeping with capital's current trend toward platform infrastructures, universities are increasingly reliant on recruitment aggregators offering technologized mass screening, processing and matching that add another layer of remove and potential high-stakes misguidance for prospective students seeking an international credential as a pathway to immigration and/or work. For indeed, and particularly in Canada where credentials via study can support a path to permanent residency status, what is marketed as an educational experience is sought in the terms of more and less skilled migrant labour, to such a degree that some international students understand and organize themselves as "migrant students."¹⁷⁹ This collective identifier reflects a

¹⁷⁷Source: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/211124/dq211124d-eng.htm>.

¹⁷⁸<https://www.applyboard.com/blog/applyinsights-canada-needs-international-students-now-more-than-ever>.

¹⁷⁹See for example Migrant Students United, who organize with the Toronto-based advocacy group Migrant Workers Alliance for Change in the terms of shared precarity. This label is based on the fragility of their legal status as noncitizens: "What having temporary status means is that power is taken away from us. ... We have less access to basic rights and protections, including labour protections. Employers have all the power." See <https://thewalrus.ca/the-shadowy-business-of-international-education/#>.

logic in which international student recruitment is a site of commodification, and students enter the university feeling as though they are already its “products.”¹⁸⁰ In one domain, international students are used representationally to sell the institution’s global value and brand for ongoing market capture and as its roving assets competing with expanding PSE systems in source countries. In another, they are fodder for the country’s immigration and migrant work policies and their associated national mythos, including racializing and discriminatory politics in situ.

Like the diversity transactions examined in *Broke*, international students do often economically benefit from these arrangements, as well as desire them for their own self-development. Alongside a range of determinative political, environmental, economic and other crisis conditions, contemporary migrancy, as Amitav Ghosh’s recent critical writing has explored, is also shaped by personal technology-enabled mimesis of diasporic life that circulates via social media and relationship networks, including for people with stable communities and work in their home countries. Ghosh argues that globally widespread personal tech goods, especially smartphones, connect a wide range of individuals and conditions with transnational imagery of commodities and lifestyles that reinforce a “global citizenry of desire” (726). International credential-seeking exhibits a range of postures, from professionals changing careers, to the near half of international students pursuing STEM training and its extended work sponsorship in the US and Canada as a kind of individualized tech transfer via human capital, to younger adults seeking any credential for accessing stable work and living conditions. It is fair to assume that, unlike some other types of migrants, social diasporic networks provide international students with foreknowledge of undergraduate labouring conditions in these settings, in some cases as an extension of colonial education’s material and institutional sedimentation around the

¹⁸⁰For an extended account on this business layer, see the article in footnote 61, “The Shadowy Business of International Education” published in Canadian independent news magazine *The Walrus*.

world. For example, the human capital proposition of “black ethnic” or “special Black” international students is valued more highly than that of domestic Black students:

From the students’ perspectives, U.S. universities are a part of a post-colonial game of western credentialism where those with the means in nations beset by extreme income inequality purchase a pathway into the global labour market. Just as is true of international students from China, Japan, and India who find their way to the United States, our universities are generally cherry-picking the winners of extreme social stratification in other countries through our admissions processes (McMillan Cottom, *Thick* 139-140).

This logic is especially apparent in Canadian higher ed, where the interlinked merit-based immigration system extends more chance of permanent residency to Canadian educational credentials than foreign credentials, which also intensifies the credential’s sorting of racialized, minoritized and noncitizen individuals into the available forms of institutional management or discipline: manageable difference via professionalization, debt, and surveillance, or policing of the social borders of the university as economic engine. The disciplinary effect is clear, to the degree that students cite social and employment-based experiences of racism and discrimination as an expected local tax they will incur in Canada or the US, based in racializing international and domestic policies around differential citizenship.¹⁸¹

In many sites, universities offer international students a relative lack of pastoral care at best and outright fraud at worst, which has generated nationally and internationally-networked student activist cultures responsive to their conditions as well as related institutional and transnational politics. I would argue that one form this is taking is against a kind of risky stateless cosmopolitanization as another type of credentialing diversity transaction, such as for the 1,000 Indian students protesting the sudden closure of three for-profit technical colleges in

¹⁸¹Per Abigail Boggs, policy regarding noncitizens shapes the wider political environment a campus is situated in, “cross-hatching anti-immigrant logic with the antiblackness, antibrownness, and anti-Asianness endemic to the US social order.” Studies show students experience the negative social effects of US-specific forms of racism compounded by the material effects of such racism in the loss of opportunities to learn and to work” (“On Borders” 12).

Quebec in early 2022 that left them with tens of thousands in debt and sunk costs and no valid degrees, visa status or leverage.¹⁸² The 2021 case of insolvency at Laurentian University in Sudbury, Ontario illuminates a wider, less acute context for this institutional norm with international students, in which a quiet pattern of campus overdevelopment and excess expenditures relative to revenues in pursuit of ongoing market capture generates a fragile institutional infrastructure that flux in global conditions can majorly disrupt. There, loss of international student (and domestic) revenues due to the pandemic compounded other financial mismanagement and initiated a break-up of the institution, a declared “publicly-funded, bilingual and tricultural postsecondary institution” serving northern Ontario’s Francophone and Indigenous populations alongside a mix of international, low-income, first-generation, domestic and immigrant student populations, into an unbundled education provider offering micro-credentials. Laurentian U suddenly cut dozens of programs and research, fired over 200 faculty and ended partnerships with neighbouring institutions, replacing its maximalist campus model funded by tuition revenues with a model serving the global knowledge economy and its corporate managers through market fundamentalist programming. Its 2020-2024 microcredential plan fully inhabits the “new credentialism” mode named by McMillan Cottom above, citing alignment “with the competencies of the workforce, including critical thinking, professionalism, intercultural sensitivity, and digital dexterity” (Greenfield). Analysts have noted that this unprecedented event of any public institution in Canada filing for insolvency was ultimately permitted by the conservative provincial Ford government in support of a cheaper, more marketized corporate business model.¹⁸³ Thus a “new university” analogue can be found in

¹⁸²See reporting from February 2022 on this event:

<https://www.studyinternational.com/news/canada-student-protest/>.

¹⁸³For an account of provincial politics around this event, see for example,

<https://www.thesudburystar.com/opinion/columnists/unmaking-a-university-laurentians-insolvency> and the article linked to in footnote 87.

Canadian higher ed in its similar rationalization of international student populations for its own degrading continuity, based in diversity transactions between the corporate sector, inclusive of university administration, and the human capital politics of state multiculturalism.

Whether international students are seeking a kind of cosmopolitan entrepreneurialism, access to “global” institutional resources and legitimacy from sites of imperial overaccumulation, or an uncertain path toward local, diasporic citizenship, the true risks that they sustain as part of their transaction of international diversity for credential are barely studied or publicized by university administrators and policymakers. A few social facts are perhaps sufficiently revelatory of this institutional infrastructure in the US and Canada as another type of informal work and management. One is the transnational border regime to which international students have been subject, especially since official Islamophobia materialized as security policy after the September 11th attacks of 2001, that continues as special, routine surveillance of (especially non-white) international students by university officers alongside border and local police partnerships. This practice that has coincided with two decades of expanded enrolments and “effectively delocalize[s] the border” (Boggs “On Borders” 5) requires students to operate from a contingent baseline of permitted noncitizenship status that must be institutionally renewed, per another kind of dignity work in the face of conditional inclusion’s inherent threat of expulsion.

The basic profiles of these international student demographics in each setting and their points of national origin are also reflective of global resource nationalism and colonial development and education’s *longue duree* under the decades of neoliberal globalism. There’s considerable overlap in the top source countries in both contexts, as China has been the most populous source until the Covid-19 pandemic, when India took over the first spot in Canada while remaining at second in the US. Other main sources for international enrolments seem to

reflect global relations as competitive development, partial dominion and historical claims to alliance or beneficence: South Korea, Saudi Arabia, Canada, Vietnam and Taiwan round out the US's top sources, and "emerging market countries" present greatest enrolment growth such as Bangladesh, Brazil, Nigeria and Pakistan¹⁸⁴; Canada's top points of origin after India and China are France, Iran, Vietnam, South Korea, and the Philippines. Canada also offers expedited visa processing for prospective students from an additional set of postcolonial and Commonwealth countries, including Antigua and Barbuda, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Peru, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago, Pakistan, Morocco and Senegal.¹⁸⁵ Per Kemal Gürüz's work on international student mobility, "brain drain" has flowed toward settler nations since the 1990s, with ROIs and skilled migrant labour and residency policies driving most of the world's international students to the US, Canada, Australia and New Zealand (including from Europe); this has been the case for foreign students and skilled migrant workers alike, suggesting their infrastructural entanglement for settler nationalism and its credentialing institutions (232-235).

These broad portraits don't capture the particular and intimate dynamics of diversity transactions that international students must navigate in situ. Data portraits for these students in terms of debt loads, ROI, credential and labour market outcomes, and basic demographics are also partial. US reportage primarily examines whether international student employment reduces domestic labour market outcomes in an echo of anti-immigrant and xenophobic conservative talking points, and Canadian reportage reflects studies mainly examining outcomes for those who remain in Canada for permitted work and pursue residency and work in the long term,

¹⁸⁴Per 2019 data here:

<https://www.iie.org/Why-IIE/Announcements/2019/11/Number-of-International-Students-in-the-United-States-Hits-All-Time-High>; and updated for pandemic flux in 2021 data:

<https://www.statista.com/chart/20010/international-enrollment-in-higher-education/>.

¹⁸⁵Source:

<https://monitor.icef.com/2021/07/canada-adds-latin-american-and-caribbean-countries-to-expedited-student-visa-programme/>.

which as of 2019 data is around 38% of the total immigrant population.¹⁸⁶ More than half of international students in the US who take advantage of Optional Practical Training (OPT) as a temporary employment provision of the student visa attend public universities, and equivalent or better labour outcomes than domestic graduates are found among STEM graduates in both countries.¹⁸⁷ Yet 2021 data that just 3 out of 10 students at the bachelors level who have entered Canada since 2000 had transitioned into permanent residency status¹⁸⁸ should prompt us to ask, what about the rest? While the credential can function over time as it is intended for some – creating social certainty and exchange – the general condition of uncertain access to rights and labour as noncitizen local residents also hosts an unmeasured proportion of international students who do or may experience uneven and precarious ROIs in the US, Canada, back in their home countries or elsewhere. Their economic burden in terms of debt, family support, and income relative to their financial situation at their point of origin is also indeterminate, despite anecdotal reports of mortgaged farms, land sold, and family debt as means to international study.¹⁸⁹

This open production of economic uncertainty or risk as an institutionalized globalist practice appears to be expansionary, after new deterritorialized models for international study appeared as a market response to enrolment flux caused by pandemic conditions. While international enrolments have been steadily declining in the US over the last decade, with its cultures of racism, violence and xenophobia often cited as a factor, Arizona State and NYU took advantage of pandemic disruption to launch satellite infrastructures for students abroad to study online, with NYU partnering with start-up WeWork to provide work spaces in and around major

¹⁸⁶Source: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/36-28-0001/2022002/article/00004-eng.htm>.

¹⁸⁷For more on this finding, see Throy A. Campbell, Maria Adamuti-Trache, and Krishna Bista, “Employment and Earnings of International Science and Engineering Graduates of U.S. Universities: A Comparative Perspective,” *Journal of International Students* vol. 8 no.1, 2018, pg 409–430.

¹⁸⁸Source: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/36-28-0001/2022003/article/00001-eng.htm>.

¹⁸⁹Source: “The Shadowy Business of International Education”, *The Walrus*, September/October 2021 <https://thewalrus.ca/the-shadowy-business-of-international-education/#>.

cities and ASU offering “ASU Global Flex” that enables students globally to take online ASU courses while also enrolling locally in a host country, with locations in London, Dublin, Paris, Berlin, Madrid and Sydney. This deterritorialized vision for the American university echoes a study via subscription model first introduced by mega-university Georgia Tech, which hosts online learning programs in coworking rooms for students staffed by nonspecialist academic coaches, often in strip malls or other one-time corporate properties. Both officialize the global university as a roving infrastructure driven by global brand equity that can operate without any direct or situated institutional beneficence via the social resources of imperial accumulation and wealth, obviating questions of rights, labour, citizenship and pastoral care. The University of Wisconsin literalized this lack when it stopped paying international student workers who were forced to telecommute from abroad during the pandemic, citing red tape, until organizing around the globe reversed this shocking policy.¹⁹⁰

In Canada, where a 2016 policy change began to favor economic migration applicants with a Canadian study-based credential of one or more years via extra points in the merit system,¹⁹¹ a 2022 policy update slashed the number of available pathways to residency via the Express Entry path for federal high-skilled workers in half.¹⁹² This most common pathway to residency for international students, requiring Canadian work experience for eligibility, is also undermined by high admissions rates and domestic labour conditions, such as when foreign students were only hired for unskilled, precarious, “essential” work as foreign names and credentials were quickly devalued by employers reflexive to the Covid-19 pandemic’s effects on

¹⁹⁰Source:

<https://badgerherald.com/news/2021/01/10/uw-to-reverse-policy-barring-compensation-for-international-telecommuting-student-workers/>.

¹⁹¹Source: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/36-28-0001/2022002/article/00004-eng.htm>.

¹⁹²Source:

<https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2022/03/14/cuts-to-express-entry-may-affect-thousands-of-international-students-activists-warn.html>.

labour conditions, prompting activist demands for more than 20 hours of permitted weekly work for international students aiming for residency.¹⁹³ Perhaps learning from competitors in the US, Canada continues to market itself as a superlative current and future site for international study regardless of this regime of human capital glut plus labour discipline.¹⁹⁴

Thus a range of potential crisis conditions generated by global forces, including flux in the global knowledge economy, also create glitches in these infrastructures for higher education's means to social continuity as expropriation via debt alongside uneven, downwardly mobile labour integration via expanding credentialism. Chris Newfield projects a possible future of "Fragmented Decline" extending from the status quo's trajectory of privatization and platformization ("Universities" 78), in which institutional risk management and rationalization are likely to be bolstered by increasing securitization, exclusion and predatory inclusion, and policing of the university's campus and digital interface borders. These carceral and financial control operations of universities represent anti-democratic population management, echoing Quinn Slobodian's account of neoliberal globalism's project to encase the world economy through institutions that repress democratic activity and redistributive justice. This is hardly news to the higher ed activist landscape, often led by international, undocumented, diasporic, disabled, queer, feminist and Indigenous students in direct contest of this imperial and settler colonial legacy of PSE in the US and Canada, or as abolitionist rejection of resource misallocation and deprivation perpetuated by universities throughout national histories.

¹⁹³This phenomenon is registered across recent reporting: on pandemic work conditions <https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2020/11/24/theyve-graduated-in-canada-but-they-need-work-experience-to-stay-here-thanks-to-covid-19-no-one-is-hiring.html> and <https://theyee.ca/News/2020/11/10/Permanent-Residency-Migrant-Students/>; on student-worker demands, <https://cpj.ca/migrant-workers-are-organizing-and-winning/> and <https://migrantworkersalliance.org/press/mar10pressrelease/>.

¹⁹⁴See the federal government's 2019-2024 "Building On Success" International Education Strategy, which "ensures that Canada will remain among the world's top destinations for learning": <https://www.international.gc.ca/education/assets/pdfs/ies-sei/Building-on-Success-International-Education-Strategy-2019-2024.pdf>.

Militarism and social control via campus security infrastructures and financialized personhood are already linked to forms of colonial extraction and management in extranational contexts by students, alongside organizing that seeks to equitably transform university labour ecosystems.

And so, the student situation in the political economy of globalist infrastructure affirms the centrality of cultural assets, institutionally recognized and promoted as representation, authenticity and identity-based performance, to the university's decades-long strategies of social capture and risk management, as a counterinsurgency tactic that binds human material and psychic needs to the university credential and its sentimental promise of social transformation via the futurity of personal and corporate goods. The global knowledge worker figure, a "lifelong learner," thus is itself a pedagogical mask as defined above, linking commodification and expropriation, managerialism, and data and border regimes in humanist social terms that elide the actual range of risky learning and labour conditions. While corporate cosmopolitanism and digital or site-based access, networks and commodification may be dominant forms of university globalism at the time of writing, that these infrastructural arrangements exhibit continuity since global financialization began in the 1970s suggests their durability in forming student experience and knowledge production under the mutations of global racial capitalism and US and Canadian settler nationalism. The next chapter will examine student experiences within this infrastructural situation via their own narratives of global study, and poses the question: what is the gap between the student figure above, an informal, masked worker yet rationalized global student, and the one in class, the formal learner experiencing an institution's global curriculum?

CHAPTER 5: THE GLOBAL CLASSROOM

This chapter continues thinking with students by examining accounts of learning experiences from the citizen-consumers of (inter)national difference named in Chapter 3 through ethnographic analysis. If the infrastructural role students play for university globalism tends to be informal, as the previous chapter mapped, then we might consider a student taking a course, pursuing a major or minor, or participating in some other curricular experience that has been administratively designated as global as the formal version of the global student. As already discussed, this may be elective pursuant to student choice of degree programme, if conditioned by the memes of the global knowledge economy or cultural/or and familial pressures, or as part of core curricular requirements. Formal “global” student experience is therefore variable, as with any element of curriculum across individual academic trajectories and institutional experiences. This heterogeneity of relationships to globally specified aspects of student experience at a Canadian or American university is part of the occasion that global study presents for cultivating critical pedagogical objectives, as much as it is also a site for observing unequal learning infrastructures or practices of norming and corporate training. Despite burdens and constraints around social reproduction and learning work that students carry, the experiential aspects of learning as a relational and situated process in the world are not fully deterministic. Social locations of individual students, their instructors and related staff also shape learning assemblages, creating particularized relationships to globality’s rhetorical life within an institutional culture that also slices individuals via its production of and narratives for difference and diversity, in dialogue with narratives that individuals bring with them into classrooms.

Despite this fundamental complexity, it is necessary to ask: how do students in these

educational situations understand themselves as global? To what degree is this understanding produced by their experience of study? And, to what extent does undergraduate experience reproduce existing understandings of global relationships, positions or identities in the social infrastructure of that institutional context? How do students narrate their relationships to the knowledge project that global study assigns to them? Student relationships to their instructors, syllabi, interfaces, co-curricular experiences and fellow classroom members constitute elements of their global learning, and any individual narrative of these relationships reflects wider social and environmental dynamics, comprising a site for examining the work that “global” performs institutionally. This chapter pursues analysis of this “global” sociability by collating student perspectives in dialogue with particular course offerings at FIU and McMaster U. Key features of both curricular contexts are presented across the thesis, although I summarize relevant aspects of their organization of global curricular experience here as part of my ethnographic approach.

In 2018, I conducted interviews with a small number of undergraduate volunteers from global studies courses to gather qualitative data about “student experience” proper to specific curricular programming. This ethnographic research was formalized by McMaster’s Research Ethics Review Board and facilitated with recruitment support from course instructor Dr. Liam Stockdale, at the time a postdoctoral researcher at the IGHC, and from FIU’s Office of Global Learning Initiatives, which administers, develops and promotes global programming as required elements of their undergraduate credential. Participants were enrolled in the Globalization minor’s introductory-level “Global Citizenship” at McMaster; and at FIU, in select courses from their catalog of approved GL courses that had been offered within the previous year and featured the study of culture, cultural objects or processes in some obvious sense. Participants ended up representing seven GL courses: “Intro to Sociology”, “Intro to Anthropology,” English course

“Global Issues in Literature,” Interdisciplinary Studies course “How We Know What We Know,” African & African Diasporic Studies course “Black Popular Culture: Global Dimensions,” and Women and Gender Studies courses “LGBT & Beyond: Non-Normative Sexualities in Global Perspective,” and “Gender Violence and Law: Global Perspectives.”

At McMaster, Dr. Stockdale distributed my call for participants among roughly 200 students from the previous term’s enrollment, presented as a voluntary experience with no immediate benefit to participants; five students elected to participate. Interviewees had taken the course’s Fall 2017 version, and this publicly available syllabus is included in Appendix B, where the chapter’s ethnographic data is organized.¹⁹⁵ At FIU, I had hoped to set up a similar archive that would position student interviews in close dialogue with a course syllabus, but my attempts to contact specific faculty about their courses were unsuccessful, which led me to the Office of Global Learning Initiatives for support. Eric Feldman, Program Manager at the time, facilitated recruitment among 1,202 student enrollees from the 2017 rosters of the select course list I provided; to increase our recruitment success, Eric also targeted participants of their Global Medallion programme with the incentive of one point (out of the required 20) toward this extra global credential. In total, seven students participated. While FIU’s GL courses are also publicly available online, syllabi are presented in lite, sample format featuring the core curriculum approved as “global” and reflecting the distribution of FIU’s three required Global Learning Outcomes (GLOs) in an accompanying matrix document detailing how course goals and related major assessments map onto GLOs. Hoping to secure more detailed and current versions of syllabi, Eric and I made several attempts to contact instructors listed for these course offerings in 2017, but these went unanswered. In lieu of term-specific syllabi, I instead include links to

¹⁹⁵ The dataset generated by my ethnographic research is also accessible via McMaster University Dataverse, a public data repository. See D’Adamo, Sarah. “Globalism for Undergraduates: Student Interview Materials.” *Borealis*, McMaster University Dataverse, November 25 2022, <https://doi.org/10.5683/SP3/ORHBRU>.

relevant downloaded GL assessment matrices, which are publicly available online, in Appendix B; the 2017 sample syllabi downloaded at the time are no longer publicly available and not available for reproduction here, with more recent versions listed on FIU's GL catalog online.¹⁹⁶

Kept the same for all participants, the interview consisted of 15 preset questions answered in a live, structured and recorded dialogue with me or in written form per student preference. Interview contents were focused on how students relate to global frameworks for their learning in and beyond the course, with questions addressing:

- 1) how they define globalization and the concept of global citizenship, and what images or associations the adjective 'global' summons to mind;
- 2) whether and how their ideas about the terms above evolved via taking the course;
- 3) general thoughts about their course experience through its organization, core texts, themes and concepts, and instructional delivery, including its online vs face-to-face elements;
- 4) what motivations led them to enroll, and how or whether those were realized;
- 5) how they understand their social situation in a globalized world after taking the course;
- 6) evaluation of their broader experience at their university as a “global” learning environment.

Students were also given an opportunity to comment on aspects of the course that they did not find useful, as well as to suggest something that would have liked to add to the curriculum.

Considering basic demographic information for the participants as members of their undergraduate student worlds, these small groups of individual students were roughly reflective of the types of students enrolled on campus and/or online. Given participation bias, especially the case for FIU students incentivized toward GL Medallion and true merely in that all participants were already interested in or engaged by the subject of globality at all, interview responses are not taken up as inherently representative discourses for student perspectives of global learning at

¹⁹⁶ See the full current list of GL course offerings here: <https://goglobal.fiu.edu/gl-curriculum/course-list/>.

scale in each institution. Rather, each student's reflections on the interview questions are taken up as a site through which to characterize what global learning actually is relative to the learning context and to consider what is revealed by student narratives of their own learning with some temporal distance from their classroom work and frameworks.

To conduct this analysis, which proceeds in absence of inputs about instructor performance or orientation toward the material, each set of narrative data is presented in dialogue with GL pedagogies as expressed in syllabi, alongside the institutional subjectivities expressed in these learning settings. I also consider the epistemic projects of global courses against student reports of their learning conditions in terms of instructional delivery and organizational resources. For example, the successes and limits of FIU's curriculum-wide programming for the "internationalization gap," becomes visible by examining such student perspectives. Higher ed scholar Sharon Stein's schema for global citizenship curriculum is also applied to identify structuring epistemic norms underneath the nominalist projects of syllabi and institutional LOs that map onto university globalism. As a meta-cognitive learning heuristic "to identify, and possibly interrupt, existing representations and meanings" ("Mapping" 243), Stein's mapping of GCE is especially helpful given global curriculum's tendency toward generalism and thematic approaches, which can vary widely in their politics, pedagogy, and frameworks for learning while invoking the same terms and complex phenomena. While this taxonomy of GCE indexes the circular terms of its common typologies, my application of it here, mapping student alignment with and in excess of these curricular projects, also works to clarify other ways students register global learning experience at the edges of these types.

Stein sorts GCE programming into four main strands — "entrepreneurial," "liberal humanist," "anti-oppressive," and "incommensurable" — as "positions" capturing the range of

the curricular and epistemic norms in programme frameworks and syllabi (“Mapping” 243). The entrepreneurial position, which sees global citizenship as a means for the global competition of individualistic or nationalist rational economic actors, is perhaps unsurprisingly not the orientation of the courses I chose to discuss with students, although it was somewhat embedded in student reflections about their own educational development. The courses relevant to this ethnographic data instead took on the liberal humanist orientation, which promotes reform to render our systems more inclusive and displays universalist concern for human others, and to some degree included the anti-oppressive position, which contests liberal humanism as colonial, racialized, gendered, and insufficiently humane or just. While these courses did not take up the incommensurable position, which seeks new categories for the human and modes for working across difference at the limits of existing social relations, occasionally students reported experiencing the inadequacy of available discourses or a kind of epistemic impasse regarding particular course material. Arguably, then, the types of courses represented by this ethnographic data are the most common, as the last chapter explored, so the positioning that students narrate can offer insight into the pedagogical effects and social reproduction of GL as a broader institutional project as well as highlight effects of GCE’s commonly reproduced and circular curricular habits. In my analysis, the schema clarifies how the terms of globalist curricular projects tend to dominate student discourse as such, though not necessarily student experience.

A preliminary note about the learning paradigm in these curricular sites: one basic finding of Chapter 2’s infrastructural approach to learning interfaces was the co-emergence of new experiential, digitalized and “personalized” learning modes with the expansion of digital connectivity, global institutional branding and the changing political economy of this region’s PSE in its global context. In curricular practice, this shift often corresponds to reductions in

instructional substance, relational contact and resourcing, as highlighted in Chapter 1 on FIU's GL curriculum development. At McMaster, a similar kind of revision can be observed in the IGHC's undergraduate programming. As aforementioned, two courses are offered under a Globalization minor to supplement the discipline-based course listings that can fulfill its requirements: "Global Citizenship," which will feature below, and "Globalization, Social Justice and Human Rights," an upper-level course that surveys global injustice in the terms of human rights and human development. Both rely on a course calendar introducing conceptual foundations followed by thematic applications, punctuated by individual and group writing; "Global Citizenship" initially incorporated a public Twitter micro-blogging assignment, and the latter course's culminating assessment formalized a collaborative international research exercise.

In the version of "Globalization, Social Justice and Human Rights" offered from its 2016 creation until 2018, a group assignment was organized in collaboration with universities in the US, Italy, Portugal and Russia also offering versions of the course.¹⁹⁷ These students populated digital forums for sharing select student blogs and for completing a research project in "an international team exploring a specific issue/problem with global, social justice and human rights implications," collectively explaining the problem and proposing solutions as curricular applications. The LO associated with this collaboration element names the encounter and group communication across national difference as fundamental, via the technology that is their means:

The ability to discuss course topics via technology on a global scale will inevitably influence the direction and results of the discussion and learning. This course recognizes the importance of not only communicating but also acting respectfully across both linguistic and cultural differences (Butler 2).¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁷This programming was part of COIL, or Collaborative Online International Learning, which "connects accredited courses, linking the classrooms of two or more higher education institutions, each located in a different country or cultural setting." McMaster's 2021-2024 strategy suggests they wish to rejoin this network and provide more course offerings of this kind, while FIU already is a participating institution, as mentioned in F5's course experience below. Source: <http://www.coilconsult.com/what-is-coil-.html>.

¹⁹⁸See the syllabus link provided in Appendix B, in "Globalization, Social Justice and Human Rights," under Learning Objectives.

Here we can see the group norm explored in the previous chapter as defined by FIU in action: collaboration across greater scales of difference is seen as superadditive, while here staged at a multi-sited, international scale (as opposed to a diverse campus or a located digital-institutional site with some international spread). Later versions of the course included a 2019 iteration taught entirely via traditional lecture, discussion and exam-based instruction, or intimacy pedagogy, and a 2021 online version replaced the international collaboration with a group writing assignment among classmates, jointly writing keyword entries for core course concepts toward a crowd-sourced class study guide. Per current Director of IGHC and Anthropology Professor Petra Rethman, the course's international collaborations became unsustainable for instructor workloads in absence of sustained financial support for this programming from McMaster administrators.

While none of these study modes is inherently most appropriate or superior, these varied learning orientations toward global study, fitfully rescaled according to instructional resourcing but presented with institutional consistency in strategic initiatives and programme materials regardless, are forces of sociability for students, engendering their experiences with norms and affects appropriate to the global knowledge worker in lifelong learning conditions, as I hope the data below will further illuminate.

Ethnographies of global learning at FIU

FIU provides a rich site for ethnographic observation due to its scalar production of an explicit institutional culture around globality and its cosmopolitan social modes. Given FIU's GL requirements for all undergraduates, I interpret course experiences reported by students as part of an institution-wide promotion of GCE, consistent with the programme's founding *Global*

Learning for Global Citizenship framework.¹⁹⁹ Even when global citizenship framing is not explicitly used in a course's LOs, it is reinforced by the GLOs that align the course with the university's broader curricular goals, focusing on *global perspective*, *global awareness* and *global engagement*. The courses represented in student comments are more specific in their inclusion of the study of culture and/or cultural objects or processes in the syllabus.

The seven interview participants are best described as presenting a range of study orientations and demographic information native to FIU's undergrad population: two students who were at or near the end of their degree programmes, aged 22-23, identified as what FIU calls "binational", in this case Cuban-American and Haitian-American; a third recent graduate aged 23 identified as Black but included Haitian heritage, and all three join a fourth, white participant aged 19 in calling Miami their home base; one student aged 26 was enrolled internationally, from Mexico City, MX, and the remaining two were older, fully online students aged 40 and 41, one a white, lifelong northern Floridian and the other originally from Curitiba, Brazil with mixed European and Brazilian native heritage but resident of FL for 18 years as an immigrant / "citizen of the world" (F7). Their degree programmes included Communications, Art, Journalism, Sociology, Hospitality Management, Women & Gender Studies, Public Relations Advertising Applied Communications, and Interdisciplinary Studies. Student comments will be reproduced here for analysis anonymously, using identifiers F1, F2, F3, F4, F5, F6 and F7.

Student conceptions of globalization, global citizenship and global as a descriptor are revelatory of commonplaces that circulate in their educational setting and curriculum. Asked about globalization, students generated a range of definitions that centered around the spread of new technologies globally, the reflexivity of global cultures and communications, heterogeneous meanings across geographies, increased democratization through interconnection, and a social

¹⁹⁹See the original framework here: <https://goglobal.fiu.edu/about-us/global-learning-reports/qep-report-2010.pdf>.

issue with a mix of good and bad. While some students exhibited awareness of Western-centrism as they offered these definitions, the origins of globalization were not located anywhere in their responses, geographically, institutionally or via historical genealogy, such as in F2's "the influence the world has on itself...and how it's different." Instead, globalization appears as a diffuse worldwide force, in keeping with neoliberal globalism's depoliticizing institutional encasement of "the world economy," or with the awareness of "unicity" that is commonly understood to result from globalization as its "cultural-political principle" of a global albeit non-homogenizing human condition (Tomlinson 11-12).²⁰⁰ For some this force is technological, as in F1's "the future that we're living in through the internet and everything, we're all in this together"; F3's "the [globally uneven] advance and spread of new technology being placed around the world"; or F6's "the world-wide interconnection people and societies have due to ease of communication and technology. i.e. a global village."

Others recognized globalization mainly as relative to geography or as a project of unrealized universality, dependent "on what region you're asking that question in" (F4) or based on "the possibility of globalization" for social goods such as technology, culture, education and ideas to be accessible to all (F5). Though couched in awareness of "global haves vs have-nots," these conceptions do not appear to be economic in nature, certainly not reflecting capitalist practice as constituted by institutional actions and actors. F7, who described living through the rise of globalization's multinational trade discourse in the 90s, also presented these processes with a passive voice that invisibilizes policymakers, profiteers and their histories. Accompanying these definitions were relatively literal associations with the descriptor global, including images

²⁰⁰As Tomlinson summarizes, this is a characteristic of the connectivity era as a social paradigm: "Connectivity thus supposes unicity as a cultural-political principle. Local experience has to be raised to the horizon of a 'single world' if we are to understand it, and local practices and lifestyles increasingly need to be examined and evaluated in terms of their global consequences" (12).

of a world map with seven continents, the planet Earth and its diverse life forms, and NASA's famous image of Earth juxtaposed with images of Amazonian Indigenous peoples who have resisted technological and cultural change; two students instead suggested social imagery, such as "unity, innovation, inclusiveness" (F1) and a "coming out of yourself" into "experience, understanding, knowledge of others" (F3).

On global citizenship, aside from one exception,²⁰¹ students expressed a relatively unified conception of this term and its value in terms consistent with the GLOs that organize FIU's global courses. Awareness and advocacy were the major orientations that they assigned to global citizenship, with emphasis placed on transformative knowledge acquisition and recognition of one's own limited perspective or experience. Global civic awareness means "being aware that we— our culture's not the only one, that our country's not the only one, that we don't rule everything, that there's so much more in the world to learn, and not being ignorant about it" (F2), or not just using new technologies oneself but being "aware that other citizens of the world should have the right to have access to this information and this technology" (F3). Engagement as an aspect of global citizenship reoriented individual student perspectives and awareness toward social applications that are collaborative and against competition and/or difference: "Global citizenship is, to me ... that the entire globe and its residents are equal and we must all work together as one people, rather than multiple warring factions, each attempting to prove how much better they are than their neighbor who is other" (F5); or, "The global citizen seeks common ground in an exchange with someone from far away, thereby creating a relationship of

²⁰¹ F4 noted the elite nature of global citizenship as a concept in lived realities globally, though this perception did not engender any particular contradiction or self-criticism for this student as a participant in GCE: "I just I don't think when people wake up, I mean most people when they think about let me, you know, be a good citizen, they think about it in their region. Or let me, you know, like, I'm going to go out to that, it's more like country and like territory oriented. So it's not like a global, I don't think the term global citizen is widely used. I think only a select few that are more globally conscious use it" (F4).

equals & trying to ‘neutralize alterity’” (F7). It’s unclear exactly how global citizens take these actions to work together – perhaps via connectivity, as technology’s feature in the definitions above suggests – although F6’s definition of a global citizen as “someone who actively is involved, contributes, and is aware of global issues” maps squarely onto the global engagement, perspective and awareness GLOs and thus the social vision for the global learner FIU aims to produce, suggesting the institution provides the default context or modes of engagement.

Indeed, across all student comments, including three enrolled fully online, an investment in the value and opportunity represented by diversity was expressed as part of what has been made possible by studying in Miami and at majority-minority FIU, where diversity is less of a project than a default of the student population. With demographics quite like Miami’s, FIU’s undergraduate student population is dominated by Hispanic/Latinx membership (68%), followed by Black/African-American students (12%), then international students (10%), and lastly non-Hispanic white students (8%) and students with Asian, multi-ethnic or other ethnic identities each with low single digits.²⁰² For 6 out of 7 participants, this (“structural”) form of diversity was seen as enabling access to a wide range of perspectives or lived experiences that gave the course material extra-local significance, and the dialogic exchange of culturally authentic knowledge or interpretations of ideas and information was interchangeable with global awareness, perspective or engagement in the learning process.²⁰³ Students generally saw GL’s value as a way to mitigate against ignorance and global problems through greater knowledge and world perspective, alongside the opportunity to be exposed to diverse viewpoints and cultural traditions.

²⁰²Full demographic data represented in College Factual’s 2021 report here:

<https://www.collegefactual.com/colleges/florida-international-university/student-life/diversity/>.

²⁰³The lone dissenter from this finding was F6, the group’s sole international student, who generally reported that study at FIU and in its global courses didn’t produce much change or transformation, since they had already seen their life in global terms or as part of a globalized world and had the fortune of “always” experiencing cosmopolitan awareness and sociability (F6).

Accordingly, most student comments about the civic contents and value of their learning are consistent with liberal-humanist global citizenship. Absent any structural analysis or critique of power in globalized life, liberal humanist GCE affirms and aspires toward a common humanity through acts of recognition, imagination, cultural exchange, and the overcoming of difference is seen as professionally advantageous and ethically appropriate (Stein “Mapping” 245-6). This institutionalist position is compatible with development or human rights-based policy and discourses of global governance institutions that reinforce the supremacy of Global North countries, although this did not arise as a concern among these students, perhaps due to their “International” setting at FIU and/or in cosmopolitan Miami. Instead students associated global citizenship with humility: a recognition that one’s setting or knowledge does not encompass the world. While for some students this was expressed in anti-national, utopian, transcendental or planetary terms (or “global emotions” (F7)), this LO could be read administratively as intercultural or global competency, promoted as a means “to achieve consensus with more ease or to ensure access to better career prospects (thus making it compatible with the entrepreneurial position), as well as an ethical imperative” (Stein “Mapping” 245).²⁰⁴

Entangled with discourses of personal enrichment experienced via global learning was a sense of “competitive advantage” (F1) that several students associated with this aspect of their learning and social positioning, exhibiting the coincidence of the entrepreneurial position with the liberal humanist position. This fusion seems to have been supported by the mix of easy multiculturalism and capitalist individualism local to Miami as urban campus setting, combined with FIU’s “higher standard” (F4) around its “International” identity relative to other institutions.

²⁰⁴As Stein points out, “racialized U.S. students’ ‘daily encounters with racism and ethnocentrism make them painfully competent in issues of diversity and cross-cultural difference’ [but] this competency is rarely recognized, which suggests ‘global competence is the domain of White/Anglo knowers’” (“Mapping” 245). The demographic dynamics of FIU complicate this schematization, of course, though it seems clear from the students interviewed that this dynamic of whiteness is still in play, if minoritized in that setting.

Notably, their sense of positional advantage was more explicitly sentimental and civic than entrepreneurial, suggesting a “global” *Bildung* in the racial capitalism-diversity nexus. In keeping with celebratory discourses of connectivity and personal transformation, F1 qualified that asserting competitive advantage was not meant “in a narcissistic way ...[but] in a genuine way, that like, like, I can humble myself and lead a more happier life because I have a global understanding of the world”; instead F1 cited improving global conditions and our video conversation across contexts and social difference an example of this occasion for greater tolerance and humility (F1). F2 saw FIU’s global programming as its essential moral and social development of students, operating together with skill development and Miami’s affordances as a place where you can be more than or other than American while still living as one:

I think the things you experience in this city, you don't experience in a lot of other places. Even if you are American, you know what it's kind of like to be Latino. Skills- I can work on my writing anywhere in the world. I can work on my Photoshop skills anywhere in the world, my production skills anywhere in the world, but my attitude, which I think is what's really important, FIU is really helping me work on my character. I think it's helping me be a global citizen. And I think they push that, with the Global Medallion programme, they have so many other programmes, they want to just keep pushing you forward. ... it gives me an advantage in this world because I don't- I live like an American but I don't necessarily think like one because I'm Cuban. So I think it just ... pushed me more forward towards being a journalist, being global, understanding different perspectives, not being stuck in that one mindset that I think a lot of us are stuck in. (F2)

F2 seems to have found global study at FIU to activate something internal to their social location that was already global, but latent, and now credentialized.

Similarly, F3 found GL’s benefits via structural and classroom diversity to be affordances for ethics, civics, and sentimental cultural literacy via representative authenticity. F3 linked diverse interactions to the development of intellectual capacity, citing the perspectives fellow students share based on their cultures as “really enriching [and] ... beautiful”:

there are a lot of different people that come from all different cultures, religion,

countries, whatever, and that enriches the educational experience because it's one thing when you're learning about something else, but it's also another when you're actually sitting with people who understand it from a personal perspective... that's what I think FIU students internally benefit from. Just being in a very diverse environment. (F3)

These student discourses about their personal and social experience of GL accord quite closely with FIU's promoted discourses and programme descriptions, suggesting that this institutional identity and curricular paradigm is indeed performative in the university's social infrastructure, regardless of the relatively scant class time spent properly pursuing GL. Interviewees appeared quite comfortable with a civic form in which FIU students in general and in particular racialized, ethnicized or otherwise culturally "different" students act as cultural representatives in classes and beyond, or that class time includes participatory representationalism that is recouped into individualized global citizenship and human capital by potentially anyone. Perhaps most noteworthy is that these accounts appear to be more directly and openly shaped by American civic and cultural life rather than by geographic, scalar or ethical dislocation from it, even while uplifting that experience in extra-American terms; it appears to be an internalized version of the settler university's "moral because marketable" logic.

Other students located the value they assign to GL along a spectrum from enhancing self-development and personal identity to social development and progress that layers neoliberalism's identity-based asset logic into the liberal humanism position. Some students expressed an enhanced ability to understand the immigrant, diasporic and settler histories of which they are personally a part after taking their courses, while others highlighted a more humanitarian imperative to understand and advocate for global "others" with less access to shared global resources; there was no sense of being positioned by complicity, institutionally or socially. On the global surveying mode found in the more sociological courses, such as in Women's Studies and African Studies, global knowledge approached as cultural and geographic

breadth was valorized for its staging of issues and experiences across the world, manifesting intellectual tourism as civics for US-based students. F5 reported that theirs on Gender Violence "was a pretty broad course. If anything, I think that more classes should become global as knowledge of the global community could aid in defeating prejudice and bias"; F7 reported that studying sexual politics and difference in LGBT & Beyond was relatable given their past "closeted" identity as an atheist, and that it legitimized their "concern for the developing world" and desire to be a well informed cosmopolitan citizen helping others when possible. Education, generally speaking, was invoked as a means toward solving global problems, which in this curricular realm are presented as sociocultural in nature. This reflects a rationalist, individualist orientation shared across the entrepreneurial, liberal-humanist and anti-oppressive positions, which "presume that their desired educational and/or political outcomes can be known and determined in advance through the thought, planning, and intention of individuals" (Stein "Mapping" 247). These postures also express an assumption produced by university globalism, compatible with service learning and co-curricular programmes that blend humanitarian and professional training: that knowledge functions in the world as "an arena of problems to be solved ...and to be fixed by the appropriate technical skills, tactfully administered with cultural sensitivity" (Cororaton and Handler 89).

This institutionalist position was enhanced personally for F7 by the course Global Issues in Literature, which has a specific focus on cultural otherness:

after taking the course and studying a history of 'otherness' or alterity, I feel more comfortable with the idea that there are differences and we must work on negative or poor reactions and create a healthy contact zone —and I feel comfortable being a subject in a contact zone, as well.

F7's self-positioning in the terms of the "contact zone" (a course concept) does not use FIU's more romanticized terms of the diverse but egalitarian team derived from corporate aesthetics,

although it does square itself with a bounded and managed mode of cross-cultural communications that presents as globally democratic. Per the interview, the literature course emphasized the problem of alterity via a fictionalized account of a real-world extractive event at the moment of commodification, using the case of Hoodia, a South African plant with medicinal uses, to merge philosophical and literary discussions of alterity with theories of successful stakeholder communications in global capitalism (F7). This notable lack of cynicism or pessimism about global civic action or corporate awareness is expressed here by the FIU case's two mature students who are studying in their 40s as lifelong learners. Both also upheld access to online learning and global "others" as affordances of FIU's programming, with F5 citing the "awesome" experience of "working with students from another country on a group project," and F7 offering up the suggestion that an international connection like this would enhance the "reality" of FIU student understanding of global issues if added to their courses: "Maybe a student from another country could 'sit' in class with us ... and we would hear their experience first-hand." These classroom postures desire experiences of connectivism as it was conceived per Chapter 2, yet embrace institutionally managed encounters with difference as diverse cultural authenticity, exhibiting the layering of social desires generated by connectivity infrastructure into curricular (neo)liberal humanism.

Notably, no FIU students expressed the anti-oppressive position in response to their course experiences or contents. Courses about global Black popular cultures, issues faced by sexual minorities around the world, or the conditions of gendered injustice in different legal and cultural contexts contain instructional texts and themes that express the critiques associated with this position. Accordingly, perhaps, students experienced these courses as occasions to learn thematic content knowledge that highlights connections, relationships, and differences across

places and histories that also enmeshed the personal learning modes associated with FIU's GLOs into study. But, in evaluating this thematic study of minoritized and popular cultures in a global frame, reflexivity about the "depoliticization, ahistoricism, salvationism, ethnocentrism, and paternalism that often characterize global citizenship efforts" (Stein "Mapping" 247) was not expressed by students. On Intro to Anthropology, F1 discussed the value of a concept like "culture shock" for understanding their professional encounters and their social location as a "Black kid from an inner city" (Miami's Liberty City neighborhood) seeking a business career, while also celebrating the course's small groups in dialogue model and its Turkish instructor as an "international person," and suggesting that a short-term cultural immersion experience would deepen global learning into "applied knowledge" (F1). In a more inward turn for the connective self-in-relation, F4 reported that the assigned films (and not the many, nondirected readings) on Black popular cultures around the world provided the most lasting learning, including an incommensurable encounter with a historically enslaved person's documentary account from the early 19th century as a Haitian culturally positioned by a divergent geohistory of imperial modernity.

F4 also reported that the course clarified:

the why to my thinking, and that was what I appreciated about it, not that it changed the way I thought about things. I mean, of course some things I'm looking at differently. But...most of my picture is still the same. You know? So I think it just helped with the why.

This student also was one of several, across both institutions, who mentioned self-knowledge gained through reflection or reflective dialogue that uses a global heuristic, including through the interview with me itself. GCE Scholars have noted a pedagogical tendency to redirect global study back to the self at the point of student assessment, whether that take the form of a universalizing "we" speaking from one's limited perspective, self-centric reflection upon student

identities, opinions or relationships, or the product of a desiring, activist self that falsely speaks for others (Wang and Hoffman). These orientations reflect the residual liberal-humanism in university globalism's maximalist strategies, expressive of their scalar, categorical, institutional and historical limits, albeit they don't entirely map onto the appetite for *Bildung* expressed here, which appears as a cosmopolitan mix of sentimental, intellectual, skills-based and identity-based images of self-development via global learning.

However, the variety of classroom conditions that exist for FIU's undergraduates (in-person, hybrid, fully online, or mixing these) also shapes this data. There were real limits to the learning modes available in FIU's model noted by students, especially for this self-scalar and potentially romanticized image of global learning. A few students noted how their preferred GL mode of group discussion was incompatible with common online learning formats. F6's experience highlights the possibility that critical reflection that ends up centering the self as a core GL component is a resilient mode of learning institutionally because it is compatible with the reality of under-resourced androgogic (or self-teaching) conditions for FIU's many online and hybrid courses. F6 reported that most texts for *How We Know What We Know* were "of little use" and "classroom time was mostly almost irrelevant", as it was devoted to quizzes and explaining assignment instructions for exercises in self-teaching and independent writing guided by web lectures. For F6, rather than developing reflective knowledge of oneself or dialogue based in perspectival knowledge, a final research paper was the most beneficial mode of GL:

this was the best assignment...because rather than writing about a personal experience that had somewhat of a connection to the concepts taught in class, you actually had to go out and find sources and info and other research in order to write your paper and also have to have it relate to the class concepts (F6).

In context with the class's priority of online asynchronous learning – "We had no discussions, no real lectures, no activities" (F6) – the opportunity to gather and analyze new information and

insight about a global issue or event marks the greatest occasion for learning, not the opportunity to reflect on one's experience as global. For a student like F6, who in coming internationally to FIU already identified as "global" with a diverse social milieu, GL doesn't occur through self-reflexivity or reflection but through the global as a means to particular types of knowledge and contexts; multicultural group active learning was also foreclosed from the course's inception due its andragogic instructional design. The research paper assessment is also where this course locates the "global perspective" LO, with articles from the *New York Times* providing its texts each week, alongside a reflective self-assessment metric at the beginning of the course and at its end to measure global awareness and engagement respectively.

Finally, critical student discussions of their learning conditions did not register as a significant positive or negative force in their evaluation of global learning overall, though they together provide evidence of the pedagogical infrastructure for GL experiences. F5 celebrated fully online learning as enabling for lifelong learning, yet students like F6 criticized its social and instructional leanness. F4 experienced her online course consisting merely in lists of assigned texts and writing assessments, one of many of this type at FIU, as too unguided and andragogic, requiring F4 to relearn how to learn unlike online courses with interactive elements. This frustrated sense of instructor absenteeism was more literal in in-person classes, where the cost of undergraduate learning was keenly felt, such as for F4 who rejected cancelled class meetings as inappropriate as someone "pay[ing] for everything out of pocket." F1 discussed this dynamic specifically in labour terms as setting a generalized floor for the transaction of cost, labour and debt into a credential, resigning students to degraded knowledge projects for their learning. Asked if the GL course met their expectations that motivated them to enroll, F1 demurred:

F1: I never really expect anything from courses, to be completely honest with you. I just take it for what it is, and like if I gain something from it, okay, but if

not, it's like fuck, okay, there's another \$2,000 loan that I have to pay back for nothing, you know what I mean? ... Because I literally had some courses, where like the teacher wouldn't even show up, and it was like, fuck, are you serious? I mean like, I'm happy, because it's like, okay, you just made my life easier.

Interviewer: I have some time back, yes.

F1: Yeah, but, it's like also fuck dude, I'm actually taking out student loans to pay for this class, and you're fucking me over.

Global contents and social goals of courses were potentially undermined, even ironically, by course formats. In *How We Know What We Know*, which F2 described as a media-focused course that considers “how everything’s distributed among everyone,” F2 also reported a “confusing” lack of transparency in the course’s main lecture contents: “I’m pretty sure those professors aren't really the ones that are teaching us.... I don't really know who was my professor. I just know that I had one writing coach.” Students also acknowledged uneven learning resources across instructional delivery formats. F2 described the requirement to write three successive blog posts with an assigned team as far more meaningful than the discussion board assignment of one individual post plus two comments on other students’ posts, which is the most common form of assessed social learning in online courses today, including at FIU (F2). There was also an awareness of organizational resources that sustain FIU’s unique GL project: F4 commented on superlative student services infrastructure relative to other public institutions (excepting private University of Miami) as an essential lubricant for their curricular formula, alongside study abroad opportunities and FIU’s corporate events programming for students:

FIU has like, some of the strongest counselors ... that I've dealt with, and I've, like I've taken classes at Dade, I've taken classes at Broward, and I've taken classes at University of Miami. I'm even taking some classes at the University of Houston, and it's like, yeah, whatever, but like, these advisors, they really do work around the clock. (F4)

This environment of uneven learning experience perhaps syncs with GL as an educational project that is reliant upon a prosocial mix of consumption and elective or corporate engagement,

while also drawing from Miami's cultural mixture as a diverse capitalist enclave hospitable to transamerican anti-communism and pro-business sociability. We can see the form this takes in FIU's vision for global engagement, defined as: "students will be able to demonstrate willingness to engage in local, global, international, and intercultural problem solving."²⁰⁵ In the matrices for the courses relevant to this data, the "engagement" GLO is assessed through research with a focus on intercultural communication or solutions, mock-professional applications of global knowledge and characteristics developed by the class, or student reflections. Echoing the equation in Chapter 3 of institutionalized diversity with universal global learning, this pedagogy is consistent with what Hilary Landorf and colleagues promote as "inclusive excellence", in which "classroom diversity is coupled with structural diversity" ("Universal"). Reflection plus group diversity is promoted as the pedagogical approach that allows difference to be elided and replaces learning about others with collaboration: "Diversity courses have been found to have less of an impact on perspective-taking outcomes than either meaningful interactions with diverse peers or reflective learning" (Doscher and Landorf). As a model promoted for all institutions, this formula appears to be rather deterministic in promoting collaborative learning as a reliably accessible or effective mode of labour and social reproduction, as evidenced by student experiences of andragogy here, and perhaps instead expresses a corporate labour ideal.

This model also allows the university to systematize its student services administration under one global banner: "Even the act of dichotomizing the needs and characteristics of domestic versus international students seems restrictive and invalid when short- and long-term immigration dynamics have transformed local communities into global communities" (Landorf et al 45). The collapse of GL into domestic pluralism evidenced by this rationale inhabits a blend

²⁰⁵To access these GL outcomes in full, see under the Learning Outcomes heading here: <https://fiuonline.fiu.edu/experience/student-services/development-opportunity/global-learning-medallion.php>.

of utopian institutionalism about administering non-agonistic social change and asset-based understandings of human capital and difference, which uses the unique cultural setting of Miami (oft-cited as a “global city”²⁰⁶) as the ground for its vision of transforming PSE:

The goal of universal global learning is to produce and spread widely new knowledge and new solutions for complex global problems facing people and the planet. In this sense, universal global learning shares the same mission as higher education. But when global learning involves only some students, it limits global problem-solving for all. We contend, therefore, that all colleges and universities should engage all students in global learning. . . . we also believe that universal global learning serves another aspect of higher education’s mission, which is the promotion of inclusive excellence for our increasingly diverse student populations (Landorf et al 41).

This vision’s expansionary institutional sublime – of “inclusive excellence,” “universal global learning”, and engaging “all students” to enable “global problem-solving for all” – sits uneasily beside the narrowness of the curriculum’s materiality: just two GL courses are required of each student. Additionally, FIU’s admissions page describes the university as a competitive, exclusive environment, hardly universally inclusive or excellent: “with a first year student acceptance rate of 50%, FIU admissions is considered selective” (“Admission Standards”).

Overall, the students interviewed at FIU received and applied the global information and themes in their courses in somewhat situated and regionalized ways, reflective of their own setting and backgrounds. Their perceptions of limited learning as GL’s conditions seemed to deepen their self-discourses for making use of its valuable aspects. However, these student perspectives also were couched in versions of FIU’s institutional pedagogies and corporate cosmopolitan subjectivity across all learning situations and student locations, effectively identifying with the global self-imagery of its GCE that blends the more identity-based asset logic of the entrepreneurial position with the liberal humanist position. This examination of

²⁰⁶See, for example, Saskia Sassen and Alejandro Portes, “Miami: A New Global City?”, *Contemporary Sociology* vol. 22 no. 4, 1993, pg. 471-477 and Saskia Sassen, “The Global City: Introducing a Concept”, *The Brown Journal of World Affairs* vol. XI no. 2, 2005, pg. 27-43.

FIU's curricular globalism thus reinforces the "relatively few studies that assess student perspectives of these efforts" noted as of 2020 (Butler and Reinke 2). My general observation about student and institutional alignment supports other findings, such as those from a surveying a public liberal arts university in the southern US with a mandatory Global Perspectives course for second-year students: there, 83.4% of students surveyed support including global courses at all PSE institutions, 71.7% agreed it should be mandatory, and 80% reported their course experience encouraged them to be a better global citizen and to better understand their place in the world. Notably, there was little attitudinal difference when comparing students who had already taken a global course and those who had not; "nearly all, (95.2%) believe[d] learning about global perspectives helps students understand social issues broadly in other cultures" (Butler and Reinke 3). And finally, several FIU students voiced that their global learning did not enact a personal transformation so much as reinforce their existing perspective by expanding their awareness into a global framework (F1, F2, F3), affirming their existing humanitarian concerns (F5, F7) and providing discursive terms for existing knowledge: "I feel as though I had just naturally knew [sic] these concepts, the class simply brought them to my attention and made me conscious about them" (F6; and F4). This finding will also appear among the McMaster data. The fundamental epistemic work of nominalism in global study will be revisited again below.

Ethnographies of studying global citizenship at McMaster University

Set among the dense network of PSE institutions in southern Ontario, McMaster University also reflects its host city, Hamilton, as well as development patterns in its border-adjacent region. The third largest city and destination for immigrants in Ontario after Toronto and Ottawa, Hamilton is known as a diverse, growing city of 500,000+ in the Greater Toronto

area where one in four residents was born outside of Canada, with largest immigrant populations at the time of writing originally from the Philippines, China, India, Iraq, Colombia, the US, the UK, and Pakistan (“Population and Diversity”). The city itself claims a global identity on this basis, asserting its hospitality to diasporic cultures as a source of richness much like institutional diversity discourses, and celebrating immigrant citizens for providing human capital, global competitiveness via “a multi-lingual, multicultural workforce with connections to global markets” and replacements for its aging workforce (“Global Hamilton”). Hamilton’s historic profile as a port and deindustrializing steel-mill city has been updated in the period of the thesis’s study with growing development toward global knowledge and creative economies (and their accompanying gentrification), an infrastructural shift which is also reflected in the “institutional strengths” of the health sciences, engineering, information sciences, multi-disciplinary studies and business that McMaster has organized its provincial performance-based funding around.²⁰⁷

McMaster’s student body, to the partial degree that self-reported data is available, also reflects these regional histories of settlement, development and immigration. A 2021 internal census with an 18% response rate shows a bit less than half of its undergraduate population identifies as non-racialized and/or white, and roughly half identify as a member of a racialized group and with a range of other racial and ethnic identities; the university also cites an international student population from 120 countries as comprising around 16% of its undergraduates (“Get to Know McMaster”). Around one quarter of the undergraduate population at McMaster studies arts & sciences, social sciences or humanities, where McMaster’s global curricula mostly tend to be located, with the remainder in business, engineering, health sciences

²⁰⁷See “Institutional Strengths” on pages 9-10 of the university’s 2020-2025 Strategic Mandate agreement with the Ontario Ministry of Colleges and Universities for discussion of this set of programming investments and the forms they take in research and curricular programmes:
<https://ira.mcmaster.ca/app/uploads/2020/11/McMaster-SMA3-Agreement-August-31-2020-SIGNED-FINAL.pdf>.

and science.²⁰⁸ As a portrait of student orientations towards the institution and their learning, I note that around 55% of census respondents agreed that all academic programmes should require a social or global equity and justice course, and a majority at around 83% thought these courses should be permitted as electives in academic programmes. Around 42% of respondents confirmed that their programme of study includes such courses, and 43% affirmed that their undergraduate study has equipped them to address those issues in the world.²⁰⁹

The undergraduates I interviewed for ethnographic analysis are reflective of the institutional orientation toward social justice suggested in the data above. All five students were in their first or second year and aged 18 or 19. Three were Canadians based in Hamilton or nearby in Ontario prior to enrollment, one of whom identified as diasporic Egyptian, another as diasporic Iranian and the third as from “different places” but citing Burlington, ON as home; one student was a permanent resident of Canada in Ontario but identifies as Colombian, and the lone international student was from Wuhu, China. Their planned majors included Political Science, Health Sciences, Commerce, Economics and undeclared Social Sciences.

The framework for the “Global Citizenship” course emphasizes a “critical” orientation to global learning work, though does not define this in terms of methods, concerns or knowledge areas as discussed in Chapter 3. Relative to other global curriculum at McMaster, “critical” here suggests a more academic rather than obvious GCE orientation. The IGHC’s interdisciplinary Globalization minor collates courses from the humanities, social, health and material sciences faculties and includes fairly typical objectives among interdisciplinary programmes, allowing

²⁰⁸Source: “McMaster Factbook 2019-2020,” pages 30-32.

https://ira.mcmaster.ca/app/uploads/2020/10/Fact-Book-2020_1.pdf

²⁰⁹This information derives from a confidential, partial aggregated data profile of the student body that was provided to me for use as a “diversity snapshot” by McMaster’s Equity and Inclusion Office and Office of Institutional Research and Analysis, based on a 2021 self-reporting student survey and census. It is hardly a complete picture, but does suggest some general observable trends among a fraction of undergraduates. Source: per emails exchanged between March 14 and April 8, 2022 with Joanne Gittens, Director of the IRA and Arig al Shaibah, former Associate Vice President of Equity and Inclusion.

students to explore globalization's complexity, thematic range and their own interests across disciplines. As a curricular example that takes up the field of global study on some of its terms, and as a site for analysis of classroom infrastructure, the course registers a more intimate scale of GL experience and dialogue. Rather than mapping onto Stein's four categories for GCE curriculum, the course alternates between critical and cosmopolitan registers as its method of highlighting epistemological reflexivity about its terms, positioned at what Stein alongside other GCE scholars have indexed as an ambivalent interface between neoliberal and common critical-liberal orientations toward global study.²¹⁰

The introductory-level course plan for "Global Citizenship" was designed to first define globalization, global citizenship and their debates, and then to discuss sites of application using themes that fall under these terms as defined by the course's introductory meetings. Its outline follows a content-mastery approach, focused on terminology, reportage, and scholarly analysis as constitutive of global knowledge (and tested via exams) with interwoven opportunities for students to present original research and argument through individual blog posts and a research paper. Alongside class lectures and accompanying tutorial sections led by TAs, two books were assigned as core texts for this approach: Manfred Steger's 2017 fourth edition of *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*, and Nigel Dower's 2003 text *An Introduction to Global Citizenship*. Assigned in its entirety, Steger's book covers globalization as a contested term, its histories and economic, political, cultural and ecological dimensions, globalist ideologies based in markets, justice, and religion, and globalization's future. Dower's book promotes global citizenship as a framework that provides necessary ethical, existential and aspirational claims to humanity, with emphasis on the ideals represented in human rights, international law and global governance;

²¹⁰For the detailed account of this meta-analysis and its terms, see Pashby et al, "A meta-review of typologies of global citizenship education" as cited in the Bibliography.

assigned chapters cover this framework, examples of civic works in the environment and development that include governments, corporations, global governance institutions and non-violent activism as their actors, theoretical critique of global citizenship featuring responses to Martha Nussbaum's classic writings on patriotism and cosmopolitanism, and global citizenship's as-yet unrealized potential for the global present and future. Supplementary readings around these themes were drawn from related scholarly journals and from popular news and magazine venues in Canada and the US, such as *The Globe and Mail*, *The New York Times*, *The New Yorker*, *Vice News*, *Vanity Fair*, *Al-Jazeera America*, and *The Economist*; a 2016 address by President Barack Obama to the Canadian Parliament is also included.

Toward a general accounting of this syllabus's approach to global studies, I note here that the course's content is derived from a social sciences approach to globalization, privileging formal global categories of description and analysis like nation, security, human rights, and economic vs cultural globalization, and based in an unstated Eurocentric perspective, per the synoptic scholarly approach of the course's two main texts written by white European men and the provenance of the curriculum more generally. Supplementary readings complicate or exemplify particular critiques of such perspectives, per the course's primary goal, stated as its first LO, to teach students how to evaluate the real-world relationship between its two main terms as a kind of global analytic training: "Demonstrate a capacity for critical engagement with the concepts of globalization and global citizenship, particularly in terms of how the latter informs individual and societal responses to the former" (Stockdale 1).²¹¹ Its second and third LOs also help to clarify the approach to global studies that the course takes in support of the Globalization minor, focused on applying nuanced understandings of current world events and communicating original ideas with self-reflexivity. In combining research-based analysis,

²¹¹ See the syllabus link provided in Appendix B, under "Global Citizenship" for further description.

reflective writing and content mastery skills with a framework around global citizenship and globalization as based in normative debates, the course sets up a circumscribed field in which students should develop “their own answers” to the major questions raised by these real-world and abstract formations (Stockdale 1). The course also examines select contexts of global citizenship, studying examples in popular culture, sports, social media, humanitarianism, protest, and immigration policy. Arguably, the curriculum partly deconstructs its own terms by studying phenomena both with and against their abstract categorizations or philosophical positioning. Yet it does not go as far as a comparative course like Appiah’s in Chapter 3 would, nor does it include “critical reflection on its connections to political and economic systems” in Canada or around the world that would “help to overcome some of the oft-noted parochialism that still informs global education” (Wang and Hoffman 14). For its introductory level the course defaults to an individualistic literacy in complex, abstract global forms, instead of introducing global citizenship as a genre of civic participation that could be understood in specific relation to the scene of study or as particular to contemporary institutions, regions, histories and power relations that could be analyzed in relation to other civic or social genres.

I provide this extended parsing of the course’s academic content to set up the way that students in the course were positioned socially and epistemically by its framing. All five students interviewed, hereafter referred to as M1, M2, M3, M4 and M5, expressed awareness of this framing and its effects on their perspectives of themselves and their understanding of and relationship to the rest of the world. Students chose the course after reviewing its syllabus online in advance, and most of the five participants sought the course out as an introduction to the topic, hoping to deepen basic understandings of economics, politics, and sociology, which derived from secondary-level courses in world cultures or geography and for some in relation to their social

positioning as immigrants, members of transnational diasporas, and an international student. All students came into the course with some preconceptions about globalization and global citizenship: one student out of five entered the course with a suspicious view of globalization based in its effects on the Global South, while another highlighted its hierarchical nature and uneven benefits around the globe; one explained that their understanding of globalization moved from a static condition of the world to a complex human construct because of the course; and two upheld the positive view of globalization that they came in with overall while integrating more knowledge of its complexity and drawbacks.

With the exception of M1, most students therefore defined globalization, global citizen and global matter-of-factly per the course's emphases. M3's definition of globalization was more or less shared: "the growing interconnection of the world in terms of culture, economics, financial, geography, movement, like, information--basically growing and intensifying connections on all levels of ... humanity, I guess I would say"; albeit M4 specified economic policy created by governments and global governance structures, explaining globalization "as more of an economic sort of thing where I would see orders coming down for trade and money." Global citizenship was understood generally to be a feeling, duty, or belief that "you have your first allegiance to the world as a whole" (M3), though acknowledged as aspirational or elective, such as for those who "choose to participate in [globalization] willingly" (M2). On "global", M3 and M4 associated the descriptor with global governance and financial institutions like the UN or IMF, M5 with a harmonious, multicultural Earth, and M2 with a broad, simultaneous trend in places around the world, approaching but not really a universal phenomenon. These student conceptions of the basic terms of global study don't map squarely onto Sharon Stein's four orientations for GCE, suggesting that core academic content was presented as based in textbooks

with relatively straightforward authority or as empirical accounting of global processes.

This is not to suggest, however, that all students emerged as credulous realists of the global international-relations order or that the course's aims were internalized without any particular orientation toward global citizenship for themselves. Grounded in the Globalization minor's objective "to explore the complex idea of globalization from a multi-disciplinary perspective", the course sampled the terms of entrepreneurialism, liberal-humanism, and anti-oppression critiques, while anticipating some of their limits by surveying political and scholarly debates. Some of this was quite pointed with regard to liberal-humanist GCE in that setting: all students, for example, expressed that their learning was strongly impacted by a class focused on the theme of voluntourism and tourism from the Global North more generally that featured a guest speaker, a resident doctor who had previously served as Health programme Coordinator for AKF-Afghanistan. This particular lesson on "Performing Global Citizenship" brought critique and self-reflexivity into the eventual civic or activist aims of studying global processes by examining lasting harms caused by Canadian humanitarian actors elsewhere, including by youth and university students who pursue service learning and reinforce voluntourism as a durable media product of the Global North through their own social media activity (M4). This produced a sense of relative inadequacy for straightforward ideas of global citizenship, though most students continued to affirm the idea of a common humanity through renewed attention to local actions and their global consequences and a sense of humility toward the mixed character of lived experiences of globalization. For students M3, M4 and M5, global citizenship was still accepted or promoted as part of the recipe for reducing conflicts around the globe, though only M5, a graduate of an international secondary school in China, assigned it the status of a duty or a responsibility that is common to civics. For M2, M3 and M4, the course

critically repositioned their civic and social relations to the world, with M2 emphasizing “grassroots ... problem solving [that] could happen at different scales”, M3 highlighting heightened awareness of complicity in global inequalities as a resident of Canada, and M4 describing routine awareness of global consequences from civic life and consumption in Canada.

These student experiences were not without criticisms of the course’s approaches, especially of its emphasis placed on nominalism, or terminological exposure and mastery. Students expressed disorientation from opening the course with extended definition work when they did not yet have a referent or an object for understanding globalization in the world, and feeling bogged down by detailed categorizations of global citizenship that they did not retain after the course; academic global knowledge as such did not seem important to them. They also desired more applied knowledge on these topics, such as classes focused on health, education, religion, global governance institutions, and examples of alternative forms of citizenship that counter nationalism. M3, who had entered the class with a negative view of globalization given cultural loss and homogenization and economic suffering in Colombia, suggested the course should have further explored “globalization in a non-Western context and its ...[effects] on non-Western nations” in order to flesh out a more complex, mixed picture of global citizenship and global change. Again, these curricular desires don’t name elements of liberal-humanist global citizenship, although they do seem located in its default episteme of complexity that, as Stein describes, does not “include a strong critique of power nor trace colonial histories and ongoing racialized structures of expropriation and exploitation”²¹² including those of Western

²¹²This missing context is arguably the primary focus of “Globalization, Social Justice and Human Rights”, IGHC’s upper-level undergraduate course (not a required course for the minor), as cited in its first LO: “This course provides an opportunity for students to apply their knowledge of some social theories on globalization, human rights and development to analyze contemporary global processes as well as case-studies of social problems across the Global South. By expanding their understanding of major issues in the area of development, human rights, and social justice, students will further develop breadth and depth of knowledge in the field of globalization” (Butler 2, as cited in Appendix B).

universities. This makes some sense given how the course's projects of Global North-focused contextualization are thematic but largely not historical, as noted by M5 who was socially positioned by "non-Western" experience as a cosmopolitan Chinese citizen:

Globalization is a popular topic but not a new one. It happened hundreds years ago. [sic] I remember prof talked a few transnational companies in class and some historical events but did not particularly introduce more of that parts. [sic] I want to know more about it and analyze that part because I think it is very important for studying globalization happening nowadays.

This curricular desire was echoed and expanded upon by M1, who reported extensive frustration with course's curriculum and pedagogy and taking on public attempts at real-time counter-pedagogy in critique of the course's narratives of globalization and framing of class conversations. M1, who grew up in diaspora in Canada with family still in Egypt, most singularly inhabits the anti-oppressive position toward GCE across all students interviewed, demanding "more critical, politicized, and historicized approaches to global engagement" (Stein "Mapping" 246) in class and course materials. To M1, whose identity was "inherently politicized" in the learning context, especially as a Muslim wearing a hijab, the course presented "simple narratives," such as summarizing the anti-globalization politics of the left and the far-right as the right's immigration concerns based in "economic issues" and the left as "against everything", without examining the "why" or the ideologies that interact with globalization. M1 also noted a lack of discussion of the international division of labour, the role of Western and white supremacy in producing global conflicts and suffering, and histories of imperialism and Global South perspectives. In absence of these, M1 saw a missed opportunity for contextualized pedagogy: "you have a class of first-years who are very impressionable, who are very also vulnerable, and I think that courses like these can--can really, like, develop their, like, like the narratives, and like ideologies. And I just wish he'd taken advantage of that." This concern

became concrete when student writings for the class replicated the course's more basic terms, including via an open-ended opportunity for individualized research via assigned blog posts:

M1: We had three blog post assignments to do, and I kind of wish [the instructor] forced us to look at the Global South and write about the Global South for that blog post. And when I brought that up, he said that he couldn't force anyone to write anything, but I was like, "You can force people to think critically, right?" Like, you can do that. And even like, all the blog posts were posted online and when you're like looking through them, it was all very simple stuff. It was all global warming, and it was all about food, it was all about clothing, it was all about the internet. There wasn't any, sort of like, critical lens that was, like, displayed, you know?

I: So like, if he could have given people prompts or topics or something like that.

M1: Yeah. Yeah. I think you have to force people to think critically, because people aren't going to do it on their own.

M1's pedagogical impulse here, based in part from disappointing past curricular experiences, exhibits the "understanding in the anti-oppressive position that, although the concept of global citizenship is not transcendently tied to any particular state, institution, or identity, the ways in which it is commonly deployed tend to reify existing inequalities" (Stein "Mapping" 246-7). It was reinforced by the core texts for the course, too, as M1 described refusing to read parts of the Steger book discussing "religious globalization" that was "all about ISIS and Islam" and economic globalization without any attention to regimes of labour exploitation or profiteering.

This sense of the need for epistemic regulation in GCE was generated by the course experience for M1, forming in reaction to inadequately framed or managed class discussion and a kind of free speech default for student positions toward the course material. M1 reported not coming into the course with a "critical lens" or "with anything really" but with foreknowledge of uneven global conditions, so the class forced a "do my own research" posture that prompted M1 to contest lecture contents, as well as student comments and posts that expressed unidentified white supremacist talking points about cultural difference or politics. M1 describes this deficiency, especially in response to the "basic" and "Eurocentric" opening definition work of

the course, as a kind of pedagogical and epistemic irresponsibility on GCE's own terms:

There was this one lecture I remember. I put up my hand and I started talking about cheap foreign labour, like it was in the earlier half of the course. And I was talking about how the Global South's perspective, and their sort of, experience of globalization is one that is always ignored. It's one that we've never--we never talk about, and we never hear. And he says, "I don't want to speak on their behalf." I never asked you to speak on their behalf, I asked you to show us a more objective lens of the reality of globalization and what it does to the Global South. Right? Like, I'm not asking you to--like, we know what's going on there. There's lots of videos, there's interviews, there's people talking. There are activists who are doing this work, right? I think we--we need to look at them, we need to, like, hear them out, right?

The collapse of epistemic, civic and pedagogical modes here into a demand based in the politics of knowledge, I would argue, indicates the limited modes of response available to M1 due to what Stein calls "the weight of accumulated discursive-material effects" ("Mapping" 244) in settler social institutions; the instructor's response about hesitancy over "speaking for" others seems to reflect these over-determining social conditions as well.

While M1 may wish to revise the curriculum in name of a more complete and accurate global field of study, the learning context's constitution by what M1 called "Eurocentrism" alongside disciplinary infrastructures that fuse culturalism with undergraduate learning and academic practitioners as its "means of generating capital, including the 'cultural capital garnered in the name of the political' indicate the extent to which the very move toward the political, in identity domains, has become politicized" (Mitchell "The Object" 187). M1's experience suggests the possibility that GCE is institutionally positioned as its own site of an undifferentiated, unacknowledged "identity knowledge", or as a coeval identity domain with its own infrastructure. This way of seeing GCE as a site of institutional identity positions it in counter-formation to the identity knowledges based in the disciplinary traditions of "difference studies" or minoritized interdisciplines, which Robyn Weigman suggests are

knowledges distinguished...not simply by their interest in the investigation and deconstruction of social marginalized or dominant identities but also, and crucially,

“by their acknowledged attachment to the political” (Mitchell “Review 744).

Per Weigman, such an identity basis for a knowledge project is determined in relation to its field imaginary, so in this case denotes the politics of reproducing institutional globalism as multicultural institutionalism administered by settler integrationist whiteness, here as an echo of Canada’s own self-image. The indeterminacy of this institutional knowledge project’s relations to cultural essentialism vs. assimilationism, social administration by whiteness and its technologies, and settler national self-image (i.e., politics) is part of GCE’s durability: its capacity for “inexhaustibility” based in social innovation and application as a pessimistic infrastructure for social and institutional enterprise sits alongside its curricular “optimism – often in the face of much to the contrary – in the ‘world-building agency’ of fields ‘founded on the *belief in knowledge*” (Mitchell “Review” 747, emphasis in original). This anti-political contradiction is likely far more visible in a historically white-administered settler institution like McMaster than in a far younger, historically diverse or majority minority institution like FIU, in particular for minoritized students who resist the managerial overcoming of difference in the learning context, alongside its generic, non-performative institutional commitments to anti-racism.

In the McMaster context, where the administration now boasts of its diversely populated projects and an “international culture” as part of its “creation of a global identity” as an institutional initiative (“The McMaster Model”), the global “reality of relativism” that M1 wished to integrate into the curriculum was trumped by the local and regional cultural politics of relativism, drawing M1 into many arguments with classmates equating the hijab with the red MAGA hat, immigrants with rape, and BLM with the KKK, and denying the existence of cultural appropriation.²¹³ These incidents, especially aggravated by a range of students posting on

²¹³Per M1, one student with whom she argued over his comments used relativism specifically to provide intellectual cover: “And--and basically, he compared the MAGA hat to the headdress. And then he was like, "Everything is very relative." I was like, "But objectively, like, hate speech exists, and objectively, like, consequences of hate speech

the course's Twitter page for optional credit without instructor moderation, led M1 to decry the course's debating, free speech approach, managed poorly by TAs during tutorial discussion as permissive to hate speech and, especially on a public platform like Twitter, replicative of "colonial structures." M1 reported that friends in the class censored their leftist views in their blog posts and class comments for fear it could affect their grades, and that M1 herself became a moderator to prevent the proliferation of "problematic narratives" unchecked by the course's instructors. While M1 made sure to note that the instructor extensively engaged her questions and concerns individually, both privately and publicly, this responsiveness did not translate into the course more generally. Additionally, M3 noted a gendered dynamic in tutorial discussions in which the primary active participants were nearly always "girls", and that when "guys" did participate they consistently downplayed or naturalized any negative aspects of globalization. These dynamics suggests that reproduction of white male authority may have extended from the course texts to course lectures on "both sides" of a particular theme or phenomenon to some students taking up the course's LO with the ideological stakes of academic debates as cultural politics, as indeed some readings framed it, rather than for analysis of "global challenges," real world phenomena or sociohistorical conditions. The course's social infrastructure may also be a product of a wider institutional climate, per the needs of the global knowledge economy, that uses GCE to "evaluate cultural practices" (Pashby et al 152) alongside the development of (inter)cultural competencies, here essentializing students at the same time as it extracts and individualizes culture into actionable knowledge or cosmopolitan identity.

In sum, M1 was positioned by the course's organization as what Stein describes as GCE's anti-oppressive script, questioning

the depoliticization, ahistoricism, salvationism, ethnocentrism, and paternalism that

also exist. And that ended up being a twenty minute conversation, and it was just a joke" (M1).

often characterize global citizenship efforts, and thereby offer a means to speak back to the two dominant global citizenship scripts, and create important opportunities for discussion, systemic analysis, and self-reflexivity (“Mapping” 247).

Given this position’s apparent compatibility with generic anti-racist and/or diversely populated institutionalism under global citizenship, M1’s experience of the curriculum was not incommensurate to the knowledge projects of the class but contained within them and not, ultimately, a site of epistemic impasse or crisis. In absence of any curricular responsiveness, M1 came away from the course frustrated, tired, and more confident in an activist voice identifying with the Global South. Speaking to me after several months after the course ended, M1 defined globalization as “a new form of neocolonialism and imperialism. And...a way for the west to continue to maintain this, like, hegemonic power,” and global citizenship as merely “a way to assuage our...guilt about some of the things happening in the world” (M1). This politicized understanding of globalization as Western colonialism plus globalism, contra today’s increasingly multi-polar globalization and hegemonic disorganization with its international economic conditions of “converging divergence” named in the Introduction, is an effect of the representationalist logic to which M1 was personally subject as a participant per the course’s framing. Global Citizenship’s reliance on a generalized or universalist framework for discussing globalization and global citizenship as terms or nominal containers acted as a well-established epistemic limit in resistance to the possibility for deconstructive epistemic work or self-situation among students, via heuristics like Stein’s for GCE or comparison of global citizenship genres in different cosmologies. As a result, class dialogue opened up a global-facing terrain for abstract civic analysis while obviating historical or situated critique, such as moves to “recognize [student] complicity in the systems under critique or to question their own assumptions and motivations” (Stein “Mapping” 247) in an extra-national context, to consider the geohistorical

positioning of a Chinese international student like M5, say, or to put globally elite education in a settler capitalist institution in conversation with global citizenship.

These findings also seem to suggest that the course's "critical" approach refers to an academic description of cultural valuation as named in Chapter 3, and fits in with general patterns observed by Stein and others across sites of GCE: that "critical" GCE broadly includes "'types' of GCE that acknowledge and address social injustices" and "can refer to any approach that raises the status quo as problematic, grouping together quite distinct approaches" (Pashby et al 153). The course fits their macro-characterization of critical GCE approaches that "to varying extents put into question the roots of current mainstream Eurocentric notions of GC and cosmopolitanism" (Pashby et al 153). And it also appeared to largely affirm and reproduce the social infrastructure for GCE and the project of multicultural global identity at McMaster, as students (excepting M1) reported that they would take a similar course in the future and find that the campus environment generally help to broaden perspectives and curb ignorant behaviors among their peers, even if this is not necessarily due to concerted efforts the university makes to be a "global" learning environment. Due perhaps to a more academic approach, the course did not seem to leave students wrestling with answers to its animating questions about globalization and global citizenship as the categories promoted and defined for use in understanding and navigating the "extraordinary levels of interconnection between people and institutions across the globe" (Stockdale 1). It did demonstrate how "GCE can reinforce a limited view of global citizen subjectivity in terms of gender, culture, language, religion, and race" (Pashby 346), and highlights the limits to default global pedagogies of individualized reflective learning for difference-transcending global citizenship, given the tendency toward the social reproduction of university globalism at the classroom scale, and the complimentary curricular forms of the wider

field of GCE projects McMaster is pursuing. With this in view, I conclude by considering both of these sites in dialogue with critical pedagogy's "repressive myths" to clarify the situation of students in their classrooms and outside of them (Ellsworth 298).

Concluding Remarks: In the Gap

What can be established across this data? First, we can observe how interfaces for global learning are indeed shaped by social infrastructures of institutions as normative environments, as well as by the curricular nominalism projects that organize global study and the university's management of difference more generally. At McMaster, such nominalism largely reproduced global citizenship as a Western-defaulting both-sidesism about the cultural politics of globalization and its processes, appearing as an accommodating mode in a Canadian public institution that reproduces "an imperialism that cannot say its name, an imperialism recast to look tolerant, liberal, multicultural, pacific, and universal while actually remaining aggressive, partial, and exclusive" (Morefield 102). At FIU, curricular nominalism took the form of team diversity as roving globality, reproducing its terms of "universal global learning" via "inclusive excellence" as a kind of corporate and connectivist *Bildung* among students centered around the experience of diversity. This chapter clarifies the pedagogical and substantive gap between student conditions as part of globalist infrastructure and the kinds of social facts that are formalized into subjects of global study as part of "the global university" in these settler national contexts. Undergraduates in fact experience institutional rationalization as a semi-deterministic aspect of their learning that shapes real infrastructure for their self-development, social relations and intellectual desires and have some collective discourse and praxis about this, including a form of *Bildung* that remains flexible to degraded learning or institutional disappointment while

harvesting whatever personal or social goods it can from study. Collectivizing learning experience of the sort that might engender organizing or counter-programming in university worlds appears fundamentally limited by the managerial, rationalizing and reproductive infrastructures universities organize, instead directing students towards the university's mutating social capture through credentialism, the paradigm of social innovation, and their mix of methodological individualism and social connectivity through institutional administration; or toward alienation and disaffection from these.

Additionally, this managerial environment is largely not accounted for in the overdetermining active, civic qualities assigned to individual learners via GLOs, but students do know it in various ways and act on it as worldly knowledge in their global study, sometimes credibly and others resistantly, in interaction with the managed and incentivized forms of learning they have time and other means to experience as workers, consumers and risk managers. This chapter shows, perhaps unsurprisingly, that nominalism has significant figurative power as a project of situated global study over and above relational work among institutional members. The compatibility of culturalist representation and asset logics for identities with common global programming organizes students along institutionalized forms of self-development, especially a corporate cosmopolitan *Bildung* in US settings and a social justice oriented institutionalism in Canadian settings that mixes liberalism, entrepreneurialism and political pessimism into its vision of learning. Via such curricular projects, which afford students discourses of reflective self-empowerment, authenticity based in awareness, civic participation and self-development via credentialism, and critical dialogue based in culturalism and reason, student antecedents toward pro-social, global citizen identity formation per Chapter 3 tended to be confirmed by global study outcomes. Student narratives found scalar experiences within their social locations in

relation to particular genres of the curricular programmes they were organized by.

This finding alongside the substance gap in global curriculum thus suggests some new practical potential for critical pedagogical programming in global study. The global learning modes surveyed herein replicate critical pedagogy's "repressive myths that perpetuate relations of domination," such as "empowerment,' 'student voice,' 'dialogue,' and even the term 'critical'" (Ellsworth 298). These learning figures rely on a repressive set of assumptions about classroom members and relations that reify formal learning's foundations in presumed rationality, paternalism, fixed or singular notions of identity and difference, and the authentic, unencumbered possibility of student self-knowledge and self-expression per a universalist democratic ideal in the classroom. Instead, global curriculum can organize the study of infrastructure and its glitches inclusive of global institutions like the university in ways that reflect learning labour's dynamics between instructors, students and their epistemic and political economic conditions. As performed throughout the thesis, an infrastructural curricular mode can accommodate the "multiplicity of knowledges [that] are present in the classroom as a result of the way difference has been used to structure social relations inside and outside the classroom" that are also "contradictory, partial, and irreducible" (Ellsworth 321) as the contextual terms for negotiatory mapping of a particular university infrastructure's processes and objects. As the concluding section will explore, classroom work against an anti-social and degrading globalist *Bildung* must "begin within constitutive contradiction" and the "particular position of complicity within the dominant" (Mitchell "(Critical Ethnic Studies)" 91) that global study in US and Canadian universities organizes relative to learning's status in a global crisis landscape.

Conclusion: Global Occasion

“What remains for our pedagogy of unlearning is to build affective infrastructures that admit the work of desire as the work of an aspirational ambivalence.”

Lauren Berlant

University globalism in the US and Canada has been a multi-decade project of social management and training that partly obscures its definitional infrastructure. This “lifeworld of structure” (Berlant “The Commons” 393) in institutional worlds layers extractive cultural and economic programmes into commonsensical postures toward the globe as an existential and technological figure of connectivity and scale, or toward global as an institutional modifier summarizing sentimental, transcultural and innovative learning and corporate aesthetics. Across its chapters, this thesis has sought to flesh out this definition work, studying globalist practices in the public higher education systems of the US and Canada as locally and internationally consequential institutional formations with features and glitches that shape undergraduate student experience as well as its surrounding environments. In an archival mode that seeks potential data and objects from a wide field of networked and entangled phenomena, I have read the globalist projects of these PSE systems as infrastructures that condition learning and credentialing as forms of anti-social, settler national and managerial self-development for today’s undergraduates. These forms have emerged across a thirty-plus year history and showcase the mutations of institutional globalism in these settler national contexts per accompanying imperatives of global reflexivity, capital accumulation and risk management in the scene of PSE. These evolving organizational modes have included financialization, platformization, digitalization, culturalist representation and entrepreneurialism, maximalist market capture, corporatization and commodification of university environments and modes of sociability, and carceral control.

University globalism as this thesis's object of study thus solidifies as a global capitalist formation with infrastructure and institutional politics spanning the Cold War university, state multiculturalisms and liberal anti-racisms, neoliberal globalism as an institution-building project after 20th-century decolonization towards ongoing Global North imperium, informationalism as learning's behaviorist data regime and networked connectivism, and expanding, unbundling credentialism for post-productivity capitalism's degrading labour conditions.

The keyword I have supplied for this period's composite and morphing set of institutional practices and cultures is connectivity, defined as the social and infrastructural good through which globalism is variously represented and embedded into undergraduate study. This infrastructure is both managerial, with accompanying pro-social ideologies of diversity and inclusive excellence, social innovation and enterprise, and global citizenship, and socially reproduced via the interfaces, programming and learning conditions students must navigate as individuals engaged in pre-professional self-development through learning experiences and self-commodification as human capital. Connectivity as an infrastructural formation thus encompasses both the globalized economic dynamics that position students as infrastructure for institutional reproduction and capital continuity and the institutional imaginary of undergraduates as the subjects of administrative and curricular efforts to stage "internationalization at home." These pedagogical efforts demonstrably promote corporate cosmopolitanism, social justice institutionalism, and global citizenship rationality as personal goods for the global knowledge economy. Connectivity thus acts as a site by which to observe cosmopolitanization as an uneven and differential yet systemic effect of training students for the global knowledge economy in the region's undergraduate education, spanning the classed, racialized, gendered and colonial stratification of institutional and learning resources and their managed potential outcomes.

In a cultural studies mode of critical intimacy with these projects and their situating discourses and environments, each chapter has also lingered with the facts of institutional and social reproduction via university globalism at particular scales, layers or sites of experience management to foreground their generation of particular contradictions and affects. Throughout the thesis, registers of ambivalence have been visible in institutional policy and resourcing, in the mixed terms of curricula, and in the experiences of institutional members themselves.

Ambivalence emerges as an infrastructural by-product in our time of global “polycrisis”²¹⁴ and regional institutional erosion, however counter-intuitive this mixed attachment may seem against a backdrop of disruptive, disabling and disastrous conditions. One function I have intended for this study is to organize and narrate this mixture of conditions and attachments that characterize the ongoing membership of individuals or groups within universities who would identify with ambivalence toward their learning and labouring conditions – in other words, what I have called the double binds of contemporary higher ed that enable its reproduction and continuity despite its production of social depletion, alienation and exclusion. Ambivalence has appeared in a range of sites: among academics engaged in radical critique of institutionalized life and in the minoritized interdisciplines; in myself as a university labourer and junior academic researcher; in UNESCO’s education reports and recommendations as a global policymaker responsible for steering imperial modernity’s durable educational infrastructure in the postcolonial international state system; in the administered learning objectives and citizenship discourses that circulate institutionally to claim various, often contradictory kinds of transformation and revaluation of students; and among students navigating learning and curricular conditions, and by extension, in the desires for connection, exchange and intellection potentially expressed therein. As a site of labour, the

²¹⁴Adam Tooze has mobilized this term to describe the multiple, overlapping and linked crises in the world system visible in the present decade, especially since the start of the Covid-19 pandemic, which organizes his book *Shutdown: How Covid Shut Down the World Economy*; see the Introduction for an overview of “polycrisis.”

university invites other narratives of its infrastructural conditions, such as “the affirmation trap” in which “labor is locked into the position of affirming its own exploitation under the guise of survival” (Clover, *Riot Strike Riot* 147), as a structural condition of Berlantian cruel optimism that the university as a core social institution of labour skilling, credentialing and discipline enacts. Yet ambivalence as a summary term more fully reflects the sedimentation of the social forms and goods that the university is hospitable to in its worlding infrastructure and that institutional members may desire and/or seek to survive it with, while also clarifying the co-presence and co-registration of their rottenness, non-performativity, and/or negation and the mixed material and sentimental effects this strain generates.

Another reason to stick with ambivalence, pun intended, is that the production of critique, critical research, critical pedagogy and critical study about this institutional infrastructure is of course also part of such an infrastructure, including this very writing towards a postgraduate credential. The historical arc of elite and institutional capture of such criticality has contributed to higher ed’s pessimistic yet expansionary reproduction, as visible here in the mutation of the tradition of anti-oppressive critical pedagogy toward corporatized forms of diversity, dialogue and cultural rights and in the likewise movement of conflicts around resource distribution, social reproduction and historical reparation “towards ever more remote decision sites where interests appear as ‘problems’ in the abstract jargon of technocratic specialists” (Streek 20). While some activism within institutional worlds therefore focuses its demands on accountability and non-reformist reform rather than institutional inclusion and integration,²¹⁵ this broad trend

²¹⁵For an extended discussion of this, see Boston Review’s forum on Robin D.G. Kelley’s essay “Black Study, Black Struggle,” which offers a critique of reformist activism toward institutional inclusion and improved conditions among Black students in the second decade of the 21st-century, with a rejoinder from Derecka Purnell (alongside many others) that rejects his characterization and instead insists on a both/and recognition of the complexity of student activism today, asking: “Is it not possible for students to reject the ideology of inclusion and demand reform from their universities?” Source: <https://bostonreview.net/forum/robin-kelley-black-struggle-campus-protest/>.

suggests that radical exhortations to be “in but not of”²¹⁶ university environments functionally abstract from and thus leave in place the broader anti-social foundations of the university by amplifying critical theoretical production as refuge over responsiveness to complicity and its immediate harms. This is not to condemn all oppositional life within the university to futility nor to undermine the necessity of critique. Rather, we can recognize the production of contradictory sociability and complicity as one kind of universal ground and infrastructural element for institutional participation in post-basic, globally elite settler educational settings that privatize intellectual labour, even while its conditions also include differential administration of social citizenship, expropriation via debt and commodification of individuals and their cultures.

As a term summarizing hegemonic forces of abstraction in the world system, however increasingly disorganized, “global” invites this kind of scalar critical thought about contemporary life that can enable a desire for or habit of “transcend[ing] from complicity in colonial harm without giving anything up” among settler citizens, especially in global citizenship training toward “correct” forms of cultural awareness, complexity and ethnicity (Stein and Andreotti 2). Critical university studies, too, relies on systemic analysis of settler infrastructure that typically includes “an explicit continued acknowledgment of ongoing imperialist and racial violence in order to incorporate it ... [which] also enables the imperialist/settler subject’s creative practice” (Stuelke, “Books in Conversation”). Critically intimate and deconstructive modes of engagement with these figures of scale and system thus must make their reproductive worlding visible as politics yet also work from the politicizing ground of “complicity within the dominant,” as I have attempted here. In recognition of my inheritance of and participation in these reproductive modes, affective production has been an important infrastructural element to

²¹⁶See Moten and Harney’s “The University and the Undercommons: Seven Theses” for the original usage of this influential phrase describing the work of “the subversive intellectual” (101), picked up by many pursuing radical scholarship over the last 15 years.

highlight to avoid an overdetermined discussion of PSE as a core site in the “experience economy” (Moten and Harney, “the university”) making use of identity, cultural authenticity, and sentimentality, and pedagogy a particularly concerted site of these social projects.

As Sianne Ngai has written (updating Freud) about contemporary modes of attachment and judgment in scenes of aesthetic and intellectual consumption, especially those that navigate complicity rather than staging a critical outside,

ambivalence is not an act of simple bookkeeping, where you have some positive and some negative feelings about something, and take the balance of the two sums. Rather, the co-presence of clashing feelings about an object, positive and negative, always serves to intensify our attachment to that object.

If we can presuppose, by our being here at all, that one of these objects is US or Canadian university experience, another is critique, and a third is the planetary necessity of working with and across difference, then what has been produced by this lengthy exercise of conducting a type of critical, global social analysis across multiple scales and sites of institutionalized life? As set out in the thesis’s introduction, one main goal has been to perform the kinds of multi-scalar, region-based thinking about social infrastructure that I am offering as a politically generative pedagogical mode for undergraduate global study. In my study, this performance illuminates the mechanisms, requirements and traps of “the quotidian world of work, anti-social reproduction, and anti-social life, that is to say the very forces the experience economy is designed to further by way of false remediation” (Moten and Harney, “the university”).

Per my own training in critique, originating in literary and cultural studies and postcolonial and social theory, this reflects a composite posture drawn from several thinkers and traditions. Ann Stoler’s characterization of the “epistemic habits” formed by historical practices of colonial governance into “ways of knowing that are available and ‘easy to think,’ called-upon, temporarily settled dispositions that can be challenged and that change” (39) grounds my project

of realist critique of the histories and politics of present-day common sense. Gayatri Spivak's promotion of a pedagogical ideal of an "uncoercive rearrangement of desires" ("Righting Wrongs" 526) that pursues intimate kinds of deconstruction in the classroom, both destructive and constructive, affirms my ongoing attention to reading the "micrology of practice" (*Readings* 5) and the politics-shaping imaginative power of language use. I also draw upon Stuart Hall's commitment to a cultural studies "project that is always open to that which it doesn't yet know" yet also has real stakes, including the imperative "that the organic intellectual cannot absolve himself or herself from the responsibility of transmitting those ideas, that knowledge, through the intellectual function, to those who do not belong, professionally, in the intellectual class" ("Cultural Studies" 278; 281). This mixture affirms the value of fighting with and for the university as a popular domain for political struggle, curricular work, and institutional reevaluation. While it has long been easy to engage in anti-capitalist, anti-colonial condemnation of US or Canadian universities, via appellations like the imperial university, the settler colonial university, the university as hedge fund management, or the ivory tower, these figurations of power can act as shorthands for disempowerment and political depression among institutional members that may be glib about the continuance of intimate relationships (to power, but also of academic reproduction, skilling, survival, and mutual exchange) therein and about the potential functions of abstraction, intellectual labour and their ambivalent conditions in the world.

There have been a few such rhetorical shorthands indexing institutionalized power relations that this writing has intentionally relied upon to pursue their denaturalization and demystification, including the global university, undergraduate education as *Bildung*, and higher ed's contemporary narrative of crisis. While each of these figures has a basis in the real economy, as my discussions of the glitching infrastructure for US and Canadian higher ed's "moral because

marketable” justificatory logic have highlighted, they also represent core genres in the public imaginaries and pedagogies for higher education today. To work with institutional genre and its subgenres, my analysis has centrally relied on institutional cultures, administrative and pedagogical discourses, programming and policy literature, and promotional rhetorical production, with the focus on “textually-mediated social organization” that sociologist Dorothy Smith identifies as proper to institutional ethnography (155-165). Yet these have also been mobilized as infrastructural material, in particular representing administrative, pedagogical and cultural practice as concrete aspects of social reproduction in institutional worlds.

I take cues from Lauren Berlant here, whose social theory identifies genres as “sites of mutual collective recognition” and therefore potentially normative or coercive, but also potentially unsettled, “flailing”²¹⁷ and available for renovation as “signs and figures for shared world making” (Jackson 2015). Berlant has modeled a function for criticism and therefore critical thinking and pedagogical work in our historical present of infrastructural vulnerability by centering genre, which enables intimate yet abstract observation about the generic as personal and the personal as generic in relation to scenes of sentimental, institutional, or infrastructural fantasy, disappointment and inadequacy. This is especially relevant in the current context of curricular “personalization.” I have applied this kind of generic analysis to the scene of undergraduate education in these settler colonial contexts, which remains to some degree characterized by romantic imagery of self-cultivation despite or in “educated ignorance”²¹⁸ of its

²¹⁷This is a core theoretical set piece for Berlant in working with genre: as they explain, “genre flailing is a mode of crisis management that arises after an object, or an object world, becomes disturbed in a way that intrudes on one’s confidence about how to move in it. we genre flail so that we don’t fall through the cracks of heightened affective noise into despair, suicide, or psychosis” (“Genre Flailing” 157).

²¹⁸This term is offered by Eli Meyerhoff in *Beyond Education*, describing the effects of romantic narratives of formal education as self-cultivation as an “epistemology of educated ignorance.” I coin this phrase as a variation of Charles Mills’s theory of an ‘epistemology of white ignorance.’ In general, an epistemology of ignorance is a way of *knowing what not to know* in order to maintain some dominant way of being in the world, whether white supremacy, colonialism, patriarchy, capitalism, or—as I argue—the education-based mode of study” (49).

capitalist and imperial degradations and corporate appropriation. Here, Berlant's "signature double move" of "the sympathetic embrace and the unrelenting analysis of the genericization of the personal" (Jackson) is salutary, clarifying and worthy of emulation for an examination of institutionalized life, especially when PSE conditions are so determinative of a kind of public personhood and cultural value as well as the social exclusion from these as I have demonstrated.

To linger with the genre of *Bildung* as a developmental, progressive narrative for education based in self-cultivation, one goal of this study has been to make the practical mixture of orientations toward undergraduate global learning that this term now summarizes available for analysis. The contemporary maximalist version of this progressive development of the student appears variously in the thesis: in the campus-based student experience model that universities develop and market as an environment available to undergraduates for consumption, networking and accessing professional and positional advantage (Chapter 1); in the "roving autodidact" figure effectively designed to be the white, male, cosmopolitan subject of learning interfaces and ed-tech innovation (Chapter 2), in the "inclusive excellence" model of human capital and functional global literacy development presented in terms of diversity, authenticity and cultural assets (Chapter 3), and for the international students recruited as infrastructure for post-public, globally competing universities but marketed to in the terms of merit, good ethnicity, and cosmopolitan, multicultural citizenship (Chapter 4). Chapters 4 and 5 began to explore to what degree students identify with these projects and are positioned by others, such as the less romantic logics of "diversity transactions," migrant studentdom, and credentialed debt as the terms for their economic self-development, though this dynamic and complex field of experiences and conditions could be the subject of another thesis-length query. It has been evident that at least some students do identify with these institutional visions for learning, and

they mobilize certain forms of desire and identification with university education that supply students with terms, imagery and possible futurities for their exchange of labour for credentials. In other words, this genre is persistent in university worlds and therefore counts as part of its reproductive infrastructure. This finding accords with how abolitionist university studies scholar Eli Meyerhoff has characterized the education romance as a narrative frame for “students’ processes of grappling with their *ambivalent relations to education*,” in which “[t]hey express desires for the expanded possibilities that can come from attending college, but they also share anxieties and fears about it” (47, emphasis in original).

Such student ambivalence, in which “critical feelings about the education system – their motives to organize for systemic change – are in tension with their desires to accept the status quo so as to complete and succeed, or at least survive, within it” (Meyerhoff 53), is reproduced in the overdetermined programmes for global learning themselves alongside its risky and precarious conditions. Global programming invites students to resolve ambivalence via its scalar self-imagery of expanding awareness and cultural range, orientation toward transformative action based in the resources of institutionalism, networking and social innovation, and the romantic, cybernetic promise of social engagement or citizenship via connectivity; these programmes also afford the university with a romantic, heroic role organized via the ostensible production of global citizenship as well as jobs and credentials in the global knowledge economy. While I have argued and demonstrated that these individualist ideals in fact express the foundational anti-sociality built into these settler capitalist institutions, even the crisis narrative version of this developmental genre, characterized by claims of crisis conditions especially describing today’s post-public universities, reflects these same institutional ideals. The rhetoric of crisis suggests a linear trajectory in which something has gone wrong in the present that could

be corrected through crisis management and rational, technocratic expertise, including via the self-management of students in another site of participatory institutional management.

Tressie McMillan Cottom's public discussions of a "crisis of faith"²¹⁹ in these PSE systems today, especially pronounced in the politically polarized and institutionally fragmenting US, remind how a faith basis for the value and necessity of higher education is built into basic social orientations toward the university as infrastructure, especially among historically racialized, marginalized and underserved populations, and has become especially visible as institutional legitimacy falters or fails in the context of withdrawn public investment replaced with financialization and privatization. This dynamic takes form as the crisis narrative that "students are increasingly 'bound' to higher education while higher ed itself is increasingly becoming unbound" (Meyerhoff 40). The crisis narrative is therefore also regenerative for university infrastructure, as can be seen in the concerted programmes of debt-based citizenship and expanding credentialism: the unbundling of the undergraduate credential itself into micro-credentials and just-in-time skilling is a project that makes use of a faith-based afterimage of PSE class production that the crisis narrative undergirds, while also anticipating the end of US or Canadian prestige based in the firm or the profession as platformization becomes more deeply embedded in labouring and managerial infrastructures.

On my part, I have made reference to crisis conditions in PSE systems, or in global capitalism as its extractive and financialized practices are disrupted by shocks, disasters and conflicts with a global impact or scale, as a way to parse what "crisis" designates and for whom in PSE infrastructure. Despite its limitations and contextual variability, I find the term useful for

²¹⁹In addition to her aforementioned analysis of the "education gospel," through education persists as a social good even when some forms of it are obviously bad, exploitative, fraudulent, life-destroying, etcetera, McMillan Cottom has framed higher ed's recent legitimacy collapse among various parts of the populace in the explicit terms of faith-based institutions and their crises; see this highlight from a longer discussion hosted by Duke University's Ethics department for a succinct overview of her analysis: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jqv03m7V7mw>.

indexing the mixture and disorganization in university globalism's infrastructure, evidencing Berlant's argument that "in a crisis, what passed as 'structure' passes into infrastructure" (*Inconvenience* 24). Critiques of planetary apocalyptic rhetoric regarding climate breakdown (or to a degree, the global pandemic) make an example of this, highlighting that the loss of universalist structures for some ignores multiple historical and present realities of world loss or destruction, especially for Indigenous and formerly enslaved peoples in these settler nations as well for those subject to the violence of imperial domination, debt and militarism as practices of racial capitalism and parasitic governance around the world. In PSE, crisis narratives overwrite those excluded from university worlds, along with those expelled from its terms on economic, political, social or legal grounds, and those whose tether to credentialing work is the normalized practice of predatory inclusion.

However, instead of reading crisis as a genre for nostalgic or idealized versions of university education, I also see the registration of crisis among institutional members who are doing institutional labour while experiencing the increasing insecurity and difficulty of social reproduction and unavailability of high-skill credentialed employment, alongside the university's commodification of their experience (and resulting self-commodification among students navigating human capital's logic). Institutional members experiencing these conditions wherever they are, as the adjunct crisis also indicates, are not inherently privileged, middle-class, or delusional about their relationship to the university nor how it operates in the world. Many enter precariously and experience the lack of institutional accountability, resources and outcomes on a spectrum from expected individual and group risk to crisis to galvanizing conditions for collective organizing, compounded by widespread debt-holding. Like *Bildung's* romance, this genre of contemporary university experience is highly personal, entangled as it is with PSE's

intimate and determinative valuation of personhood as well as its mobilization of personal authenticity, identity and cultural assets in the learning context. Rather than a false universalism with false urgency, crisis narratives studied in context with infrastructure illuminate the structural unevenness, contingency, and settler innocence built into PSE experience and its systemic national infrastructures, as well as their expanding usefulness to capital and its managers.

Given this degraded context of global learning, the impersonal intimacy²²⁰ of global pedagogies, institutionalist, critical, or abolitionist, must also be parsed as part of global study. One form this has taken in the thesis appears in Sharon Stein's decolonial, heuristic-based approach as a pedagogical resource for denaturalizing the epistemic terrain and dominance of global citizenship education. To disrupt the circular terms of GCE discussed in Chapter 5, Stein and collaborator Vanessa Andreotti rely on a pedagogical model that aims to interrupt colonial "habits of being" and "grammar[s] of reasoning and desire" (2), focusing on identifying colonial forms of being, doing, knowing, hoping and desiring and fostering just relationships in their possible unsettling. Like Stein, I have been attentive to the pessimistic infrastructure for critical or anti-colonial, anti-capitalist knowledge work in university settings, where it is susceptible to the shelflife generated by informationalism and corporate and settler appropriation. It also often serves as a form of false mediation, as "current global challenges are not primarily the result of a lack of adequate knowledge or information, but rather an investment in an inherently violent modern/colonial 'habit of being'" (Stein & Andreotti 5). Stein and Andreotti's development of decolonial pedagogy as a form of global study – what they call "global citizenship otherwise" – has taken place outside of the classroom context among more elective and nonhierarchical communities, a necessity given what they identify as the formal classroom's "currently

²²⁰Ellen Rooney also theorizes the affordances of the classroom as a "semiprivate room" in these terms: "Rather than grieve over the exclusions that enable and constrain it, the semiprivate makes active use of its partialities, accidents, and historical limits in order to generate critical exchange – an impersonal intimacy" (135).

consumerist context” in which “learners may be seeking an experience that will affirm their perspectives, choices and self-image” (Stein & Andreotti 6). While their pedagogical intervention offers a valuable template for building relations through affinity-based group deprogramming, my interest in global pedagogy aims to take up its classrooms as theorized across PSE’s privatizing spectrum as nevertheless a kind of popular context. I read this context not under the constraints of a limited, circular imagery of students as consumers but in the more relational, structuring terms of students as globalist infrastructure and therefore serving as participatory risk managers for university assets and continuity.

Earlier in my teaching career, a professor mentor once cautioned that we can’t just tell students to be conscious, especially in a faith-based context; likewise, I caution against instructing students their attachments are bad, faith or investment in institutions misguided, or their identities rotten, especially when conditioned by ambivalence, risk and a range of potential deprivations or unmet needs in university settings. It’s worth noting that alongside the emergent paradigm of expanded credentialism, despite the systemic whiteness of university administration, the undergraduate majority is becoming non-white. This complicates any direct discussion of student identity, complicity, or responsibility in a globally extractive settler institutional context with historical and present-day resources derived from colonial genocide, enslavement, conquest or administration, alongside capitalist capture of surplus value for Global North institutions from Global South resources, IP and human capital as well as from regional and local sources. In this context, the politics of personhood under racial capitalism condition ambivalence in personal identities as they are activated by institutional pedagogies, curriculum and professionalization, with the potentially “self-colonizing trajectory of certain forms of identity politics” (Butler 104) a complex, often unconscious symptom of capitalist management in institutionalized life. As

Asad Haider, among others, has theorized: “We are constituted as subjects within the individuation that is characteristic of state power; we are activated as political agents through the injuries that are constitutive of our identity” (63). Identity is obviously a central pedagogical object and site for global learning in the social yet individualistic registers of global citizenship, innovation, enterprise, and diversity, which can replicate identity-based injury or social grievance as much as they may also neuter them by elevating student identities through networking, branding and credentialing transactions.

These intimate, personal dynamics are difficult to discuss in any semi-public setting, from psychotherapy to community organizing to the classroom, as well as to write about in this individualized academic genre: discussion of social infrastructure requires collective efforts, limned by shared, live practices of uncertainty, encounter, acknowledgment and participation more than simply better or more advanced forms of knowing that can be assessed as learning or scholarship. Yet, per Stuart Hall’s aforementioned call to take up cultural studies as a constantly updating project with real stakes, the invitation that global study must provide for the global and regional contemporary’s infrastructural urgencies is to “take planetary life as the totality of our collective inheritance” (Walcott, “Neither Native Nor National 406). And, given planetary life’s profound contemporary fragility and obviously interdependent risks and systems, Rinaldo Walcott insists this entails taking “significant risks. The risks at stake are to develop new modes of political identification” and “new and different kinds of solidarity ... in a post-Columbus migratory world” in recognition that “our current modes of identity – native, national, citizen, migrant and other niches have failed us” (“Neither Native Nor National” 406, 407, 406). This includes their mutating institutional (ab)use as tools of demobilization²²¹ evidenced by the

²²¹This concept of demobilization as a feature of the institutional administration of counterinsurgency is explored at length in Walcott’s “Against Social Justice and the Limits of Diversity,” as cited in the Bibliography.

current “inclusive excellence” higher ed era. The uneven effects of higher ed’s globalist practices in these settings also make such critical intimacy work riskier for some students and instructors than others, as Chapter 4 began to demonstrate. Yet Rinaldo Walcott’s exhortation here, in keeping with his naming of institutionalized diversity as the structural limit for any desired inclusive society that continues to accommodate foundational antiblackness in my Introduction, marks the abolitionist orientation with which a critical global pedagogy can align its goals and purposes in order to further the project of decolonization. The arc of this ongoing work is toward developing “another and different account of our shared and collective histories” while trying to “risk the identities that we think makes it legitimate to rule others out” such as those that universities foster, reinforce and manage (Walcott, “Neither Native Nor National” 407, 408).

How can institutionalized global study be useful in this work? However backward-looking much of this study may turn out to be as various forms of globalist institutional infrastructure fragment, glitch or contract in the 21st-century’s third decade, teaching, writing or learning in university globalism’s sedimentary historical present affirms the contemporary’s global problems and institutional management of them as political occasions for study with a global frame. Given the centrality of scale and abstraction to global study, the work of supplying figures of genre, scalar and institutional concepts, and maps of relationships and processes is necessarily embedded into global learning. Alongside critical intimacy towards the genres generated by American and Canadian higher education, the role of heuristics has been essential for mapping globalist infrastructure in these settings. These two modes of global analysis, heuristics and mapping, draw upon and inform one another as tools of realist critique of university globalism and within its worlds. As Berlant has theorized,

Infrastructure ... is another way of talking about mediation—but always as a material process of binding, never merely as a material technology, aesthetic genre,

form, or norm that achieves something. Mediation is not a stable thing but a way of seeing the unstable relations among dynamically related things. It is in this sense that any formulation of mediation is a heuristic, which is one kind of infrastructure, a propositional one. A heuristic is a thought experiment floated on offer, its logic followed through. ... when extended as an inflammatory counter-realism or as a counter-power, heuristics alone don't defeat institutions like, say, racialized capital, patriarchy, or the fantasy of the law as justice. But they do spark blocks that are inconvenient to a thing's reproduction (*Inconvenience* 22).

One goal of working with infrastructure as method, then, has been to use heuristics to summon counter-realist knowledge into being that organizes dynamically linked processes of political economy and social reproduction at multiple scales and sites; or, put another way, to draw global abstractions down into their concrete expressions in university worlds, inclusive of campus and digital environments, curriculum, and the everyday of student experiences and labours.

Each chapter was initially posed as a question: what is revealed if I read the university, the learning interface, the curricular programme, the student, and the classroom in the terms of globalism? I might now answer this question, along with its companion "What do these heuristics of global institutionality allow me potentially to teach or discuss with others?", by naming a particular layer of mediation, including both processes and relationships, that is revealed through globalist practice in those sites: Chapter 1, focused on the US and Canadian genre of the global university, maps the entanglement of property and pedagogy by "global" university subjectivities; Chapter 2, focused on the learning paradigm and its interfaces, maps regimes of information management and informational goods that accord with university globalism; Chapter 3, focused on global educational policy and global citizenship curriculum, maps the administration of students through developmental and cultural directives proper to institutional and field imaginaries for global programming based in the Global North; Chapter 4, focused on how students serve as globalist infrastructure for universities, maps institutional rationalization and the local, regional and international learning and labouring conditions and

modes of social citizenship it produces for undergraduates; and Chapter 5, focused on ethnographic reportage and analysis of student experiences of global curricula, maps classroom sociability under global learning paradigms.

Each of these heuristics focuses university globalism into a particular domain of cultural processes and relations that can be read contextually in situ as well as regionally, nationally and for transcontextual comparison. If we can generalize that the goal of university managers and administrators is to “break relationships and replace them with processes,” as Jennifer Doyle’s 2015 polemic *Campus Sex, Campus Security* on corporate jurisprudence and campus security practices exposed (113)²²², then infrastructuralism as a pedagogical mode can index both social relations and institutional processes, postulating relationships where pedagogical abstractions and interfaces, the institutional management of difference, and bureaucratic administration work to obscure or narrow them. This mode of collectively developing institutional literacy serves organic intellectualism within PSE as it “increasingly assumes the social function of embodying, enabling, and managing social insecurities of various forms” (Boggs et al 440) and, arguably, continues to be infrastructural as “the key mediating institution in imagining links between scholars and global justice movements” (Denning 1) as a global mass cultural form that has enabled the proliferation of abolitionist, anti-capitalist and anti-colonial analyses, tactics and cross-pollinations alongside their institutional demobilization.

Additionally, this mode of global study makes use of the classroom, constrained as it is, as an extant site of assembly and labour that offers an occasion to develop analysis of relations where they are already socially organized. This approach is indebted to Ruth Wilson Gilmore’s

²²²This quote comes from a documentary about governance in the U of California system that features an administrative workshop with a private consulting firm discussing their \$3 million recommendations for “Operational Excellence.” The consultant continues: ““You cannot optimize relationships,” the unnamed man says, so you must break them. You cannot control relationships, but ‘you own the process’” (Doyle 113).

elaboration of abolitionist geography as method, which emphasizes the production of time-space as a practice of presence against its enclosure and policing by carceral geographies (wherein time is the primary site for extraction “from the territories of selves” (*Abolition* 474)), inclusive of legitimating, securitized, managerial institutions like universities. As a mode for collective analysis, this approach includes the mixture of deductive and inductive thinking about social forms and their potential negation that I have performed throughout the thesis:

Instead of imagining the persistent reiteration of static relations, it might be more powerful to analyze relationship dynamics that extend beyond obvious conceptual or spatial boundaries and then decide what a particular form, old or new, is made of, by trying to make it into something else. This—making something into something else—is what negation is. To do so is to wonder about a form’s present, future-shaping design—something we can discern from the evidence of its constitutive patterns, without being beguiled or distracted by social ancestors we perceive, reasonably or emotionally, in the form’s features. ... To think this way is to think deductively (there are forms) and inductively (interlocking patterns reveal generalities which might or might not be structural). I suppose I became a geographer because this kind of back and forth is what we do, trying to see and explain the formalities and improvisations of place-making, which are shaped by human/environmental relationships, always elaborated by dependency—the coupling or connection of power with difference ... (*Abolition* 477).

In her definition of abolition geography, Gilmore emphasizes its premise that “freedom is a place” and “place-making is normal human activity” (*Abolition* 474-5) combining people, resources, land and social capacity. It’s important to be clear that the university classroom is not available for such place-making and that its overdetermined conditions for knowledge work should not be mistaken for abolitionist place-making or organizing. Rather, it remains primarily a labour site for assessed skilling and credentialing, and secondarily a place for encounter, the guided generation of inquiry and resources, and the potential anarchic life and affordances of group study via realist critique, affirmative deconstruction and generic analysis or renovation.

So, what then can be done in a global studies undergraduate classroom toward these ends that could exist within institutional constraints around curriculum and pedagogy? Consider again

the pedagogical method of social cartography introduced at the end of the Introduction. Staging the negotiatory classroom work of mapping relations and discourses under a particular heuristic provides a classroom mode of doing toward Gilmore's model that foregrounds "meta-thinking" (Andreotti et al 1) and visualization about common sense imaginaries (genres) and their normative claims, including their intersections, limits, contradictions and ambivalences. Social cartographies are collectively produced and described among students, and proceed by

"selecting the issue to be mapped, selecting a range of texts that substantially address that issue, identifying the positions of each text ... and the ways that they intersect and overlap with other texts, and finally, adjusting the map with those communities that are mapped" (Pashby et al 147).

This openly politicized, exploratory mapping of particular debates, discussions and their problematic boundaries based on phenomena outlined by the mapmakers generates questions and invites further remappings based in the fissures and edges of existing positions or rationalities.

Rather than pursuing omniscience or reifying the terms of globalist education, social cartographic work in class can flow from themes, heuristics and core genres proper to the subject of global study that also work to draw its abstractions down into multi-scalar analysis of infrastructure that is inclusive of the local and the personal. If the personal is not merely political but also institutional, as I alongside many critically intimate academic practitioners have been performing throughout, this mapping work might take form through structuring questions for situating students themselves into this curricular mode. The first I draw from the list of questions I used to interview students in global courses, which set up a basic orientation toward globality, its formal study, and core social facts about students as institutionalized members:

- 1) Information about you: Your age now? What programme of study are you pursuing, and what year of your degree are you in? What city and country are you from?
- 2) How would you define globalization and the concept of global citizenship?
- 3) What associations or images does the adjective "global" summon to mind?
- 4) What motivated you to take this course? Feel free to cite multiple reasons if relevant.

In simpler terms, these questions establish some information about student priors toward global study while beginning to mobilize some of the elements discussed here for class conversations or social cartographic work: epistemic habits, educational genres including possible versions of *Bildung*, potentially ambivalent rationales and positioning in university experience, relational inheritances that may condition desires for knowledge and their outcomes, and the possible functions of undergraduate learning, abstraction and intellectual labour. Opening a class this way sets in motion the situation of classroom work and its subjects as terms that can be collectively examined, named, or analyzed, while setting up a framework for infrastructural analysis at multiple scales or in relation to the class's setting. As a culminating question that might frame such ongoing analysis of university globalism by a course's end, I would offer a point of application for students and their experiences of the social relations universities organize with the question, "What Institutional Genre Am I?" This question extends from the introductory discussion into infrastructural questions of political economy, institutional rationalization and social reproduction. It could enable the emergence of forms of aspirational ambivalence that Lauren Berlant names as the task of unlearning above, especially after identifying institutional subjectivities in that setting, such as the corporate cosmopolitanism common in post-public US universities, the social-justice institutionalism with which Canada promotes its globality, or global citizenship's capitalized forms of settler national connectivity comparable in both.

For the classroom subjects that could enable this kind of critical global pedagogy in the method of infrastructuralism, I offer the following basic themes that could frame and encompass major substantive aspects of university globalism in the US and Canada or their region:

- ❖ Debt and Finance
- ❖ Development and Literacy

- ❖ Educational Ecologies and Genres
- ❖ Digital, Technological and Institutional Cultures
- ❖ Economic Institutions and Mass Culture
- ❖ Migrancy and Social Citizenship
- ❖ History of Corporate Cultures
- ❖ Connectivity and the Experience Economy
- ❖ Learning in Place and in the World

Each of these clusters have been covered in the thesis's chapters and could take on globalism's regional, site-based or population-based particularities to be responsive to classroom conditions and sociability, co-developed by the curriculum and the students via social cartography.

Rather than prescribe particular assessments or modes of pedagogical delivery beyond this, which are always contingent per the particular context and people involved, I conclude by offering examples of this type of pedagogical engagement or application. These examples are drawn from sites including formal curriculum, political education, and organizing work, in forms that could be studied, applied and/or extended in classroom work. Like abolition geographies, which take “the processes of hierarchy, dispossession and exclusion that congeal in and as group-differentiated vulnerability to premature death” (Gilmore *Abolition* 475) as the horizon for abolition's unfinished work, these efforts do not offer wholesale rebirth of relations, genres, or infrastructure. But they do pursue the renewal of time-space through practices of presence and counter-narrative, mapping conceptual connection and contradiction, and more fully accountable forms of relating that shift consciousness and intellectual, spatial and epistemic ancestries with which to imagine the rearrangement of resource and practice, also known as infrastructure:

1. The “Disorientation Guide” : Across campuses in the US and Canada, student activists have been developing, authoring and circulating counter-resources for incoming students that

work to resist the political attrition and demobilization built into the finite temporality of undergraduate experience. These “Disorientation” guides serve as a record of recent student activism, alongside their knowledge production of university entanglements and promotional projects into which new students are enlisted through “Orientation Week”s: these are debunked and recharacterized in the terms of power mapping and critical geography that attempt to undermine the border of exclusion and containment maintained by the university for the optimal management of “student experience” and to invite students into alternative forms of place-based movement, connection, and participation. They also emphasize practices and resources of care available to students. See, for example, the University of Maryland College Park’s Disorientation Guide in the US²²³, or the University of Toronto’s student-organized Disorientation, a week of teach-ins and counter-programming for new students.²²⁴ York University’s Disorientation Week has also been at the center of restrictive university policies for uses of university spaces for student-led public activity, the increased access to which is also a prominent request from community and abolitionist organizers outside universities in both countries.²²⁵

2. Divestment and Reparations Campaigns: Continuing the student activist tradition that originated in solidarity with movements against South African apartheid, undergraduates in both countries have been focused on online, local, national and international campaigns for the divestment of institutional capital from fossil fuels, militarism and ongoing colonial infrastructures in transnational capitalism. This work takes the form of non-reformist reformism, which organizes tactics that are simultaneously pedagogical and material demands to shrink

²²³ Available here: <https://umddisorientation.wordpress.com/umddisorientation-guide-2021-2022/>. The online magazine *The New Inquiry* has also organized a short sampler of these efforts: <https://thenewinquiry.com/guides-for-the-perplexed/>.

²²⁴ Outlined here: <https://diso-uoft.tumblr.com/about>.

²²⁵ For an overview of this history, see Elizabeth Brule, “Voices from the Margins: The Regulation of Student Activism in the New Corporate University,” *Studies in Social Justice* 9.2 (2015) 159-175.

institutional infrastructures, as “measures that reduce the power of an oppressive system while illuminating the system’s inability to solve the crises it creates” (Berger, Kaba and Stein). There have been many successful campaigns at individual institutions during the 21st-century; more recently, in the past few years, as the heightening stakes of climate breakdown, organized abandonment and racialized state violence have inspired record-setting protest activity, national aggregate organizations have emerged with a higher advocacy and pedagogical profile.

I highlight here one in each national setting. The Divestment Coalition Canada, established in 2020 by 30 groups from institutions across the country jointly organizing and developing advocacy literature for divestment from fossil fuel industries, especially highlights the hypocritical claims of Canadian universities to “sustainable development” that feature in its national portrait of university globalism herein, while also invoking its infrastructural power as a means to decarbonization at scale: “Educational institutions have enormous power to harness their intellectual and moral authority to help remove social licence from this industry.” Simultaneously, they warn against university responses that amount to greenwashing, like “responsible investing” in the environmental, social and governance model that has emerged with the Investing to Address Climate Change charter co-signed by 15 Canadian universities.²²⁶ McMaster students, for example, organized a strike and held a sit-in outside Board of Governors meetings, reflecting critical literacies in the governance mechanisms of institutional power.

In the US, Project H.E.R.E. (Higher Education Reparations Engagement) emerged in 2020 after the anti-racist uprisings against police violence and systemic anti-Blackness via a course on community engagement in higher ed that approached those terms with the kinds of infrastructural analysis and affirmative deconstruction discussed here. This led to the creation of

²²⁶An overview of this domain of student protest activity is provided here: <https://www.macleans.ca/society/environment/inside-the-student-led-movements-urging-canadian-universities-to-divest-from-fossil-fuels/>.

a national resource hub “for use by students, faculty, staff, and community partners to examine, organize around, and act on securing reparations” for the ongoing injustices of slavery and colonialism and “aimed at change internal to the campus as well as change in the community, with community partners.”²²⁷ Their work promotes situated engagement with these resources per local institutional histories and surrounding community infrastructures, while organizing nationally toward extant reparations policy proposals for higher ed such as HR40 (building on momentum from a recent reparations law instituted in Virginia for its five public universities²²⁸) and inviting ongoing coordination, networking, knowledge-sharing, etc. across institutional contexts.²²⁹ The project promotes restorative and transnational justice at multiple scales that works against university borders and anti-social membership.

3. Campus Police Resistance: In recognition of the campus police force as part of a national and international militarist infrastructure of social control and racial violence, the 21st-century has seen many campus-based movements to reject campus police in university infrastructures. In an abolitionist mode, this often has taken two forms: direct resistance to university police and administrations, physically and discursively, as well as the provision of alternative campus resources through teach-ins, syllabi, practices of care such as the provision of free food, access to university resources, free public arts and performances, and labour solidarity across university services and workers. UC Davis, known for its radical student organizing culture and especially since Occupy, maintains the latter infrastructure at the time of writing through the UC system’s Cops Off Campus network. This network, for example, organized a highly publicized day of free

²²⁷Source: <https://projectthere.givepulse.com/about>.

²²⁸See

<https://www.insightintodiversity.com/as-virginia-colleges-begin-restitution-plans-for-slavery-widespread-reparations-remain-in-question/>.

²²⁹For an overview of the current status of reparations initiatives in US higher ed, see <https://www.thethinkingrepublic.com/being-counted/the-reparations-movement-in-higher-education>.

food on campus dining halls in spring 2022 as an abolitionist practice of decommodification, presented pedagogically as against police-enforced hunger in a world of abundance.²³⁰

At JHU in Baltimore in 2019, where a new, armed private campus police force has been proposed, students organized a walkout, a sit-in of an administrative building accompanied by teach-ins, a website tracking duplicitous university rhetoric and lack of transparency, and canvassing on campus and in the neighborhoods surrounding JHU campuses. The proposal was paused during the pandemic and resumed in 2022 with outcomes uncertain, but a contract with ICE was cancelled, and media and outreach campaigns by students had the effect of deepening ties across community and local institutions and activists from different milieux in the city, who collectively resisted the proposal as expanding Baltimore's infamously abusive police and carceral infrastructure. Two participating students published critical reportage in *TruthOut* in which they explicitly rejected the genre assigned to them, as the institutional members whose experience the police were purportedly going to protect, while students organized a public history of incidents of racialized, sexist targeting and criminalization of students by campus security. Their rejection took on their default status as white students in need of racialized security – “We refuse to allow our university administration to take these dangerous actions in our names any longer” (Payne and Saxton) – and allowed them to claim the genre of local resident in solidarity with longer-term Black-led police resistance among city residents while also calling out militarization at JHU as part of a national trend on university campuses.

4. Place-Based Counter-Geography: In brick-and-mortar settings, the integration of performative remapping has appeared in curriculum to recast the land and property infrastructures of universities in historicized, genealogical terms for an activist present. At UBC,

²³⁰This project's broader abolitionist and solidaristic commitments are outlined in their website: <https://copsoffcampusucsd.org/node/42>; see this post for the public pedagogical accounting of this event and its rationality that Cops Off Campus provided: <https://twitter.com/ucftp/status/1527001005426106368>.

institutional acknowledgments of the presence of Indigenous history and the campus's situation on the traditional, ancestral and unceded territory of the Musqueam people are both rhetorically produced and materially memorialized in the campus environment. As a project of encounter and counter-mapping, first-year undergraduate course Knowing the Land Beneath Our Feet was developed by an interdisciplinary team in consultation with local Musqueam and other Indigenous communities as a digitally guided walking tour “highlighting the artworks, buildings and places that tell of the deep histories and continued presence of Indigenous people on the land now known as UBC’s Point Grey Campus,”²³¹ including their long history of education on that land. The course employs augmented reality and global positioning systems to counter a default, past-facing narrative of colonial contact that the university’s campus-based experience tends to reify, and to reject the coherence of the university campus experience genre. Instead, students are asked to “learn to listen differently” to a living, experiential history via “stories, videos, photographs and text drawn from archives and interviews with community members and elders”²³², which reorganizes campus geography and membership toward place-based experiences of contestation, coevalness, and resistance to settler reproductive futurity.

Davarian Baldwin’s 2021 monograph *In the Shadow of the Ivory Tower: How Universities are Plundering Our Cities* examines the history and present of university infrastructures in urban settings, based in institutional practices of dispossession, displacement, expropriation and gentrification of local communities and their cultural and place-based resources. Baldwin’s activist scholarship promotes civic advocacy that works to eliminate university tax exemption and landlordship as common and uncontested elements of urban

²³¹Source: <https://thetalon.ca/knowning-the-land-beneath-our-feet-ubcs-indigenous-histories-and-presence/>.

²³²Source: <https://stlthe15.sched.com/event/3N2n/con0713-knowing-the-land-beneath-our-feet-integrating-a-digital-indigenous-walking-tour-into-university-of-british-columbia-classrooms>.

infrastructures, to be replaced instead with university resources appropriated for community public safety, zoning, housing, access to food, medicine, care and labour benefits and equity. He offers the exemplar of a north campus building Merchants Corner that is part of the University of Winnipeg in Manitoba, developed to be a satellite location for the university's urban and inner-city studies collegiate programme "with a focus on urban poverty, Indigenous culture and community advocacy" (Baldwin, "Epilogue"). Funded externally by private donors, a local NGO and a grant from the Council on Postsecondary Education, the satellite building primarily serves its "low-income, largely indigenous neighborhood," working "to attract indigenous and newcomer students who wouldn't otherwise step foot on a college campus" (Baldwin, "Epilogue"). Additionally, the building has been designed as an integrated affordable housing and educational environment according to Indigenous cultural principles, and partners with local high schools to offer free tutoring, mentoring and food and pathways to higher ed. This situated development project sits beside and in contradiction to the university's other development projects (including some with a green sustainability banner) in Winnipeg that reflect a history of displacement and revaluation of community assets. In attracting students from the main campus as well, the center acts as a place-based, confrontational and reparative performance of alternative educational forms and genres within the UWinnipeg urban geography. As its faculty leader summarizes, "Our whole operation runs against the neoliberal tide of universities today" (Baldwin, "Epilogue"), offering another kind of "sustainable development."

5. Power Mapping of Institutional Infrastructure: Students, scholars and activists have been using mapping and data visualization to draw colonial histories and present infrastructures into a shared frame with university geographies and their wider political networks and activity. Two recent digital projects exemplify this mode of politicizing institutional infrastructures through

critical cartography: First, the Land Grab University project published in 2020 is a new open-access database and public archive of the history of the development of US land-grant universities as a national project of accumulation by Indigenous dispossession. The project disrupts the settler-national mythos of these public universities with a full accounting of “how land taken from tribal nations was turned into seed money for higher education in the United States” (Ahtone).²³³ Beyond merely mapping institutional wealth, the database provides a quantified, historicized landscape of university debts and responsibilities to Indigenous peoples in development since the Morrill Act of 1862. Their work also disrupts the settler-national genres of public university and public higher ed by foregrounding their “conversion and convertibility of land into property,” as well as “the political function of producing subjects endowed with the capacity and the desire to accumulate property in and exterior to the self and in the production of subjectivity as the capacity for possession” (Boggs and Mitchell 450).

Second, the Mapping Project, published online in 2022 by activists and organizers in the Boston, Massachusetts area, provides an online, interactive map of local institutional networks and ties for the institutional support of the colonization of Palestine and related “harms”, with universities as a central nexus in the regional map. The map visualizes these institutional links and their structural ties to “policing and systemic white supremacy here where we live, and to US imperialist projects in other countries” (“The Mapping Project”). The Mapping Project is not contiguous with the international BDS movement against Israeli settler colonialism and apartheid, though offers reinforcement for such non-violent institutional resistance. Intended as a resource for organizing that highlights shared institutional tactics and thus intersecting struggles, the project’s goal is to coordinate intergenerational knowledge sharing and “cultivate relationships between organizers across movements and deepen our political analyses”,

²³³The full set of publications and the open-access database are available here: <https://www.landgrabu.org/>.

supported by accompanying analyses of what the map represents (“The Mapping Project”).

These examples are each site-based, taking up university infrastructures via particular scales and their place-based contexts to posit relational ecologies and possible pedagogical networks that disrupt or work beyond the institutional genres mapped herein. Rather than contesting learning’s management as individual self-development for settlers and their others, they confront “pedagogies of coloniality” as a “set of relational logics ... skilled at producing what can too easily appear to be nonrelational dynamics” (Walcott, “Diaspora” 354). As Tuck and Yang’s germinal critique of Freirian critical pedagogy reminds, the project of developing critical consciousness has not been transformative toward the ends of decolonization, instead acting as a “stopgap” by providing “settler harm reduction” (21) while preserving mistaken associations between “personalized pedagogy of self-actualization for decolonial transformation” (la paperson 42) or freedom. Yet contemporary abolitionist, decolonial and planetary thinkers acknowledge a constructive mass politics is urgently necessary, and might be sought by “risking identity in favor of a politics of thought” that moves “away from Euro-Western foundational understandings of the globe” (Walcott “Diaspora” 355). Knowledge work is pessimistic and ambivalent because it is the site for encountering how “coloniality’s most profound operations work at the level of what it means to know and how knowing places some bodies out of place” by (Walcott, “Diaspora” 355) alongside the limits of knowledge work for systemic redress. Yet at its best, group learning engenders a shared situation negotiating these contradictions that can develop as a means of intellectual production: the “means through which we imagine ourselves into the future” and a performance of the need for future-oriented “organizations [as] the form” (Gilmore “Change”), or the infrastructural work of social reorganization still to be done.

BIBLIOGRAPHY²³⁴

“25 Universities with Global Studies Programs or Programs of Similar Interest.” *Fort Bend*

Independent School District,

<https://www.fortbendisd.com/cms/lib/TX01917858/Centricity/Domain/2400/25%20UNIVERSITIES%20WITH%20GLOBAL%20STUDIES%20PROGRAMS.pdf>. Accessed

August 4 2022.

“About.” *Institute on Globalization & The Human Condition,*

<https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/globalization/about>.

“ACCC Pre-Budget Consultations.” Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC).

Submission to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance Pre-Budget

Consultations, 2009, http://www.accc.ca/ftp/briefs-memoires/201008_FinanceBrief.pdf.

Adamson, Morgan. “The Financialization of Student Life.” *Polygraph* vol. 21, 2009, pg 97-110,

https://www.academia.edu/7721249/The_Financialization_of_Student_Life_Five_Propositions_on_Student_Debt.

“Admission Standards.” *Florida International University.*

<https://admissions.fiu.edu/admission-standards/>. Access May 30 2022.

Ahmed, Sara. “The Nonperformativity of Antiracism.” *Meridians* vol. 7 no.1., 2006, pg 104-126,

<https://fas.columbia.edu/files/fas/content/Ahmed%2C%20Nonperformativity%20of%20Antiracism.pdf>.

Ahtone, Tristan, “Lost and Found: The Story of Land-Grant Universities.” *High Country News,*

²³⁴Much of this research material was accessed without institutional library access, using para-academic internet resources organized by nonaffiliates or by journals and publishing organizations who have opted to make their content open-access. So, rather than citing a library database as the source for many of these cited works, I have included the actual hyperlink that I used to access that material, where appropriate. This includes works published to Academia.edu that are otherwise unavailable to the public.

March 30 2020,

<https://www.hcn.org/issues/52.4/editors-note-lost-and-found-the-story-of-land-grant-universities>. Accessed July 29 2022.

Andreotti, Vanessa de Oliveira, Stein, Sharon, Pashby, Karen & Nicolson, Michelle. "Social cartographies as performative devices in research on higher education." *Higher Education Research & Development*, 2016, pg. 1-16,
https://www.academia.edu/30681542/Social_Cartographies_of_Internationalization_of_Higher_Education_in_Canada_A_Study_of_Exceptionalist_Tendencies_and_Articulations_2016.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. Interview with Homi Bhabha. "Cosmopolitanism and Convergence." *New Literary History* vol. 49 no. 2, 2018, pg 171-198,
<http://mx1.newliteraryhistory.org/articles/49-2-appiah-bhabha.pdf>.

"Are We A Truly Global Institution?" *Youtube*, uploaded by McMasterUTV, May 26 2014,
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zgyZC8ECbmM>. Accessed March 15 2016.

Armstrong, Jeanne. "New Global Competency Distinction on TRU Transcripts." *University Affairs*, September 13 2010,
<https://www.universityaffairs.ca/news/news-article/global-competency-distinction-tru/>.

Ashcroft, Bill, Griffiths, Gareth, and Tiffin, Helen. *Postcolonial Studies: The Key Concepts*, 3rd ed. Routledge, 2013.

Asif, Manan Ahmed. "Technologies of Power – From Area Studies to Data Sciences." *Spheres* vol. 5, 2019, pg 1-13,
<https://academiccommons.columbia.edu/doi/10.7916/d8-rkqp-q511/download>.

Bady, Aaron. "The MOOC Moment and the End of Reform." *Liberal Education* vol. 99 no. 4,

2013,

<https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/mooc-moment-and-end-reform>.

Baldwin, Davarian. *In the Shadow of the Ivory Tower: How Universities are Plundering Our Cities*. ePub edition, Boldtype Books, 2021.

Barbarič, Diane. "Federal government sends an encouraging sign on outbound student mobility." *University Affairs*, April 9 2019.

<https://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/in-my-opinion/federal-government-sends-an-encouraging-sign-on-outbound-student-mobility/>. Accessed September 20 2020.

Barbour, Nancy. "Global Citizen, Global Consumer: Study Abroad, Neoliberal Convergence, and the Eat, Pray, Love Phenomenon." *Oregon State University Graduate Thesis*, 2012, https://www.academia.edu/25556286/Global_Citizen_Global_Consumer_Study_Abroad_Neoliberal_Convergence_and_the_Eat_Pray_Love_Phenomenon.

Barry, Laurence. "The rationality of digital governmentality." *Journal for Cultural Research* vol. 23 no. 4, 2019, 365-380, DOI: 10.1080/14797585.2020.1714878.

Beck, Kumari. "Globalization/s: Reproduction and Resistance in the Internationalization of Higher Education." *Canadian Journal Of Education* vol. 35 no. 3, 2012, pg 133-148, <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ995614>.

Berger, Dan, Kaba, Mariame and Stein, David. "What Abolitionists Do." *Jacobin*, 2017, <https://jacobin.com/2017/08/prison-abolition-reform-mass-incarceration>.

Berlant, Lauren. *Desire/Love*. Punctum Books, 2012.

—. "Genre Flailing." *Capacious: Journal for Emerging Affect Inquiry* vol. 1 no. 2, 2018, <http://capaciousjournal.com/article/genre-flailing/>.

—. *On the Inconvenience of Other People*. Duke University Press (2022).

- . “The Commons: Infrastructures for Troubling Times*.” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* vol 34 no. 3, June 2016, pp. 393–419, doi:10.1177/0263775816645989.
- Bettinger, Eric and Loeb, Susanna. “Promises and pitfalls of online education.” *Brookings*, June 9 2017, <https://www.brookings.edu/research/promises-and-pitfalls-of-online-education/>.
- Biesta, Gert. “How Useful Should the University Be? On the Rise of the Global University and the Crisis in Higher Education.” *Qui Parle*, Vol. 20, No. 1, 2011, pp. 35-47, *Project MUSE* muse.jhu.edu/article/454322.
- Boggs, Abigail. “On Borders and Academic Freedom: Noncitizen Students and the Limits of Rights.” *AAUP Journal of Academic Freedom* vol. 2 no. 11, 2020, pg 1-16, https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/Abigail_Boggs.pdf.
- Boggs, Abigail, Meyerhoff, Eli, Mitchell, Nick and Schwartz-Weinstein, Zach. “Abolitionist University Studies: An Invitation.” *Abolition Journal*, August 28, 2019, <https://abolitionjournal.org/abolitionist-university-studies-an-invitation/>.
- Boggs, Abigail and Mitchell, Nick. “Critical University Studies and the Crisis Consensus.” *Doctoral Degrees in W/G/S/F Studies: Taking Stock*, spec. issue in *Feminist Studies* vol. 44 no. 2, 2018, pg 432-46, doi: 10.1353/fem.2018.0028.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Wacquant, L  ic. “On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason.” *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 16, no. 1, Feb. 1999, pp. 41–58, doi:10.1177/026327699016001003.
- Bousquet, Marc. *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low-wage Nation*. NYU Press (2008).
- Braskamp, Larry. "When Will Global Learning Cease to Exist?" *Peer Review*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2018, p. 31. *Gale Academic OneFile*,

link.gale.com/apps/doc/A596860408/AONE?u=anon~b3b04867&sid=googleScholar&xid=f2e399ed.

Bratton, Benjamin H. *The Stack: On Software and Sovereignty*. MIT Press, 2016.

Brenner, Robert. *The Economics of Global Turbulence: The Advanced Capitalist Economies from Long Boom to Long Downturn*. Verso, 2016.

Brigham, Margaret. "Creating A Global Citizen and Addressing Outcomes." *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education* vol. 1 no. 1, 2011,
<https://journals.sfu.ca/jgcee/index.php/jgcee/article/viewArticle/27/12>.

Brouillette, Sarah, "Neoliberalism and the Demise of the Literary." *Neoliberalism and Contemporary Literary Cultures*, edited by Rachel Greenwald Smith and Mitchum Huehls, JHU Press, 2017, pg 277-290,
https://www.academia.edu/35673763/Neoliberalism_and_the_Demise_of_the_Literary.

—, "Paranoid Subjectivity and the Challenges of Cognitive Mapping." *e-flux*, Marco 2015.
<https://conversations.e-flux.com/t/paranoid-subjectivity-and-the-challenges-of-cognitive-mapping-how-is-capitalism-to-be-represented/1080/9>

—. *UNESCO and the Fate of the Literary*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 2019.

Brown, David K. "The Social Sources of Educational Credentialism: Status Cultures, Labor Markets and Organizations." *Current of Thought: Sociology of Education at the Dawn of the 21st C*, spec. Issue of *Sociology of Education* vol. 74, 2001, pg 19-34,
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2673251>.

Brown, Wendy. *In the Ruins of Neoliberalism: The Rise of Antidemocratic Politics in the West*. Columbia UP, 2019.

Brownlee, Jamie. *Academia, Inc. How Corporatization is Transforming Canadian Universities*.

Fernwood Publishing, 2015.

Burden-Stelly, Charisse. "Cold War Culturalism and African Diaspora Theory: Some Theoretical Sketches." *Souls* vol. 19 no.2. 2017, pg 213-237,

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10999949.2016.1239169>.

Butler, Judith. *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection*. Stanford UP, 1997.

Butler, Scott M. and Reinke, Amanda. "Global Perspectives in the Core: Student Attitudes and Instructor Performance." *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* vol.14 no.1, 2020, pg 1-10.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol14/iss1/4>.

Castells, Manuel. *The Rise of the Network Society*. 2nd edition, Wiley, 2010.

"Centre for Diaspora and Transnational Studies." *University of Toronto*,

<https://www.cdts.utoronto.ca/>. Accessed January 22 2022.

Chatterjee, Piya and Maira, Sunaina. "Introduction: The Imperial University, Race, War and the Nation State." *The Imperial University: Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent*, edited by Chatterjee and Sunaina, University of Minnesota Press, 2014.

Chow, Rey. "Close Reading and the Global University (Notes on Localism)." *State of the Discipline Report*, January 30 2015,

<https://stateofthediscipline.acla.org/entry/close-reading-and-global-university-notes-localism>. Accessed January 21 2022.

Clover, Joshua. "Fanon: Absorption and Coloniality." *College Literature* vol.45 no.1, 2018, pg 39-45, <https://doi.org/10.1353/lit.2018.0005>.

—. *Riot Strike Riot: The New Era of Uprisings*. Verso (2019).

—. "Speechbros, Concern Trolls, and the Free-Speech Fraud." *The Nation*, December 17 2015.

<https://www.thenation.com/article/speechbros-concern-trolls-and-the-free-speech-fraud/>.

Clover, Joshua and Nealon, Christopher. "Literary and Economic Value." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Literature*, July 2017, DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190201098.013.123.

Coles, Gerald. *Miseducating for the Global Economy*. Monthly Review Press, 2018.

Collini, Stefan. "Who Are the Spongers Now?" *London Review of Books* vol.38 no.2, January 21 2016, <https://www.lrb.co.uk/the-paper/v38/n02/stefan-collini/who-are-the-spongers-now>.

Connery, Christopher Leigh. "Introduction: Worlded Pedagogy in Santa Cruz." *The Worlding Project: Doing Cultural Studies in the Era of Globalization*, edited by Rob Wilson and Christopher Leigh Connery, New Pacific Press, 2007, pg 1-11.

https://www.academia.edu/781972/The_Worlding_Project_Doing_Cultural_Studies_in_the_Era_of_Globalization.

"Consolidated Budget Report 2014/2015." *McMaster University*, June 5 2014,

https://financial-affairs.mcmaster.ca/app/uploads/2018/07/2014-15_budget_REVISED.pdf.

Cooper, Melinda. *Family Values: Between Neoliberalism and the New Social Conservatism*. Zone Books, 2019.

Cororaton, Claire and Handler, Richard. "Dreaming in green: Service learning, global engagement and the liberal arts at a North American university." *Learning and Teaching* vol. 6 no. 2, 2013, pg 72-9, <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1027097>.

Crawley, Ashon. "Introduction to the Academy and What Can Be Done?" *Critical Ethnic Studies* vol. 4 no. 1, 2018, pp. 4-19. DOI: 10.5749/jcritethnstud.4.1.0004.

Crehan, Kate. *Gramsci's Common Sense: Inequality and its Narratives*. Duke UP, 2016.

"Critical Global Studies." *Pitzer College*,

<https://www.pitzer.edu/academics/field-groups/critical-global-studies/>. Accessed March 2 2022.

Davidson, Cathy. *The New Education: How to Revolutionize the University to Prepare Students for a World in Flux*. Basic Books, 2017.

Dawson, Diane. "Looking Back, Looking Forward: A short history of Teaching and Learning at Western." *University of Western Ontario Teaching Support Centre*, Nov 12 2016, https://www.uwo.ca/tsc/resources/publications/newsletter/current_issue/looking_back.html.

Deane, Patrick. "Forward with Integrity: A Letter to the McMaster Community." *McMaster University*, September 21 2011, <http://fwi.mcmaster.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Forward-with-Integrity-A-Letter-to-the-McMaster-Community.pdf>. Accessed October 15 2015.

Delors, Jacques. "Learning: The Treasure Within." *UNESCO*, 1996, pg 1-46, <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000109590>. Accessed January 3 2020.

Denning, Michael. "Lineaments and Contradictions of the Neoliberal University System." *Breaking Down the Ivory Tower: The University in the Creation of Another World*, spec. issue of *Work & Culture* vol. 2, 2005, pg 1-10, <https://wgcc.yale.edu/projects/breaking-down-ivory-tower-university-creation-another-world-2005/lineaments-and>.

Diamond, Robert. "Foreword." *The Course Syllabus: A Learning-Centered Approach* by Judith Grunert, Anker, 1997, viii-x.

Doscher, Stephanie and Landorf, Hilary. "Universal Global Learning, Inclusive Excellence, and Higher Education's Greater Purpose." *Peer Review*, AAC&U, Winter 2018, pg 4-7.

<https://www.aacu.org/peerreview/2018/Winter/FIU>

Douglas, Mary. *How Institutions Think*. Syracuse University Press, 1986.

Doyle, Jennifer. *Campus Sex, Campus Security*. MIT Press, 2015.

Duffield, Mark. *Posthumanitarianism: Governing Precarity in a Digital World*. Wiley, 2018.

During, Simon. "Postdisciplinarity." Humanities Research Centre's Disciplinary Seminar series, Australia National University, May 2011, Lecture,

https://www.academia.edu/764233/Postdisciplinarity_2011.

Eaton, Charlie, Goldstein, Adam, Habinek, Jacob, Kumar, Mukul, Stover, Tamera Lee, and Roehrkasse, Alex. "Bankers in the Ivory Tower: The Financialization of Governance at the University of California." *IRLE Working Paper No. 151-13*, 2013, pg 3-29,

<https://www.irle.berkeley.edu/files/2013/Bankers-in-the-Ivory-Tower.pdf>.

Eaton, Charlie and Stewart, Brian. "Wall Street & California's Student Debt Crisis." *IRLE Center on Culture, Organizations and Politics Issue Brief*, pg 1-11,

https://www.irle.berkeley.edu/culture/papers/wall_street_ca_student_debt_crisis.pdf.

Egron-Polak, Eva and Hudson, Ross. "Internationalization of Higher Education: Growing expectations, fundamental values." *IAU*, 2014, pg 1-19.

<https://www.iau-aiu.net/IMG/pdf/iau-4th-global-survey-executive-summary.pdf>.

Ellsworth, Elizabeth. "Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering?: Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy." *Harvard Educational Review* vol. 59 no. 3, 1989, pg.

297-324, <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.59.3.058342114k266250>.

Emejulu, Akwugo & McGregor, Callum. "Towards a radical digital citizenship in digital education." *Critical Studies in Education* vol. 60 no.1, 2019, pg. 131-147, DOI:

[10.1080/17508487.2016.1234494](https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2016.1234494)

“The Emerging Landscape.” *McMaster University Forward with Integrity Advisory Group*, July 12 2012, http://www.mcmaster.ca/presidentsoffice/priorities/ag_report.html. Accessed August 25 2015.

Ewell, Peter T. “An Emerging Scholarship: A Brief History of Assessment.” *Building a Scholarship of Assessment*, edited by T.W. Banta and Associates, Jossey-Bass, 2002, pg 3-25, <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED465324>.

Fabricant, Michael and Brier, Stephen. *Austerity Blues: Fighter for the Soul of Public Higher Education*. JHU Press, 2016.

Franklin, Seb. *The Digitally Disposed: Racial Capitalism and the Informatics of Value*. U Minnesota Press, 2021.

Fraser, Nancy. “Expropriation and Exploitation in Racialized Capitalism: A Reply to Michael Dawson.” *Critical Historical Studies* vol. 3, no. 1, 2016, pg. 163-178, <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/685814?journalCode=chs>.

Frauley, Jon. “Post-Social politics, employability, and the security effects of higher education.” *Journal of Pedagogy* vol. 3 no. 2, 2012, pg. 219-241, <https://sciendo.com/article/10.2478/v10159-012-0011-y>.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Continuum, 1970.

Freud, Sigmund. “Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego.” *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud, Volume XVIII (1920-1922): Beyond the Pleasure Principle, Group Psychology and Other Works*, 65-144, 1921.

Ferguson, Roderick. *The Reorder of Things: The University and its Pedagogies of Minority Difference*. Minnesota University Press, 2012.

—. *We Demand: The University and Student Protests*. University of California Press, 2017.

“FWI: Reflections on the Landscape.” *McMaster University Office of the President*, October 8 2013,

http://www.mcmaster.ca/presidentsoffice/documents/FWI_Reflections_8Oct13_B.pdf.

Accessed October 1 2015.

Galloway, Alexander. *The Interface Effect*. Wiley, 2012.

Gardner, Lee. “The Rise of the Mega-University.” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 17 2019.

<https://www.chronicle.com/article/mega-universities-are-on-the-rise-they-could-reshape-higher-ed-as-we-know-it/>. Accessed February 23 2022.

Gaudelli, William. “Heuristics of Global Citizenship Discourses Toward Curriculum Enhancement.” *Journal of Curriculum Teaching* vol. 25 no. 1, 2009, pg 68-85,

<https://journal.jctonline.org/index.php/jct/article/view/GAUDHEU>.

Gaztambide-Fernandez, Ruben, and Alexandra Arraiz-Matute. “Pushing Against”: Relationality, Intentionality, and the Ethical Imperative of Pedagogy.” *Problematizing Public Pedagogy*. Edited by Jake Burdick, Jennifer Sandlin and Michael O’Malley, Routledge, 2014, pp. 52–64.

Gerone, Michelle. “10 College Majors for a New Economy.” *The Street*, July 18 2011,

<https://www.thestreet.com/personal-finance/10-college-majors-new-economy-html#gid=ci025716bd10022687&pid=global-studies>. Accessed May 24 2018.

“Get to Know McMaster.” *McMaster University*, 2022,

<https://discover.mcmaster.ca/fast-facts/get-to-know-mcmaster/>. Accessed July 15 2022.

Ghosh, Amitav. “The Great Uprooting: Migration and Displacement in an Age of Planetary

Crisis." *The Massachusetts Review* vol. 62 no. 4, 2021, pg. 712-733. Doi:

[10.1353/mar.2021.0158](https://doi.org/10.1353/mar.2021.0158).

Gilliard, Chris. "Pedagogy and the Logic of Platforms." *EDUCAUSE Review: New Horizons*, July/August 2017, pg. 64-65,

<https://er.educause.edu/~media/files/articles/2017/7/erm174111.pdf>.

Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. *Abolition Geography: Essays Toward Liberation*. Verso, 2022.

—. "Change Everything: Racial Capitalism and the Case for Abolition." *Youtube*, uploaded by Haymarket Books, September 3 2022,

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hyBEf8VPfuY&t=948s>.

Glass, Erin R. "Software of the Oppressed: Reprogramming the Invisible Discipline." *CUNY Academic Works*, 2018, https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/2889.

"Global Asia Program." *Simon Fraser University*, <https://www.sfu.ca/globalasia.html>. Accessed January 30 2022.

"Global Asia Studies." *University of Toronto Scarborough*,

<https://www.utoronto.ca/hcs/global-asia-studies>. Accessed January 20 2022.

"Global Citizenship Education and the Rise of Nationalist Perspectives." *UNESCO*, 2018, pg. 1-9. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000265414>.

"Global Commerce in Culture and Society." *University of Virginia Global Studies*,

<https://globalstudies.as.virginia.edu/global-commerce-culture-society>. Accessed March 1 2022.

"Global Engagement Survey." *Community Based Global Learning Collaborative*,

<https://www.cbglcollab.org/global-engagement-survey>. Accessed April 2 2022.

"Global Hamilton." *Hamilton*,

<https://www.hamilton.ca/city-initiatives/priority-projects/global-hamilton>. Accessed January 30 2022.

“Global Learning for Global Citizenship’ at Florida International University.” *AAC&U News*, December 2011, https://goglobal.fiu.edu/_assets/docs/aacu-article.pdf.

“Global Network University Reflection.” *NYU*, December 21 2010, <https://www.nyu.edu/about/leadership-university-administration/office-of-the-president-emeritus/communications/global-network-university-reflection.html>. Accessed May 5 2015.

“Global Strategy.” *Boston University*, 2011, <https://www.bu.edu/ar/2011/intro.html#globalreportOverlay>. Accessed June 6 2020.

“Global Studies.” *University of Delaware*, <https://www.udel.edu/apply/undergraduate-admissions/major-finder/global-studies/>. Accessed April 4 2021.

“Global Studies.” *UMBC*, <https://globalstudies.umbc.edu/>. Accessed June 10 2021.

“Global Studies.” *UVA*, <https://globalstudies.as.virginia.edu/>. Accessed December 19 2021.

“Global Studies (BA).” *Vancouver Island University*, <https://www.viu.ca/programs/arts-humanities-social-sciences/global-studies-ba>. Accessed December 20 2021.

“Global Studies (GST).” *University of Washington Bothell*, <https://www.uwb.edu/global-studies>. Accessed December 1 2021.

Godwin, K. A. “The Counter narrative: Critical analysis of liberal education in a global context.” *New Global Studies* vol. 9 no.3, 2016, p. 223-244, https://www.academia.edu/20106132/The_Counter_Narrative_A_Critical_Analysis_of_L

[liberal Arts Education in Global Context.](#)

Godwin, Kara and Altbach, Philip. "A Historical and Global Perspective on Liberal Arts Education: What Was, What Is, and What Will Be." *International Journal of Chinese Education* vol. 5, 2016, pg 5-22,

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1163/22125868-12340057>.

Goldberg, David Theo. "Coming To You Soon: Uber U." *Inside Higher Ed*, August 12 2016,

<https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2016/08/12/dangers-uberization-higher-education-essay>.

Goldberg, Michelle. "This is What Happens When You Slash Funding For Public Universities."

The Nation, June 8 2015,

<https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/gentrification-higher-ed/>.

Goldie, John Gerard Scott. "Connectivism: A knowledge learning theory for the digital age?"

Medical Teacher vol. 38 no.10, 2016, pg. 1064-1069, DOI:

[10.3109/0142159X.2016.1173661](https://doi.org/10.3109/0142159X.2016.1173661)

Gore, Jennifer M. *The Struggle for Pedagogies: Critical and Feminist Discourses as Regimes of Truth*. Routledge, 1993.

Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Edited by Q. Hoare and G. Nowell Smith, International Publishers, 1971.

Greenfield, Nathan M. "Laurentian – Insolvency, mass firings and the erosion of multiculturalism." *University World News*, June 5 2021,

<https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20210604121808388>.

Gürüz, Kemal. *Higher Education and International Student Mobility in the Global Knowledge Economy*. SUNY Press, 2011.

Guskin, Alan E. "Reducing Student Costs and Enhancing Student Learning: The University Challenge of the 1990s: Part I: Restructuring the Administration." *Change* 26.4 (1994): 22-29. *Jstor*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40165141>.

Haider, Asad. *Mistaken Identity: Race and Class in the Age of Trump*. Verso, 2018.

Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies." *Cultural Studies*, edited by Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler. Routledge, 1992, pp. 277-294.

Hamilton, Laura T., Daniels, Heather, Smith, Christian Michael, and Eaton, Charlie. "The Private Side of Public Universities: Third-party providers and platform capitalism." *Berkeley Center for Studies in Higher Education Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE* vol. 3, 2022, pg 1-35. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7p0114s8>.

Hamilton, Laura and Nielsen, Kelly. *Broke: The Racial Consequences of Underfunding Public Universities*. University of Chicago Press, 2021.

Harris, Malcolm. *Kids These Days: Human Capital and the Making of Millennials*. Little, Brown, 2017.

Hartman, E., Pillard Reynolds, N., Ferrarini, C., Messmore, N., Evans, S., Al-Ebrahim, B., & Brown, J. M. "Coloniality-Decoloniality and Critical Global Citizenship: Identity, Belonging, and Education Abroad." *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, vol. 32 no.1, 2020, pg 33–59. <https://doi.org/10.36366/frontiers.v32i1.433>.

Hayot, Eric. "On Literary Worlds." *Modern Language Quarterly*, vol. 72 no. 2, 2011, 129-161, https://www.academia.edu/5931183/On_Literary_Worlds.

Hena, Omaar. "The Global Turn in Postcolonial Studies." *the minnesota review* vol. 71-72, 2009,

pg 289-296,

https://www.academia.edu/8154014/_The_Global_Turn_in_Postcolonial_Literary_Study
[S.](#)

Henry, Frances, Dua, Enakshi, James, Carl E., Kobayashi, Audrey, Li, Peter, Ramos, Howard and Smith, Malinda S. *The Equity Myth: Racialization and Indigeneity at Canadian Universities*. UBC Press, 2017.

Hirschman, Daniel, and Berrey, Ellen. "The Partial Deinstitutionalization of Affirmative Action in U.S. Higher Education, 1988-2014." *SocArXiv*, 21 June 2017,
<https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/gdjp6/>.

Horney, Rory and Hulme, David. "From International to Global Development: New Geographies of 21st Century Development." *Development and Change* vol. 50 no. 2, 2017, pg. 347–378, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/dech.12379>.

Huelsman, Mark. "Social Exclusion: The State of State U for Black Students." *Demos*, 12 Dec. 2018, <https://www.demos.org/research/social-exclusion-state-state-u-black-students>.

Hughes, C. & Barrie, S. "Influence on the assessment of graduate attributes in higher education." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* vol. 35 no.3, 2010, pg 325-334. DOI: [10.1080/02602930903221485](https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903221485)

Hunter, Walt. "For a Global Poetics." *ASAP/Journal* vol. 1 no. 3, 2016, pg. 365-377. Doi: [10.1353/asa.2016.0027](https://doi.org/10.1353/asa.2016.0027).

"Institute on Globalization and the Human Condition." *McMaster University*,
<https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/globalization>. Accessed June 18 2016.

"Institutional Priorities and Strategic Framework 2021-2024." *McMaster University Office of the President*, May 5 2021,

https://president.mcmaster.ca/app/uploads/2021/05/Institutional-Priorities-and-Strategic-Framework_FINAL_5May21.pdf. Accessed April 20 2022.

“Internationalization in Action.” *American Council on Education*,

<https://www.acenet.edu/Research-Insights/Pages/Internationalization/Internationalization-in-Action.aspx>. Accessed June 15 2022.

Jackson, Virginia. “The Function of Criticism at the Present Time.” *LARB*, April 12 2015,

<https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/function-criticism-present-time/>.

Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Duke UP, 1991.

Jaschik, Scott. “When Colleges Rely on Adjuncts, Where Does the Money Go?” *Inside Higher Ed*, January 5 2017,

<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/01/05/study-looks-impact-adjunct-hiring-college-spending-patterns>.

Jorgenson, Shelane, and Shultz, Lynette. “Global Citizenship Education in Post-Secondary

Institutions: What is Protected and what is Hidden under the Umbrella of GCE?” *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education* vol. 2 no. 1, 2012,

<https://journals.sfu.ca/jgcee/index.php/jgcee/article%E2%80%8CviewArticle/52/26>.

Kahn, Hilary E. “Introduction.” *Framing the Global: Entry Points for Research*, edited by Hilary

Kahn, Indiana University Press, 2014.

Kamola, Isaac. *Making the World Global: US Universities and the Production of The Global Imaginary*. Duke UP, 2019.

Kamola, Isaac and Meyerhoff, Eli. “Creating Commons: Divided Governance, Participatory Management, and Struggles Against Enclosure in the University.” *Polygraph* vol. 21, 2009, pg 5-27,

https://www.academia.edu/344226/Creating_Commons_Divided_Governance_Participatory_Management_and_Struggles_Against_Enclosure_in_the_University.

Kim, Joshua. "Why Higher Ed Must Resist the 'Platform Revolution.'" *Inside Higher Ed*, July 12 2016,

<https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/technology-and-learning/why-higher-ed-must-resist-%E2%80%98platform-revolution%E2%80%99>.

Klein, Christina. *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1945-61*. University of California Press, 2002.

Kniffin, K. "The good at their worst: Campus procurement in the global pillage." *Campus, Inc.*, edited by G. White, *Prometheus Books*, 2000, pg 36-49.

Korn, Sandra Y.L. "Harvard's Timber Empire." *The Harvard Crimson*, April 7 2014,

<https://www.thecrimson.com/column/the-red-line/article/2014/4/7/harvards-timber-empire/>.

Krabill, Ron. "American Sentimentalism and the Production of Global Citizens." *Contexts* 11. 4 (2012): 52–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1536504212466332>.

Kramnick, Jonathan. "The Interdisciplinary Fallacy." *Representations* vol. 140, 2017, pg. 67-83, <https://english.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/Representations.pdf>.

la paperson. *A Third University is Possible*. University of Minnesota Press, 2017.

Landorf, Hilary and Doscher, Stephanie. "Defining Global Learning at Florida International University." *Diversity & Democracy* vol. 18. no. 3, pg 24-25.

https://goglobal.fiu.edu/_assets/docs/doscher--landorf-2015_definition-of-global-learning.pdf.

Landorf, Hilary, Doscher, Stephanie, and Hardrick, Jaffus. *Making Global Learning Universal:*

- Promoting Inclusion and Success for All Students*. Stylus Publishing, 2018.
- Leary, John Patrick. "Innovation and the Neoliberal Idioms of Development." *b2o: the digital turn*, boundary2, August 2 2018. <http://www.boundary2.org/2018/08/leary/>.
- . *Keywords: The New Language of Capitalism*. Haymarket Books, 2018.
- Lehman, Robert S. "Formalism, Mere Form, and Judgment." *New Literary History* vol. 48 no. 2, 2017, pg. 245-263. Doi: [10.1353/nlh.2017.0012](https://doi.org/10.1353/nlh.2017.0012).
- Lemasson, Jean-Pierre. "Introduction: The Internationalization of Canadian Universities." *A New World of Knowledge: Canadian Universities and Globalization*, edited by Jean-Pierre Lemasson and Sheryl Bond, International Development Research Centre, 1999, pg 1-20.
- Levine, Caroline. *Forms: Whole, Rhythm, Hierarchy, Network*. Princeton UP, 2015.
- . "Infrastructuralism, or the Tempo of Institutions." *On periodization: selected essays from the English Institute*, edited by Virginia Jackson, English Institute in collaboration with the American Council of Learned Societies, 2010.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb.90047.0001.001>.
- Lim, Eng-Beng. "Performing the Global University." *Social Text 101* vol. 27 no. 4, 2009, pg. 25–44. https://www.academia.edu/1267837/Performing_the_Global_University.
- Liu, Roseann. "Cultivating Cosmopolitans: Culturally Relevant Pedagogy in an Age of Instrumentalism." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* vol. 0 no. 0, 2019, pg. 1–22, <https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/aeq.12321>.
- Lyons, John L. *Globalization and the Neoliberal Schoolhouse*, Brill, 2019.
- Manion, Caroline and Weber, Nadia. "Global Education for Ontario Learners: Practical Strategies." *Ontario Ministry of Education*, 2018.
<https://www.ontario.ca/page/global-education-ontario-learners-practical-strategies>.

“The Mapping Project.” <https://mapliberation.org/>. Accessed July 6 2022.

Mbembe, Achille. “Decolonizing Knowledge and the Question of the Archive.” Wits Institute for Social and Economic Research, 2015, <https://worldpece.org/content/mbembe-achille-2015-%E2%80%9Cdecolonizing-knowledge-and-question-archive%E2%80%9D-africa-country>. Accessed September 29 2015.

McClanahan, Annie. “Becoming Non-Economic: Human Capital Theory and Wendy Brown’s *Undoing the Demos*.” *Theory & Event* vol. 20 no. 2, 2017, pg. 516-517, https://www.academia.edu/37842418/Becoming_Non_Economic_Human_Capital_Theory_and_Wendy_Browns_Undoing_the_Demos.

—. “The Living Indebted: Student Militancy and the Financialization of Debt.” *qui parle* vol. 20 no.1, 2011, pg. 57-77, https://www.academia.edu/4174120/The_Living_Indebted_Student_Militancy_and_the_Financialization_of_Debt.

“The McMaster Model for Global Engagement.” *McMaster University*, July 2017, <https://global.mcmaster.ca/app/uploads/2018/10/Global-Engagement-Strategy-2017.pdf>. Accessed August 2 2018.

McMillan Cottom, Tressie. “Intersectionality and Critical Engagement with the Internet.” *SSRN*, (February 10, 2015). <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2568956>.

—. *Lower Ed: The Troubling Rise of For-Profit Colleges in the New Economy*. The New Press, 2018.

—. *Thick and Other Essays*. The New Press, 2019.

—. “Where Platform Capitalism and Racial Capitalism Meet: The Sociology of Race and Racism in the Digital Society.” *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* vol. 00 no. 0, 2020, pg 1-9,

<https://doi.org/10.1177%2F2332649220949473>.

McMillan Cottom, Tressie, Hunnicutt, Sally, and Johnson, Jennifer A. "The Ties That Corporatize: A Social Network Analysis Of University Presidents As Vectors Of Higher Education Corporatization." *OpenCottom SocArXiv*, May 22 2018, pg 1-35.

<https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/wpcfq/>.

McMillan Cottom, Tressie, and Tuchman, Gaye. "Rationalization of Higher Education." *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, edited by Robert Scott and Stephan Kosslyn, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2015.

Meister, Robert. "Confronting the Corporate University: From Cold War Federalization to Financialized Higher Education." *Public Seminar*, March 29 2017,

<http://publicseminar.org/2017/03/confronting-the-corporate-university/>.

Meyerhoff, Eli. *Beyond Education: Radical Studying for Another World*. University of Minnesota Press, 2019.

"Millennium Fellowship." *Florida International University Global Learning*,

<https://goglobal.fiu.edu/students/scholarships-fellowships/millennium-fellowship/index.html>. Accessed June 2 2022.

Mintz, Steven. "Student Protests, Past and Present." *Inside Higher Ed*, January 25 2021,

<https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/higher-ed-gamma/student-protests-past-and-present-0>.

"Mission and Diversity." *UNC College of Arts & Sciences Curriculum in Global Studies*,

<https://globalstudies.unc.edu/hom/mission/>. Accessed August 4 2020.

Mitchell, Nick. "(Critical Ethnic Studies) Intellectual." *Critical Ethnic Studies* vol. 1 no.1, 2015, pg. 86-94, <https://doi.org/10.5749/jcritethnstud.1.1.0086>.

- . “Diversity.” *Keywords for African American Studies*, edited by Erica R. Edwards, Roderick A. Ferguson, and Jeffrey O. G. Ogbar, New York University Press, 2018.
- . “The Object of “Object Lessons”: Thoughts and Questions.” *Inhabitations: On Robyn Wiegman's Object Lessons*, spec. Issue of *Feminist Formations* vol. 25 no. 3, 2013, pg. 180-189,
https://www.academia.edu/80476169/The_Object_of_Object_Lessons_Thoughts_and_Questions.
- . “Review: [Untitled] Reviewed Works: The Geopolitics of the Cold War and Narratives of Inclusion: Excavating a Feminist Archive by Kelly Coogan-Gehr; A Community of Disagreement: Feminism in the University by Danielle Bouchard; Object Lessons by Robyn Wiegman.” *Signs* vol. 38 no. 3, 2013, pg. 739-747,
https://www.academia.edu/2992282/Review_Kelly_Coogan_Gehrs_The_Geopolitics_of_the_Cold_War_and_Narratives_of_Inclusion_Danielle_Bouchards_A_Community_of_Disagreement_and_Robyn_Wiegmans_Object_Lessons_Signs_38_3_Spring_2013.
- Mohrman, Kathryn, Ma, Wanhua and Baker, David. “The research university in transition : The emerging global model.” *Higher Education Policy* vol. 21 no.1, 2008, pg. 5-27,
<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ787304>.
- Morefield, Jeanne. *Empires Without Imperialism: Anglo-American Decline and the Politics of Deflection*. Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Moro, Jeffrey. “Against Cop Shit.” February 13 2020,
<https://jeffreymoro.com/blog/2020-02-13-against-cop-shit/>. Accessed February 2 2022.
- Moten, Fred. Interview with Jarrett Earnest. *The Brooklyn Rail*, November 2017,
<https://brooklynrail.org/2017/11/art/FRED-MOTEN-with-Jarrett-Earnest>.

Moten, Fred and Harney, Stefano. *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning and Black Study*.

Minor Compositions, 2013.

—. “The University and the Undercommons: Seven Theses.” *Social Text* 79 vol. 22 no. 2, 2004, pg. 101-115,

<https://ou.edu/content/dam/Education/documents/the%20university%20and%20the%20undercommons.pdf>.

—. “the university (last words).” *Academia.edu*, 2021,

https://www.academia.edu/43580248/The_university_last_words_fred_moten_and_stefano_harney

Nash, Jennifer C. and Owens, Emily A. “Introduction — Institutional Feelings: Practicing

Women’s Studies in the Corporate University.” *Institutional Feelings: Practicing*

Women’s Studies in the Corporate University, spec. issue of *Feminist Formations* vol. 27

no. 3, 2015, pg vii-xi. Doi: [10.1353/ff.2016.0004](https://doi.org/10.1353/ff.2016.0004).

Newfield, Christopher. “The Counterreformation in Higher Education.” *Los Angeles Review Of*

Books, October 19 2013,

<https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/the-counterreformation-in-higher-education/>.

—. *The Great Mistake: How We Wrecked Public Universities and How We Can Fix Them*. JHU

Press, 2018.

—. “Universities after neoliberalism: A tale of four futures.” *Radical Philosophy* vol. 2 no.10,

2021, pg 77-86,

<https://www.radicalphilosophy.com/article/universities-after-neoliberalism>.

—. “University Research and the Great Mistake.” *Inside Higher Ed*, April 13 2017,

<https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2017/04/13/how-universities-have-gotten-caught->

[privatization-trap-essay](#).

Ngai, Sianne. "Bad Contemporaneity." Interview by Matthew Rana. *Kunstkritikk*, August 20, 2021, <https://kunstkritikk.com/bad-contemporaneity/>.

Nichols, T Philip and Smith, Anna. "Critical Literacy, digital platforms, and datafication." *Handbook of Critical Literacies*, edited by Jessica Zacher Pandya, Raúl Alberto Mora, Jennifer Helen Alford, Noah Asher Golden, Roberto Santiago de Roock, Routledge, 2021, pg 345-353.

Obyrne, Darren J. and Hensby, Alexander. *Theorizing Global Studies*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020.

Park, Julian Francis. "Mills and Capital." *Wordpress*, October 22 2015, <https://jfprk.wordpress.com/2015/10/22/mills-and-capital/>. Accessed March 3 2016.

"Partnered in Teaching and Learning: McMaster's Teaching and Learning Strategy 2021-2026." *McMaster University*, June 2021, <https://provost.mcmaster.ca/app/uploads/2021/06/McMaster-TLStrategy-Web-final.pdf>. Accessed May 4 2022.

Pashby, Karen. "Conflations, possibilities, and foreclosures: Global citizenship education in a multicultural context." *Curriculum Inquiry*, vol. 45 no.4, 2015, pp. 345-366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2015.1064304>.

Pashby, Karen, da Costa, Marta, Stein, Sharon, & Andreotti, Vanessa. "A meta-review of typologies of global citizenship education." *Comparative Education* vol. 56 no. 2 2020, pg. 151-156, <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1252876>.

Payne, Corey and Saxton, Steph. "The Militarization of Johns Hopkins Exposes a Nationwide Trend." *Truthout*, April 4 2019,

<https://truthout.org/articles/the-militarization-of-johns-hopkins-exposes-a-nationwide-trend/>.

Peters, Diane. "Activists Want Universities to Stop Investing in Fossil Fuels." *University Affairs*, August 6 2014,

<https://www.universityaffairs.ca/news/news-article/activists-want-universities-to-stop-investing-in-fossil-fuels/>.

Peters, John Durham. *The Marvelous Clouds*. UChicago Press, 2015.

"PISA 2018 Global Competence." *OECD*, 2018,

<https://www.oecd.org/pisa/innovation/global-competence/>. Accessed Jan 20 2020.

"Population and Diversity." *Hamilton*,

<https://www.hamilton.ca/moving-hamilton/community-profile/population-diversity>.

Accessed May 6 2022.

"Position Paper." *McMaster University Forward With Integrity Internationalization Task Force*,

May 4 2012, https://nanopdf.com/download/support-for-international-students_pdf.

Accessed July 6 2015.

Readings, Bill. *The University in Ruins*. Harvard UP, 1997.

"Rethinking Education: Toward a Global Common Good?" *UNESCO Publishing*, 2015, pg 1-85.

<https://unevoc.unesco.org/e-forum/RethinkingEducation.pdf>.

Reysen, Stephen, Larey, Loretta W. and Katzarska-Miller, Iva. "College Course Curriculum and Global Citizenship." *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning* vol. 4 no. 3, 2012, pg 27-39,

https://www.academia.edu/3986847/College_course_curriculum_and_global_citizenship.

Riofrancos, Thea. "From Cases to Sites: Studying Global Processes in Comparative Politics."

Riofrancos, Thea. "From Cases to Sites: Studying Global Processes in Comparative Politics."

Rethinking Comparisons, edited by Erica Simmons and Nicholas Rush Smith, Cambridge University Press, 2021, pg. 107-126.

Robbins, Bruce. "Comparative cosmopolitanisms." *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, edited by Bruce Robbins and Pheng Cheah, Minnesota UP, 1998, pg. 246-264.

Roman, Leslie Gail. "States of Insecurity: Cold War memory, 'global citizenship' and its discontents." *Discourse: Studies in The Cultural Politics of Education* vol. 25 no. 2, 2004, pg 231-259, DOI: [10.1080/01596300410001692166](https://doi.org/10.1080/01596300410001692166)

Rooney, Ellen. "A Semiprivate Room." *differences* vol. 13 no. 1, 2002, pg. 128–156.
<https://doi.org/10.1215/10407391-13-1-128>.

Rosenberg, Mark B. "Internationalization of U.S. Education in the 21st Century: The Future of International and Foreign Language Studies." April 12, 2014, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA, Plenary Address.
https://goglobal.fiu.edu/assets/docs/mbr-speech-2014-04-12_internationalization-of-higher-ed_media.pdf.

Ross, Andrew. *Nice Work If You Can Get It: Life and Labor in Precarious Times*. New York University Press, 2009.

Ross, Andrew. "The Rise of the Global University." *Toward a Global Autonomous University: Cognitive Labor, The Production of Knowledge, and Exodus from the Education Factory*, edited by The Edu-Factory Collective, Autonomedia, 2009, pg 18-31.

Rossi, Enzo and Taiwo, Olufemi O. "What's New About Woke Racial Capitalism (And What Isn't): 'Wokewashing' And The Limits Of Representation." *Spectre Journal*, December 18 2020,

<https://spectrejournal.com/whats-new-about-woke-racial-capitalism-and-what-isnt/>.

Roth, Michael. "Beyond Content Delivery: Teaching Critical Thinking Skills in a MOOC."

32:00-41:30. *Youtube*, uploaded by Penn Online Learning, 10 May 2013,

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CO49eWk7o7Y>.

Roudometof, Victor. "Transnationalism and Cosmopolitanism: Errors of Globalism." *Critical*

Globalization Studies, edited by Richard P Appelbaum and William I Robinson,

Psychology Press, 2005.

Said, Edward. "Globalizing Literary Study." *Globalizing Literary Studies*, spec. issue of *PMLA* ,

vol. 116, no. 1, January 2001, pp. 64-68. <https://doi.org/10.1632/pmla.2001.116.1.64>

Sax, David. "The Failure of the iPad Classroom." *The Walrus*, November 7 2016,

<https://thewalrus.ca/the-failure-of-the-ipad-classroom/>.

Schönwetter, Dieter J. and Bateman, Dianne. "An Introduction by the Editors." *The Canadian*

Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning vol. 1 no. 1, February 2010.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2010.1.1>.

Seamster, Louise. "Transcript: Tressie McMillan Cottom Interviews Louise Seamster for 'The

Ezra Klein Show.'" Interview with Tressie McMillan Cottom. *New York Times*,

November 2 2021,

<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/11/02/podcasts/transcript-ezra-klein-show-louise-seamster.html>.

Shringarpure, Bhakti. *Cold War Assemblages: Decolonization to Digital*. Routledge, 2019.

Siemens, George. "Connectivism: A Learning Theory for the Digital Age." *International Journal*

of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning vol.2 no.1, 2005, <http://www.itdl.org>.

Slobodian, Quinn. *Globalists: The End of Empire and The Birth of Neoliberalism*. Harvard UP,

2018.

Smith, Dorothy. *Texts, Facts, and Femininity: Exploring the Relations of Ruling*. Routledge, 1990.

Sparke, Matthew. "Situated Cyborg Knowledge in Not so Borderless Online Global Education: Mapping the Geosocial Landscape of a MOOC." *Geopolitics* vol. 22 no. 1, 2017, pg. 53, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2016.1204601>.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Harvard UP, 1999.

—. "Critical Intimacy: An Interview with Gayatri Spivak." Interview with Steve Paulson. *LARB*, July 29 2016, <https://lareviewofbooks.org/article/critical-intimacy-interview-gayatri-chakravorty-spivak/>.

—. "Cultural Pluralism?" *Philosophy and Social Criticism* vol. 42 no. 4-5, 2016, pg. 448–455, <https://huminst.uic.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/412/2021/02/Spivak.Cultural.pdf>.

—. "The Rani of Surmir: An Essay in Reading the Archives." *History and Theory*, vol. 24 no. 3, 1985, pg. 247-272, http://artsites.ucsc.edu/sdaniel/230/spivak_readingarchive.pdf.

—. *Readings*. University of Chicago Press, 2005.

—. "Righting wrongs." *The South Atlantic Quarterly* vol. 103, 2004, pg. 523-581, <https://blogs.commonsgorgetown.edu/engl-218-fall2010/files/Righting-Wrongs.pdf>.

—. "Teaching for the Times." *Oppositional Discourse*, spec. issue of *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* vol. 25 no.1, 1992, pg. 3-22, <https://doi.org/10.2307/1315070>.

Srebrnik, Henry. "Football, Frats, and Fiscal Peril vs. Commuters, Carping, and Rising Costs:

- The New Financial, Social, and Psychological Context of Higher Education in Canada and the United States.” *Canada and the United States: Differences that Count*, 4th edition, edited by David M. Thomas and David N. Biette, University of Toronto Press, 2014, pg 61-87.
- Stein, Sharon. “Mapping Global Citizenship.” *Journal of College and Character* vol. 16 no. 4, 2015, pg. 242-252, <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1090077>.
- Stein, Sharon and Andreotti, Vanessa. “Global Citizenship Education Otherwise.” *Conversations on global citizenship education: Research, teaching and learning*, edited by E. Bosio, Routledge, 2021, pp. 13-36, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349051132_Global_Citizenship_Otherwise.
- Stoler, Ann. *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*. Princeton UP, 2010.
- “Stories of Belonging in Cities Around the World.” *University of British Columbia Coordinated Arts Program*, <https://cap.arts.ubc.ca/our-streams/globalization-power-society/stories-of-belonging-in-cities-around-the-world/>. Accessed July 1 2022.
- Streeck, Wolfgang. *How Will Capitalism End?: Essays on a Failing System*. Verso, 2016.
- Stuelke, Patricia. “Books in Conversation.” Interview with Michael Dango, *ASAP Journal*, April 21 2022. <https://asapjournal.com/books-in-conversation-michael-dango-and-patricia-stuelke/>
- . *The Ruse of Repair: US Neoliberal Empire and the Turn from Critique*. Duke UP, 2021.
- Szeman, Imre. “Culture and Globalization, or, The Humanities in Ruins.” *CR: The New Centennial Review* vol. 3 no. 2, 2003, pg. 91–115, doi: [10.1353/ncr.2003.0031](https://doi.org/10.1353/ncr.2003.0031).

Taiwo, Olufemi O. *Elite Capture: How the Powerful Took Over Identity Politics (And Everything Else)*. Haymarket Books, 2022.

Tarr, Robert B. & Tagg, John. "From Teaching to Learning: A New Paradigm For Undergraduate Education." *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* vol. 27 no. 6, 1995, pg 12-26.
doi: [10.1080/00091383.1995.10544672](https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.1995.10544672).

Task Force on Higher Education and Society. "Higher education in developing countries : peril and promise." *World Bank Group*, 2000, pg 9-134.
<https://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/345111467989458740/Higher-education-in-developing-countries-peril-and-promise>.

"This Month with the President: Internationalization Without Mobility." *McMaster University Daily News*, November 19 2015,
<https://dailynews.mcmaster.ca/articles/this-month-with-the-president-internationalization-without-mobility/>. Accessed March 7 2016.

Tomlinson, John. *Globalization and Culture*. UChicago Press, 1999.

Tooze, Adam. *Shutdown: How Covid Shook the World's Economy*. Penguin Random House, 2021.

Torres, C.A. "Transformative Social Justice Learning as a New Lifelong Learning Paradigm." *Political Sociology of Adult Education*, International Issues in Adult Education series. SensePublishers, 2013, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-227-3_8.

"Tribute to Paul R MacPherson." *McMaster University MacPherson Institute*,
<https://mi.mcmaster.ca/paul-r-macpherson/>. Accessed June 28 2022.

Tuck, Eve & Gaztambide-Fernández, Rubén A. "Curriculum, Replacement, and Settler Futurity." *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* vol. 29 no.1, 2013, pg. 72-89,

<https://journal.jctonline.org/index.php/jct/article/download/411/pdf/0>.

Tuck, Eve and Yang, K. Wayne. "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization:*

Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1 No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40,

<https://clas.osu.edu/sites/clas.osu.edu/files/Tuck%20and%20Yang%202012%20Decolonization%20is%20not%20a%20metaphor.pdf>.

Vidal, John and Provost, Claire. "US Universities in Africa 'land grab'." *The Guardian*, June 8

2011, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2011/jun/08/us-universities-africa-land-grab>.

Vora, Neha. *Teach for Arabia: American Universities, Liberalism, and Transnational Qatar*.

Stanford University Press, 2020.

Walcott, Rinaldo. "Against Social Justice And the Limits of Diversity." *Toward What Justice?*,

edited by Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Wang, Routledge, 2018, pg 85-100.

—. "The End of Diversity." *Public Culture* vol. 31 no. 2, May 2019, pg 393–408,

<https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-7286885>.

—. "Neither Native or National: Against Sovereignty and Towards a New Commons." *Journal*

of World Systems Research vol. 27 no. 2, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.5195/jwsr.2021.1073>.

Wang, C. & Hoffman, D. M. "Are WE the world? A critical reflection on selfhood and global citizenship education." *Education for Global Citizenship: Democratic Visions and Future*

Directions, spec. issue of *Education Policy Analysis Archives* vol. 24 no. 56, 2016, pg 1-22,

https://www.academia.edu/25552619/Are_WE_the_World_A_Critical_Reflection_on_Selfhood_in_U_S_Global_Citizenship_Education.

Wang, Jackie. *Carceral Capitalism*. MIT Press, 2018.

Watters, Audrey. "Top Ten Ed-Tech Trends of 2016." *Hack Education*, 2016,

<https://2016trends.hackededucation.com/>. Accessed May 18 2017.

Wells, Thomas. "Sen's Capability Approach." *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*,

<https://iep.utm.edu/sen-cap/#H1>.

Whitener, Brian and Nemser, Dan. "Circulation and the New University." *TOPIA: Canadian*

Journal of Cultural Studies vol. 28, Fall 2012, pg. 165-170, DOI: 10.3138/topia.28.165.

"Why Global Studies?" *University of Pittsburgh*,

<https://www.ucis.pitt.edu/global/undergraduate-programs>. Accessed April 1 2021.

Williamson, Ben, Gulson, Kalervo N., Perrotta, Carlo, and Witzemberger, Kevin. "Amazon and

the New Global Connective Architectures of Education Governance." *Harvard*

Educational Review vol. 92 no. 2, 2022, pg. 231-256,

<https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-92.2.231>.

Wilson, Ara. "The Infrastructure of Intimacy." *SIGNS* vol. 41 no. 2, 2016, pg. 247-280,

<https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/682919>.

Wilson, Rob. "Worlding as Future Tactic." *The Worlding Project: Doing Cultural Studies in the*

Era of Globalization, edited by Rob Wilson and Christopher Leigh Connery, North

Atlantic Books, 2007, pg 209-223,

[https://english.hku.hk/courses/WorldingPacificHKU2011/Worlding_Project_\[lo-res\].pdf](https://english.hku.hk/courses/WorldingPacificHKU2011/Worlding_Project_[lo-res].pdf).

Zinnecker, Jürgen. "Children in Young and Aging Societies: The Order of Generations and

Models of Childhood in Comparative Perspective." *Children at the Millenium: Where*

Have We Come From, Where Are We Going?, edited by Sandra L Hofferth and Timothy J

Owens, Elsevier Science Ltd, 2001, pg 11-52,

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1040-2608\(01\)80006-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1040-2608(01)80006-X).

Appendix A:

Tagg and Tarr's Comparing Educational Paradigms

CHART I
COMPARING EDUCATIONAL PARADIGMS

The Instruction Paradigm	The Learning Paradigm
Mission and Purposes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Provide/deliver instruction ➤ Transfer knowledge from faculty to students ➤ Offer courses and programs ➤ Improve the quality of instruction ➤ Achieve access for diverse students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Produce learning ➤ Elicit student discovery and construction of knowledge ➤ Create powerful learning environments ➤ Improve the quality of learning ➤ Achieve success for diverse students
Criteria for Success	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Inputs, resources ➤ Quality of entering students ➤ Curriculum development, expansion ➤ Quantity and quality of resources ➤ Enrollment, revenue growth ➤ Quality of faculty, instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Learning and student-success outcomes ➤ Quality of exiting students ➤ Learning technologies development, expansion ➤ Quantity and quality of outcomes ➤ Aggregate learning growth, efficiency ➤ Quality of students, learning
Teaching/Learning Structures	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Atomistic; parts prior to whole ➤ Time held constant, learning varies ➤ 50-minute lecture, 3-unit course ➤ Classes start/end at same time ➤ One teacher, one classroom ➤ Independent disciplines, departments ➤ Covering material ➤ End-of-course assessment ➤ Grading within classes by instructors ➤ Private assessment ➤ Degree equals accumulated credit hours 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Holistic; whole prior to parts ➤ Learning held constant, time varies ➤ Learning environments ➤ Environment ready when student is ➤ Whatever learning experience works ➤ Cross discipline/department collaboration ➤ Specified learning results ➤ Pre/during/post assessments ➤ External evaluations of learning ➤ Public assessment ➤ Degree equals demonstrated knowledge and skills

The Instruction Paradigm	The Learning Paradigm
Learning Theory	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Knowledge exists “out there” ▶ Knowledge comes in “chunks” and “bits” delivered by instructors ▶ Learning is cumulative and linear ▶ Fits the storehouse of knowledge metaphor ▶ Learning is teacher centered and controlled ▶ “Live” teacher, “live” students required ▶ The classroom and learning are competitive and individualistic ▶ Talent and ability are rare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Knowledge exists in each person’s mind and is shaped by individual experience ▶ Knowledge is constructed, created, and “gotten” ▶ Learning is a nesting and interacting of frameworks ▶ Fits learning how to ride a bicycle metaphor ▶ Learning is student centered and controlled ▶ “Active” learner required, but not “live” teacher ▶ Learning environments and learning are cooperative, collaborative, and supportive ▶ Talent and ability are abundant
Productivity/Funding	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Definition of productivity: cost per hour of instruction per student ▶ Funding for hours of instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Definition of productivity: cost per unit of learning per student ▶ Funding for learning outcomes
Nature of Roles	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Faculty are primarily lecturers ▶ Faculty and students act independently and in isolation ▶ Teachers classify and sort students ▶ Staff serve/support faculty and the process of instruction ▶ Any expert can teach ▶ Line governance; independent actors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▶ Faculty are primarily designers of learning methods and environments ▶ Faculty and students work in teams with each other and other staff ▶ Teachers develop every student’s competencies and talents ▶ All staff are educators who produce student learning and success ▶ Empowering learning is challenging and complex ▶ Shared governance; teamwork

Source: Robert B. Barr & John Tagg, “From Teaching to Learning — A New Paradigm For Undergraduate Education” *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 27:6 (1995): pg 16 & 17.

**APPENDIX B:
STUDENT INTERVIEW MATERIALS**

Appendix Contents

Interview Questionnaire	331
FIU Interview Transcripts.....	333
F1.....	333
F2.....	343
F3.....	351
F4.....	364
F5.....	383
F6.....	386
F7.....	387
McMaster Interview Transcripts.....	394
M1	394
M2.....	407
M3.....	419
M4.....	428
M5.....	434
FIU Syllabi Materials.....	438
McMaster Syllabi Materials.....	439

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

Your Global Studies Course Experience

- 1) Information about you: Your age now? What program of study are you pursuing, and what year of your degree are you in? What city and country are you from?
- 2) How would you define globalization and the concept of global citizenship?
- 3) What associations or images does the adjective “global” summon to mind?
- 4) Has your understanding of these terms (“globalization,” “global citizenship,” “global”) changed or evolved because of taking this course? If yes, how so? If not, why do you think that is the case?
- 5) Let’s talk about some of the content you studied in the course. Can you tell me about a text and/or a concept you encountered in the course that made a strong impression on you? Why do you think that experience matters to your understanding of ‘the global’?
- 6) Was there a text or concept that you found particularly difficult or surprising? What did you take away from this new difficult or surprising knowledge about global life or issues?
- 7) Were there any ‘global’ concepts or texts in the course that you did not find useful? Why do you think you came to this conclusion?
- 8) Is there anything that you did not study in the course that you wish had been on the syllabus? This might be a particular text, concept, topic or theme. If so, why do you think this would be important to add to a global studies course like the one you’ve taken?
- 9) Describe what your classroom time was like. For example: was it primarily lecture-based, were there other kinds of activities mixed into your class period, was it primarily discussion-based? Did it vary throughout the semester or term? Did you have a discussion section run by a TA? Etc.
- 10) Which kinds of learning experiences that you had in the course felt most valuable or enriching to you? Your answer could be focused on particular activities, assessments, or person(s), as well as on your engagement with any assigned course materials.
- 11) Was there an online component to your course (either in your classroom time or in your assignments and activities)? If not, do you think engaging online could have improved your course experience, and why? If so, how would you describe your experience of these digital learning elements? For example, were they easy to navigate and interact with, did you feel like they added a useful or difficult dimension to your learning experience, and why?
- 12) What motivated you to take this course? Feel free to cite multiple reasons if relevant.
- 13) Did your course experience satisfy this logic that motivated you to enroll? In other words, did it deliver the experience you were expecting or hoping for?

14) How do you understand your own situation in our globalized world and its histories after taking the course? How would you describe your position in the world, in terms of the global life and issues you've studied?

15) Do you feel like your educational experience at your university more generally has been global, or helped you to become more of a global thinker, citizen, or individual? How so?

Feel free to return to an earlier question, or introduce an observation of your own.

FIU INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS

F1

I: Okay, so I'm going to read you a few sentences to just set up your consent- your oral consent.

S: Okay

I: And, you'll be able to tell when it's a question that you should respond to.

S: Okay

I: So, your participation in this study is voluntary. You can decide at any time to stop, even part way through the interview, for whatever reason, or up until September 30th, 2018. If you decide to stop there are no consequences to you. If you want to stop, I'll ask you how you would like me to handle any data collected up to that point. That could include returning it to you, destroying it, or using the data. Also, if you don't want to answer some of the questions, you don't have to, but you can still be in the study. So you can kind of refuse a specific question if you want. And, if you would like me to send you a short summary of the results of the study, I'd be happy to do that, so you can just let me know how you would like to receive that.

S: Yes, please.

I: Cool. Okay, so, here are the questions for you for your consent. Do you have any questions, or would you like any additional details right now?

S: No

I: Great. Do you agree that the interview can be audio recorded?

S: Yes

I: Great. Do you agree to have your responses used for future related projects? That's probably not going to happen, by the way.

S: Yes

I: Okay. Do you agree to participate in this study knowing that you can withdraw at any point with no consequences to you?

S: Yes

I: Great. And finally, before we begin, would you like to receive a summary of the studies results and if so, at what email or mailing address would you like to receive them?

S: Yes. I can just text you the email that works for you.

I: Great, okay, sounds good. Alright, I'm going to start. So, before we get into the questions, I was trying to guess which course it might have been. Was it artistic expression in a global society or something like that?

S: No, it was like an Anthropology class, maybe like Intro to Anthropology. Like, I can get that course, the exact course, but it's for sure an Anthropology course.

I: Okay, do you remember like just..

S: And, I've taken, like I've taken several global learning classes like throughout FIU, but that's the one that..

I: Was it in 2017?

S: Yeah

I: Okay, do you remember just like what the basic topic was of the course?

S: Yeah, it was just like more of like anthropology, so like just us as individuals in the global world, you know what I mean? So, just learning, like, and exposure to like things outside of like what we would normally think. I don't know how to explain it. It was a really interesting fucking class though.

I: Cool. Great. Okay. Let's see, let's get you to talk more about it. Alright, so, first question is information about you. What is your age now?

S: I am 23 years old.

I: Okay. What program of study are you pursuing, and what year of your degree are you in?

S: I am a Communications major, Communication Arts, and I'm done. Like, I finished my undergrad already.

I: Oh great, okay. Did you finish last year?

S: Yeah

I: Great. Okay, what city and country are you from?

S: Miami, Florida, United States

I: Cool. Alright. Okay, next question: How would you define globalization and the concept of global citizenship?

S: I look at the concept of globalization and global citizenship as like the future, you know? It's literally like the future that we're living in, like I mean we're living through it now, like, through the internet and everything, like we literally live in a global world. You know what I'm saying? All through the internet. And, I think this concept of globalization and being a global citizen is sort of like realizing that we're all in this together. Like, it doesn't matter if you're from the United States or from South America or from Africa, like, we're all global citizens. Like, we all inhabit this earth together. And, for us to solve, like some of these huge global issues-Like, we sort of have to like understand like people's backgrounds. You know, like understand why they think a certain way. Like understanding like how did we get to where we are now? You know, we sort of have to reverse engineer it. And, I think just the concept of being a global citizen is just having that awareness of yourself and then the world outside of you, and knowing that we're all human, like it's humanity

above like exactly where you're from. I don't know if that makes sense, but that's sort of like my philosophical **mix** on the concept.

I: It does. Definitely. It definitely makes sense. That, and we would call that maybe closer to planetary thinking in my discipline, if you're wondering.

S: Cool

I: Yeah, which is like, yeah, we all share this planet, this is our home. We have a home together here. Cool. Okay. So, you've already given me some, but what associations or images does the adjective "global" summon to mind? What do you think of when you hear the word global? You can just like riff.

S: One World.

I: Okay, what else? Can you riff for a bit?

S: One world, unity, innovation, inclusiveness. Honestly, there's so many. Like, I really can't. Like, so many options that my brain is like freezing.

I: That's okay. Alright, well, are you happy with those?

S: Yeah, I'm fine with those.

I: Okay, cool. Alright, so, you alluded to this a little bit before, when we were talking about the course. How has your understanding of those terms like globalization, global citizenship, or the adjective "global" changed or evolved because of taking the course that you mentioned and..oh sorry, I said it wrong. Has your understanding evolved because of taking the course, and if it did, why or how so? And, if it didn't, why do you think it did not?

S: I think it certainly shifted my focus immensely. Like, just like having the knowledge of certain stereotypes and negative stigmas and stuff like that that were touched on in a bunch of my courses, not specifically like this one course, but like it was a common thing in like now in hindsight in a lot of my global learning classes of just like how us as individuals in the United States or no matter what culture you're from, is like having exposure and understanding of other cultures, it sort of makes things easier to understand. Because like, what I've noticed, a lot of people are closed off to things that seem foreign because they've never been exposed to it. It's like, for instance, I have a completely plant based diet. This is just going off the topic. But, my mom, for instance...

I: Me too, man.

S: Oh awesome. Power to you. My mom wouldn't for like the life of her try anything plant based. Like, she just thinks it's like just disgusting, like this nasty thing. And, I'm like mom, just try, you know. It's just like her upbringing, what she's been exposed to. She just doesn't have, I guess like the open mindedness to be susceptible to that. So, there's a lot of things that I was closed off to before. Like, just different global ideologies and stuff like that. But, like once I actually understood like the culture and understanding like why they got to this place, or sort of like why they have this train of thought, or this way of thinking or this way of life. It sort of just made me open to it, you know? And like, I'm working in a company right now that's a global company you know, we have like team members all over the world. And, our Philippines team, for example, like one of the members from our Philippines team, he likes to send updates to the company of his family, like his mom in the hospital in the bed, like letting people know about like what's going on his life. And, like most of the team members here in America like never met his family before, you know? So, some of our team

members, they think it's weird as shit, that like, why does this guy update us with his family life? Like, we've never met him. Like, this guy's like fucking weird. But like, me having that global understanding of like man, like, maybe like, I'm not well versed in the Filipino culture, but I understand, like, there's a reason why he's doing that, you know? Like, maybe in the Filipino culture it's normal to share how your family is doing with your colleagues and stuff like that. But the fact that they don't have the understanding of that global view and that exposure to like certain cultural ways of things, like they're kind of like, they're not receptive to it. You know what I mean? And, I hope that like, I totally forgot what the question was, but I really hope that I answered it in a nutshell.

I: Basically, it was "Did the course evolve your understanding?" And, it sounded like you said yes.

S: Yeah

I: Okay, great.

S: Awesome

I: Okay, so this might be tough for you, but maybe something will come to mind. So, I want to talk about if you can remember some of the content that you studied in the course. Can you tell me about a text or a concept that you encountered in the course that made a strong impression on you, and why do you think that experience mattered to your understanding of global life? So anything that kind of stands out as like, this had a really strong effect on me, any kind of effect, could be positive, negative, whatever.

S: This concept of an altered state of consciousness. That concept really resonated with me because, like, I mean of course, like I've experienced like many like..For instance, what you just explained to me, the planetary whatever, that term that you have is like all my life I understood that. Or, I understood it more through my studies and everything, that concept, but I never had a label attached to it, you know? So, shit, where was I going with this? I'm so sorry.

I: It's okay.

S: What was the question again. State the question one more time.

I: The question was: A text or concept that you encountered in the course that made a really strong impression on you.

S: Okay, Okay, Okay. That's so simple. The term that's so simple. And, everyone has like tapped into it, you know what I mean?

I: Wait, sorry, you froze for a bit. What was the term that you said?

S: Altered state of consciousness

I: Okay, Cool, cool, I'm with you.

S: So, yeah, that's just something that off of the top of my head that stuck with me, because like, it just sort of like, it answered a lot of questions that I had like from my childhood, just like, philosophical questions, myth questions. Like, my family is from Haiti. So, in the Haitian community or the Haitian culture they practice voodoo. And, I always thought that like voodoo was like this dark thing, like this thing that like you should stay away from and everything, and then like, just having the knowledge of like altered state of consciousness, and like these kind of things that they practice is like, is just like understanding like why people, like when they practice voodoo, like they have like this sort of like experience and that's like a state of altered consciousness. And, like, this term of

consciousness, like, I don't know, it's just like a very interesting concept because it varies from individual, you know? There's like no right way or wrong way. It's just like, it's just like, everyone has it in them. You know what I mean? And, people can find altered state of consciousness through painting, through you know taking drugs, through running, through working, like there's various forms of it. But, just that concept, it was very interesting to me.

I: Cool, thank you. Was there a text or a concept that you studied that you found particularly difficult or surprising?

S: Not to my immediate knowledge, no.

I: Okay, so you just felt open and nothing shocked you or upset you, or made you feel like, wow, I had no idea, you know? Like, I feel like I had been so ignorant before, that I never imagined something like that?

S: I mean honestly, not to my, cause like besides like having these global classes and stuff like that, I had a lot of like exposure to different cultures, like growing up. Like, being in Miami, as part of like the inner cities and stuff like that, where I was from, like I always had like this mixture of like culture around me, so I've always like been open minded to different things. So, like there was nothing that, I'm sure there has, but in like my immediate like system, I can't think of anything that really stuck out to me.

I: Okay, cool, thank you. Was there anything that you studied in the course that you did not find useful and why?

S: Honestly, anything that I probably didn't find useful, I don't remember.

I: That's fair.

S: So, honestly, the things that I remember I guess were the useful things, because I can't really think of anything that wasn't useful.

I: Cool, okay, great. Is there anything that you did not study in the course that you wish had been on the syllabus? It can be anything. It could be a text, it could be a concept, it could be a theme, a topic. And, if you can think of something, why do you think this would be important to add to a course like the one you took?

S: I mean I guess like the study abroad program sort of touches on this, but I think like in these global learning classes there should be like at least like-and this is something that I've never thought about- but the fact that you pose this question, it kind of made me think about like wow, this would be cool. So, I'm going to actually pitch it to someone in the department. Like immersing themselves-like, let's say in a course, like we're studying about-I'm going to give you one course that wasn't a course that I took that I wanted to do this for, but it's also a global learning course. It was an international business course, right? And, one of my projects was to create a campaign for like a brand in Argentina. So, I've never really had, like I just had to do research on the culture and stuff like that, and tailor my pitch towards that. But I think it would have been more beneficial if like maybe like, for a week, like, they arranged a way where we can go to the country that we're studying for like a week and actually immerse ourselves in the culture and present it in that form, because I think it's different to actually read about cultures, than to actually like, you know immerse yourselves. It's like the difference between knowledge and applied knowledge. Like, yeah, you can fucking read about going to the gym and all of this stuff, but unless you actually go to the gym and lift up some weights, you're not going to reap the benefits of it. So, I think like, just actually putting the things that we learn into practice, like having experience with some of the concepts that we learn,

like, shit, culture shock. I think it was culture shock. I don't remember the exact concept, but it's along the lines of culture shock. Like, whenever you go to a new culture and like, you know, you're freaked out, you're having like these emotions about your own family, and like trying to adapt to this new culture. So, I think it would be actually interesting because although I may have experienced those things in a sense, like being a black kid from an inner city, and like you know meeting with millionaires who run Fortune 500 companies, it's sort of like they look at you like-what does this little black kid, who's 23 years old from Liberty City know anything about business? You know what I mean? That's sort of like culture shock, but some people may not have that initial culture shock of like just being in another country, and being like, oh shit, like how the fuck do I communicate with people, like I don't understand the language? And I haven't had it to that extent, where I've been thrown into a country where I don't speak the language or anything, you know what I mean? I've been fortunate enough to be able to navigate through that.

I: I recommend it though. It's a pretty good experience.

S: It's going to happen for sure. It's just a matter of time.

I: Yeah, it's exciting. It's exciting. Cool, thank you for that. Okay, can you remember what your class room time was like? Was it primarily lecture based? Were there other kinds of activities mixed in, like more kind of discussion based or group work? Did it change throughout the semester? Did you have a discussion section run by a TA? Any details like that.

S: I think it was a culmination of all of them.

I: Oh yeah, okay.

S: So, like two of the courses like off the top of my head were certainly like a culmination of all of them. Like for example, the Anthropology class, which was the one that I tailored this to-that course for instance, it was like an hour and fifteen minute or two hour course, I don't really remember the exact time, but I guess like the first 30 minutes would be like discussions and the next 10 minutes or so or 30 minutes or so would be group activities. We'd have like an entire like class debate within our group, you know what I mean? So if like, there would be like seven groups of like five to seven people, and we'll come up, we'll discuss amongst our group, and then we'll have a larger discussion like amongst the class and other groups, you know what I mean? We'd sort of like touch on the topic and stuff like that. So, I think that was extremely effective, because like everyone from FIU are from different various backgrounds and walks of life, you know? So, it was really interesting and informative to like have someone from India or someone from like Latin America, or someone from Africa just chime in on an issue and just have like these different like history. And like, because there's a reason why they've gotten to this way of thinking, you know what I mean? I don't know, it's just really informative to have that dialogue amongst people from different socioeconomic backgrounds, from different continents, and sort of like join it into one and showing like this global, this global perspective. And, I think my professor, she was an amazing professor, and she did an amazing job at doing that, because that's like her field of research, of language and anthropology and stuff like that. So, I think she did a very amazing job at connecting it to the global perspective, especially because she's from Turkey. So, she's also an international person.

I: Cool. Great. Another question: Well, you just kind of answered this actually. I'll ask you, and if you want to say anything else you can, but if you feel you've already answered it, that's so fine.

S: Perfect

I: Which kinds of learning experiences that you had in the course felt most valuable or enriching to you, that could be based on activities, particular assignments you had to do, or particular people, or any of the course materials?

S: Yeah, like I said working in groups, like honestly, teamwork. I think a lot of these companies and stuff like that-it's true-like with these huge tech companies there is a lot of controversy with inclusivity and like all of that stuff, but like it's really important that we have as many perspectives and backgrounds to the table because it's like, it just gives you a better understanding, because if not it's only half truths. You know what I mean? It's only half the truth.

I: Definitely, I do. Cool. Great. Alright, next question: Was there an online component to your course, either in the classroom (like while you're in class) or outside of class time, and if there wasn't, do you think it would have improved the course if there was some online components? And, if there was, how was it to navigate these elements-like was it easy, did you feel like it was useful, did you feel like it was difficult? Any kind of feedback on that.

S: Honestly, for the most part, I think it was very-I think it was simple, you know? It didn't really require that much time or it would be like a simple task, you know?

I: Like what, can you think of an example?

S: Off the top of my head-I don't know, maybe like we'll have like a discussion or something or a quiz on a discussion or something that we have to take at the beginning of class or at home. I forget the exact format of it, but like, it's just simple tasks. You know? It just made it more efficient, because sometimes you may not even like need to go to class, you know what I mean? If we're not having a quiz or anything. So, it just like streamlined things that otherwise would take a lot of processes and steps, to like sort of streamline the process in a sense.

I: Cool, no, that makes sense. Alright, awesome.

S: Let me give you another example.

I: Yeah, sure.

S: The TA actually, he never really like was involved in the course unless it was like a special project or something like that. Just like having that capability of like sending him a screenshot of like, "Hey man, I think you messed up on my grading, blah blah blah, this and this and that", and just like dealing with it, it just saved a lot of time, because if not, you have to like play tag with them, like find out when they have office hours and like, you know, keep following up with them. It's just very consistent to just have that component where you just sent it, like streamline it, basically.

I: Like everybody's on the same interface and so, it's just more immediate.

S: Exactly

I: Gotcha. Cool, okay. So this is a huge question which you've sort of answered already, but let's see if you want to answer it differently. What motivated you to take this course? Feel free to cite multiple reasons if you would like.

S: To be completely honest with you, like, there's only so many courses you can take as a communications major. School in my head wasn't all the way there, like yeah, I did well in school and everything, but I kind of already knew what I wanted to do with my life, so it was like sort of

like, I reached a point where I was like, like just get me the fuck out of here already, you know what I mean? I was just like on autopilot.

I: Yeah, especially in your last year, yeah.

S: Exactly. So, I'm sorry, repeat the question one more time.

I: What motivated you to take the course?

S: Okay, yes, so also an issue with FIU that they can improve on is that a lot of their courses fill up quick, and with my communications major, there is only so many options that I have, so a lot of the courses, like, I just chose, to be completely honest with you. A lot of the courses for my major require some global learning classes, so like, it's just like some of them just worked perfectly, I was kind of like required to take. Some were just like, whatever, you know? This class seems interesting. I ran out of options of the classes that I actually, that were number one, but this is next in topic, so I just took it, you know?

I: Yeah yeah yeah, totally. Cool. This is kind of a dumb question now, but do you feel like your course experience satisfied the logic that motivated you to enroll? So, did it deliver the experience that you were expecting or hoping for?

S: I mean, I guess in a sense. I mean, I never really expect anything from courses, to be completely honest with you. I just take it for what it is, and like if I gain something from it, okay, but if not, it's like fuck, okay, there's another \$2,000 loan that I have to pay back for nothing, you know what I mean?

I: Yeah

S: Because I literally had some courses, where like the teacher wouldn't even show up, and it was like, fuck, are you serious? I mean like, I'm happy, because it's like, okay, you just made my life easier

I: I have some time back, yes

S: Yeah, but, it's like also fuck dude, I'm actually taking out student loans to pay for this class, and you're fucking me over.

I: yeah yeah yeah, totally. Okay, two more questions, and then we're done.

S: Perfect

I: How do you understand your own situation in our globalized world and its' histories after taking the course? How would you describe your position in the world in terms of the global life and issues you've studied? So, basically how do you see yourself in a globalized world? Where are you situated in that whole situation?

S: Honestly, I think I have a competitive advantage to about a vast majority of not only the United States population, but like just the global population, because a lot of people aren't aware of like- you may not think anything of it, but like you're doing all of the traveling that you're doing, and like teaching, you literally have such a huge advantage than like...

I: Oh, I think that, trust me.

S: Oh, perfect, perfect.

I: I do

S: Because you'd be surprised how many people like take those kind of things for granted. Like, I mean, I took that for granted until I realized how many fucking people are unaware of other cultures, you know? And, I just think, me personally, I think I have a competitive advantage, and I don't mean that in a narcissistic way. I mean it in a genuine way, that like, like, I can humble myself and lead a more happier life because I have a global understanding of the world. Because, although like the world isn't all roses and stuff, you know? Like, it's really hard out here. Like, there's people dying every second, like, but it's a lot better than it was ten, twenty, thirty years ago, you know? Like, during our parent's time, it would have been unheard of for us first of all, having a video conversation like from I don't know thousands of miles away and then two, like a black guy and a white woman, like having like a friendly conversation about like real life issues, you know what I mean?

I: Totally

S: So, I think that it just makes me, like even though the world is like hard and everything like I said, it makes it easier to understand like understanding, like putting myself in other people's shoes. Like, understanding why, like even though it's fucked up, like of people, like the Isis and all of these kind of stuff, but I kind of understand why they're in that position, you know? Because you never know, like a lot of those things could be childhood traumas, and they're just looking for, they're just like fighting an insecurity, you know, in that way. So it's just like understanding that and understanding it in a communication's perspective, also on a human nature perspective, it just gives me an advantage of the world to lead a more happier and healthier life, because a lot of people are like stressed, a lot of people are anxiety, a lot of people don't, like I literally saw a girl freaking the fuck out about like when Trump first got elected. I'm not sure what side of the political spectrum you stand on, and not that. it really doesn't matter to me. I personally, I don't give a shit about any of that stuff because I know, like in reality, although it does affect us, it really doesn't. You know? In a sense. And, I think it just makes me be able to accept and be more tolerant of the world.

I: Yeah

S: In a nutshell.

I: Okay, cool. Interesting. Okay, the last question. Are you ready?

S: Yes ma'am. Let's do it.

I: I don't like either of the parties, by the way.

S: Yes, I'm a human party. Like, literally there is only so much politics can do for us. Think about it.

I: Yeah

S: Like, it's all about the power is in the people, as cliché as that may sound. Like, it's literally like local governments coming together and like making shit happen, like you know? We don't really, it's like people coming together to make change, not government. Because at the end of the day, Trump, like he's looking out for his own best interest and his stakeholders-the people who helped him get in office, you know? Like it's literally like a crew and, I mean, I don't really care, I'm not the judge to say whether he's right or wrong, but he's just fucking human you know? He's just looking out for himself and his best interest and his business endeavors. And, it's like we have to stick together as people to really make an impact on the world. And, I'm sorry to go off on that tangent.

I: No, you're not. That's how people are in Baltimore too, by the way. They're like..

S: Like what?

I: They're like-We just need to do things ourselves as a community and like take care of each other. Like, that's the vibe here. It's nice.

S: Dope. Awesome. I love hearing that because a lot of people like blame problems on like the government, or like, you know what I mean? And it's like, it's not necessarily the issue. It's like, if we all come together as a community, put \$10 together, and like you know, or gather whatever resources that we can to bring it together to make shit happen in a community, you know like feed the homeless, or whatever things you may do. You know what I mean?

I: Totally. Yep, yep. Definitely. Okay. Last question: Do you feel like your educational experience at your university, more generally, (so not just, you've kind of been talking this way actually), but not just this course, but overall, has been global or helped you to become more of a global thinker, citizen, or individual and how so?

S: Absolutely. In a sense, that like, like I said, I have like exposure to people from all over the world, you know? Like, it's not every single day where you, you're on a campus of, I mean the student body is like 50,000 roughly, right?

I: That's what I thought, yeah.

S: And, and, I would say, a great percentage, I'm not sure really the exact amount, but I would say a pretty substantial percentage of those people are international students. So, like just having the opportunity of just rubbing shoulders with those kind of people are amazing. Like, I'll give you an example, like, one of my best friends to this day is from India, you know? And, like so many things, like just so many life's, like I can go on a tangent on like serendipitous things and stuff like that, but it's just like, just having that exposure to people from different cultures, from different countries, it just gives you like, it just effects you in a subconscious level, because your sort of like, wow okay. You know what I mean? Like, Miami is a very..I'm not sure, have you ever been here before?

I: I was really young, so I don't, not recently, unfortunately. I was like 17.

S: Okay

I: Yeah

S: I mean for the most part, like people don't really talk to people much here in Miami. So, it's like that instance, that example I gave you earlier of that guy who was kind of turned off by the Filipino-a lot of people are not used to like, it's just a part of a culture of people saying hello and stuff like that. You know?

I: Yeah

S: But like in the Indian culture, and I'm sure you can relate to these, like they are so hospitable and like, they are so like loving and like, you know, joy and stuff like that and it's like, having exposure to that, it effects you on a subconscious level, because you're like wow man, these people are genuinely nice people. And like, they're doing it just like out of the genuine of their heart. They're not doing it for some ulterior motives, you know? It's like just not part of their human nature. And it just like, I think it has an effect on you, on a subconscious level, having exposure to different cultures and different things outside of your element and your box.

I: For sure. I agree. You're lucky that you have that there. I didn't get that where I went. Cool, well we're done. The last thing, is that, is there anything else that you want to add, of any kind?

S: No Ma'am. Thank you so much for your time. I hope it helped.

I: Thank you.

F2

I: Okay, so, just to read a couple of key things to explain the terms of your participation: Your participation in this study is voluntary. You can decide to stop at any time, even part way through the interview for whatever reason, or up until September 30, 2018. If you decide to stop participating, there'll be no consequences to you, and I will ask you, if you decide to stop, how you would like me to handle any data collected up to that point. That could include returning it to you, destroying it, or using the data collected up to that point. If in the interview you do not want to answer some of the questions, you don't have to. So you can opt out of that specific question, but you can still be in the study. And, alright, so here are the questions for your consent. Do you have any questions or would you like any additional details at this time?

S: No, thank you. I consent to this survey.

I: Okay, great. Do you agree that the interview can be audio recorded?

S: Yes.

I: Excellent. This question probably isn't going to be applicable, but I'll ask it anyway: Do you agree to have your responses used for future related projects?

S: Sure, absolutely, I agree.

I: And then, you already answered this, but do you agree to participate in this study, knowing that you can withdraw at any point, with no consequences to you?

S: Yes.

I: Great. And finally, before we begin, would you like to receive a summary of this study's results when it's done?

S: Yes, that would be cool.

I: Great, and what email or mailing address would you like to receive this summary?

S: My email is *****@fiu.edu

I: Fabulous, thank you. Okay, so, I will start the interview now.

So, just a heads up, you know, I think I mentioned this already, usually it takes 30 to 45 minutes, so I might ask you at some point if you are okay, if you want to take a break, and feel free to volunteer

Ph.D. Thesis - S. D'Adamo; McMaster University - English and Cultural Studies
that on your own if you need to. Alright, so the first question's kind of easy, it's just information about you. What is your age now?

S: 22.

I: Great, and what program of study are you pursuing, and what year of your degree are you in?

S: I am pursuing journalism, and a minor in art, and I am a senior.

I: Excellent. And what city and country are you from?

S: I am from Miami, Florida, the United States.

I: Awesome. Alright, so the next question starts to get into the kind of concepts of the course that you took. How would you define globalization and the concept of global citizenship?

S: How would I describe globalization... I'm guessing, the influence that... Wait, before I answer this, what are you exactly, what course are you referring to that I took?

I: Well that's actually up to you, so the course, there was a list of courses that were relevant to my study, and it was sent out to students who had taken those courses, and so I actually can't know which course exactly you took, so maybe, I mean do you want to tell me which global learning courses you took and then we can decide based on-

S: Oh, I took this class called "How we know what we know," I think that's one of them.

I: Okay

S: And I think that was the one for this year.

I: Okay, cool. That's an interesting one. We can talk about that one. So that's obviously focused on journalism and media, and kind of questions of knowledge and framing and stuff, so... Cool, okay, yeah, so, really again, there's no right answers to these questions, I'm just kind of curious to hear your reflections. So for this question about globalization and global citizenship, don't feel like you need to get some perfect answer across, just whatever comes to your head.

S: Globalization, I guess, is like the influence that the world has on itself, with different cultures and different people, and the way that we interact, and the way that it's different. And what was the question about global citizenship? What does it mean?

I: It just, yeah, how would you define it, in your own words?

S: Well I think we're all global citizens. I think it's more like a mentality that people take and act like. I think it's being aware that we- our culture's not the only one, that our country's not the only one, that we don't rule everything, that there's so much more in the world to learn, and not being ignorant about it.

I: So, that's interesting. So for you, just to clarify, it's sort of an openness to learning about, you know, differences around the world and different ways that people live and experience global life.

S: Yep.

I: Cool, okay. So this next one is kind of similar. I'm just sort of hoping to get you to free associate a little bit. So, what associations or images does the adjective "global" summon to mind?

S: Images?

I: Yeah, like does it- if someone just says "global," the word, what kind of- what do you think that could be referring to? Obviously it could be many things, but like, what kind of jumps into your head?

S: This may be funny, but I think about the planet itself, from like an outside perspective, like the NASA photo. I think about the little tribes in Africa that- or the ones in Brazil, that have never associated with human beings- I mean, not human beings but other modern, like us, people who have technology and stuff. People who just live in tribes and do their thing. I think about ourselves in the United States. I think about how it's so different from 90 miles down in Cuba. But yeah, I pretty much just think of a NASA photo.

I: Cool, so you get the most zoomed-out view on the Earth.

S: Yeah.

I: Cool, alright, thank you. So, this now is getting more specifically tied to this course. So, how has your understanding of these terms- globalization, global citizenship, the adjective global- changed or evolved because of taking this course? If it did evolve, how did it evolve, and if it didn't, why do you think that is the case?

S: It did, to the extent that what I already knew, we went into more research about it and we went to people who- figures that influenced thought processes or the philosophy in our class that we learned about. What makes us a global citizen, or how people influence the media. Let me think if I can get a more direct answer for you. Can you repeat the question?

I: Yeah, of course. So, has your understanding of these terms- globalization, global citizenship, and global- changed or evolved because of taking the course, and if it did, how did it evolve, and if it didn't, why do you think it didn't? So you're saying "yes, it did?"

S: It did, we just learned more details about learning about it. In my classes, what we really did was more of a- more like working on media, but we also took into consideration how everything's distributed among everyone. So I guess that's really what we focused on when it came to being a global citizen.

I: So you're saying, all the things that you had already studied about journalism and media, and communication in general, that you now basically just shifted that knowledge into a global framework.

S: Yes.

I: Okay, cool, thank you. Okay, so let's talk about some of the content that you studied in the course. Can you tell me about a text or a concept that you encountered in the course that made a strong impression on you? Any strong impression. And why do you think that experience matters to your understanding of the global?

S: One second, let me Google this guy's name.

I: Thanks.

S: So, we studied "the medium is the message" by Marshall McLuhan.

I: Yeah.

S: It was one of the first things that we learned in the course and it's one of those things that you already knew about, but I guess you didn't- you know, you know about it but you didn't really know until you read this passage and then you really realize that this is true- the way that we swallow everything that's given to us through television and the internet, and in reality it's not really what we're looking at, it's how we're doing it.

I: Did you feel like that gave you any specific insights about the global framework part of what you were learning?

S: I guess, no not really, but I guess that if you wanted to put that in a global perspective it wouldn't be hard because it could apply to anyone that has mass media.

I: For sure, yeah. Okay, cool. Was there- next question is, was there a text or concept that you found particularly difficult or surprising, and what did you take away from this new difficult or surprising knowledge about global life or issues?

S: Okay. Repeat the question one more time?

I: Of course, so, I said was there a text or concept that you studied that you found particularly difficult or surprising? What did you take away from this new difficult or surprising knowledge about global life or issues?

S: Okay. So, I'm reading my syllabus for this class, and marriage is a topic, and I'm gonna explain to you why it's surprising to me.

I: Yeah, great.

S: The interrelationship between information systems, politics, and government control of information as it relates to global good. So, in this topic, we went into details about media censorship of China, and we went into detail about Cuba now and how they don't have internet, and to me it was just surprising to find out that in China, there are people who get paid money to be a part of- to be participants of the internet- to pursue people, and convince them that Communism is okay, to continue the lives that they have and that it's okay. It's just pretty much convincing people, that there's jobs for this in China, and that their internet's kind of limited. That was just really surprising. I didn't think China would go to that extent, and to me it was just such a big deal globally because China is such a huge country that has so much power. And it's important for them to control their society through the internet because it's not- they think they wouldn't have control through the government politics. So, I didn't think it would connect back to- I don't know, it wouldn't be a dictator. Yeah, it goes back to him.

I: Yeah, so are you kind of saying what that made you- I mean, the fact that that was happening at all, obviously is part of what surprised you.

S: Yeah, the control of information, to me, was just surprising.

I: Is that- do you think part of the reason that's surprising is that from your kind of experience and your position in the world, you associate information technology and the internet with kind of a free flow of global information, but you have this-

S: Yeah, absolutely.

I: So you have this example of a major power that's creating a limited vision of what "global" means?

S: Yeah, whether I'm here or in Panama or in Europe, I could still go on the internet and access whatever I want to on the Google, or on the app store, but then you go to China and there's- your app store is different. There are things that you can't download because their restrictions are different. So you know, it's such a big deal for the entire world to have this free information.

I: Okay, great, thank you. Okay, so this next question is kind of an opportunity for you to be critical of the syllabus if you would like to be. So, were there any global concepts or texts in the course that you did not find useful? Why do you think you came to this conclusion?

S: Okay. Yeah, there was. I guess at the end, after spring break, we started to learn about this thing called "identity correction" and it's about people who- it's called "The Yes Men Fix the World" and people who hoax other people to get things done, like they pretend they're running for an election but they're not, and it's just messed up people and their politics that's going on, and I didn't think it was useful. I'm sure it is, but to me, personally, I was just- I could be learning about something else.

I: Okay, so it sounds like, I don't know, maybe it was getting into political campaigns and how the manipulate-

S: Yeah, it has to do a lot with manipulation. And I know it was for the good because in the end these people weren't- what we learned, from the perspective that we learned, the Yes Men weren't manipulating for bad. They were manipulating for a good purpose, but to me, I wasn't really interested in that.

I: Okay, cool, thank you. Next question is, is there anything that you did not study in the course that you wish had been on the syllabus? This could be a particular text, a concept, a topic, or a theme; and if there is something, why do you think this would be important to add to a global studies course like this one?

S: I don't think that there's anything that I can imagine to add to this course because it's so different. I think that my professors really know what they're doing because this class is studying how we know what we know, and you really need to know what we know. You have to have studied the sources and, I guess, the way media works and, as a student, I really don't have knowledge on that, so I wouldn't even know where to start. I think they did a really great job. We started the course watching an anime, which was very odd, and I really didn't know why we were watching the anime until the end and I answered the questions to the assignment. I just really trust that my professors know what they're doing because this is a very different course. I don't think I've taken any other class like this.

I: Cool. Okay, well, actually I'm glad that you said that because the next questions are all about what the course was like, so maybe you can tell me more about that. So, the next question is: describe what your classroom time was like. For example, was it primarily lecture based? Were there other kinds of activities mixed into, say, a lecture or the class period? Was it primarily discussion based?

Did it vary throughout the term? Did you have a discussion section run by a TA, et cetera? So just kind of, what was it like?

S: So, this class was taken online and it was through Canvas and through a WordPress blog. The Canvas is where we took exams once a week and these exams were based off New York Times articles that we would read. In the beginning of the week, we would have- every single day we would have to read the New York Times front page and at the end of the week, on Sundays, we had to take a ten-question exam that had to do with those articles. So, the way the syllabus is set up is that they give us a topic, the details, which had everything that we had to read. It could be up to five articles, including the New York Times. And then, what else... Our lecture, which was video-based, found on the WordPress, and then what we would have to study, apart from everything that we read. And then it would tell us the assignment. So, the way that I would do it, I would dedicate four hours a week, maybe, to the test, because I would sit down on my laptop and I would actually like to read and highlight everything that I did. We would have group chats, right, because we did team assignments, we did three, and when we would submit our assignments it was through a WordPress. Through WordPress we really learned how to write blogs, that was kind of the whole class.

I: Okay, so it sounds like the group chat was the main interactive component? Is that true?

S: Yeah, so we didn't have any discussions. We didn't grade each other's work or anything. The most interaction we had with each other was through our group chats because we had to do team assignments.

I: Gotcha. Great, okay, thank you. What kinds of learning experiences that you had in the course felt most valuable or enriching to you? It could be particular activities, assessments or individual people, as well as any of the course materials that you were assigned.

S: Two things. The reading that they gave us, a lot of the times they were really good readings. And then, working on team assignments, I felt very lucky that I got a really good team. It was four or five of us that really knew what we were doing creatively, writing, creating stories. It was just nice to work with people who weren't lazy or didn't want to do this, didn't see it as a chore. We all wanted to work on it together, and then seeing our results together was really awesome.

I: Cool, great, thank you. So this next question, you've answered some of it already but maybe you can get into it a little more. So, was there an online component to your course? Obviously yes, there was. Since there was, how would you describe your experience of these digital learning elements? Were they easy to navigate and interact with? Do you feel like it was useful that the course took place online or difficult? Basically just any kind of thoughts about the experience of having the course online.

S: I think it was the best online course that I've taken, compared to using Blackboard, and the fact that it had its own WordPress. So, the WordPress was really easy to use. It had little tabs on the top, and everything was easy to find. At first you're a little confused because it's a lot of information, but this class was a lot of information. So, you just had to be aware, you had to learn it the first couple of days, and then you got the hang of it, and sometimes you would get confused because you had to do your tests on Canvas and submit it on WordPress, so then you get to Canvas and you're like "oh, shit, this isn't where I'm supposed to be." But it wasn't hard. Canvas is easy to use, to see your grades. Our WordPress, once we submitted our blogs and it was graded, you would go back to your blog post and then you would see in bold were the teacher's comments, and on the bottom they would also comment on your- they would give you feedback. So, it was easy to find.

I: Was that all public, the feedback on your blog posts?

S: Okay, so yeah, that's something that I don't agree with, is that if you Google my name, and then you write "how we know what we know" you're going to find all my assignments on the WordPress.

I: Yeah, that's an interesting choice. So, what would you say is the difference between Blackboard and Canvas? Or Blackboard and having these two different- having Canvas and WordPress? Does WordPress feel more accessible than Blackboard, or?

S: So, Blackboard is outdated. The graphics, the way that it's just set up, and it's kind of confusing, even though everything is set out to be able to be found easily, it's really confusing. Just because it's outdated, it looks like 2003, and then, I really really dislike those discussions where your teacher's like "Make a post and then comment under the other students' things." They suck because we all know we're half-assing it, right? And then I hate when I have to comment on someone's work and I know they're half-assing their work and I don't know how to write in a comment like "Yo, I'm catching you on your B.S. You did not even care about this."

I: That's interesting, so do you feel like that was different, doing the blog posts?

S: Yeah, I felt like the blog post was different because I had to work with these people and we didn't just work once together, we worked three different times, so by the third time we already knew who was doing what. We already knew our strengths and our weaknesses and it was different working several times than one time, or writing those posts to each other randomly. You know? There was no sense of rapport with each other.

I: Totally. So, you were in a team. Was it the same team throughout the whole term or did you have different teams?

S: Yes.

I: Same team. Okay, so basically it just gave you more familiarity with some of your classmates online.

S: Yeah. I feel like WordPress has more quality, and the teacher can really customize it, like she can put photos or choose what way the WordPress is going to be. So you get to know, like even though we're online I kind of want to know who my teacher is.

I: Definitely. And so Canvas was different from Blackboard. Canvas was just for essentially test taking.

S: Yes, and checking your grades.

I: Okay, cool. Thank you. That's all really helpful to hear. Okay, do you have anything else on the online components or are you happy to move on?

S: I'm happy to move on.

I: Cool, okay. So we just have four questions left. Are you feeling okay? Do you need a break?

S: Yes, are you?

I: I'm good, thank you. Okay. So the next question is, what motivated you to take this course? Feel free to cite multiple reasons, if you have multiple reasons.

S: So last year I went to my advisor and my track sheet for journalism had changed last fall. So, my advisor advised me to take this new class instead of taking an old mass media class, and I'm not sure why she pushed it on me but I took it, and this semester when I went to go see her I thanked her for it. I don't know why she made me take this class but it was just- she even made sure that we made this little contract that we substituted an old class for the new one, and maybe she just wanted kids to try out this class. I was a guinea pig, and I'm okay with it.

I: That's cool. Well it's team-taught too, isn't it? Doesn't it have multiple professors?

S: Yes, it has multiple professors, several coaches, and when you go to the lectures, which are 45-minute videos depending on your class, I'm pretty sure those professors aren't really the ones that are teaching us. So that, I can say, was a little confusing. I don't know- I don't really know who was my professor. I just know that I had one writing coach.

I: Right, okay. That's interesting. That writing coach person, were you able to just sort of message them if you ever needed help?

S: Uh huh. We also had set up once to meet through the semester. I fell asleep during the meeting, but we did email each other to meet, which I'm pretty sure she did with everyone. There was a two-week span after spring break where she was like "Everyone is allowed to e-mail me and make an appointment so we can work on your writing."

I: Cool. That's great. Okay, thank you. So, you just kind of trusted your recommendation from your advisor and it worked out.

S: Yeah, even though I study journalism, before when I did my associate's I took a lot of philosophy classes and I've taken a lot of political theory classes at FIU, so I like this kind of thinking, of questioning things.

I: Right, cool. Okay, great. So, you maybe answered this already, but the next question is, did your course experience satisfy this logic that motivated you to enroll? In other words, did it deliver the experience you were expecting or hoping for?

S: Yes.

I: Great. Okay, next question. These are a little more zoomed out, kind of to get you to reflect on your education more broadly, or yourself in the world more broadly. So, how do you understand your own situation in our globalized world and its histories after taking the course? How would you describe your position in the world, in terms of the global life and issues you've studied?

S: I think to me it's a very big deal that I am a child of- my parents are immigrants from a different country. It's something that's very important to my identity and I think it gives me an advantage in this world because I don't- I live like an American but I don't necessarily think like one because I'm Cuban. So I think it just- this just made me- pushed me more forward towards being a journalist, being global, understanding different perspectives, not being stuck in that one mindset that I think a lot of us are stuck in. Like when you watch CNN, you sometimes look at these people and you wonder, have they ever seen any other part of the world?

I: Definitely. Cool, okay great. And lastly, last question. Do you feel like your educational experience at your university more generally has been global, or helped you to become more of a global thinker, citizen, or individual, and how so?

S: Absolutely. FIU, sometimes I'm like "Dude, FIU sucks." Sorry. But then other times- and I think it's because it's in Miami- it's one of those things that, if I leave Miami I know I'm going to be prepared because, I know this sounds weird but we have a savage attitude being raised here.

I: What do you mean, "savage?"

S: This is a melting pot, you know? I think the things you experience in this city, you don't experience in a lot of other places. Even if you are American, you know what it's kind of like to be Latino. Skills- I can work on my writing anywhere in the world. I can work on my Photoshop skills anywhere in the world, my production skills anywhere in the world, but my attitude, which I think is what's really important, FIU is really helping me work on my character. I think it's helping me be a global citizen. And I think they push that, with the Global Medallion program, they have so many other programs, they want to just keep pushing you forward. They have all these classes for different things. I don't really know because I do art, so I stay in that part, but I know the people who study history and stuff, they push you. Oh, and they also have so much studying abroad. You see it everywhere. To them it's such a big deal. I know that's a big deal at FIU.

I: So, if you don't mind me asking you a follow-up question- It sounds like you're saying two things and one is that there was something already embedded in being from Miami and having kind of grown up there which gave you maybe something closer to a global perspective. Maybe it wasn't exactly global but definitely international, multinational, because of the way that Miami is and all the different populations that live there together. So, do you feel like FIU has just expanded that and added to it?

S: Yes. Even if I didn't grow up in Miami, I can tell from people who come from other parts of- people who come from Alabama and end up studying here, I can tell that the Miami root starts to sink in and FIU is that push because we're a huge university in the middle of Miami. It's like, FIU is as important as a hospital, you know? A hospital reflects on a community and so does a university.

I: Cool, thank you so much. That was the last question, so the last thing is, do you want to say anything else? Do you want to return to any questions from before or do you just want to add anything on your own?

S: No, I think I expressed myself on all my opinions.

I: Okay cool, I'm going to stop the recording.

F3

I: So, I'm just going to read you a couple of things to outline the terms of your participation. The first, your participation in this study is voluntary. You can decide to stop at any time, even partway

Ph.D. Thesis - S. D'Adamo; McMaster University - English and Cultural Studies
through the interview for whatever reason or up until September 30th, 2018.

S: Alright.

I: If you decide to stop participating there will be no consequences to you.

S: Alright. If you do decide to stop, I'll ask you how you want me to handle any data collected up to that point.

S: Okay.

I: This could include returning it to you, destroying it, or using the data collected up to that point.

S: Alright.

I: If you do not want to answer some of the questions in the interview, you do not have to, but you can still be in the study so you can opt out of a specific question or two. Um, and, I think that's it in terms of the terms. So now onto the consent questions.

S: Okay.

I: At this point, do you have any questions or would you like any additional details?

S: No.

I: Do you agree that the interview can be audio recorded?

S: Yes.

I: Great, thank you. And this is not likely to be relevant but it's still a question. Do you agree to have your responses used for future related projects?

S: Yes.

I: Thank you. And finally, do you agree to participate in this study, knowing that you can withdraw at any point with no consequences to you?

S: Yes.

I: Great. And the last thing is, um, when ... would you like to receive a summary of the study's results when they're finished.

S: Yes, please.

I: Great. And do you want me to just use the email address that we've been corresponding on?

S: Yes.

I: Okay, excellent. Thank you. Okay, so, you've seen the questions in advance. Um, it's usually taken between 30-45 minutes to get through all of them. So if you want to take a break at any point we can

do that. So I might check in with you to see if you need a break at some point. Um, and like I said, feel free to opt out of a specific question if you don't want to answer it.

S: Okay.

I: Alright, so the first question is pretty straightforward. It's information about you. What is your age now?

S: Um, 19.

I: Thank you. And what program of study are you pursuing and what year of your degree are you in?

S: Um, do you need to know my bachelors or do you need to know my major?

I: Oh, your major is fine.

S: So I'm taking journalism and sociology. So I'm double majoring. But I'm also going to graduate with an honors college.

I: Gotcha. Okay, cool. And what year of your degree are you in now?

S: I'm finishing my second year.

I: Excellent. And last one, what city and country are you from?

S: Um, I was born in Aurora, which is close to Denver, Colorado. But I moved to Hallandale Beach, Florida. So basically I grew up in Miami ever since I was 5. So, I grew up in Miami.

I: Cool. Okay, thank you. Alright, so, these next couple questions are kind of, um, big questions, just to get you to speak to whatever you think you understand. So there's no, like, pressure to have a perfect answer.

S: Mhmm.

I: So the next one is: how would you define globalization and the concept of global citizenship?

S: Um, so, based off of recent sociology courses I took, not just the Intro to Sociology, I think globalization is the advance and the spread of new technology being placed around the world. But I also think that there are many, many parts of the world that are not ... that are not able to get equal access to these technologies and the same benefits that the rest of the world is getting at improving its technology, improving its economic, political, or social systems. So, globalization in a sense, I think, is also a very big social issue. And, like anything, it has its pros and cons. But I think that ... I don't think that people should always see that it's a thing where "Oh yeah, well everyone is getting more internet so, something" But yeah, that's also ... that's also not really a good thing because not everyone is able to benefit off of it.

I: Mhmm.

S: So, that's how I feel about it.

I: Great. The second part of that question is, maybe, connected to what you just said. But, um, how would you define the concept of global citizenship?

S: Um, so, I think that if you're a responsible global citizen, you are aware of the issues around the world, not just the issues that are present in Western countries, like in Canada, America, and Western Europe. I think it's also very important to understand the events that are occurring within Asia, within Africa, within Latin America. So, a global citizen is not one that's just enjoying, just, all the technology that's being placed, that's being given to us. They're also aware that other citizens of the world should have the right to have access to this information and this technology.

I: Mmm. So, so it sounds like, um, you strongly understand global citizenship as a kind of awareness about the world. Are you also saying that it's, that there's a kind of advocacy on behalf of those other places too?

S: I think it's, yeah. I do think that there's an advocacy for because, if you ... I feel like people that have my kind of point of view, they kind of understand that globalization may seem like a really great thing, but it's also a large part in why there's so many issues in the world. There are so many identity crises and ... um, it's just, it also fuels a lot of the reasons why we continue to have so many issues because while globalization, it may seem like a good thing for technology, it also allows, it also makes it easier for Western countries to impose their version of capitalism onto other countries that may not want that put on them because it just hasn't worked for them.

I: Mhmm.

S: So, it is a form of rebellion against the popular system, I believe.

I: Mhmm.

S: So, yeah.

I: Great. Thank you. Um, so the next question is really trying to get you to free associate a little bit. Um, so whatever comes to mind. How would you, I'm sorry. What associations or images does the adjective "global" summon to mind?

S: Um, ... Like an image of a person who sees it well?

I: Um, however you want to answer, to be honest. So, if I ... you know, you could imagine that we're in the classroom and that I'm writing the word "global" on the board. And I'm like, "Call out whatever that makes you think of." So it could be through a person's experience or could be anything, really.

S: Uh huh. Um, I think it's, it's experience because if you have traveled the world and if you understand how people live and how other people see the world, I think that adds more to the definition. Because everyone can have their own, own vision, their own belief on what they think "global" is, but I think the most, the most broad way to see it is if you understand how other people see it.

I: Mhmm.

S: So a large goal of mine is to be able to travel to understand how people see the world to underst--.

And that's part of why I'm majoring in sociology. That's exactly what it's all about, to understand how people see the world, to understand how people fit in this global system. Um, and yeah. So, "global" as a world, to me, means experience, understanding, knowledge of others.

I: Mhmm. So, not just experience, not just your own experience, but kind of a diversity of experiences, or?

S: Yeah, it's more coming out of yourself. Because if you think of global, how it is that you can only think of yourself? It literally means the globe, the world, you know? [laughter]

I: [laughter] Yeah, yeah. So true. Cool, thank you so much. So the next question, uh, kind of is to try and place all those things you just said in context with your course. So, has your understanding of these terms "globalization," "global citizenship," or "global" changed or evolved because of taking this course? If yes, how so? If not, why do you think that is the case?

S: Um, Intro to Sociology was one of my core requirements to take. I do not remember why I took it, I just thought it was interesting based off of a Google search of what sociology is 'cause honestly I had no idea what it was. And so, I had an amazing professor and just from this core requirement I decided to change my major from biology to sociology.

I: Wow.

S: Yeah. And with the addition of journalism. So it was in this course that, it, like, really introduced me to what I really believed and what I really ... It really fit how I saw the world, so ... It was ... It just, it kind of just added to what I wanted to know more about. I wanted to be more of, like, say, a "global citizen" in understanding how the world works because the Intro to Sociology course, it really brought about understanding many sides of the world in a very broad sense because it's an intro course because it talks about religion, it talks about social issues, it talks about basically everything and it was, I had an amazing professor so it was, she really put it all really into this amazing space for us. Like, I can tap into anything and still understand a lot because it made everything connected. That's what I really loved about the course. It was very connected to everything.

I: So it sounds like you think that, um, definitely that maybe taking the course broadened your thinking or deepened your thinking, or also maybe gave you some new language to understand things you already were thinking.

S: Definitely. It made things easier to understand because, it just, yeah, you just learn about everything else. And then, you're pinpointing on things that you didn't really know about and you're starting to know more about them. Yeah, it was a really good course.

I: Great. So you're making connections, but you're also building more context for your thoughts.

S: Definitely.

I: Awesome. Okay, great. So, the next set of questions gets into some more detail about the course content. So, let's talk about some of the content you studied in the course. Can you tell me about a text or a concept you encountered in the course that made a strong impression on you. Why do you think that experience matters to your understanding of the "global."

S: Um, so, I took the course last spring so ...

I: It's been a year.

S: It's been a year, but it made a biggest impact so that's why we're talking about it. One of the key things that I remember from that class was obviously the biggest project. So, we... my group and I, we did a presentation on the women's movement in the 60s. And, ... No, it was the women's movement in the 20s, right before they started to get, right before they started to get the right to vote. And when I was looking, when I was doing research on that, I realized that the movement was actually so much larger than I was taught it to be because it was one of the very first major movements that happened within, uh, the Western world and I was just shocked because no one ever taught me about that. Like, in high school or in middle school or whatever, we always learned about wars, we always learned about, yeah, like, really big movements that were always really focused on the Western world, very focused on masculine perceptions of changing the world. And this movement was actually very huge and it tapped into so many issues that need to be fixed, that still need to be fixed. And it just added to this understanding of the economic status of how freedom for women would actually benefit the world. And it just really shocked me because it was then that I started asking why is this not being taught in public education where you are free to learn and you're not learning everything that you should know. Because to me, that seemed extremely important. People should understand this. And I thought that if people understood that, there would be a lot more issues. You know, people would have stronger values and positive things.

I: Mhmm. So, do you feel like the, um, the, that that kind of research project was even more powerful for you because you discovered that it was such an international movement.

S: Definitely. Um, I mean, to be honest, I was the only woman in the group that I was working with.

I: Oh, wow.

S: And it just made me, actually ... It was me, one other girl, and three guys. And, it just made me really happy to see that other, obviously other guys, would be very passionate about it as well. And it was actually me that chose the topic of the women's movement. I said, "let's look into this because we don't really know a lot about it. I know that it's a really big movement. Let's see how impactful it is."

I: Great.

S: Yeah, so it opened all of our eyes.

I: That's great. Thank you. Um, the next question is: was there text or a concept in the course that you found particularly difficult or surprising? What did you take away from this new difficult or surprising knowledge about global life or issues?

S: Mmm... Everything that our professor gave to us to read, it wasn't really that complicated but, like, complicated to read. But it was very impactful in the information, the information that she gave to us was always very impactful. She gave us articles on the ... on how Black Americans are, are highly incar-- is that the correct word? Incarcerated, like put into jail?

I: Yes, you got it.

S: Yeah, so she gave us an article for data off of that and even though I knew that there's a higher ...

Ph.D. Thesis - S. D'Adamo; McMaster University - English and Cultural Studies
as a minority I can't think of it.

I: You're fine, you're doing great.

S: Yeah, my brain [inaudible/laughter]. Yeah, so, it's just that the articles that she gave to us it was very eye-opening, very impactful. It came to show that there's a higher chance for you to go to jail if you're Black than if you're white. It's not even that there's a higher change. It's ridiculously high. So that was one of the biggest articles that just blew my mind because it was just, the ratio was so off and it was so unfair and it was ridiculous, you know?

I: Absolutely.

S: Yeah.

I: Thank you. So this next question is sort of an opportunity for you to be critical of this course if you want.

S: Mhmm.

I: Were there any global concepts or texts in the course that you did not find useful? Why did you think you came to this conclusion?

S: Um, to be honest, I think that everything in the course was very useful [laughs] obviously because as a sociology major. But there were some people in the class that just, I don't know, they didn't take it to their liking as much. And obviously you shouldn't enjoy everything that should be put in front of you. But as a student, but as a very passionate student, I really love what I learn and I really love what I do. It's just, it's really frustrating to see how we had this professor who was giving out all of this knowledge and she was doing it, I think, in the best way possible. It was very interactive, it was not very lecture-based, and even if it was lecture-based, it was very, very interesting. And I don't know if these were younger kids or anything but they just, I don't know, like ... If you don't give respect to important information, to interactive, amazing material, like, how do you see yourself growing as a person? Because I honestly feel like I grew so much out of this experience, you know? I mean, I changed my major because of it. You know, I just... Like, I don't know, like, ... For me, I feel like a lot of the reason why public education in America is not great is because people don't value teachers, they don't value professors, like as, like as much as other countries.

I: Mhmm. Yeah.

S: Yeah, that's the only complain I have. Why do other kids not value education as strongly as other countries?

I: Yeah, that's, that's something I'm very interested in as a teacher obviously [laughs]. And it's always a question of how do you teach curiosity. It's kind of impossible to teach if someone doesn't have it already.

S: Definitely.

I: But it is a really interesting problem.

S: Yeah, I feel like that's also trained right from the beginning of when we start school.

I: Totally. For sure. Great, thank you for that. Um, next question is: Is there anything you did not study in the course that you wish had been on the syllabus? This could be a particular text, a concept, a topic, or a theme. If so, why would you think this would be important to add to a Global Studies course like this one?

S: I mean, when I first came into the course I was very open-minded, very wide-eyed into what I was going to learn. And I honestly feel like everything was well-covered because we covered religion, we covered economic systems, political systems. We learned about some of the largest and most impactful countries in the world that made a very large impact on global systems. Um, that's what I really, really loved about the course because it wasn't just focused, it wasn't just a case study of anything. It was very broad, it was very well-covered. It wasn't just focused on Western systems, which is what I had always been taught going to an American school. We talked a lot about India, we talked a lot about China, and that was interesting because it was very open, it was very ... just, broad. It was just very nice to look into other sides of the world. I feel like with it, it could have made anyone really interested in a specific point and help fill in and focus more on that. And, yeah. I was very ... very open to it. And I was really happy that it was very broad and everything was pretty much, everything was pretty much covered.

I: Cool. Alright, thank you. So you started to touch on this next question a little bit. So basically I'm curious about what your experience of being in class was like. Describe what your classroom time was like. For example, was it primarily lecture based, were there other kinds of activities mixed into the class period, was it primarily discussion based, did it vary throughout the semester, did you have a discussion section run by a TA, etc.?

S: It was honestly one of my most, top, favorite classes because it was very unique, but it was still very organized. The professor was extremely professional. She always had set syllabus, she always [inaudible] she had to talk about. So there was never any confusion on when class was, or when an assignment was due, or when a class time was. It was very, very organized.

I: Mhmm.

S: However, when we were within the classroom, she would never pull up a PowerPoint. She would speak from her own knowledge. She had a PhD and she was passionate about what she was talking about. And I remember on the very first day of class, and I think, no, it was throughout the entire year that she always had some kind of music playing in the background that helped her. She was also a preacher at a church so she had experience with public speaking. She was experienced at talking to people and impacting them and not just information-giving ways, but mental ways, but also in a very spiritual way. On the very first day of class, she had, she had an R&B beat going in the background and I think it was also jazz. And when she first introduced herself she was talking like she was in, like, talking within a song. It was amazing. Like, like, I felt like I was watching a performance on sociology. It was insane.

I: That's so cool.

S: And then, and, like, I don't know, like, maybe because I grew up with a very large appreciation for the arts, I saw this and was mind-blown. But there were, like, kids in the class like "She's weird, what is she doing" and I was just so angry because, like, kids in my generation are always saying, "Oh, the American education system sucks. It sucks. We need something better." And you have something that's better right in front of you, something that's different that's right in front of you and you're

judging it. And I was just like, you're such hypocrites. This is what you wanted and you're not even accepting. You don't even see it.

I: Like they have to be too cool for it or whatever.

S: [Laughs] And it was cool. It's just, it's different.

I: Yeah.

S: She's a very different professor. But she's still professional about it, she's still amazing about it. And, so, the rest, the rest of the year she always had music playing in the background. Sometimes it was a little off, it kinda distracted you, but not in that strong of a way. She always kept it low. It was always for her own experience to give a better environment to teach because she loved to teach. So, she would, she would give us like a study guide that would kinda give her a guide to what she would talk about. She would look at it and we would follow along and fill in notes as she talked. And so that's how she would ... She would walk around the room and she would give her lecture. So it was always her own information and she always spoke it in a very understandable way and it was more of her talking and giving us information than a discussion.

I: Gotcha.

S: But I still liked it either way.

I: But would people ask questions or chime in while she was talking?

S: Yeah, it wasn't, she would be more focused on her lecture than asking questions. Asking question she would encourage people to come after class. If it was something that people, like she paused and she would wait for some questions, it would be like this. But there weren't a lot of times like that. Usually if you were to ask a question she would honestly get a little annoyed because it would throw her off her beat. Because she had a set plan of what she wanted to talk about. And so she didn't want to fall off that plan, you know?

I: Hmm. So.

S: I feel like, some students took advantage of that and they asked really ridiculous questions. And because of that, at some points she got really frustrated. I honestly believe that a lot of what she talked about, it really filled up anything that you would have to say because it's an intro course, like, how would you know any more information than what you had before.

I: Right. So it sounds like it was mainly a lecture course but because she wasn't, like, using a PowerPoint,

S: Traditional.

I: Yeah, she was kind of more among the students and more interactive in a way.

S: Definitely, definitely. She walked among us, she walked around us to not make it look like she was just in one place.

I: Right, and ignoring the audience and whatever. Yeah.

S: Yeah, yeah.

I: Was it a large group, the class?

S: Um, I would say it was medium. There was around 30 people in the class.

I: Okay, so fairly intimate.

S: That was kind of on normal lecture days. But on test days it fills up to like 60.

I: [Laughter] Did you have any discussion sections, like with a TA or something?

S: No, just her and us. On some days, actually, on Fridays she would really love to give us, like, kind of like a day off. We'd have, like a, session within class, but she would also really like to take the classroom outside because she believed that learning within the classroom was important but it's also very important learning outside the classroom.

I: Absolutely.

S: So there would be some days when we would actually walk around the bay. We took the class at BBC, so we would just walk around the bay and we were just enjoying ourselves. And Friday was kind of like an extra credit kind of day. It was very free. I don't know, it was a very beautiful experience being in the class because it was just, it really fit into what can draw into what students way. And I just really fully experienced everything that she offered us and I loved it.

I: That's great. Thank you. Okay, so maybe you've answered this already, but the next question is: What kinds of learning experiences that you had in the course felt most valuable or enriching to you? Your answer can focus on particular activities, assessments, or persons, as well as your engagements with any of the assigned course materials. So, you mentioned your research project already. Sounded like it was really meaningful. Um, and then also obviously her approach to the course itself. But if there's anything else you want to add.

S: The total experience was honestly, I think, the most impactful because when I look back on it, it was just, like, to me I would say she's a magical person because she, like, it's everything I ever wanted as a professor, as a teacher, and it happened for me. And I don't know. I'm so grateful because I'm going to be taking her other class this next semester, so I'm really excited to see her again. But it was just the entire experience was just so enriching, so valuable, because I learned so much. I was so passionate, like I became so passionate about sociology afterwards because she gave us an experience that was enjoyable yet still enriching, you know? She was a very positive person, yet she knew how to talk about deep, important issues in a way that still made an impact on you.

I: Right, right.

S: That, yeah, very serious issues.

I: Right.

S: Everything was just very balanced. She was a very balanced person, I believe. And it was enriching. I was really happy to take the course.

I: Okay, great. Thank you. So we have 5 more questions. Are you doing okay?

S: My voice is kind of falling off, but I'm okay.

I: No you're fine. I think some of these might be shorter.

S: Okay.

I: You've actually answered one of them already completely. Okay, so, next question is, Was there an online component to your course, either within your classroom time or within your assignments and activities? If not, do you think engaging online could have improved your course experience and why? If so, how would you describe your experience of any digital learning elements? For example, were they easy to navigate? Interact with? Do you feel like they added a useful or difficult aspect to the learning experience?

S: Um, no, there wasn't anything that she really gave that was online besides like turning in assignments and doing research. Um, she really focused on just in-class education and I think that's so-- And that's what I really liked about it. Like, I understand the benefits of online learning. There's some cases where it's really useful, like in a language class. But no, there was nothing online because she really wanted the focus to be on in-classroom learning with other students and with the professor. So, yeah, there was nothing really online. And honestly I don't think you could have made the course any better if it was online.

I: Yeah, cool. So there was maybe, there was Blackboard or something to submit things.

S: Yeah, she used that to put all the information we needed on there. Like, um, like study guides she would put on there.

I: Mhmm.

S: Actually, no. She would actually email us a lot of those. So, like, the basic information of how to reach her and everything was on Blackboard, but she was, and yeah. And study guides and whatever. But she would also email us on some information. So we didn't, we just used that to, like, gain content from the course.

I: Gotcha.

S: The information that was really required for the course. But using that, like, as one of the main forces, definitely not.

I: Right, regularly.

S: It was always very in classroom.

I: Okay, got it. Thanks. So the next question, this is the one that you already answered: What motivated you to take this course? So you said that, you know, you didn't really know why but you Googled sociology and were like "Sure I'll try it."

S: Yeah.

I: So we can skip that one if you feel like you don't have anything to add. Um,

S: Uh.

I: Next question.

S: Uh, go ahead.

I: No, you can go. If you have something to say, go ahead.

S: I mean, I don't know. I'm just like talking about myself. It's okay. You can ask.

I: [Laughs] Well that's the point, don't worry. The next question is, uh, did your course experience satisfy the logic that motivated you to enroll. In other words, did it deliver the experience that you were expecting or hoping for. So you've already sort of answered that too.

S: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that question please?

I: Sure. Did your course experience satisfy the logic that motivated you to enroll? In other words, did it deliver the experience you were expecting or hoping for?

S: Oh, most definitely.

I: It exceeded, it sounds like. Exceeded your expectations.

S: Yeah, it was just, like, I was kind of worried to be honest because I understood that because she was an amazing professor in sociology I feel like there was a very large bias on sociology as, like, as my field of study. Because obviously if you have an amazing professor or teacher or anything, you're going to learn more about that subject but I was worried that other professors are not as impactful as her, you know? But thankfully, so far I've had really, like, really good professors in sociology so it made me realize that it wasn't just her that I'm really interested in, it was also sociology in general. But definitely she, like, really set down the point that, yeah, it wasn't just her as an amazing professor but sociology is still very interesting.

I: Yeah, that's great. That's great.

S: Yeah, I'm pretty happy with it.

I: Excellent. Alright, last two questions. Um, these are kind of broader, um, more reflection questions for you in your life. So, um, this question is: How do you understand your own situation in our globalized world and its histories after taking the course? How would you describe your position in the world in terms of the global life and issues you've studied?

S: Mhmm. Um, honestly, because I, like, the most recent sociology course I took was on social theory, and I feel like that really changed, I would say, changed my life on how I see the world because the intro to sociology course it just gave a broad view on other worlds, into other culture, into other systems of being. So it just gave me an education on what it's like in other worlds, but not really tapped into why these changes are occurring and why everything happens. But the social theory course, which the Intro to Sociology course led me to take that course, it really changed my

view on who I am as a person, as who I am within an American system because it really gave a different perspective on how I saw the world. I always thought that the, the implementation of American global-, I mean as Western globalization is a good thing because countries are promoting democracy and things like that. But my mind completely changed because I feel like so many countries say that, that they're going into these other countries and they're saying that, but it's actually a mode of promoting capitalism on their system. That as a system is not that great because it allows continents to remain poor and it just, I don't know how to tap into that in the Intro to Sociology course because that's very social theory based. So I would just say that because I took that course, it gave me an appreciation, a strong appreciation for other cultures, other countries. Because you have to respect, you have to respect other people and what they believe in to understand them, to want to understand them. So, I feel like the course gave me a very strong, like, gave me encouragement to want to keep learning about others and want to help others because I think if you learn about it, it's just, I feel like you're instinctively going to want to do something to help others.

I: Mhmm.

S: It tapped, like, it planted this seed in me that said if you want to make change, this is like a good way to start. You know? So that's how I feel about it.

I: Great. No, that's a great answer. Thank you. Um, Okay, last question. This is sort of more about FIU, your experience there. Do you feel like your educational experience at your university has more generally been global or helped you to become more of a global thinker, citizen, or individual? How so?

S: I think a very, very large benefit of going to FIU is that it's just, it's just a very unique social environment because FIU has a very different demographic than a lot of the other colleges around America because we're very diverse. A major population of the university is Hispanic/Latino. And, I don't know, to have that along with the courses especially from sociology, it really allows you to really think in a more diverse way to actually interact in a more diverse way because, honestly, I haven't met a lot of international students that come from other countries to come to FIU. But I know that there are a lot of different people that come from all different cultures, religion, countries, whatever, and that enriches the educational experience because it's one thing when you're learning about something else, but it's also another when you're actually sitting with people who understand it from a personal perspective. And I think that's really enriching. It's really beautiful to, like, make friends with those people or ask them questions about what they think about the material because everyone has a different point of view but their points of view might be very largely affected by their culture. And I think that's really important and that's what I think FIU students internally benefit from. Just being in a very diverse environment.

I: Great. Thank you so much. So, that's the last question I have. Um, but if you would like to, you're welcome to add something on your own or return to an earlier question if you have anything else.

S: No, I'm so good. I felt my voice about to fall off. Literally, I was like "Oh my god I'm not taking a break. I'm doing this right now, I need to finish this."

I: Okay, I'm going to stop the recording.

S: Okay, cool.

F4

I: Okay, so I'm just going to read you a couple of sentences to explain kind of how this works and then ask you some questions for your consent. Your participation in this study is voluntary, you can decide to stop at any time, even partway through the interview for whatever reason, or up until September 30, 2018. If you decide to stop participating, there'll be no consequences to you, if you decide to stop I will ask you how you would like me to handle any data collected up to that point, which could include returning it to you, destroying it, or using the data collected up to that point. If you do not want to answer some of the questions, you do not have to, but you can still be in the study, so you can opt out of a specific question if you do not want to answer it. And also, I can send you a summary of the results when it's over with, so I'll ask you if you would like to maybe do that. All right, here are the questions for your consent. Do you have any questions or would you like any additional details at this point?

S: I'm okay, thank you.

I: Okay. Thanks. Do you agree that the interview can be audio recorded?

S: Yes.

I: Thank you. Do you agree to have your responses used for future related projects? I don't think that's going to happen, but...

S: Oh, yeah, why not?

I: Thanks. Do you agree to participate in this study, knowing that you can withdraw at any point with no consequences to you?

S: Yes.

I: Great. And finally, before we begin, would you like to receive the summary of the study's results?

S: Yes, please.

I: Cool. And do you want me to just use the e-mail address we've been corresponding on?

S: Mm-hm.

I: Ok.

S: You can use that one. And I think on the consent form I put--

I: You put another e-mail?

S: I put my home address.

I: Oh, okay. Awesome.

S: So whatever's easier for you.

I: Cool, thank you.

S: No problem.

I: Excellent, all right. So, like I said, feel free to just say, "I don't want to answer that question," if you want to skip it, and also if you want to take a break, like if you get tired and you need to get some water or something, just chime in and say that. I might ask you at some point if you need a break.

S: Okay, perfect.

I: All right, so the first one is just information about you, pretty straightforward. What is your age now?

S: I am twenty-three.

I: Okay. And what program of study are you pursuing and what year of your degree are you in?

S: My program is hospitality management and it's my senior year.

I: Great. And what city and country are you from?

S: I am, well, I was born in Port-au-Prince, Haiti. And I'm from Miami Beach, Florida.

I: Great, thank you.

S: No problem.

I: All right, so the next two is just to get you to speak from your knowledge. So again, you don't have to be too formal.

S: Okay.

I: How would you define globalization and the concept of global citizenship?

S: How would I define globalization? I would define as...to me, personally, globalization can mean a plethora of things. Just because it depends on what region you're asking that question in. So if you're

asking, "What is globalization?" in America, you're going to get a completely different answer than if you're asking "What is globalization?" in Italy. So, so, I think that's kind of my answer to that. I mean it's very broad. You can't--I don't have one answer to it.

I: Mm-hm.

S: And what was the other question?

I: How about the concept of global citizenship?

S: The concept of global citizenship. Okay, so that stems from my previous answer, which is just I don't think when people wake up, I mean most people when they think about let me, you know, be a good citizen, they think about it in their region. Or let me, you know, like, I'm going to go out to that, it's more like country and like territory oriented. So it's not like a global, I don't think the term global citizen is widely used. I think only a select few that are more globally conscious use it.

I: Okay. That makes sense. Great. Okay, the next one kind of is to get you to like, free associate a little bit? So just kind of say whatever comes to mind. What associations or images does the adjective global summon to mind?

S: Like a world map, seven continents, you know, like, yeah. It's just--global, it's just like, I don't know. It just feels, I want to say, worldly, but it just feels like an entirety, like if you put something that says global, you want to like, I feel, I associate it with a whole, you know, just one, if that makes sense.

I: Yeah, it does. Thank you. So has your understanding of any of these terms--globalization, global citizenship, or global--changed or evolved because of taking the course that you took? If yes, how so? And if not, why do you think it didn't change?

S: Well, I do think that it's changed, just in the fact that I started thinking about it more. With my major being management and what I did for work in the past, it's not something that I really, you know, put too much thought into. But then as my background, coming from a different country, and you know, just being a part of the, taking the course that I did take, it just made me realize that, like, with my mindset, there's a lot of reasons why I think the way I think, without, like, really knowing why, and there's a lot of other countries and other people that think completely different from me, which is fine, and there's a lot of people that think semi-similar to what I think, too. So I do think that taking the class has changed the way that I think.

I: So it gave you access to maybe more ways of--more diversity of ways of thinking?

S: Yeah. And it, it, kind of put things in like, in a different perspective too, for me, if that makes sense. Like it kind of, how do I say it? It kind of like, I don't know. I'm kind of blanking. But it kind of just made everything make sense, you know, like things that you, you know when you think of something for like a split second, and then you just let it go, because you're like, "This probably

Ph.D. Thesis - S. D'Adamo; McMaster University - English and Cultural Studies
means nothing"? But those small little thoughts with like, a course that's guided to expand those thoughts, like, means so much more, so you kind of like, you kind of like "Oh, okay, so I understand why now that I'm not just thinking about it, it actually has like a background to it."

I: Mm-hm. So it made it possible for you to make more connections, it sounds like.

S: Yeah.

I: And like, feel like you had basis for making those connections.

S: Right.

I: Cool. Great, thank you. Okay, so the next set of questions is a little more focused on, like, the content of the course, and how you experienced it. So, let's talk about some of the content you studied in the course. Can you tell me about a text or a concept you encountered in the course that made a strong impression on you? Why do you think that experience matters to your understanding of global life?

S: Yeah, actually one that sticks out. I don't remember the name, but it was, it had to do with Cuba. Which is so fascinating I think, to me, which I didn't think that it would be, you know. I was taking this course initially for, I have a certain amount of global learning courses that I need to take. And I needed to take. And it was like another reason I was taking it. But then when I came across, and it was towards the end of the course, too, that we did this, it was like the Cuba passage and it had, like, a video, and it was just, how the Afro-Latinos and the regular Latinos, and like I told you, I'm from Haiti, so the island side is semi-similar, and Cuba's actually even way smaller than Haiti. So, to me, it was so easy to associate island to island and be like, "Oh, well, it's gotta be the same as Haiti," but as I learned and as I dug in to some of the cultural differences and I learned there's tons of Haitians in Cuba, as I learned, it was, you would think because of the Communist mindset and you would think that even the people that are around our age would have a completely different mindset. But it's a lot of the same things that we struggle here in the States, as opposed to some of the issues that happen in Haiti.

I: Interesting.

S: So it's closer, it's like, it's more related to United States and like, millennials in the United States, than it is to an island that's like, a boat ride away.

I: Yeah, yeah.

S: That kind of like threw me off balance, and it, and a lot of, you know, even, the Afro-Latinos, they, like the older ones, you would think they would be anti-communist, but they weren't. They were pro-communist. They were like, "Well, Castro did this for us," and they--

I: Right.

S: That's what they knew him. It just took me aback. I was like, "This is what they actually--" because, and I think it's not, I don't want to say lack of education, but I want to say, like, what you're used to, you know, what has been drilled into you and so they were very anti-getting rid of that, and then a lot of discriminations happen from the fair-skinned Latinos and then the Afro-Latinos and even the millennials out of all of the Afro-Latino millennials. And Cuba, like, a way that they use to express themselves is rap, and they're like, I don't know, it's like, it's this way of speaking to that, and it doesn't matter the ones that are older, the older generation. It doesn't matter if they're fair-skinned or darker, they just don't want to hear it, they're like "Oh, what is this? It's not music." They don't want anything to do with it.

I: Interesting.

S: And it just pushes the Afro-millennials even harder to do it, you know. So that's one thing that I, that's something that I, even after forgetting lots of material from the course, *that* just sticks there.

I: That's really interesting. When you said that you felt like it was closer to like, some of the kind of cultural dynamics in Cuba were closer to the U.S. than Haiti, do you mean especially like a place like Miami, or do you mean bigger things?

S: Definitely. And I say that because I'm also more, I'm more used to Miami, like, my, when I said the U.S. I correlate that to Miami--

I: Yeah.

S: Because that's where I'm, you know, I spent the most time in.

I: Right.

S: That's how I see it. Which, you can go down to, you know, Ohio, and it's not going to be the same, you'll be like, "This is nothing like--"

I: "Cuba"? Yeah.

S: "I don't understand why!" But I'm sorry, yeah, I meant to say, like what I experienced in Miami.

I: No, you're fine. I was just asking 'cause maybe you didn't mean that, but I could definitely see it if that is what you mean. So, yeah, thank you. That's really interesting. Okay, the next question is, was there a text or concept in the course that you found particularly difficult, or surprising? What did you take away from this new difficult or surprising knowledge about global life or issues?

S: Hmm. If there's one thing I found difficult.

I: And that can mean a lot of things, right? It can mean like, kind of, difficult to see, you know, like it could be disturbing--

S: Right.

I: Or it could just be like it challenged something that you previously believed, like, difficult could mean a lot of different things.

S: Yeah, I mean, I think, again, I don't remember off the back of my head the titles of these, but there was one, and it was like, it was about an African-American man who was very, like he was very intelligent, and he just spoke. It was very close to after being freed, I guess, so he spoke on what it was to have that slave mentality, and it was just hard for me to kind of, like, I mean, of course, we study it, and we see different things, there's movies about it. It's more like, everyday now than it was, but like I told you, like, being whereas in 1804, where I come from, slavery ended so long ago, that it's not, and they don't, I don't know. Haitians don't really, they don't really, like that's not something that comes up in the everyday conversation. You know, it's not something that's like, "Oh, well, I was enslaved," like, most of the people, because of so many generations have gone by, they don't bring that up. So it was just very difficult for me to even, you know. Because, you know, you know it happened.

I: Sure.

S: You know that it, you know slavery happened, you know a lot of the details that happened with it, but you don't really, especially for me, uh, I'm not, I don't want to say affected by it? But I don't understand like, the mindset correlated with it from my standpoint. So it was just hard for somebody that had, like, just been freed, is super-intelligent, the things that he was saying, it was just hard for me to, like, put together I guess.

I: Mm-hm, mm-hm. That's really interesting.

S: In the course.

I: Thank you. Okay, so the next question is an opportunity for you to be critical of the syllabus if you want to be. So, were there any global concepts or texts in the course that you did not find useful? Why do you think you came to this conclusion?

S: I think the professor, like, I think he did a great job with a lot of the things that he, that he gave to us to, you know, understand and dissect and try to learn more things about. It was an online course which is completely different. I feel like I had a different experience than somebody that took the course in person, because you can, I think you can kind of get more out of it depending on who your professor is. And this is a lot more, like, self--

I: Guided

S: --regulated. Yeah, self-guided. So, the one thing that I feel like, it's not a specific, it's just, you know. And, it was just, not a lot of reading, but it was just a lot of, so let's say, he took excerpts out of, like, books, right? Now, and I understand, you have to like, read certain parts to understand it as a whole, but there was some parts in it that made no difference, you know. It probably gave some background or something like that, but it was just, like, I think if people probably would have gotten a lot more out of it if there was not as many--

I: Readings.

S: You know, pages or--

I: Yeah, yeah.

S: Straight to the point, if that makes sense. A little more than, like, trying to, cause you would have, and, a lot of the stuff was written a very long time ago, so you have to read it, and then re-read to kind of even understand, you know?

I: Mm-hm.

S: So it's like, most college students, if they just want to pass, and answer the question, they're going to skim through and get to what they need to get to, and leave that out anyway, so its was like the double-edged sword--

I: Yeah.

S: I understood why you put so much information in there, but a lot of people didn't get what you were trying to give them to get out of it.

I: Mm-hm.

S: Because there was so much information.

I: Yeah. And maybe, like you were saying, if it was, if there were in-person meetings, like.

S: Yeah.

I: The material might come alive in a different way or something, but.

S: Right.

I: Yeah.

S: And you would probably, like, explain these things to us more than just, "Hey read this and you'll get it."

I: Right.

S: You know? Like, you'll have to read like, it wasn't even just like one, it would be like six different, like, excerpts, and I'm just like, "Damn."

I: Just like, pick two or something. Yeah.

S: Exactly. I don't know, that's the only criticism that I have. And I think he tried, I think he really honestly did try.

I: Yeah.

S: And I think I did pretty well, I think I got a B or an A. But it was just like, at some point, unless it was a subject that I was really interested about, at some point, it was just, let me get the answer that I need to answer the question that he's asking me.

I: Right, right.

S: Not, let me learn everything about this that I possibly can.

I: Yeah, I hear you. Totally. Great, thank you. The next question is, is there anything you did not study in the course that you wish had been on the syllabus? It could be a concept, a topic, a text, a theme, and if there is something, why do you think it would be important to add to a course like this?

S: Yeah, so. We talked about a lot of different, I feel like he went into--which I really appreciated--he went into like the Caribbean, and he went into like, Africa, he went into other countries that dealt with race. Not *dealt* with race, because I feel like everybody deals with race in one way or another. That had like, that we as students can relate to more. But what I don't think he went into is how...Because he went into, or the course went into the black Americans, you know, in the United States, and how they feel, and why they feel what they did, but not a lot of the immigrant Americans. You know, that come from--and that doesn't even have to be black, you know. There's from Middle Eastern immigrants, and there's Asian immigrants. And that all experience it in a different way, um, even though this is African studies. But, yeah, that's what I feel like he could have probably called on a little more.

I: So this, this course was about the diaspora, right?

S: Right.

I: So that's really interesting, right? Because obviously you're in the diaspora, too.

S: Right.

I: With being a Haitian. Yeah, no, that's a really good point. Cool, thank you. So, the next question, you've already started talking about the next couple questions. Which are sort of about, like, what happened during class, or what, like your experience of the mechanics of the course were like. But, um, yes, so you can add to what you've already said. So describe what your classroom time was like. For example, so it's online, so that'll affect your answer. Was it primarily lecture-based, were there other kinds of activities mixed into your class time, was it discussion based? Did it vary throughout the semester? Did you have a discussion section run by a TA?, etc. So, yeah, whatever replies, or however you can describe it as a online experience.

S: Well, I know I spoke a lot about how much reading and materials were in the course, but he did have these, like, film reaction papers. Which I think like, papers in general are my strong suit, I don't know why, maybe because I talk a lot, so it's easy to like, get that thought out on paper.

I: Yeah, yeah. I'm like that, too.

S: Most people hate essays, and I'm like "Two pages? Psh."

I: Yeah.

S: "I can do that." Um, but he had, like four or, I think he had like six film reaction papers. Right? Throughout the course. And they were, like, films that, and it was refreshing after doing so many--reading so much, to get a film. So he did one on Sarah Baartman, which was so interesting, because, you know, you've heard the name. I mean, most people have heard the name, if you've taken a history class of some sort. You know, and, but, not really knowing the full story. And then you saw it, I appreciated that he had those. And I think I got more out of the film reactions, out of the films that he had us watch, than anything else. You know? I think of any, out of the six, you only had to do four reaction papers. So, and I think I watched all six, because it just helped.

I: Cool.

S: A little more with understanding the course as a whole.

I: Yeah.

S: So that's one thing that I appreciated. And then he had discussion boards on everything that we read, which, I mean, like I said. Depending on the type of student you are, you can either read it and really understand what the text is about. Or, whatever question he asked you on the discussion board, read it to understand enough to write five hundred words. So.

I: And so, so basically, so there were discussion boards and there were all your assignments?

S: Mm-hm.

I: Were there other things like, where you could kind of like, directly interact with the instructor?
Or...

S: Oh yeah, I mean, I always try, even if I don't really need anything, I always try to e-mail, but he didn't really have something where it was like--

I: Open office hours, or--

S: It was like, "Here's a video of me talking about this." No, he didn't have that. Or he was like, "I'm going to be on live for this amount of time and we're going to talk about the subject." It was more like "Read this, understand it."

I: Okay. So you didn't have like video lectures from him.

S: No, it was all, like, yeah. But he was willing, like if I e-mailed him, he e-mailed me back, and there was like two, I believe there were like two exams in the course.

I: Mm-hm. Like midterm and final.

S: Yeah, midterm and a final. And it just, it those got, like, just what we read.

I: Mm-hm.

S: Like, "Hey, in this passage, what did they mean by this?"

I: Gotcha.

S: Like that.

I: Ok great, thank you. That's really helpful. Um, so maybe you've answered this already, just now, when you talked about the films. But, what kind of learning experiences that you had in the course felt most valuable or enriching to you? Your answer could be focused on an activity, an assessment, or a person, as well as on any specific materials that you read or engaged with.

S: Yeah, I would say I got most, like, the things that I retained are from the films. Maybe I'm more of a--I'm more of an audio and visual learner regardless. So the things that I can remember to now, which I took the course last summer.

I: Mm-hm.

S: Or last fall.

I: Mm-hm.

S: I don't remember.

I: No, but that's such an interesting thing to find out. Like, what sticks with you over time.

S: Yeah.

I: Right, because, we're always trying to measure learning, like in each moment, but a lot of it is actually longer-term. Right, what actually sticks with you, so that's really interesting to hear.

S: So I think the film was what helped my learning in the course. Or what stuck out to me. Helped me. Most of the films.

I: Cool. Cool. So the next question is a kind of--maybe not, maybe pointless, but is, was there an online component to your course? Obviously yes, the whole thing was online. So, maybe this is an opportunity for you to kind of evaluate the online learning? So, do you kind of, was the interfaces that you used, were they easy to navigate and interact with? Or not? Were there elements that you wished were part of your online course that were not there?

S: So, all my learning has been, most of it, because I moved to Texas, that all my classes had to be online, and then, last summer around this time was when I started taking online. I didn't move yet, but I was doing a study abroad in Italy. So, it was all brand new. Like, I had to relearn the way of learning, if that makes sense.

I: Yeah.

S: So, with that being said, especially with a course, when I do better remembering certain things that professors. Like, that's how I remember. So it's like, you say it to me, we talk about it, and then I write it down, like the key things. And that's typically how I learn.

I: Right.

S: And that's typically the professors that did more of the explaining, that had like, you know. Even if they invented PowerPoints, even if they spoke about it, like, I did better remembering things like that. And so I had to move to that to like, everything was like [inaudible: 26:52], or like, you had to read on your own, and it was just different. I did pretty well, but it was so different, so, the online option to me was something that I had to relearn how to learn. And I had to work a little bit harder, you know?

I: Yeah.

S: Because although I can write a million essays, to sit there and read.

I: And feel engaged, yeah. I mean.

S: Right.

I: So it sounds like you, you would have liked it a lot if there was some kind of interactive element in the course. Because there are a lot of online courses like that, right?

S: Right.

I: Where there's, there's some kind of like group meeting, you know, or whatever.

S: There's tons. I took a biology class, which is random. But that had, it had, we had to meet up on Fridays for an hour, and then we met up on Wednesdays for like two and a half hours. It was like peer learning, I don't know if you know that you are familiar--

I: Yeah, yeah.

S: --with peer learning. And then the professor would do these like, live interactions every Tuesday. And so, like, it was, like, almost the same thing, it's just through screen, but then there's some that are like, read chapters blah blah blah. And like, I had courses which neither the biology nor the African studies were, like, at, but every module was like, "Read three chapters." And then nothing else.

I: Wow.

S: And then you take a test. And, it's like. "Huh? How am I supposed to know if like? I read your chapters, how am I supposed to know if I should focus on the key terms or, what am I really supposed to be learning?"

I: Yeah.

S: So.

I: I also have heard other people say, like, "I'm paying how much for this course?" Right, like "I'm paying six grand for this" or whatever.

S: When I actually, a lot of people used to, when I used to take classes in person, a lot of people would get upset when professors--Or, a lot of people would leave when a professor would miss class. "Oh, let's not come to class," you know. Me, I'm like, "Oh no, I paid for this, you guys, you need to--why is that class canceled? No! Uh-uh." I have to pay everything out of pocket. No, you don't get to be sick. Where's a substitute teacher?

I: So funny. Okay great, thank you. I think you kind of answered this earlier, but maybe you have more to say about it. So, what motivated you to take this course? Feel free to cite multiple reasons if you want.

S: Yeah, it was, it was a couple. There was a couple. I spoke to a guidance counselor, I needed to take--I told you, I needed to take some global learning courses in order to graduate. And then I became part of the global learning, and so I just needed to take a couple of them. And she...I think, FIU has like, some of the strongest counselors. [inaudible, 29:50]. She's an advisor, but. They have some of the strongest advisors that I've dealt with, and I've, like I've taken classes at Dade, I've taken classes at Broward, and I've taken classes at University of Miami. I'm even taking some classes at the University of Houston, and it's like, yeah, whatever, but like, these advisors, they really do work around the clock. And so she was asking me, like, when it came to, you know there's like the little checklist of courses that you need to take. And she was like, "Hey, you need a global learning. What are you more comfortable with?" And I'm like--she's like, "What are you good at?" you know, and I'm like, "I can write a lot, like I love to, if you give me a topic, um, for the most part, I can write something about it." She's like, "Well, I know this African Studies class has a lot of writing," and I'm like, "So, let's do it." And so that's why I did it, that's why I took that class. Because I, she told me there was going to be, the majority of it was writing, which it was. Reading and writing, she didn't tell me about the reading part, but. You know. That's why I took it. And I'm glad I took it. It helped me, with some of the things I was thinking and trying to understand.

I: Great. That's actually the next question. So, the question is, did the course, your experience in the course satisfy the logic that motivated you to enroll? In other words, did it deliver the experience you were hoping for or expecting?

S: Yeah. And, you know, honestly, I wasn't even really expecting to get. I mean, like I said, like, FIU does a really amazing job at getting you to learn the material. And the real world aspect of it. So there wasn't like anything that I planned on like, "Oh my goodness, this material is going to teach me so much." It was like more of "Hey, I need to take this class, and why not take a class that, like, can mean something to me, too?" But it was more than that. Like I ended up enjoying it more than I thought I would. You know?

I: Yeah.

S: And even to remember things to this day, cause like, you ask me about accounting, and I can't tell you anything, so.

I: Awesome thank you. Okay, we just have two more questions. Are you doing okay?

S: Yeah, I'm fine.

I: Okay. So these are a little bit more like zoomed out. Try to get you to kind of think about yourself in the world. So, how do you understand your own situation in our globalized world and its histories after taking the course? How would you describe your position in the world in terms of the global life and issues you've studied?

S: How would I--Well, with respect to the course, I think, I think because of where I grew up and how I grew up, I was...I mean, I guess people can sit there and say that "Hey, you know, I have a little

more insight on this," or, "my thinking is a little better than everyone else's." And I could say that. But I, it can sound kind of, like, pompous. But I really do believe that. You know, like, I think my thinking is more than just, "Hey, I'm, you know, I'm an African-American, or an immigrant, of Haitian parents." And that has taught me an aspect of what I, you know, what I am, and who I am. And then living in America as an African-American person, that has taught me an aspect. And, you know, being in an interracial relationship, that has taught me. But it all has--you know when you learn something but you don't really know the source of why? And I think the course helped me the why. With the, "Okay, you think this way because," you know, it like separated a lot of. It was the why to my thinking, and that was what I appreciated about it, not that it changed the way I thought about things. I mean, of course some things I'm looking at differently. But it didn't like overall--most of my picture is still the same. You know? So I think it just helped with the why. If that kind answers the question that you asked?

I: Yeah, no, yeah that's a great answer.

S: Okay.

I: Thank you. Yeah. I feel like you gave me a sense of this when we were talking before, so thank you for talking about it again.

S: No problem.

I: All right, last question. Do you feel like your educational experience at your university more generally has been global or helped you to become more of a global thinker, citizen, or individual? How so?

S: Yeah, I do. Because, like I was saying, I've experienced a couple other universities and colleges, and FIU with the international part, they hold that to a higher standard. And like we were talking about, with it being majority minorities, they don't look at it that way, it's more of a, you know, that's a fact that I didn't even think of until we had a conversation. Because it's more of a normal, it's like, most of everyone has a Hispanic background, and that's normal. You know, and it's like, there's a lot of, there's a lot of Haitians, I think it has close to, one of the, that and [inaudible 35:26] has like, a larger Haitian population. They have like, you know, Club Creole, which is the language. Like they have these things and it's like, you don't think of them as anything special, anything global, until you're like, we're having a conversation like this. You know? So that's why I do think that they do go out of their way. There's like a Cuban club, there's like, you can name, you name it, and they have it and they have the most study abroad that I've seen. You know, I haven't been that many places, but they have, and they do them so that you can experience, you know, things like that. And they have speakers come from different places. They do free events and things like that. They just, they're very hands-on, and they're very hands-on with the community, which I feel like, in order to be a part of the bigger picture, you gotta start small. You know? Inside where you're relatively at. So if, they're very involved, like, they have an event that's called South Beach Food and Wine Festival. And they have it for the college that I'm in, at the school of hospitality. And it's all these big name stars that you see on the Food Channel.

I: Oh, wow.

S: You would think every state has them, but because of the location that we're at, it's kind of more enticing to get, you know, celebrities there. And so basically these people come and they donate all this time and they have, like, a camera crew. They have all these types of different people, and all the money that is raised, they have events. They have like, the Bobby Flay burgers, they just have like so many different events. And it's like four or five days. All the hospitality students work as staff at these events, and the stars, like, host the events. They have like a Bacardi event. All the--they just have tons of events. And then they make these, like, they raise all this money, and it all goes back to FIU students. Which is like, ridiculous, you know? You would think people were--like, Rachael Ray comes every year. All these people, and you're just like, "Wow." So I feel like they really build on the community which in turn stems to globally. If that makes sense.

I: Mm-hm. No, it does! I totally see what you're, know what you're saying. Cool, great. So that was the last question, if you want to speak about anything else, you're welcome to. Or return to something you said earlier. But otherwise, I'm good.

S: Yeah. I mean, I didn't realize how much I'd learned. I guess, you know, speaking things out, like talking things out, helped, they helped me. Because a lot of things just came into a different, like, I realized more as we just had this conversation. So, I think more people should do this, because it just helps to realize, like I really do, and I'm not just saying that. And it was one, I get a global point for this. So I'm like, "Okay, of course, why not? Forty-five minutes, a global point." But I feel like the experience, you know, it came so easily, and you're like, so easy to talk to, too.

I: Thanks.

S: Especially with, like, things that people can spend hours talking about. So.

I: That's cool.

S: That's always good.

I: Someone told me that yesterday too. They said, "I actually learned about myself doing that interview." I was like, "That's so nice."

S: Yeah.

I: That's really cool to hear.

S: It helps your thought process.

I: Yeah, I'm a big believer in, in reflection. Students often hate it when you asked them to do them. They're like "Ugh, why do we have to do reflections?"

S: Right.

I: But, yeah. I like it. I do agree with you. I like dialogue as a form of reflection better than just, like.

S: Than just, like. Well, if it was writing, too, I probably. I don't know. Cause you always can think of a million things to say, and only remember four of them. So when you're having this conversation, like.

I: Yeah, yeah.

S: It's good.

I: Do you wanna--do you want to say anything at all about your study abroad experience?

S: Yeah.

I: Like in terms of like adding to your global learning. If you feel like it, you don't have to.

S: Yeah, sure. I mean, I'm actually doing another one that I'm, like, super excited about.

I: Cool.

S: Because it's, I'm going to Prague.

I: Oh, wow.

S: In June, in the beginning. So I'm so excited about that. And when I think of Prague, I haven't even been, but I can like speak on it already. I'm going with University of Houston, not even FIU.

I: Oh, cool.

S: I know, it's random. I just love traveling, period, so. And before I graduate, why not get a couple more traveling things under my belt?

I: Definitely.

S: But, random. So they were showing us a video of Prague. And to me, with the whole communist thing, and like it's so crazy to have this [Inaudible, 40:31], so I thought, you ever watch like, old school cartoons? If you don't mind, how old are you?

I: I'm thirty-two.

S: Thirty-two. Okay, so you--

I: I'm an old millennial. But I'm also a millennial.

S: No you are, you're a millennial, definitely. My husband's thirty. So, what was I gonna ask? Oh, okay. You know like if you ever watch, I just wanted to see like, what kind of cartoons like, what--

I: I grew up on, you know, like--

S: You ever see, like, like *Fairly Oddparents* or something? Where they mess something up in the future and then they have like, a communist world, where it's black and white, and like large statues, and like. Everybody's gloomy. And so, when I think of communist, that's what my, I thought Prague was not gonna be colorful, like, I didn't think it was going to be as beautiful. I thought it was going to be--even though it's been gone for about thirty years, communism has not existed in that country, and it's now thriving. I still didn't think that, you know, you think of Italy, and you're like, "Oh, beautiful," like, all this stuff. So I was thinking about it, and they were showing us this video from there--it's gorgeous. And it's like so easy, I think, if you don't travel, I think the number one way that I have this open view. I have this list of countries that I've been to and it's only just the beginning, and if you don't travel. And you, like you said, people that stay in their, and it's not their fault, most people don't have the means to do it. But people that stay in their comfort zone, or where they grew up, they're going to keep, you know. You think of Haiti, and you don't think of the beautiful part. You don't think of the island part, you just think, very poor, um, you think of, you just think of poor, corrupt, Haiti.

I: Right. And tragedies that have happened.

S: Yeah! Exactly. And you like, if somebody, like you ever play like the adjective game? Like, or you, just, you say a word, and somebody says the first word that they can think of. And they're just like, "poor," you know. It's like, "sad." And they just feel bad, and you're like, the Haitian people are the most, like, I would spend some time, I would go there once a year. Random, I would go there once a year and I always, always, to myself I'm like, these people are supposed to be the saddest in the world, and they are one of the happiest people that you--they have, it's like so full of life, and the energy as soon as you touch down. You have merchants with baskets on their head, and you're just like--"You're supposed to be like--". Even me, and like, that's my culture, and I'm like, "Why y'all so happy? You have nothing. There's no electricity. I don't understand." But they are, and so it's like, unless you actually go there, and people, like, I've met a lot of people in Texas that have actually been to Haiti for mission work. It's a very large community in Texas. So mission work is like Guatemala, Honduras, Haiti, like these places they go and so everybody, not everybody, but most people that I've spoken to that's been, they're like, they love it. Like the people, they just, the energy that they get, it's just unheard of. And the same thing with, you just, it's so easy to think one way and not come out of that. And that's what I thought about Prague. I was just like "Oh, this is going to be a gloomy city, and everything's going to be sad, and nobody's going to be happy, no one's going to talk to me, I'm just going to go and do my business and leave," but that's not the case. Like from the video that I saw, people were working--like there's markets, like there's shops and there's like, markets that you can go to and buy fresh fruit, and I'm just like, "This is, like a mini Italy," that's what it reminded me of. And you don't, you don't think about that when you hear "Prague," and when I went to Italy,

I'd been before I did the study abroad. So, when I went, I thought I saw all there was to see, and I went with my husband on our honeymoon, and it was just like...Well, we're not planners, either one of us, so we're like, "Well, let's just go. We'll go to the big-name places and we'll be fine."

I: Wander around, yeah, yeah.

S: And we had fun. Yeah, we're just like, "Why not?" But, like, we, when I went with FIU, we saw it on, like, a not a touristy side. Like a living-in Italy, and it was, it was beyond amazing. We just saw, you know--and of course, like, everywhere you go, you don't think, "Oh, well, I wonder how the government is" or any of that. You know, like, I'm on vacation, I don't care what their government's like! Like, that's not something that I want to know about, but once you're there, you like have a mini apartment, and you get to know some of the locals and they're like, "Hey, you know, this is what we do. If it wasn't for tourism, we would be in a bigger hole than we are."

I: Yeah.

S: And you're just like, "Oh, I never thought about that." And.

I: Yeah.

S: So, uh--

I: And like, "Oh, maybe that's similar to Haiti in some ways," or something. You know? Yeah.

S: Yeah. Yeah, exactly.

I: Yeah.

S: You just realize how everything is like, more in common than you think. And, you know, even another random, is like, we went to Peru at the end of last year. And I don't know what was going on there, but, there was a lot of, like in the--Peru, by the way, if you've never been--and not Machu Picchu, like, Lima. Go to--like, everybody goes to Machu Picchu, so it's like touristy prices, like everything. And I'm, I'm--I like to travel more into like, I want to try to blend in as much as I can to the locals. You experience it better than you--

I: Totally.

S: Then you go and you're like, "Everybody speaks English!" Like, "I'm not getting anything out of this." Like--

I: Yeah. Yeah.

S: "I don't want to be here!" But if you go to like, Lima, and you go and--we had, one of our friends. And this is another thing, like, his--he was a political...I don't remember what his major was.

I: Political science or something?

S: But he opened up a restaurant. He, he--he's amazing, like, he's one of those that you're just like, I know you're going to go far. But he works at the embassy in Peru. At the American embassy, and he like, he lived there. From FIU, like he got that position from FIU.

I: Wow.

S: Yeah. Which is amazing. And he lived there, for about six months, so he was able to, like, show us--

I: Oh, great.

S: Like behind the scenes. And he was just, you know, and there was so many protestors on the streets.

I: Really?

S: And they weren't angry. I mean, of course they were angry.

I: Yeah.

S: But they weren't, like--

I: Agitated.

S: Violent.

I: Yeah, yeah.

S: Yeah, they weren't, they were just, like, really, like--

I: Passionate.

S: Wanting things to change. And that's not something you would look at if you're in the middle of Machu Picchu.

I: No.

S: You're not gonna see any protestors, like, you're not going to see any of them, and he was explaining, like, why they're upset, and it was like, there were police there that were, like, covered, you know, just in case it got a little more intense. And it was just like--and then it was so

inexpensive. Like one American dollar is like seven, I don't remember the name of it. It was like seven whatcha call it. And you can get food--

I: Pesos, maybe?

S: --for like six, six of their currency. So you can get food, like a whole plate of, a meal for like, a dollar.

I: Wow.

S: So it's like, super inexpensive and it was just like, I don't know. Their--like the way that they are set up, nobody really talked about Peru, but the way that they're set up globally, like with their, you know, government and all that, it's kind of like the United States. I mean, it reminded me a lot of the United States. But you don't think, when you think of Peru, you--from what you see, is like, Machu Picchu. You see, like, old, you know, old buildings and things like that. And--not buildings, but like, you know, old ruins and stuff like that. That's what I think of. But you, you see like, in the capital where you know, it's just like America.

I: It's just a city. Yeah.

S: Yeah. So. I was gonna say, I wasn't gonna talk your ear off anymore.

I: No, no, you're great. Okay, I'm going to stop the recording. One second.

F5 (Written Answers)

1) Information about you: Your age now? What program of study are you pursuing, and what year of your degree are you in? What city and country are you from?

I am 41, pursuing a BA in Women's and Gender studies, I am never really sure on the year of the degree. I began this in summer 2017 and I will finish with the summer 2018 semester. I am from Lake City, FL, USA, Earth.

2) How would you define globalization and the concept of global citizenship?

Globalization is the way in which people are better able to mobilize, not only in their home country but in others as well. The way that technology, culture, education, ideas, and so much more can be utilized by all; at least that is the possibility of globalization. The reality currently is that we are better able to make wars against countries that are not as advanced and thus take from them resources of value that would need to be paid for or would in some way grant the less developed country leverage to develop itself further. Global citizenship is, to me, the idea that we are all citizen of the

planet rather than just of a country or a state or a city. That the entire globe and its residents are equal and we must all work together as one people, rather than multiple warring factions, each attempting to prove how much better they are than their neighbor who is other.

3) What associations or images does the adjective “global” summon to mind?

The adjective global brings to mind the earth, in its entirety, and an image of the many life forms which populate it. The many varieties of human, animal, plant, fungal, and microbial life. We are all connected and dependent on each other, whether or not that fact is appreciated or acknowledged.

4) Has your understanding of these terms (“globalization,” “global citizenship,” “global”) changed or evolved because of taking this course? If yes, how so? If not, why do you think that is the case?

Yes, I think they have. My understanding became broader and more in depth. I have a better understanding of peoples outside of the comparatively small sphere of the US. As well as concepts like the global north and south of which I had not previously been aware.

5) Let’s talk about some of the content you studied in the course. Can you tell me about a text and/or a concept you encountered in the course that made a strong impression on you? Why do you think that experience matters to your understanding of ‘the global’?

Well, the most recent course I took was Gender Violence. The whole class made an impression on me, as it really drove home how widespread patriarchal social systems are and that they are not everywhere. The class helped make it very apparent that violence is a huge part of the patriarchy and that that violence is aimed at controlling men as well. Many men feel like their hands are tied because they face very real consequences for acting outside their assigned role. While women face consequences for being women, whether or not they fight the system.

6) Was there a text or concept that you found particularly difficult or surprising? What did you take away from this new difficult or surprising knowledge about global life or issues?

Ignorance. The staggering amount of ignorance in regards to women, to race, and to learning. I was a bit floored to find that this was not just an American trait, and happy to see that it is changing, if slowly.

7) Were there any ‘global’ concepts or texts in the course that you did not find useful? Why do you think you came to this conclusion?

Um, no. Knowledge is power and whether people like it or not, we are moving into a global community.

8) Is there anything that you did not study in the course that you wish had been on the syllabus? This might be a particular text, concept, topic or theme. If so, why do think this would be important to add to a global studies course like the one you’ve taken?

Not that I can think of, it was a pretty broad course. If anything, I think that more classes should become global as knowledge of the global community could aid in defeating prejudice and bias.

9) Describe what your classroom time was like. For example: was it primarily lecture-based, were there other kinds of activities mixed into your class period, was it primarily

discussion-based? Did it vary throughout the semester or term? Did you have a discussion section run by a TA? Etc.

Well, my class was online. My professor provided us with powerpoint lectures that included audio, discussions, readings (both textbook and online), videos, and we eventually worked with students from another country on a group project. It was awesome. We (students) utilized WhatsApp for discussions about our project.

10) Which kinds of learning experiences that you had in the course felt most valuable or enriching to you? Your answer could be focused on particular activities, assessments, or person(s), as well as on your engagement with any of assigned course materials.

I don't know that any one part was most valuable or enriching. I feel like the course as a whole was valuable and that it was better for the sum of its parts than any one facet.

11) Was there an online component to your course (either in your classroom time or in your assignments and activities)? If not, do you think engaging online could have improved your course experience, and why? If so, how would you describe your experience of these digital learning elements? For example, were they easy to navigate and interact with, did you feel like they added a useful or difficult dimension to your learning experience, and why?

I love online learning. It gives me the freedom to work at my convenience within the time frame given rather than having to schedule my life around class times. The entire class was online, as is my degree. I have never set foot on the campus and yet I have learned so much.

12) What motivated you to take this course? Feel free to cite multiple reasons if relevant.

First was that it fit with my degree, secondly the professor. The professor is an intelligent, fair minded, woman that I feel lucky to have learned from. The topic was also of interest, as gender violence has definitely affected my life.

13) Did your course experience satisfy this logic that motivated you to enroll? In other words, did it deliver the experience you were expecting or hoping for?

Yes, it delivered and then went above and beyond my expectations.

14) How do you understand your own situation in our globalized world and its histories after taking the course? How would you describe your position in the world, in terms of the global life and issues you've studied?

I understand that it is up to all of us to change our patriarchal society. That teaching is a powerful tool, whether for good or ill. That we all are responsible for teaching and learning from each other, and that knowledge can be found where it is least expected.

15) Do you feel like your educational experience at your university more generally has been global, or helped you to become more of a global thinker, citizen, or individual? How so?

I think my experience has been more global, as my university is an international one. We do have students from all over that we are interacting with online and Miami itself is a global place. There are a wide variety of cultures living, learning, and working there.

F6 (Written Answers)

1) Age: 26. Program of study Public Relations, Advertising, and Applied Communications (P.R.A.A.C.) Junior Year. Born in Mexico City, Mexico.

2) I would define **globalization** as the world-wide interconnection people and societies have due to ease of communication and technology. i.e. a global village. A **global citizen**, in my definition is someone who actively is involved, contributes, and is aware of global issues.

3) The image that comes to mind is literally one of the whole planet Earth. Also, images of various people and cultures.

4) I wouldn't say so. If anything, it has simply re-enforced what I had already known about it. Growing up in the digital age, I constantly see globalization in action. That, coupled with the fact that I myself come from another country further re-enforced my understanding of what a global citizen is. In short, I feel as though I had just naturally and knew these concepts, the class simply brought them to my attention and made me conscious about them.

5) I feel as though Marshall McLuhan's "A Global Village" and "The Medium is the Message" where the most impactful. Mainly because they were predicted way before the advent of digital/instant communication and things like file sharing. But, even more incredible was how right he was in those statements. In many ways the world has gotten smaller because of our advanced communications where everyone can know what is going on in any part of the world at any time, much like a local village, but on a global scale. The "Medium is the Message" is also spot on because in many ways what is important is not the content, but how that content is sent i.e. a cell phone, computer etc.

6) YES! Oddly enough it from Marshall McLuhan. While his concepts weren't too difficult to understand, especially since so many of his ideas and predictions came to be true, his actual interviews and explanations in magazines were incredibly long-winded and very dense to understand. Often, they would require multiple attempts to understand. What was surprising is how spot on McLuhan's predictions were and how relatable and observable they have become in the 21st century.

7) In all honesty, I found a majority of the texts and concepts to be of little use, I know that sounds a bit arrogant but I'm sure if you ask anyone over 18 who is remotely aware of world events will feel the same. The reason I feel this way is mostly due to the fact that I see it on a daily basis and have grown up and lived through most of the stuff covered such as digital privacy, secrecy, globalization, social media, and current social issues and movements.

8) Personally, I feel like this was more of a self-taught class writing class more than anything. Maybe it was the title being called How We Know What We Know, but, I was expecting more of a philosophical class that really got in depth out the spread and dissemination of info rather than a class briefing and links to articles and then write a paper with a predetermined word count. Some exceptions to this were when we learned about the spread of information via social media.

9) Classroom time was mostly almost irrelevant. Again, I know that sounds very arrogant, but, most classes consisted of a brief quiz (spread out though the semester) a brief explanation of the weeks assignment and that was it, the rest of the info was recorded on web lectures. The only real motivation to come to class was to listen to the assignment instructions (because the written ones were very unclear), quizzes, and the occasional attendance credit. We had no discussions, no real lectures, no activities.

10) The only assignment I could think of that I felt I really benefited from was the final research paper. This was due to the fact that we had to research a particular event that had global significance. The reason why I felt this was the best assignment is because rather than writing about a personal experience that had somewhat of a connection to the concepts taught in class, you

actually had to go out and find sources and info and other research in order to write your paper and also have to have it relate to the class concepts.

11) Yes, this class involved a pretty decent amount of online learning. Mostly using WordPress and Wikispaces as well as online video lectures done by the professors. The video lectures for the most part was pretty helpful. Also, since our assignments were all done online it made submission and getting feedback pretty easy. If you are not familiar with WordPress or Wikispaces there is a slight learning curve but nothing too bad or complex.

12) The motivation for taking this course was simply that it was a required class.

13) No, since I was taking it for a requirement the only thing I expected was to pass and I did. Also, as mentioned before, the course title led me to think the class was or philosophically/discussion oriented, which wasn't, so in that respect my experience did not meet my initial expectations.

14) I guess you could say that my position is still relatively the same as when I started. I see myself as a consumer and observer in a globalized world. Again, coming from another country I have always been privy to other events outside of the U.S. and my home country.

15) I would say my experience at FIU has helped but again, in general my life experience fortunately has always been global. I have had the good fortune of having many friends from all over the world who have taught me some of their customs and due to my curiosity I'm always eager to learn about a new culture and customs.

F7 (Written Answers)

1) Information about you: Your age now? What program of study are you pursuing, and what year of your degree are you in? What city and country are you from?

I'm a late returnee to college, I turned forty this past March, but am excited about continuing my education. I am currently pursuing a Bachelors in Interdisciplinary Studies, fully online--because that's convenient for me now. I have 35% of my program left to graduate. I was born in Curitiba, Brazil, and have lived in the United States (Florida), for eighteen years.

2) How would you define globalization and the concept of global citizenship?

Globalization is the interconnection of nations and cultures of the world in a very dynamic way, as it's possible in the twenty-first century—especially with the advent of the internet, which has facilitated world communication. I hear the term “globalization” usually associated with multinational trade and financial transactions; and I started hearing it more frequently from the 1990's on. Globalization has seen weaker economies (nation states) continue to struggle or become weaker, while advanced countries have kept the upper hand. Being in contact with my country of birth allows me to see the signs of this phenomenon, as does observing the recent history of modern nations of the world (by reading or in history classes). A global citizen is an individual who, to the best of their ability, takes actions to benefit/collaborate with the world rather than just a specific group or a nation. A global citizen looks to establish contact with (to get to know and communicate with) individuals of different regions of the world or from different cultural backgrounds—in person or remotely—with great care to understand these “others.” The global citizen seeks common ground in an exchange with someone from far away, thereby creating a relationship of equals & trying to “neutralize alterity.”

3) What associations or images does the adjective “global” summon to mind?

Planet Earth; the world map and its continents, time-zones, and geographic zones; countries of the world; or just a sphere with intersecting lines.

4) Has your understanding of these terms (“globalization,” “global citizenship,” “global”) changed or evolved because of taking this course? If yes, how so? If not, why do you think that is the case?

The meaning I associated with the term “globalization,” remains intact, as does the general meaning for “global.” Before taking a “global course,” and when I saw new courses available with the word “global” in their title, for instance, I quickly understood what that would entail: that the material of the courses would consider not only the realities covered by the discipline in the United States, but also realities outside of the U.S., and world-wide. I did feel that my understanding of what it is to be a “global citizen” evolved. I took the courses “Global Issues in Literature” and “LGBT and Beyond: Non-Normative Sexualities in Global Perspective,” and they both exposed issues I had not had the opportunity to think about much (or enough) in the past.

In Global Issues in Literature, I was required to read and think about some works which I had run into before (and had read /watched), such as the autobiographical graphic novels *Maus* and *Persepolis*; and new texts which I got to explore for the first time, such as a piece about the writings of Todorov on “otherness.” By analyzing the works that I had read before in class, I got to hear both the instructor's and other students' interpretations; and this time around, focus on “otherness.” I saw myself, and my own experience as an immigrant, in the works we talked about. By considering Todorov's alterity axes, I learned of the experience of contact between conquistadors and natives of the Americas; that made me think of my family roots, the evolution of the peoples they come from, and the conflict of interests between groups that come in contact for the first time. Now, activism for LGBTQ people and women's rights has reached a pinnacle these last few years. Gay marriage rights, for instance, have finally emerged victorious in the U.S., there's a stronger discussion of non-binary pronouns taking place now, and the “me too” movement has been exposing abuse that was somehow dismissed before. So, I decided that I needed more information on these fronts. As a heterosexual cis-male born in a massively Catholic country in 1978, I knew there were improvements to be made in my perception regarding LGBTQ people and women—even if flaws might be subconscious. The

“LGBT and Beyond” class helped me confirm the truth in that. I realized that some of my first mental reactions when regarding these minorities were highly sexualized. What helped me get to that conclusion were, for example, videos I was required to see in class--of LGBTQ people talking about themselves and their emotional needs; videos of famous show hosts evading LGBTQ people’s privacy by asking questions of their sexuality in national television; and etc. I also learned about how the struggle of LGBTQ people is even tougher overseas, and that much work is needed to accommodate these people who are people just like us. I, therefore, gained both insight in feelings and needs of divergent populations, and an outlook I didn’t have before of how there are complexities that mustn’t be overlooked when thinking, communicating, or even intervening with people who have different backgrounds than us.

5) Let’s talk about some of the content you studied in the course. Can you tell me about a text and/or a concept you encountered in the course that made a strong impression on you? Why do you think that experience matters to your understanding of ‘the global’?

In my answer to question 4, above, I went into some of the content of the courses I took, but I could expand. From the LGBT and Beyond course, I can mention the situation of LGBTQ people in Iran, where there’s an imposition of gender reassignment surgeries on people that do not conform to the social binary “normality” there. Such regulations prompt people to either flee the country (penalties are severe, including death), or undergo surgeries when they don’t want them or haven’t thought about them. And there are other countries with death penalty to LGBTQ individuals. The reason why learning about such situations matters is they remind us that many societies in the world are imperfect in different ways when gauged against the evolved moral arc of our times. Human rights are in constant improvement, and all nations need to be up-to-date on new consensus and education is needed to reach understanding and compromise.

6) Was there a text or concept that you found particularly difficult or surprising? What did you take away from this new difficult or surprising knowledge about global life or issues?

Continuing from answer 5, we know that such violence as the death penalty is still resorted to even in developed nation states as the U.S., but the knowledge that capital punishment for people who are just following their biological tendencies and their feelings is a reality in some regions of the world is surprising. Surprising, yet NOT unbelievable, since I’ve approached other subjects in college work such as female genitalia mutilation before.

However, let me include Global Issues in Literature here as well. We explored in a short story, the Hoodia case. The fictional account, which borrows from a real case, is something that most probably happens often in the current globalized world. We read the text, about a company interested in marketing a supposedly medicinal item, native of mid-African regions, and its plight (the company’s) of negotiation with local protection agencies, jurisdictions, and the tribe. The tribe in question (The Sans) which possessed knowledge about the item had beliefs that ran contrary to the idea of mass production of the medication or sharing of their recipes; they were nomadic--so their rights were influenced by overlapping jurisdictions; and they did not seem interested in the benefits the company claimed it would award them with if they allowed the company in. In the story, a representative is sent to Africa to mediate for the company and try to reach an agreement. The story shares a possible solution with the reader, via a simile of metal binding techniques: use different tactics with different stakeholders (like metals can be welded, different metals must be bolted together). What is notable here is how global differences can encompass a variety of issues that don’t just touch acceptance of others, but can get entangled with consumerism, exploitation, domination (this makes me think of petroleum, and the Middle East too). Hoodia was just a very marketable item because of the belief of

its potential to curb obesity--despite how the claim of its efficacy in weight control can be far-fetched to most critical thinkers. While the focus of the course was in the communication between the stakeholders (including NGOs), I liked how other issues came to mind for me to think about.

7) Were there any 'global' concepts or texts in the course that you did not find useful? Why do you think you came to this conclusion?

I've rarely found something that was completely irrelevant in my college education so far. I guess I've been lucky with my courses and instructors. When I look back at the two Global Issues courses specifically, I see that all the material explored excited thinking about the course themes. I sometimes find frustrating to discuss the material read with students who have either not grasped the essence of what is being explored, or are not paying attention or doing the work ("the work" usually involves a good deal of reading). But, even when re-explaining what I learned to unfocused students—or correcting them—ends up benefitting my learning process, I feel.

8) Is there anything that you did not study in the course that you wish had been on the syllabus? This might be a particular text, concept, topic or theme. If so, why do think this would be important to add to a global studies course like the one you've taken?

I think there were themes in the syllabus I didn't think about before—and that is great. As for a learning concept which I imagine could be useful to grasping the reality of "Global" communication (or issues), would be the opportunity to communicate with a person or people of another country or group, provided the encounter relates to the unit we are studying, via video-conference in a carefully controlled interview (that means having the proper questions for the person, and interpreters in both ends). Maybe a student from another country could "sit" in class with us (with an interpreter, if the student doesn't speak English) and we would hear their experience first-hand.

9) Describe what your classroom time was like. For example: was it primarily lecture-based, were there other kinds of activities mixed into your class period, was it primarily discussion-based? Did it vary throughout the semester or term? Did you have a discussion section run by a TA? Etc.

Note, again, that both were online classes.

Global issues in literature: this class had a good mix of lecture and discussion; there was an interactive element to it which made it more fun than most online classes I've taken; i.e., we had weekly online meetings, in which the professor would lecture / talk to us in a live video, while each student's prompt (first name, I think) would appear on a real-time text feed on the right of the screen. We could answer the instructor there, and ask questions, and comment on his or students entries. The instructor did not fail to address every student's entry. The off-line part of the course required us to read books and articles; watch videos and movies; and write papers, post them, and comment on papers by other students. It was a short- term class (Summer), but we could tackle all the material proposed. No teaching assistants participated in this class—every lecture was led by the instructor, and the texts had a written introduction by the instructor.

LGBT and beyond: the format of this class provided a much less personal level of interaction with the instructor. It surprised me at first, as it did the number of students in class—over 100. The instructor's initial idea of separating the class into groups was soon abandoned after the first week (it became more feasible to have all the posts in one feed, apparently). For this class we received the deadlines for quizzes and discussions; and each module, discussion area, and quiz were made

available when the time specified in the syllabus and online interface (Blackboard) came. The instructor only communicated with everyone via email (with the content of each email also mirrored on Blackboard), and PowerPoint files created by her were used as introduction for most modules. I initially resented the absence of the instructor, but then got used to the format and understood that the class was large. Her e-mails would reinforce the instructions given in the syllabus. The material available to read (and videos to watch) was extensive and rich (sometimes a bit too extensive—yet no notes from the instructor like I usually get in other courses whenever a document has over 40 pages, such as “skim through this part,” “pay attention to that,” “if you can’t go through all of it, make sure to read this part”). The discussions due were provoked by one or two questions about the material in the module, and each question required an answer with a minimum of three hundred words and one citation of a credible source used as support for the student’s entry. We were required to comment on at least two students’ entries, and encouraged to discuss the topic—but a true “discussion” was not enforced, all that was required was to comment in at least two sentences on another student’s entry. The quizzes tested us on the material read, by multiple choice options, which at times did not seem to test the concepts learned, but bits of information which don’t tease critical thinking—such as the name of a notable person, or title or date of a certain event. There were no variations throughout the semester, and TA’s were used “behind the scenes” only--to evaluate and post a short feedback on each discussion.

10) Which kinds of learning experiences that you had in the course felt most valuable or enriching to you? Your answer could be focused on particular activities, assessments, or person(s), as well as on your engagement with any of assigned course materials.

It is hard to single out which kinds of learning experiences were more noteworthy than others because I feel like I respond well to most kinds of delivery methods (text, video, discussion, lecture). However, I do like a good mix of these different possibilities because that keeps things interesting and easier to learn, since too much of one style tends to get tedious; and the brain must be stimulated! So, it’s mostly all material to me, if the material is relevant and there’s something intriguing to learn from it, I’m excited.

Global issues in literature: the live video talks by the Professor were great, and so was the inclusion of film (specifically *To Live*, 1994), autobiographical graphic novels, and texts which put the material in historical perspective (classic texts, contemporary, and even conversations about the future).

LGBT and beyond: I particularly enjoyed the videos included; the human emotion /expression they carried added to the more abstract information in written form we received. Seeing the people whose lives and access we talk about helps us relate to them. The State Quality Index on LGBTQ people was notable because of the well-designed graphs and maps, and the statistics, that type of document affords us opportunity for a broad view of the changes taking place and the places where change is most needed in the country. World reports with visual aid were great too.

11) Was there an online component to your course (either in your classroom time or in your assignments and activities)? If not, do you think engaging online could have improved your course experience, and why? If so, how would you describe your experience of these digital learning elements? For example, were they easy to navigate and interact with, did you feel like they added a useful or difficult dimension to your learning experience, and why?

Because my courses were fully online, the answer to this question is included in all answers above. I don’t think there was an added dimension of difficulty because the courses were online, but I do

think that classes in person (or hybrid classes with meetings in person and online) are more engaging to me—and I will go back to taking classes the traditional way whenever that's convenient.

12) What motivated you to take this course? Feel free to cite multiple reasons if relevant.

&

13) Did your course experience satisfy this logic that motivated you to enroll? In other words, did it deliver the experience you were expecting or hoping for?

Global Issues in Literature was appealing to me because of the “literature element” of it, since I want to focus on writing at this stage of my education. But the “Global” quality of the course also sparked curiosity in me; that is because as an immigrant, and a person who condemns the flaws of nationalism (tribalism, blind devotion to a hegemonic cause, subscription to dichotomies such as “them and us,” etc.). I’ve always been inclined to say, “I am a citizen of the world” rather than a Brazilian, or an American. Furthermore, my intuition tells me that all our great nations would fare better as one big nation sharing resources and enjoying the awesome diversity of Earth. But, for now, I understand how that’s quite a utopian dream. In the meantime, (while utopia is too utopian to consider) I have plans of visiting different parts of the world I haven’t been to yet. Hopefully this expresses my global emotions, which lead me to take global courses. As for Global Issues in Literature specifically, it absolutely did meet my learning expectations. Could it be a longer class? Yes. And if it was longer, with more time with the subject at hand, I’d perhaps be even more fluid with the language of it; but as it is, I feel I’ve kept key concepts which are now part of my way of thinking and idiolect. I spoke of why I found it important to take the LGBT and Beyond course in my answer to question 4, paragraph 4. I’m very satisfied with the course, and happy I took it—especially because it made me more aware of the needs of the minorities we explored during that course; and more aware of how systems and cultures that neglect them end up barring their access to health and a just life, and promoting the continuation of a stigmatic narrative. The course helped in both clearing assumptions “outsiders” (like myself) have, and improve communication between “us” and LGBT people.

14) How do you understand your own situation in our globalized world and its histories after taking the course? How would you describe your position in the world, in terms of the global life and issues you’ve studied?

How did my understanding of my own position in the world change after taking the courses Global Issues in Literature, and LGBT and Beyond? I should expand on before the courses first. So, before I took the Global courses, I perceived “otherness” in a natural way, the way we bump into different people in our everyday routine and they stand out, so we are at first a little surprised, and then we look for common ground to communicate as equals (if there is opportunity or need for communication).

And regarding how I perceived myself (how I’m different to others in the world) before taking the course: I know I’m from Brazil, and I know I’m the product of a mixture of Polish, Italian, and Brazilian Native blood—although I have not sent my saliva to Ancestry.com yet to find out what the exact mixture through time may have been. I traced the basic movement of the families I’m connect to over the world map not long ago, and looked up the meaning of our surnames. I know beliefs I was given which I was not sure about were impacted by my education—now I’m an atheist, and a skeptic. Though a permanent resident, I know I’m a foreigner in the U.S. and some people around me often don’t let me forget the fact that I’m South-American by remarking on my accent or by their facial expressions when I make a mistake in my speech; I fight my accent daily, in efforts to sound more intelligible to others in my community. After Global Issues in Literature, and LGBT and

Beyond, I felt I could focus on abstract concepts such as alterity, cosmopolitanism, and non-binary genders, and I could say I belong to minority groups which overlap, making me an “other” to various groups. I’m a person who migrated to the U.S. in my early twenties and speaks English as a second language, and I am finally comfortable to disclose that I’m an atheist—so, to an extent, I realize what is to be “closeted” and that helps me understand closeted LGBT people better (although their difficulties are much denser than mine). In the U.S., typical Americans and religious folks, or typical Americans who are religious often see me as an outsider, as well as an infidel. I can feel similar reactions in Brazil, regarding my lack of religious affiliation—I’m labeled an infidel, a heretic, or a person who can still be saved. Similarly, there are people I have looked at as “others,” as dictated by the cultures I’m linked to. Changes have taken place as I moved to the US, lived here for eighteen years, and had the opportunity to be in contact with people of different groups and cultures I had not been in contact with before (North Americans—people who’ve come from everywhere in the world); after taking the course and studying a history of “otherness” or alterity, I feel more comfortable with the idea that there are differences and we must work on negative or poor reactions and create a healthy contact zone—and I feel comfortable being a subject in a contact zone, as well.

After taking the courses, I realized that my prior wishes to be a global citizen are legitimate, and in my cosmopolitan posture I must continue to do my best to be well-informed of what is happening in the world and to be ready to communicate and to help, when possible. I’m courteous and attentive to people of all ethnicities and backgrounds in my community, and as I find time I feel I can be more active. I’m an artist, so from my online platform with social media I post art that triggers global thinking whenever I can. And though I’m lucky to live in a first world country, I know that most people in the world don’t have the same quality of life I do, so the Global courses also remind me of the legitimacy of my concern for the developing world. It’s easier to act locally, so local issues receive more of my action. A couple of weeks ago, for instance, I participated in the March for our Lives in Parkland, FL, because I felt close to the families affected by the tragedy of February 14, and I wanted my opposition to violence and to damaging politics to be heard. Days later, I realized that there were March for our Lives events not just in the U.S., but abroad as well, in Mumbai, Copenhagen, Paris, London, Madrid, Tokyo, Brisbane, and Rome; and that I was part of a movement of Global action. After taking the LGBT course, I realize that my position towards that community is of an ally, who can help creating awareness of much needed improvements to LGBT people in North America and the world.

15) Do you feel like your educational experience at your university more generally has been global, or helped you to become more of a global thinker, citizen, or individual? How so?

My answer to question 14 fits here, towards question 15, also. And I can add that my education experience at FIU so far has indeed had a Global aspect to it—and that is besides the fact that Miami / South Florida are melting pots, a condition favorable to a feeling of cosmopolitanism, due to the richness of cultures and ethnicities here. The activities, classes, and classroom dynamics are always inclusive of multi-cultural elements and themes at FIU, so the general experience I’ve had at FIU was that there is a bridge connecting my global thinking with the global awareness in the education they are offering. As an aside, and a closing thought, I do firmly believe that if higher education was free in the United States, like it is in some developed countries of the world, universities here would become even more Global and inclusive of all people.

MCMASTER INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS

M1

I: All right, so I'm just going to read you an overview of your voluntary participation and then ask for your oral consent. So, your participation in this study is voluntary. You can decide to stop at any time, even partway through the interview, for whatever reason, or up until September 30, 2018. If you decide to stop participating, there will be no consequences to you. If you decide to stop, I will ask you how you would like me to handle the data collected up to that point. This could include returning it to you, destroying it, or using the data collected up to that point. If you do not want to answer some of the questions, you do not have to. So you can opt out of a specific question if you want. But you can still be in the study overall. If you have any questions about this study or would like more information, you can call or e-mail me. And you have my information, from my notes. Okay, here are the questions for your consent. Do you have any questions or would you like any additional details at this time?

S: I'm okay.

I: Okay, thanks. Do you agree that the interview can be audio recorded?

S: Yeah.

I: Great, thank you. Do you agree to have your responses used for future related projects? That's unlikely to happen, but...

S: Yeah, that's fine.

I: Okay. Thanks. Do you agree to participate in this study knowing that you can withdraw at any point with no consequences to you?

S: Yep.

I: Thank you. And finally, before we begin, would you like to receive a summary of the study's results? If so, at what e-mail or mailing address would you like to receive them?

S: Oh, sure. It'd be cool to see, like, the thing, that's, yeah.

I: Yeah.

S: Okay, cool.

I: Do you want me to e-mail you at your McMaster e-mail?

S: Yeah, that's fine. Whatever works or whatever.

I: Okay, cool. Or, you've been e-mailing me from your Gmail, haven't you?

S: Yeah, yeah. The Gmail's fine.

I: Great. It will be a while, but I will--

S: That's fine.

I: --follow up at the end of 2018, probably.

S: Thanks.

I: Okay, thank you. So, just--you've, you've seen the questions already, but I'm just going to kind of go through this opening, just to remind you. So, the exact wording of the questions that you've received might change a little. I might use other short questions to make sure I understand what you've told me. Or if I need more information when we're talking, like, rephrasing back to you what you've just said. There are no wrong answers, please feel free to be honest. If you feel tired or fatigued, we can take breaks. Or we can stop. And I'll ask you periodically if you want to take a break. You're also free to decline from answering a question if you would like. Okay?

S: Cool. Sounds good.

I: Awesome. So, first question is easy. Just information about you. What is your age now?

S: I'm nineteen.

I: Great. And what program of study are you pursuing and what year of your degree are you in?

S: I'm a first year, I'm in social sciences, and I'm applying in to second year for Poly Sci. Political Science.

I: Awesome. And what city and country are you from?

S: So I was, I'm from Hamilton, I was born in Alberta, but I've been here my whole life, so.

I: Cool.

S: Yeah.

I: Okay, next question. We're getting into stuff a little bit. How would you define globalization and the concept of global citizenship?

S: Okay. For me personally, I--I honestly think globalization is just like a new form of neocolonialism and imperialism. And, like, it's just a way for the west to continue to have, like, to continue to maintain this, like, hegemonic power. And like, have a hold on the rest of the world. And sort of impose its own structures into, like, impose western structures into non-western structures. I think the benefits of globalization are not universal, and the way they benefit the west does not translate into the rest of the world. I think it's resulted in this gap that continues to grow between the

west--and even, like, the rich and the poor even within our own countries. Through things like exploitation of labor, through things like just, like, cultural genocides and imperialism and just, like, the way...Honestly, I just think it's everything that's happening now, like in terms of global--well, it's like. Okay, sorry, so while we see it as a, a form of interconnectedness of the world and, like, the reason of bridging borders, I think that isn't a reality for the people who [inaudible--5:01] global [inaudible 5:02]. I think that's the reality for us. You and me, who sort of have this idea that whatever's good for us is good for everybody else, which is not true. We don't really have a very, like, nuanced, or a very, like a critical lens of actually, like, evaluating, like, the reality of relativism and the idea that, like, the world doesn't revolve around us. Yeah.

I: Great. Okay, so, maybe then if you don't mind, if that's your definition of globalization, how does the idea of global citizenship fit into that understanding of globalization? Which was the theme of your course, right? So...

S: Yeah. I honestly think it's a way to assuage our sort of, like, guilt, about some of the things happening in the world. I don't think it's anything real. Like, even looking at things like voluntourism. I don't think that's an embodiment of what a global citizen should actually be. Like I think at this point it's just a made-up term to assuage our guilt about things going on.

I: Okay, great. I'm not supposed to comment, so. Okay, next question is what associations or images does the adjective "global" summon to mind? So what--just kind of free associate--what does that make you think of when you hear something described as "global"?

S: I think it's just another word for, like, the world or the earth or like the actual physical structure of--of the globe and sort of where we live.

I: Great. Next question. Has your understanding of these terms--globalization, global citizenship, or the term--the adjective "global"--changed or evolved because of taking this course, Globalization 1A03?. If yes, how did it change? And if not, why do you think that's the case?

S: So a lot of the stuff I've talked about kind of briefly, like, I didn't learn this throughout the course, but I think what the course did was it sort of forced me to look beyond, like, the simple narratives that were presented. And sort of forced me to look into, like, the reality of globalization. And the reality of what it does. So in a sense, so it changed my sort of view--not changed, but it sort of, like, challenged my view. It challenged me to continue to, like, dig deeper, and, like, look at the reality of things from the Global South especially.

I: So, what, if you don't mind me asking you to explain more, what do you mean by "challenged your view"? Like what was your first view that you kind of think you came in with? And then maybe--maybe you just looked more deeply into that view and it didn't fundamentally change, but what would you say you came in with?

S: I actually don't think I came in with much of a, like, critical lens. Like I--I don't think I came in with anything really. And I think what the course did was it forced me--I'd always kind of been critical of things and I always kind of like to, like, look beyond what's presented. And so--and I knew the Global South was suffering because of the west. Like, I knew that that was a reality, and so--and

a lot of the things that were presented, like, were hard for me to sort of believe. And so what that course did was it forced me to kind of, like, do my own research. So, that was one of the pros I got from that course is forcing me to do my own research, instead of just listening to what he was saying.

I: Great. Okay, next question. Let's talk about some of the content you studied in the course. Can you tell me about a text or a concept that you encountered--or it could be both--in the course that made a strong impression on you? Why do you think that experience matters to your understanding now of the global? So--anything, if you can remember any specific text or concept or maybe meet--class meeting, that topic, that made a strong impression on you.

S: We had two textbooks. The one was sort of just, like, facts. Well, as much into it as I read, I didn't read too much into it. And the other one, I read one chapter and I was like, "I'm not going to read this." It was talking about religious globalization. And then it was--it was really problematic in the sense that, like, well it was talking about different forms. So economical globalization, it talked about, I think it was religious globalization, and there was another one I can't remember right now. But the part of religious globalization was all about ISIS and Islam. And I put the book down and I was like, "I'm not gonna read this." So that was the one part of the text I remember. I just remember it being very problematic and kind of, concerned as to why that specific text was assigned. Because it didn't present a very critical lens of--even the part about economic globalization didn't really challenge, like, exploitation or why--why, like, who else is benefitting and, like, why this wage gap is increasing.

I: So it, so it felt sort of like an unbalanced presentation--

S: Yeah.

I: --to you, and, and that, was that surprising or was it just a really strong reaction against it?

S: Well, in my senior--like last year, in grade 12, I--I took a World Issues course. And I think I, I sort of, I was hoping that things would change once I got into postsecondary, I was hoping I'd have, I'd be in a space with a lot more people who would be aware. And I think I had hope, but I wasn't too sure what to expect, and I didn't expect that. So, yeah. Like, I expected what I got, but I was--I was really hoping it wouldn't be the case. Yeah.

I: Okay, thank you for that. Okay, so, more on this topic, was there a text or a concept that you found particularly difficult or surprising? So something that was, that you hadn't thought of before, or that was sort of hard to stomach in some way, intellectually? And what do you think you took away from that new knowledge which was difficult or surprising?

S: The one thing that I remember that kind of bugged me--I have my notes from the class in front of me, just to kind of remember--was he talked a lot--he talked a bit about, like, the two sides of--so, the anti-globalization side and sort of, from the right, from, like, the far-right's perspective versus the, the left's perspective. And talking about the left's perspective, just kind of the way he presented it made it seem like left is just, like, against everything. And how, it didn't really--so he, and he criticized the left, the left's opinions of globalization, but he didn't really talk about why the left thinks this. Why the left is so anti-globalization. Like there wasn't any context to it--and that's...And, and you have a

Ph.D. Thesis - S. D'Adamo; McMaster University - English and Cultural Studies
class of 500 first-years who are very impressionable, who are very also vulnerable, and I think that courses like these can--can really, like, develop their, like, like the narratives, and like ideologies. And I just wish he'd taken advantage of that.

I: So, in, in terms of the second part of the question, like, what did you take away from that, does it--what I think I'm hearing you say, is that it makes you realize, like, how important teaching is and how dangerous it can be to kind of be like unbalanced or...

S: Yeah.

I: Is that--like, is that a good summary of what you took away from that?

S: I think so, yeah. The, the thing is, I liked him--like, like I like him a lot as a person. And I--we've had tons, like tons of conversations, like, hours of conversations, just like, I challenged him and he challenged me back. And, like, we had a good conversation, like I raised my hand up in class a couple times, and he was, like, willing to have those conversations, which was good. I just wish it had translated into the actual curriculum. Especially a lot more in, a lot more--the first half of the class is very Eurocentric, it was very basic, very, like--I remember this one class he asked us what was something that happened today that was the result of globalization and the only answers we got were, that you could eat food from--like, Asian food. That you can--just like, very, yeah. It wasn't very, like--there wasn't, like, there's no critical thinking. And I wish we had challenged those narratives a little more, I wish he had forced us to, like, deep, like part of the assignments. We had three blog post assignments to do, and I kind of wish he forced us to look at the Global South and write about the Global South for that blog post. And when I brought that up, he said that he couldn't force anyone to write anything, but I was like, "You can force people to think critically, right?" Like, you can do that. And even like, all the blog posts were posted online and when you're like looking through them, it was all very simple stuff. It was all global warming, and it was all about food, it was all about clothing, it was all about the internet. There wasn't any, sort of like, critical lens that was, like, displayed, you know?

I: So like, if he could have given people prompts or topics or something like that.

S: Yeah. Yeah. I think you have to force people to think critically, because people aren't going to do it on their own.

I: Great, thank you. So maybe this--you've already been talking about this question a little bit, but, were there any global concepts, global concepts, or texts in the course that you did not find useful? Why do you think you came to that conclusion?

S: What do you mean? Like--

I: Well, so, for example, you've been saying that, like, you felt like the framing of the first half of the course was Eurocentric, even if it wasn't acknowledging that. Right? And, so maybe this is a--a more specific question in that vein. Right, is there a specific concept or a reading that was assigned that you didn't really think helped advance the class's understanding of the topic of global citizenship? In--in your view, right? So, obviously it had a purpose in the instructor's view. But in your view.

S: Honestly, I think all of it, to be honest. Like, it wasn't anything specific. Like, in the first class, he was talking about what globalization means. He talked about interconnectedness, borderless politics, multinational corporations. He didn't talk about capitalism and neoliberalism and sort of, cultural appropriation--cause he talked about cultural exchange. And he defined globalization and--he sort of, he was like, "Is it just a buzzword, or is it actually just, like, [inaudible--15:36] to the world, when we talked a bit about, theories. Like Thomas Friedman, Anthony Giddens, Roland Robertson. And sort of, it wasn't--but that went on for a while. I was like, "Okay, it's just starting to be a little--", like it would get a little bit better. And then we talked about the myths of globalization and is globalization good or bad, and he sort of presented both sides. But, yeah, like, yeah, like he talked a bit about--like, here in my notes it says--I don't know if this was me or if it was actually him--he sort of, so he presents both sides of globalization, but he doesn't really talk about why the left thinks this, or why the right thinks this, you know. Like, like, and even when we were talking about the right, and what they think of globalization, how they're very anti-globalization because of immigrants, we don't talk about white supremacy, we don't talk about why they think this stuff. And I think that stuff is important to talk about. It's--it's not enough to just say, "The right is against globalization because of economic issues," right?

I: So, so basically, this is actually the next question. And what I think I'm hearing you saying is that you wished that globalization had been discussed as an ideology.

S: Yeah.

I: Or the ideologies which interact with globalization. So the next question is, is there anything that you did not study in the course that you wish had been on the syllabus? Sounds like there's many things. There might be a particular text, concept--*concept*, theme, or topic. If so, why do you think this would be important to add to a global studies course like the one you've taken? So this is kind of your opportunity to, like, envision the curriculum you want.

S: Okay. So, we hear--we heard these words that--we heard "neoliberalism" in class--we heard "voluntourism" in class. We heard, like, we heard these very, like we heard these buzzwords, but that was, like, like that was it. We didn't talk about them. We didn't talk about--the one thing I was really hoping to talk about was exploitation of labor. I think it's a huge part of globalization. I think there's also a question about an internet component, and I have something else to talk about for that. But, the one thing I liked was he brought in this speaker, and he talked about voluntourism. And it was, it was very, very, it was a very critical lens of--like she really critiqued voluntourism and the implications it has on the Global South. And I know a lot of students are not very happy if there is a speaker. I was very happy with her. And she talked a lot about who it really benefits and how it was almost just a way to assuage our liberal guilt. And I really appreciated that, I appreciated her coming. And then, we had another speaker who spoke a little bit about South Africa. I don't really know what happened in that lecture, I kind of zoned out for a while to be completely honest.

I: That's okay, it happens. So, more, more of that. It sounds like more specific looks at the effects of some of these--

S: Yeah, yeah.

I: --global citizenship sorts of actions that people take.

S: Yeah. The tutorials we had in that class were really cool because there was lots of--it was a lot of discuss--it was very discussion-based. And she asked very critical questions, we talked about terrorism. Oh, yeah, we had a huge lecture on terrorism. I don't think I was very happy with that, I can't remember exactly what happened in that lecture. Let me see if I have...[rustling papers]...I can't find too much about it, but I think the overarching thing I--I hoped for was more--so we talked about terrorism a bit, we talked about, very vaguely about, like, labor and exploitation and neoliberalism and, like, free market, but we didn't talk about how...We just talked about the negatives of those, but we didn't talk about how the west has resulted in--like the west's rule in these--in creating these policies, right? The west's role in imposing these structures into the Global South.

I: So like a little more history perhaps? You know, this is, this is something that people often critique about globalization studies is that it treats everything as if it's in the present and there's no history, right?

S: Yeah. And even when talking about terrorism, we didn't talk about, like, the war on terror in a way that, like, shows that the, like the Global South is the victim of, of a very colonial, very imperial war, right? And I think you have to talk about those things because, that's, unless you give a face to the actual issues, unless you talk about how the war in Iraq and Afghanistan were just--were, were, weren't, it's not actually a war on terror--then people are going to continue to believe that we are fighting actual terrorists. But that's not what's going on, right?

I: Okay, great. So more context, more history, and more perspectives from the Global South. And also more discussion of labor and exploitation and the west's--western and white supremacy's role in producing these conflicts. Is what--I'm summarizing back to you what I'm hearing.

S: Yeah. There was this one lecture I remember. I put up my hand and I started talking about cheap foreign labor, like it was in the earlier half of the course. And I was talking about how the Global South's perspective, and their sort of, experience of globalization is one that is always ignored. It's one that we've never--we never talk about, and we never hear. And he says, "I don't want to speak on their behalf." I never asked you to speak on their behalf, I asked you to show us a more objective lens of the reality of globalization and what it does to the Global South. Right? Like, I'm not asking you to--like, we know what's going on there. There's lots of videos, there's interviews, there's people talking. There are activists who are doing this work, right? I think we--we need to look at them, we need to, like, hear them out, right?

I: Okay, great, thank you so much. Okay, so the next are a little bit more--you started to get into this a little bit--a little bit more about just, like, what the class experience was like. How it was structured, etc. So, can you describe what your classroom time was like? For example, was it primarily lecture-based? Were there other kinds of activities mixed into the lecture time, like group work or, you know, breakout groups or something? Was it primarily discussion-based? Did it vary throughout the semester or the term? Did you have a discussion section run by a TA? Etc.

S: Okay, the course itself it was very, just, him talking, like it was lecture-based. He did have discussions every once in a while, he would put [inaudible--22:42] up your hand and interrupt him,

and bring up something, which I did a couple times, just to challenge what was being talked about. We had a tutorial on top of that, and that was interesting, cause it was very discussion-based. I remember, I think it was, like, the very first tutorial essay, what was it? Someone. We were talking about--I think we were talking about police, and probably like--I think it had to do with, like, Black Lives Matter, and then we were talking about the system, and, I think I was, like--I think, the problem is, like, even, I have a friend who's in the [inaudible--23:19] studies tutorial, and the problem is TAs aren't--aren't really trained in how to handle very sensitive topics, and how to, like, make sure--like how to handle it if things go out of hand. I had a friend--in my friend's tutorial there was a student who compared BLM to the KKK. And it was like a very, like, overtly racist student who is, like, just problematic all the time. But then whenever my friend talks, my friend is the one who gets in trouble, my friend is the one who's asked to sit down and be quiet. My friend's the one who's--who's reprimanded for her actions, but--regardless of the fact that she speaks up for everybody. Right? We had one of those arguments once, and like it was a heated argument. It was myself and two other people. Against other people. And we were talking about the system. And police brutality and whatnot. And--like, she just ended up shutting it down. She goes, "All right, stop talking or else[inaudible 24:11]" instead of addressing, like, what actually happened.

I: So, it was discussion-based but kind of managed, and not well, is what I'm hearing.

S: Yeah. Yeah, yeah.

I: Like, it was stifled discussion in some ways. Okay. That's useful to know. And, basically Dr. X lectured, that was the primary, like you didn't, you didn't do other stuff during lecture?

S: No, not during.

I: Okay, cool. Thank you.

S: Sometimes he'd ask discussion questions and then we'd talk for a couple minutes.

I: Gotcha, okay.

S: Yeah, yeah.

I: Okay. So, what kinds of learning experiences that you had in the course felt most valuable or enriching to you? Your answer could be focused on particular activities, like discussion, assessments, maybe that's research, maybe that's a blog post, you know. It's whatever, any of the things that you were assigned. Or persons, right? It could be focused on, like, your TA or your lecturer or your classmates, it could be anyone in the experience. As well as on any specific course materials that were assigned if that is an area you're interested in talking about.

S: So, I think one of the biggest things I took away was, I think I found my voice a little bit in that class. I had, like, three or four like, just, meetings with the professor. Like, we talked for, like, an hour. Just about everything. And, and I think that helped me sort of, um, become more vocal and sort of, like, challenge him, and I even challenged him a couple times in class. And, and I, and I appreciate the time he spent to talk to me. And I even, like, I went up and talked to him at the end of class. And I thanked him for all the time he actually spent, like, hearing me out. And one of the

biggest things I--one of the biggest concerns I had with the class was the Twitter page. I don't know if you were aware of the Twitter page.

I: I was following.

S: You were--oh--okay. I don't know if you saw me at all?

I: I don't remember, it's been a while, but--it's, it's possible.

S: So there's this one student. You should search her on Twitter. You'll get a good laugh. Her name was Liberal, Not Lefty. But she's not liberal. Like, she's--she's as right as they get. She's problematic in every possible way. She was in our class. And, so she--I don't have the Twitter pick at all, but her week, I was like, "All right, I'm ready for this." Like, "This is gonna be good. I'm ready to fight." And then, I was like, no. Like, I'm not gonna--so, she posted some really problematic things. On the first day, back when Quebec introduced the niqab ban, she goes, she was like, something about, like, humble religious practice. Like it was really problematic things on the page, one time she equated immigrants to rape. On the Twitter page. On the course's page. And so I went to my prof one day after class, and she was in the front row, and I--and I saw her, I was like, "I know who you are." And then I--I looked at the prof and I was like, "I don't know if you're following the page, but there's some really problematic content on it. I don't know how you're allowing this to be on the page." And then, she goes, "X, I'm the one who posted to the page if you want to talk about anything." And so me, him, and her, we sit aside for like, half an hour, and we were talking and, and, we talked about freedom of speech. And like, where you draw the line. I was like, no, I said, "Like, I'm going to be genuinely honest, I don't have time to spend here and debate you about your political views because you're really problematic." And she goes, "Do you think I'm racist?" I was like, "Absolutely, I think you're racist." And she goes, "That's really offensive," like, I don't know. Like, she was really butt-hurt that I called her racist. And he goes, "I can't police people's thoughts." I was like, "On the course page you can, you can't allow hate speech. You can't allow like [inaudible 27:48] rhetoric on a page like that." Like, it's a course page. Even, like, her and me, we talked for a while, and it wasn't getting anywhere and it was just a bunch of back and forth between like where you draw the line between freedom of speech and hate speech. And I--she was saying, like, I was trying to suppress her voice, when the reality was just, like, not allowing for, like, hate speech to be spewed under the guise of freedom of speech. And so, like, I walked away after a while. And I had two friends who also had the page. And I remember them actively censoring themselves because of, because they were worried about their mark. And so one of my friends, who had a--I, I asked for the password then one day.

I: Do you mean, like, censoring, like, more leftist views or more critical views?

S: Yeah. Yeah, yeah. Censoring their leftist views because they were worried about--they were worried about their grade being affected. And so I remember, I took my friend's password the one day, and for the page, and I posted something about Burma, the genocide against Muslims. And, and I was like, and the leader, Aung San Suu Kyi, she is a Canadian citizen. And so she--well, she's an honorary Canadian. And so I said, I was like, "What does this say about our Canadian values when a murderer, when a person who's committing genocide, is also a citizen of Canada?" And it was a long debate, like she went off on the page, and whatever, and like, lots of back and forth, just like, talking

about it. But like, and then my, my friend was kind of upset that that was posted, because he didn't want to have to debate it.

I: Yeah.

S: Yeah. And so I went to my professor, like after, to talk about our conversation with Amanda, with the really racist student. And I just talked to him, I was like, I talked to him about my reality as a Muslim, like my identity has been politicized in every possible way. And, and the Twitter page is becoming a platform for just, bigotry, like, you're allowing her to spew hatred. She also posted something about cultural appropriation and how it wasn't actually real. And I was like, I'm not gonna, like I--I understand, I'm fully aware of the fact that people are not born, like, politically aware. People are not born understanding the realities of--and I'm okay having those conversations, but I'm not okay having a conversation of whether or not cultural appropriation is real. Because we know it's real, we know the implications of it, right? That's--like, I, I just, I'm not gonna do that. Like, I think it frankly replicates colonial structures. Like I think that's what the page, the Twitter page did. And I think, like, allowing that stuff even if he didn't agree with it, it validated those racist and xenophobic views, right? I don't know, I think covert racism is still racism. And it shouldn't be given a platform under the guise of freedom of speech. And, and like I think parameters should have been set, and that, the tweet is still up there, it was never taken down. And, when I--he said he talked to her about it, the one that equated rape to immigrants, and that--that shouldn't be up there. And it's still up there, it was never taken down.

I: So, I'm wondering, I don't mean to interrupt you, but I'm just curious about the--this, the question that I was asking that led you to talk about this, which sounds like it was such a hotbed of conflict and strife and negotiation, right? That this forum was created online. In addition to the other forums, but that specifically the way that this sat next to the class actually made a lot of your feelings about it more intense and more difficult, right? Is that--am I--is that a good summary?

S: Yeah.

I: So, I'm wondering, so the question I'd asked, actually, was about what was most valuable. What experiences were most valuable. So, do you think that, I mean you said that you found your voice. Do you think that this was, perversely, a kind of way--a valuable way to kind of locate that voice? Like, having to keep pushing back against--obviously, I don't want you to have to do that. But, is that, would that be a way to understand it as valuable? Or do you just wish that none of it was happening?

S: I guess, I mean at the end of the day I wish none of it was happening, because it's so exhausting and draining all the time to be having these conversations over and over. But at the end of the day, like, I do a lot of work, like, I do a lot of activism, and like, just with different clubs. And I think I'm gonna have to have these conversations a lot more, especially within my program. And so while I wish it didn't happen, I think, like, I did learn a lot from those experiences. I did learn a lot from talking to--from being forced to have these conversations. Even just, like, the one thing I'm working on right now is, like, being able to sit down and have a genuine conversation without getting angry. And without kind of like, like being able to draw the line, between like "Okay, I'm just gonna walk away, because it's not worth my energy" and like, genuinely trying educate someone. And I think, sort of, that helped me, sort of develop that, kind of, what I'm working on right now.

I: Okay, great, thank you. So, we've obviously already been talking about the next question, which is about whether there was an online component to the course. So, there was Twitter and the blog, so you can talk about both or either. Do you think that...Okay. How would you describe your experience of these digital learning elements? So, you don't need to repeat yourself, but if anything else that you haven't already said. Did you feel like they were easy to navigate and interact with? Did you feel like they added a useful or difficult dimension to your learning experience? Why? So you could also talk about, like, using Mosaic and Avenue To Learn and that kind of thing, too, if you want.

S: So I personally had a lot of fun making the blog posts. I just had to, like, complain a bit. So, like, my experience of globalization is sort of, like, not being able to speak to my family back home, because of, like my language is devalued, you know. So I had lot of fun writing them. The Twitter page was not fun because I found myself spending so much time and energy just, like, making sure there's nothing problematic. Making sure that there if there is anything I can try and challenge it somehow. So, it sort of like, also the page kind of, in a way, sets precedence for the narratives that people are expecting, and the narratives that are there. So when you have problematic narratives, there's going to be more problematic narratives. So I'm always, like, trying to--I spent a lot of time on the Twitter page, and at one point, I went to him, and I was like, "This is it, I can't be on the Twitter page anymore," and I just like, stopped going on. Because I have other things to do.

I: So you, like, kind of became a moderator?

S: In a way.

I: Wow. That's so--that's very generous of you, I mean, I know that it's not coming from a place of generosity, but that's a lot of time.

S: Yeah.

I: And energy to spend. Okay, great, thank you. So, we're in the last four questions, are you okay? Do you need to take a break?

S: No, I'm good.

I: Okay. Okay, so next question is, what motivated you to take this course? Feel free to cite multiple reasons.

S: I think--the reason I took it was there are very few first-year courses that have to do with politics, and sort of activism, and sort of talking about the current political climate. And that was one. And so I, I took it because of that.

I: So, so what, if you don't mind me asking, what about it made it seem like it would be about politics? Before you took it.

S: I think I looked at the course syllabus, and I thought it was really interesting. I saw, I just saw, like, "economic globalization." I also wanted to learn a lot about economic globalization. Sort of how money works, because I don't think it makes any sense. And I just saw things about, I saw things

about that, I saw things about the Global South, and I just wanted to explore that a little bit more. Sort of broaden my horizons on, sort of, the things I learn.

I: Great. Okay. And this next question is related to that one. Did your experience in the course satisfy the logic that motivated you to enroll? In other words, did it deliver the experience you were expecting or hoping for?

S: No. I think last semester, like. So, I--in my world issues class, like, I guess it was the closest thing to my world issues class, and I was hoping it'd be different than my grade 12 experience. And like, last semester, I was still kind of, like, you know, I--I, I was, every once in a while like it'd be exciting to have to fight someone, it'd be exciting to have to, like challenge someone. And then something interesting would happen and I'd have to fight. That was, like that was fun to have, every once in a--like, not fun, but it was something, like, like once it happened, I'd get really excited, and I'd be like, "Okay, here, like let's talk about this." But I think now, at this point, I've done it so much that I'm like, "No, I don't have any more time or energy for this." Yeah. So, for a while it was, like, it was okay.

I: But you came--you came away frustrated.

S: Yeah.

I: And tired.

S: Yeah.

I: Okay, great. Okay, next question is--I've already gotten a little sense of this, but maybe you wanna speak to it specifically. How do you understand your own situation in our globalized world and its histories after taking the course? How would you describe your position in the world, in terms of the global life issues you've studied? So, maybe another way to say that is, did something about taking this course actually make--actually clarify to you your situation in the world? Because it sounds like you already had a lot of language around that before you took the course.

S: I think, if anything, it sort of--I didn't know much, I knew, like, very briefly about the global stuff, but like, but I didn't have, like, words to put to the issues. I didn't, like, know about exploitation of labor. I didn't know about, like, displacement of, like, and ownership of black peop--black bodies all over the world. And I think sort of it--it sort of cleared those realities and sort of helped me, sort of, kind of, look for productive ways to become allies to different communities. And how I can continue to educate myself and educate other people on, like, the plight of the Global South. And sort of their experiences. And, yeah. I think, like I think it helped me do that a little, in a way.

I: So it sounds like it actually, like, solidified and strengthened your identification with the Global South.

S: Yeah.

I: Cool.

S: Yeah. Yeah sort of, also, it made me think of back home, and sort of, like, trying to go back home. My parents are from Egypt. And visit my family a little bit. So, yeah.

I: I bet. Okay, thank you. All right, last question. How--do you feel like your educational experience at your university more generally has so far been global or helped you to become more of a global thinker, citizen, or individual? How so?

S: Honestly, like, not really. Everything's very Eurocentric. Every single political science class I've taken is problematic in one way or another. My friends' classes are problematic. I have a friend in fourth year, and we just, like, talk about this and it doesn't get any better, apparently. So, not really. Like, it hasn't been. I guess valuable in the sense that, like, I'm doing my own learning. And like I, like I do appreciate that. Like I, I, I am happy that I'm being forced to do my own learning. But also, not valuable in the sense that I'm always having to, like, fight someone. This morning, in one of my classes, in my tutorial, some, uh, he was presenting his topic. And he was talking about basically globalization and China and the U.S. And he was saying how basically the U.S. has to take a stronger stance against globalization and how China is taking all of our jobs. And I was like, "Let's talk about exploitation of labor and corporations." And then, then another kid after him was doing a presentation on, like, the rise of white supremacy in the states. And, like, it was very well done, he had some really good points. And that same kid puts up his hand, and he goes, "What do you mean by the alt right?" Like the same kid who was presenting about the U.S. and sort of how Trump's like voter base was a bunch of poor people, and like, how Trump is helping poor people. I was like, "What do you mean?" Like, he's obviously, like, right-wing. And, like, that was interesting. Yeah.

I: So it sounds like what you're saying is, McMaster is not offering you a global education particularly. But that while you're there, you're able to seek that out on your own terms to some degree.

S: Yeah. But the only reason I'm seeking them out is because, like, my identity is inherently, like, politicized, right? But no one else is doing that. That--my, my friends in the globalization class. All the people I've talked to in that class are very comfortable thinking that globalization is them being able to eat food from Japan, right? That to eat sushi is because of globalization, and they're very comfortable in that [inaudible--41:11]. And, and, they're just thinking about how global warming is bad because of that, but like, that, it, like it doesn't go beyond that. That step. So.

I: Yeah. Okay, that makes sense. All right, lastly, do you want to say anything else? Is there anything you want to return to, or just add? That you--you are moved to say.

S: Let me look at my notes and see if there's anything that might help.

I: You can say no, also. You don't have to say anything more, if you don't want to.

S: I just want to see if there's anything that might help a little.

I: Thanks.

S: I don't know, is there anything that might help you in needing a little bit more? Anything else?

I: No, I mean you've been so articulate. No, like, I'm really, really, really interested in you and what you think. So, it's really, if there's anything, you know, this is your moment to say whatever you want. So, if there's anything you feel like you haven't said that you wanna get out there, about what a course should be or any frustrations you have. Or, or even, you could zoom out a little bit and think about, like, political science as a discipline. You know, any of these things, if you want. But, you don't have to.

S: I was talking to a friend who's in Poly Sci, and, like, she's in fourth year. And so, I was just kind of, kind of like, we were just talking about professors and courses--and, and sort of how it's how--like, how the curriculum changes. And, and it's very similar, like, there's like, three or four profs I've heard of who have a very, like, postcolonial, a very, like, critical lens, of sort of current political climate. Even yesterday in my Poli Sci class, like, my professor's okay, like, when he talks about globalization, when he talks about, sort of, like, colonial--colonial powers. But then after class, I was just asking a question about the ICC, and sort of, Palestine and what's happening. And then some kid walks in wearing a MAGA hat, and so--the class after us. And so, I was like--like jokingly we were talking about a dress code. And he goes, "Well, if some people think that MAGA hat is offensive, some people also think the headdress is offensive." And--and basically, he compared the MAGA hat to the headdress. And then he was like, "Everything is very relative." I was like, "But objectively, like, hate speech exists, and objectively, like, [inaudible--43:49] of hate speech also exist. And that ended up being a twenty minute conversation, and it was just a joke.

I: Wow. Wow.

S: Yeah. Yeah. I also just heard that two professors wrote an op ed, I don't know where it was, but basically talking about how anti-Palestinian...Or pro-Palestinian movements, and Palestinian liberation movements, are inherently anti-Semitic. And, and, and...yeah.

I: I've heard of this view. Yeah. Okay, I'm going to stop the recording, and talk to you more freely.

M2

I: Okay, so, um, I'm just going to read you a few phrases to establish your consent, followed by some questions for you to answer. Um, so, your participation in this study is voluntary, you can decide to stop at any time, even part way through the interview for whatever reason or up until September 30th, 2018\ . If you decide to stop participating there will be no consequences to you. If you decide to stop I will ask you how you would like me to handle the data collected up to that point. This could include returning it to you, destroying it, or using the data collected up to that point. If you do not want to answer some of the questions, you do not have to, so you can opt out of the specific question, um, but you can still be in the study. And if you have any questions about this study, now or in the future, um, you can contact me by email or phone. Um, alright. So...last thing: I would be pleased to send you a short summary of the study results when I finish going over all the data I've collected. If

you would like a copy of that, um, there's a question about what the best way of going about getting it to you is.

S: Sure.

I: So, here are the questions for you. Um, do you have any questions at this point, or would you like any additional details?

S: Um, as of now I don't have any questions.

I: Okay, great, um, do you agree that the interview can be audio recorded?

S: Uh-huh.

I: Thank you. Um, do you agree to have your responses used for future related projects-- that's probably not gonna happen but I'm supposed to ask? (Laughs)

S: Yeah, sure.

I: Okay, great. Um, do you agree to participate in this study knowing that you can withdraw at any point with no consequences to you?

S: Yes.

I: Great. And finally before we begin, would you like to receive a summary of this study's results--if so at what email or mailing address would you like to receive them?

S: Uh, yeah, I'd like to receive them and you can give it to the same address that I have on the email.

I: Okay, great. Thanks. Um, okay. So, I'm ready to begin with the questions. So just, uh, a couple of, a little bit of information before I start: u, I might--I sent you the questions in advance, I'm, um--I'm not sure if you had an opportunity to look at them, but, I might add a follow up question in between, um, just to clarify my understanding of what you're saying or to get you to elaborate if that would be helpful. Um, there's no wrong answers, um, I really just would like you to answer honestly, and, um, that can involve being critical, being celebratory, whatever you actually think. And if you feel tired or fatigued we can take breaks, um, so I might ask you periodically if you're good, or if you need to take a break, and you can also decline from answering a question if you would like.

S: Sure. Uh, one question actually--um, how long would the whole call take, do you think?

I: Um, in the past it's taken at the max, around 40 minutes? But it depends really on you and how, how much detail you want to get into.

S: Okay. Sounds good.

I: Alright. Alright, so I'm going to start with the first question. Is that okay?

S: Yeah.

I: Great. So the first one is easy, it's just information about you, uh, so what is your age now?

S: Uh, 18.

I: Okay, great. And what program of study are you pursuing and what year of your degree are you in?

S: Uh, I'm pursuing health sciences, and I'm in my first year.

I: Okay. And what city and country are you from?

S: Uh, would that be where I live right now, or where I was born?

I: I think where--yeah, where you grew up, I guess, if that--I don't have a clear answer to that question either, but whatever you feel, where you feel you identify as being from.

S: I'll just, like, tell you where I am right now. Because I grew up in different places.

I: Okay.

S: So right now I'm in Burlington, um, it's right next door to Hamilton.

I: Cool.Okay. Thank you. So the next question, um, has two parts, so you can take them separately or together if you want. How would you define globalization, and, the concept of global citizenship?

S: Um, well, that's a very good question. Um, I saw this question and I wasn't really sure how to respond because that's what we are trying to do in class all the time too, we've devoted multiple lessons in defining globalization and, I think our conclusion was that it's futile to try to define it, because there's so many arguments around it. But I think one thing I can be sure of is that it's a complex phenomenon, uh, it's, uh, it's, I mean, it's, it can be seen more prominently in recent years, its, uh, interconnectedness, so, all different aspects that guide our lives, like, the economy, the socio-cultural-political aspects, that kind of merge and impact each other, uh, in a way that has been more prominent than before, perhaps.

I: Great, okay. Yeah, that makes sense to me. And then the second part was the concept of global citizenship.

S: Um, I think that's if you recognize that, recognize that, globalization, if you choose to participate in it, willingly, and if you have agency to participate in it, then you might be able to call yourself a global citizen?

I: Hmmm. Thank you. Um, okay, great, this is, the next question is similar, um, and it's kind of to invite you to free associate a little bit. So, what associations or images does the adjective "global" summon to mind? So if someone says, "What do you mean by global?", like, what kind of things would that refer to or do you, would you first think of?

S: Uh, I first think of it as being sort of universal, across all people, across the world. But, then it's not really universal, because, um--uh I think in that sense that term is kind of misleading because I don't think anything can really be universal. Um, it can be somewhat of an attempt to describe a trend that is seen in some places around the world,uh, but I think the main idea is that, its, its, its broad, it's

Ph.D. Thesis - S. D'Adamo; McMaster University - English and Cultural Studies
happening in different places, um so its simultaneous, if that makes sense?

I: Mm-hm, definitely.

S: Uh, that's what I think of.

I: Okay, great. And then, the next question's related to the previous two, so--has your understanding of these terms: globalization, global citizenship, global--changed or evolved because of taking this course? If yes, how so, and if not, why do you think that is the case.

S: Uh, I haven't really thought of global citizenship before taking this course, so in that sense it's a new concept for me, and that way, the course has changed or has developed an understanding about global citizenship, although that might be very limited. Uh, globalization, I've only thought of it before as this--this connection we're having recently, um, but the course kinda taught me how, its, uh, it's not really exactly truly recent, only. It's been there for quite a bit of time, according to, uh, some, some theories. And I think I kind of uh, agree with some of those theories. And, um, I've realized how complex it is, whilst before I thought it was more of a static thing. And, I also learned that at least that one of the thoughts, uh, that are around this is that it's actively constructed by choices that people make, um, and I didn't really think of it like that before? So that's something new? Global, again, I don't know if my idea of it was changed too much on that, but--it's kind of difficult to tear apart globalization and global, because it's one of those things like a noun and the other's adjective, so, yeah, in that sense, does that-- do you have any other questions specific to that?

I: No, no, I mean, so what I'm hearing, to just kind of repeat back to you, it sounds like, um, the course gave you a more historical perspective on these processes, um, which made it possible for you to see it as a construct right, that this is constructed as a product of people's actions: group agency, individual agency, governmental agencies, all those things, is that kind of what you're saying?

S: Yes, that is what I was saying, and I think also we were able to see the positive and negatives of, the causes and effects of globalization.

I: Okay, great. So before maybe you had a more, matter of fact sense of the phenomenon, but the course gave you different frames for seeing some positives, some negatives.

S: Mm-hm.

I: Great, okay. Um, alright, next question, um, let's talk about some of the specific content that you studied in the course, to the degree that you can remember, um, can you tell me about a text and/or a concept you encountered in the course that made a strong impression on you, so--any kind of strong impression, good, bad, but just something that really affected you, um, or that made you think a lot? Why do you think that experience, that specific strong effect matters to your understanding of the global?

S: Um, the whole idea of looking at the negatives and positives of globalization, and, uh, different schools of thought was very interesting, and I think it affected me that a lot of phenomenons, especially in this kind of very, they're very gray instead of being black and white. Uh, but there is very many different sides to it, and to there's really endless possibilities of where you can investigate,

so globalization, maybe as a term the global can be referring to so many different things. Um, that idea also kind of stuck to me, um. It's not really clearly defined, except for when you use these terms it's oddly, it might not be the best choice of words if you want to convey a more specific need. Um, another, one part that kind of stuck to me I guess the most is, the, the unit or voluntourism and how that has a lot of, um, how that is seen by some people to have, like, different effects? I knew that some of those, a lot of those were kind of eye opening, and, um, yeah, it just open me to new perspectives on that.

I: Great, okay, thank you. Um, was there a text or concept that you studied that you found particularly difficult, or surprising? Uh, if there was, what did you take away from this new, difficult, or surprising knowledge about global life or issues?

S: Um, I don't think that there's just one part that I can pinpoint that was particularly difficult, um...surprising,um, I don't think it was that I was really surprised, it was more that I didn't know about it and it was kind of eye opening, so I wasn't particularly surprised either about any specific concept, um, but rather I was interested to learn that these are all the ideas surrounding, uh, some, um, phenomena,and these are just perspectives you could have. I'm not sure that I was actually surprised, its just that I felt I was able to appreciate the condition a bit more.

I: Mm-hm. Okay, so like you gave the example of voluntourism as being eye-opening, um, for thinking bout its effects from different perspectives,is there, was there anything else like that, that was particularly, um, you know, that really opened up a new area of perspective to you?

S: Um, if you're talking about perspectives, yes. Um, like, I guess, in a way the whole way the whole course was structured was looking at different viewpoints about these issues, um. Each unit we've discussed a different topics, like, first one I think was was whole condition, next one it was like politics, economy,uh, culture, so in those sense, in those lectures we always looked at both sides of the, well there's more than both sides but, uh, kind of the opposite opinions about those issues. So this did broaden my perspective. But I think perspective is different from being surprised, and, uh...

I: For sure, it is, yeah. I was trying to build on your phrase "eye-opening", um, which is similar to perspective, but yeah, you're right. (Laughs) Um, cool. If you have, if you have anything else to say, um, great but if not we can move on to the next question.

S: Yeah, if I have anything that comes on my mind then I'll let you know.

I: Okay. (Laughs)Okay, so the next question is were there any global, quote unquote, concepts that or texts in the course that you did not find useful? Why do you think you came to this conclusion? So something that you were like, I don't know why we spent time studying that, this wasn't valuable.

S: Um,I think sometimes the readings, um, for our class was a bit, um, complicated--I feel, I felt, in an unnecessary way. Um, I know that it might be because I was first introduced to these kind of readings coming into university,and that I may not have been exposed to a lot of these before, but I feel like, like a lot of the things that were discussed with readings we didn't really cover in class, um, and, it was a lot of kind of categorizations of, there's different, just, thought,and then there's these kinds of categories, but, now, that, almost the semester has passed, and I don't really recall them, uh,

so, I don't think that they were particularly valuable in understanding. Because the course was an introductory course to globalization. I think it was particularly valuable in me having a deeper understanding of these issues, because, uh, it was, just, it was, just, it wasn't framed in too much detail. Um, but yes, in some ways its kind of irrelevant, and it was not in context of, how this is too relevant. And, I feel like it, it could, we could have focused more on the general things in the book? But then again, the book is to complement our learning in class, and, its okay if it's more, um, if it's more in depth sometimes. But, uh, I guess that's one thing that I, uh, yeah. (Laughs) There were two readings and the one of the books was more like, that was more, complicated.

I: Mm-hm. So--

S: But I did appreciate from the book, that, this phenomena is complex and there's a lot of studies going on about this. But I think it could have been put into simpler words and simpler phrasing using what they were trying to communicate the same idea.

I: Mm-hm. So, so basically that, uh, you felt like, the reading load was maybe, too heavy? or could have been better tailored to the kind of introductory level conversation that you were having?

S: Um, I don't think it was too heavy, I think, maybe the choice of text?

I: Yeah. Gotcha.

S: There were two books. One book I think I found really well, really nice for the introductory level. The other one I think was a bit more complex. Um,

I: Do you remember which one--do you remember which one you liked?

S: Um, the one I liked I think was by Manfisi Deitrich?

I: Okay, great.

S: And the Dara book is the one I found kind of dry.

I: Gotcha. Okay, great, thank you. Um, okay, uh, next question is is there anything that you did not study in the course that you wish had been on the syllabus? This might be, a particular text, topic, concept, or theme. If so, why do you think this would be important to add to a global studies course like this one?

S: Um, I think there's quite a lot of things we weren't able to cover in class that I would have been interested in, probably for the sake of time. Um, first of all, I'd be really interested in health. That is what, uh, I'm studying. And, uh, I'm kind of interested in how health's handled different across the world. I'm also interested in education, so, how education is handled and how globalization has shaped education in those countries. Might be a topic of interest. Although, I recognize that, in the general scheme of things, economy politics, culture, and like those things are kinda, the bigger umbrellas, I guess.

I: Mm-hm.

S: But, I think I would be interested to have there be health, education. Um, I think, maybe, like, religion? How that's affected religion? Um, yeah, those are the three things I can think of right now. (Laughs)

I: Great, no, those are all really important, um. (Laughs) Okay excellent. Next question is a little more focused on how the course experience was itself, so, can you describe what your classroom time is like? So from what I understand I know that you had, um, discussion sections and lecture, so you can talk about both if you'd like, um, so for example, was your classroom time primarily lecture-based, were there other kinds of activities mixed into your class period, was it primarily discussion based, did it vary throughout the semester, or term? Did you have a discussion section run by a TA, et cetera. So, sort of, how was the time structured both in lecture and in discussion.

S: Um, in lecture, it was, um, our professor giving, uh, well, lecture material, he was lecturing us, and then we had a TA session once a week, so it was when we were discussing our, our viewpoints on these issues and having talks. Half of the tutorials were dedicated to assigned people presenting a summary of the readings for that week, um the rest of the lecture, the rest of the time was devoted to between, like, devoted to uh, communicating between different ideas of thought, um, within the students. So it's kind of like a debate in some parts. Uh, and I think they were very nicely complemented. They nicely complemented each other. Um, and yeah, the TA's sessions, I think--what's your question? I'm reading the question right now here too but--did you want me to talk about, kinda, like, what I liked about it? That part-- and I didn't--or is that coming up?

I: Oh--that's the next question.

S: Oh, okay.

I: So, uh, I do want to know--but yeah, I'm curious also-- in your lecture time, was, was your professor just kind of lecturing in a straightforward way? Or were there activities also built into that?

S: Uh, most of the time he did lectures, but often enough, I think, he opened it up sometimes, and asked for our opinions and what we thought globalization was, what we thought negative consequences might be, and I find it really nice that when he gave his opinions some students would kind of argue against, uh, giving contradictory evidence, uh, they would sometimes have some fruitful conversations for like 2-3 minutes before we had to move on perhaps, because we were short of time too, but, uh, I. I appreciated how we opened it up to class, and, uh, kinda seeked their opinions. He did, I think he said he liked having those kind of interactions, uh, he just said that the limitation of time that--he wasn't able to do it all the time. Yeah.

I: Great, okay, yeah. So, to get to, sort of how you felt about it, um, the next question is: Which kinds of learning experiences that you had in the course felt most valuable or enriching to you? Your answer could be focused on particular activities, assessments, or persons, as well as on your engagement with any of the assigned course material. So this could be, like, oh, I had to do a blog post, or I had to be on the twitter, or I had, you know, I really liked this essay, or, or it could be anything, right? But, just--just to let you know, you can talk about specific assignments or um, activities or individual people, um. Anything that you found the most useful and valuable to your learning.

S: Um, I found--I think I kind of liked everything, actually. Um, I did find it interesting that students were able to take control of twitter account for a week, because of its, like, a real world application in globalization. Um, and, I kind of liked the blog post--we had to do three blog posts--um, about topics we found interesting,um, sometimes it was more structured and we had to choose from some topics, other times we didn't have to. Um, one thing that I kind of, hope to be better is if we could get more feedback on these assignments. I did ask for feedback on my TA's several times, uh, so I got one for one of my blog posts but the two I never really got, and I asked like two, three times. So I had to ask him again. And, also, the final exam is the essay. So the essay, we got general feedback, like, fourth and fifth, and then our mark. But I think it would be really nice if we could get the hard copy itself and and then go see, how the TA marked it, like, which points you got a check mark and you made a scribble mark on our paper so we have more context as to where our, we can fix our problems.

I: Definitely.

S: Um, same with the exam, I know that it's quite a big class, with, two hundred-ish people, so definitely, not everybody can probably get feedback, but if there were students who were interested and request feedback, um, I did, and then it was difficult to kind of, set up, set up a time to, like, I think the professor told us that, or at least when I emailed him he said that, there isn't really a point to coming and looking at the exam, because, um, the marks are, it wouldn't really affect the mark and the course is over so he kind seems to discourage it?

I: Mm-hm. And, so--so maybe the way they were graded, they didn't really include any comments. Maybe they just read it and gave it a mark, or something like that.

S: So, the exam, I didn't get any comments.

I: Yeah.

S: So, I find, one problem with that is that, I can't improve.

I: Right, definitely, definitely.

S: I don't know what I did wrong. I feel like that's the, that's the important purpose of the course, to be able to improve on your skills, and, so, while we were able to apply it, we didn't get enough constructive feedback for us to, uh, I feel, have taken the most advantage of it.

I: Mm-hm. No, that makes a lot of sense. So, to just make sure that I understood from your previous comment, in the question before, the other aspect of the course that it seems like you really found valuable or enriching was any time that you had these kind of opportunities for debate or discussion, both in your discussion section and in lecture when that did come up, am I hearing you right?

S: Yep. Mm-hm.

I: Yeah. Awesome, okay! Um, the next question is was there an online component to your course, so you've already discussed this a little bit,um, either in classroom time or in your assignments or activities, if not, do you think engaging online could have improved your course experience, and why? If so, how would you describe your experience of these digital learning elements, for example,

Ph.D. Thesis - S. D'Adamo; McMaster University - English and Cultural Studies
were they easy to navigate and interact with, did you feel like they added a difficult or useful dimension to your learning experience, and why?

S: Um, I think the only online portion we had was uh, the twitter account. And that was only for 25 students because not everybody, there was only a certain amount of weeks.

I: Right.

S: There was the link and, so, that was interesting, um.

I: Do you--do you mind saying if you were one of them?

S: Yes, I was one of them.

I: Okay. So do you feel like that made you engage with the feed more, the fact that you;d signed up to be one of them? Like, were you kind of looking at it throughout the course?

S: Um, I did look at it throughout the course, and I think throughout that one week that I was assigned to it with another person, uh, I was more attentive to the news, because I had to, I was responsible for making posts and being caught up with what's going on in the world, so in that sense I think it did help. It did help interact with what's really happening, so it's kind of applying, again, our understanding of the course in a real life situation which is always interesting. But that was a very small portion of our , our class, and--

I: Right.

S:--and that's a very small portion of our mark.

I: Right right right.(Laughs)

S: But also a very small project. So, yeah, other than that I don't think there was anything else. Yeah.

I: Do you, did you wish that there had been more digital elements?

S: I don't really think so, because, I don't always find online things really interactive, so it depends on maybe what it is, because I wouldn't be able to tell you unless I know, uh, they have designed.

I: No, I understand. You have to, they have to be designed well I think, to work.

S: Right.

I: Yeah. Okay great, thank you! Um, so now to kind of zoom out a little bit, um, what motivated you to take this course? You can feel free to cite multiple reasons if you have multiple reasons.

S: Uh, I was actually really interested in extreme poverty across the world, and I didn't have any, kind of, other knowledge to, uh, kinda learn more about this phenomenon. My understanding was very limited. And although I did like searches on my own time, sometimes I think that taking a course could really help me understand this phenomenon a bit better, if not more. And, that was my biggest incentive, I think. Also, I'm a student studying sciences, I didn't really want to, um, just focus

Ph.D. Thesis - S. D'Adamo; McMaster University - English and Cultural Studies
on the sciences. I think I really enjoyed these kind of social, social justice talks in high school, and I wanted to kind of keep going in that direction at least in some parts. And, I think as an introductory course in globalization I think it could touch upon many of the social science topics, like politics, economy.

I: Mm-hm.

S: Financing,uh, culture, like, these, in some ways, its like many, many courses smashed into one. (Laughs) Like an introduction to social science, maybe. Um, so that's like, two, three reasons why I took it.

I: Great.

S: And I think it did a good job of exploring those, I'm happy with the outcomes.

I: So you're answering the next question for me, already. (Laughs)Which is--

S: Oh, really?

I: Yeah, which is did your course experience satisfy the logic that motivated you to enroll, in other words, did it deliver the experience you were expecting or hoping for?

S: Yeah, I think so.

I: Awesome. Great. Okay, just two more questions left, um, how do you understand your own situation in our globalized world and its histories after taking the course? How would you describe your position in the world,in terms of the global life and issues you studied?

S: Um...that's a very good question. Uh, its, I think, uh, I don't know if it changed, mm, my understanding of how I, who I am in the world, the position I have to play. I think what I did come to appreciate is that different people can make different choices, even though the phenomenon seems to be all or nothing, like, everybody needs to participate. People can choose not to. It can be difficult for them not to, um, because I feel like everybody else is on board with globalization, um, and also it kind of, opened me up to the ideas that it can be a lot of, um, work here, or in other places actually that could have an effect on different parts of the world. Um, and that is something that I had in mind before taking the course but I guess it's provided me with more specific, specific ways that what I do here can impact things there. Um, so, in that sense it's expanded my understanding, um, but, the fundamental pieces of what--of my understanding before the course I think kind of acted as a the base for growing these different understandings, throughout the course.

I: So, okay. So if you don't mind me asking a follow up question, um--

S: Sure.

I: If you had a, you've had a--it sounds like what you're saying is that you had a fairly clear idea of your position in the world, who you are in the world, before the course and this just kind of expanded upon it or gave you more, kind of, um, information to understand it. But, can you tell me a little bit about how you understood yourself before the course? So kind of, what was your, what did you come

in with that persists till today?

S: Um, I think, um--I guess--I would think of, like, some students here, and maybe this is limited to how I think of myself, is that, we are in a position where our, at this point in time, our position in the world, make us able to kind of, have, have impacts really across the world. And it depends on what we want to do, and for a lot of us we don't really know what we're going to be doing, the next five, ten years, uh, that's okay, um. I think in some ways we're like very potent. Where, there's uh, so many things that, could be possible, so, I guess, potential is one big theme. That I had in mind.

Opportunities for expansion and, uh, that, opportunities for, um, like, social innovation or scientific innovation, uh, those things. Also understanding that there are people who aren't that far way but are living in very different standards of living. Understanding that those people may not necessarily be who we picture them to be, they might not be necessarily upset about the situation, um, so, that we shouldn't, I guess, impose our own beliefs upon them, on them? I think, uh, maybe, come to think of it, the idea of grassroots really does, what an idea that I developed throughout the course. Also I don't think it was just because of the course, it was probably because of other talks I had with different people and my own research turned I turned out to have too, separate from the course, but I think, yeah, grassroots, coming from the community itself and appreciating those differences, rather than, uh...it's very hard to do. Um, I've realized in talking about it. Trying to understand their culture better before, um, making any kind of, ideas. Consolidating ideas about them. Uh...

I: So do you mean--when you say grassroots are you thinking of, um, it sounded like you were maybe thinking of more locally to your own life, like, in Canada, in the communities around you? Or do you mean in general, as a kind of way of understanding local communities globally?

S: I think in general the second one? Um, as a kind of way of understanding how we can approach problem solving? Um, yeah that could happen in Hamilton, or it could happen in a different part of the world.

I: Right.

S: Um, and it could happen on different scales. But, uh, yeah. That's what I, I guess its really difficult to express how I think of my position in the world, but that's a very good question.

I: (Laughs) It's a huge question, yeah. No, that was great, thank you. Um, okay, last question. Um, do you feel like your educational experience at your university more generally has been global, so far, obviously you're beginning your education, um, or helped you to become more of a global thinker, citizen, or individual, how so? So is McMaster kind of affording you a global education experience in some way?

S: Um, I think...it was trying to? Uh, they incorporate a lot of global aspects. It depends on what course you take. I think this course by it's nature because it's called globalization, it tries really hard, to, do that. I'm not sure if it depicted it, the right way, or in an objective way, and I wouldn't--because I don't know, I'm not a scholar of this subject, and what I know is what I've researched and what I hear from class, so my understanding of this topic is still limited and it may be biased, too, in a lot of ways. But I think the important thing is that it is trying to make these efforts, and perhaps, uh, the direction that we can go in the future is to expand this outside the classroom, and not necessarily in

Ph.D. Thesis - S. D'Adamo; McMaster University - English and Cultural Studies
the forms of exchange students, but, um, more cultural, or more, more, interactions across different parts of the world would probably make it easier as far as, to appreciate the dimensions of globalization, not just in class, but in every life setting.

I: Mm-hm. So, so it sounds like if I'm understanding you right, you think that, you know, McMaster as a university is, trying to kind of create, um, an environment where people can think globally or learn, um, globally, but that there's more that it could be doing.

S: More, like, I'm sorry?

I: But it sounds like you're saying that there are more things it could be doing--

S: Right.

I:--in, with that goal.

S: I think so. Mm-hm.

I: Cool.

S: And that puts us in a good spot, because we're doing something and there's more to do, I've always liked that.

I: Definitely. (Laughs) Okay great, um, do you have anything else you wanna add, um, do you want to return to an earlier question, or, just, kind of reflect on anything else that you think about these topics?

S: Um...overall I think I kind of enjoyed the course, I think that was one of the questions that I probably answered in a similar way, uh...if you don't have, yeah, if you have any other questions?

I: Uh, not, not at the moment.

S: Okay. If you do, though, like, you can just email me and then I'll [unintelligible] you. Uh, clear that up. Um, otherwise I don't think I have anything to add, actually at this moment and I covered a lot of things.

I: Okay, wonderful.

S: (Laughs) Yeah.

I: Thank you for, for taking this time. I really appreciate it.

S: Thanks for doing the study I'll be interested to see what you can pick up in your, in your (laughs) research.

M3

I: Ok, so I'm just going to read you a couple of statements to outline the terms of your participation, and then to ask you for your oral consent, ok?

S: Sure. Awesome.

I: So, your participation in this study is voluntary. [S:Yeah] You can decide to stop at anytime, even part way through the interview, for any reason, or up until September 30th of this year ...

S: Uh, huh ...

I: ... you can decide -- Or sorry, *if* you decide to stop participating, there will be no consequences to you. I will ask you, though, how you'd like me to handle any information up to that point, if you decide to stop. This could include returning it to you, destroying it, or using the data collected up to that point.

S: OK.

I: If you do not want to answer some of the questions, you do not have to, but you can still be in the study. So you can opt out of a specific question.

S: Mmhmm.

I: And of course if you have any questions afterwards, you can contact me by phone or email. And you have that information already, I think.

S: OK, yes.

I: Also, I would be pleased to send you a short summary of the study result when I finish going over our results. So if you'd like a summary to be sent to you, there's a question about that and how the best way to get that to you is.

S: Awesome. Cool--I'd love to ...

I: Ok, awesome, there's a question so you can tell me what means you would like to receive it.

S: Sure. Awesome.

I: So here are the questions. Do you have any questions? Or would you like any additional details?

S: Ah, no, everything is pretty clear, yeah.

I: Great. Do you agree that the interview can be audio recorded?

S: Yes.

I: Great. Do you agree to have your responses used for future related projects? -- By the way, I don't think that's going to happen, but It's one of the questions I am supposed to ask.

S: [Laughter] No problem. Yes, of course.

I: OK, thanks. Do you agree to participate in this study, knowing that you can withdraw at any point with no consequences to you.

S: Yes.

I: Great, thank you. And finally, before we begin, would you like to receive a summary of the study's results, and if so, at what email, or mailing address would you like to receive them?

S: Yes, um, at the one that we've been corresponding with.

I: Awesome. Thank you. Ok. Alright, so, I am going to start in on the interview questions now. I might ... I know you have seen them in advance, but I might--I might ask a kind of follow up question if I'm curious to hear more about something you are saying or to clarify, and of course, you know, if you don't want to answer that question since you haven't seen it in advance, please feel free to say, "nah, I don't want to say anything ... "

S: Sure.

I: And, you know, also, we can take a break if you get tired, so I'll ask you maybe half way through how you are doing and if you want to take a break.

S: Awesome. OK!

I: Alright. So. The first question is pretty simple. It's information about you. What is your age now?

S: I'm 18.

I: OK. And what program of study are you pursuing and what year of your degree are you in?

S: I am in Social Sciences at McMaster, first year.

I: Wonderful. And what city and country are you from?

S: I am from Bogota, Colombia.

I: OK, thank you. Next question--so here we are getting into the course a little bit. How would you define two big terms, globalization and the concept of global citizenship?

S: So for globalization the--you know--recurring definition that I have encountered in all of my classes has been the growing interconnection of the world in terms of culture, economics, financial, geography, movement, like, information--basically growing and intensifying connections on all levels of ... humanity, I guess I would say. And for global citizenship ... it's ... basically how I see it is something that we have yet to achieve, and it's just a concept of feeling like a member of the entire world--and connected to the people of earth, everyone, before having that allegiance to a specific nation or, you know, area of the world. Global citizenship, meaning you have your first allegiance to the world as a whole.

I: Great. Thank you. OK, the next question is similar, related. Basically to invite you to sort of free associate a little bit. So what associations or images does the adjective "global" summon to mind?

S: Immediately I think of ... you know, global organizations such as the UN, or the IMF, the World Bank, basically things that have, or organizations that have established a very tangible and real connection between the different nations of the planet, but then also the very hierarchical nature of globalization, the very uneven nature, meaning that the same phenomenon that allows for the

Western world to reap such good benefits from globalization, such as, you know, trade, access to natural resources, access to cheap manufacturing, are the same things that cause harm in the less developed part of the world. Also, I guess ... you travel faster, travel faster, access to information, and like I said before, like, growing connections that are easier and easier to make each time.

I: OK wonderful. Thank you. So these three terms that we've just talked about, globalization, global citizenship, and the adjective "global," has your understanding of these terms changed or evolved because of taking the course you took, and if they did change or evolve, how so? And if not, why do you think that is the case?

S: They *definitely, definitely* did. In high school I took an intro kinda globalization course. It was a geography course where we basically, very basically, defined these terms and kind of explored them, and how I went into university knowing these was very, very negative. I hadn't known about global citizenship. But globalization, and global were kinda something that I related to--the loss of culture, the loss of power, like, homogenization, Westernization, and that's kind of how I viewed it before taking, taking the globalization course I did last semester. And when I did take that course in university, they introduced a side of globalization that I hadn't really thought about before, which was, a lot of these changes that have been brought about by the West mainly haven't been entirely, like, forced or imposed on other parts of the world, although some of them have, all lot of them have also been welcomed, because some of these countries, some of these regions *want* that kind of change, and some of those things were things like moving away from sexist, or moving away from racism, having a more separated state organization from religion, so to have more democracy instead of, like being ruled entirely by religion, or by practices that have come a long from history that no longer apply today. So that also is a part of globalization that I hadn't thought about and probably ignored because I was so set on thinking that it was bad. And then also the positive things that have come from globalization like obviously everything I have been able to personally experience, so for example like I mentioned I was born in Colombia, and I was able to come to Canada, get an education that I haven't, you know, I wouldn't be able to have in South America. And also like all the access to resources and information and, you know, food and all these other things that I wouldn't be able to have if globalization and world trade and, you know, links with the rest of the countries of the planet didn't exist. So its more neutral, is my perception of globalization and the global then it was before. But I still now have like a positive and negative view of it [I:um hum] ... that kind of meld of to what I have and what I can get from globalization, but also the things that I know that I take part in harming the world.

I: So I'm just curious, if you don't mind a follow up question about this ...

S: Sure.

I: You said you came into this course with a kind of negative view of what globalization has meant in the world. And do you think that came from your previous course or from aspects of your own life, like where do you think that--cus that's not actually most people's assumption about it, right?

S: Yeah.

I: So where do you think that came from for you?

S: So a lot, a whole big topic for, you know, the past, you know, maybe two or three years of my life has been being exposed to cultural appropriation, which is very very important to me because, like I said, I'm from Colombia, I'm also Jewish, so I have all these aspects of my life that are import, have interregnal meaning within my beliefs and my nation and my people and then being exposed to things like---I don't know-- like movies from Hollywood, or just comments in the, passing in the

hallway and hearing those things that are important to me being taken out of context, and be taken, you know, for purposes, used for purposes that they aren't for. And I have come to know or associate that with the fact that being open to such vast amounts of information, and being free to use it how anybody wants was a result of globalization. And then in grade twelve I took that globalization course I mentioned before, and we were exposed to things like the concept that globalization, or some theories suggests, that globalization--what's it called?--basically helps to eliminate the distinctiveness of the cultures, and that like struck home for me. And I was like I can't believe that in, you know, a hundred years, two hundred years, even fifty years, aspects of my culture, and the things that I hold near and dear to my heart will be gone and replaced with, you know, a standardized version of probably a Western culture. So I have that in my head and, but you know, refused to realize that there's a lot of good things that have come with it too.

I: OK, great. Thank you for that. OK, so. Let's talk in a little more detail about some of the content you studied in the course. Can you tell me about a text, or a concept you encountered in the course that made a strong impression on you. So that can be any kind of strong impression, just maybe something you had a strong reaction to. Why do you think that experience matters to your understanding of the global?

S: Um actually, it's global citizenship. I had never thought or heard about that term before. And we were assigned to read a lot of articles, a lot of books and things on the concept. And I had never thought of, like I said before, it was very negative the way I thought about globalization before--basically a way for Western countries and global organizations to make a tonne of money, and you know, do a lot harm in the process--but global citizenship introduced these concepts in such a way that it could eliminate, you know, conflict for the most part in the world, if you thought of everybody in the planet as, you know, as your first allegiance instead of dividing yourself first, primarily between nations and creeds and this and that. So the way that they said it was something like, basically like a diagram of circles within circles within circles, and the most outer circle being yourself as a global citizen...citizenship, and everything within it is contained in that bigger circle, and your allegiance to your nation, your allegiance to your creed, to your family, to your, you know, whatever else you subscribe to doesn't, it isn't eliminated just because you have that feeling that you belong to the world as a whole, and then seeing how that can, you know, lead to things like a greater change for world peace, or greater chance for education, and higher levels of education all over the world and how that can lead to cooperation and advances in technology, and medicine and all these things, and how that cooperation can lead to better things definitely added to what I was saying before, that my concept of this concept of this, you know, globalization goes to a more neutral, even a little more positive light than before.

I: OK great. Thank you. The next question is, was there a text or concept that you found particularly difficult or surprising? What did you take away from this new difficult or surprising knowledge about global life or issues?

S: The one thing that comes to mind is one time when we were, we had to read a speech that Barack Obama did--I forget where he was--basically he was talking about global citizenship, talking about how the world needs to be united, and come together as a whole, but then there was undertones of, you know, what you hear, basically, oh America, now American, this country, how we can help your country. Very divided as he was saying a lot of rhetoric about being united. So that, that was one of the most kinda surprising, because you would think that globalization is something that, someone, a country so powerful like America would want in order to have more of the benefits that they have been able to reap from it. But at the same time, they just like, probably, like many other people wanted to keep their distinctiveness, want to keep their, you know, nationhood even though they're

probably one of the most powerful nations that have pushed for globalization. So that was a bit, you know, hard to wrap my mind around.

I: So like you felt like they wanted it both ways?

S: Pardon me?

I: You felt like they kinda wanted to have it both ways?

S: Exactly! And what struck me the most was probably the fact that they could because they are so powerful. They could probably ...

[...LINE DROPS]

I: Hello? ... Hello?

S: ... have been ...

I: Oh! You, you dropped out for a second. I'm so sorry. Can you go back ...

S: It's OK ...

I: ...if you could remember what you were saying. You said ...

S: Yeah, sure ...

I: You said you were struck by the way they could have it both ways because they were so powerful and then you, the call just went quiet ...

S: Yeah ... So because they're so powerful they could continue to push to get the benefits they have been getting from global citizenship, but also keep from having that solidarity with the rest of the world and not give as much as they take.

I: OK great. Thank you. So, the next question is were there any global, so called, global concepts or texts in the course that you did not find useful? Why do you think you came to this conclusion? So this is basically your opportunity to say, like, I didn't really think this should have been on the syllabus.

S: There was a few lectures all about food. And basically how, you know, McDonalds, or big fast food restaurants all over the world combine the country, the country they're in, like their dishes, their traditional dishes into their, into the menu, and basically that was used as the very main point about how globalization can be good, and how it can incorporate other people, so then eliminate cultures, but unite them. And I thought that was pretty... pretty stupid [Both: *Laughter*]. I mean, food ... even though there are like traditional dishes and things like that, and they are important to a culture, and things like that, food is just not one of the main, you know, main things that I would say would be good about globalization, just as something that has to come out of it--like, it's basically impossible for you to go to another place and not eat. So I thought that was pretty dumb.

I: [Laughter] That's fair. Alright, thank you. OK, similar kind of question about the syllabus. Is there anything that you did not study in the course that you wish had been on the syllabus? This could be a particular text, a concept, a topic, or a theme. If there is anything, why do you think this would be important to add to a global studies course like this one.

S: We did touch on ... OK, I wanted to explore more about globalization in a non-Western context. Because a lot of things we studied were about how the West has, you know, started this, or how it has reaped benefits, how it has harmed the non-Western world, so basically ... and they did touch on it a little bit. Like for example, what I said before about taking into consideration that a lot of the changes that globalization have brought about have been welcomed and wanted by non-Western nations, but there are also many more probably that I think were not, and I think exploring globalization and how it has affected non-Western nations was probably something that I wish, you know, they had gone into more detail on.

I: OK great. OK, so next I'd like to talk about, a little more about what the mechanics of the course was like, and how you felt about those. So the first question is about your classroom time. So from what I understand, the course had a lecture component and a discussion section component ...

S: Yes.

I: So I guess I'm curious about each of those environments. So in the lecture setting were there other elements mixed into that, into the lecture? Like were there group discussions or activities, or was it primarily lecture? In discussion, your discussion section, what would your class time be like?

S: Yeah, so, Dr X was the professor, and he was really good at making the course very engaging. So he would pose a new theme or topic or whatever and he would let us kinda discuss amongst ourselves for, you know, five or ten minutes, and then he would bring the attention back to a question he had posed, and have us all answer, like take turns offering our input. And then from there he would say where we--maybe not right or wrong--but what the people who studied globalization, you know, have to say about the topic, and then from there the lecture would build. And throughout there would also be discussion periods. So it was a very nicely mixed lecture, where he would obviously introduce topics we weren't very familiar, but he would also allow us to explore it on our own. And then in tutorial, we would mainly discuss the reading, and then each of us had to create discussion questions about the readings, and then for like half the period we would go over what they were, and then for the other half we would answer the questions. So again that was another opportunity to explore and really establish, like figure out what we think about what we were talking about. And that really helped me with framing, like understanding how I feel about globalization, how I understand it.

I: Great, thank you. So you maybe have gotten into this a little bit already just now, but the next question is what kinds of learning experiences that you had in the course felt most valuable or enriching to you? So this could be focused on particular activities, a specific assignment, or it could be focused on a person, or it could be on, you know, a specific reading, or course material that you worked with.

S: I think the most important thing that I got from that was listening to other people's comments or questions, or how they thought about it. And one thing that I consistently saw throughout the course was most of the people of the people participating and engaging in the concepts that learnt in class were girls, and saw basically that, you know, their ... how globalization has impacted *their* cultures, or impacted *their* lives, and how they see that it is changing the world is, I guess--from what I see, from the fact that only girls, or mostly girls, participated--more important to us--*cus I'm a girl* [laughter]--to us a whole, or else ... as what I could see from the class. And when guys *did* speak, it was always very, um ... very expecting of the negative aspects of globalization.

I: You mean less questioning of globalization?

S: Yes. Like more "oh, well how do you expect this *not* to happen?" Or, "why would you think that was bad?" Which I didn't really understand why, but that was the boy-girl distinction was the one thing that I could see was different.

I: Interesting.

S: So, seeing other people's perspective, and seeing that difference was probably the most valuable experience I think I found.

I: Great, thank you. We have five more questions. How are you doing? Do you need a break?

S: Good. No--we're good.

I: OK, cool. Ok so, the next question is about the online components of your course. I've seen the syllabus so I am aware a little bit, but I am curious to get you to comment on them. So the question says, was there an online component to your course, either in your classroom time or in your assignments and activities? And since I know that there was, I will say, if so, how would you describe your experience of these digital learning elements? For example, were they easy to interact with? Do you feel like they added a useful or difficult dimension to the learning experience, and why?

S: From what I can remember there was an online component. A lot of our readings were found online. And for a lot of our assignments we had to do research, which, well, I mostly found online, anyway. And it wasn't anything like next level, very basic instructions, you know, nothing difficult to navigate. And there were things, readings, research, that weren't available, or easily available, in hard copies, and having them, or being able to open them up wherever, whenever was really useful. So I think, yeah, very straightforward and useful access to information.

I: If you don't mind me following up, there's also two other specific things that I know that were in the syllabus, one of which was optional, so you might not have taken part in it, but one was the Twitter account. And then the other was, I think you had to write blog posts. Is that right?

S: Yes, yes, I forgot about that. Yes. So I didn't have Twitter so I didn't engage in that part. And then the blog post, yeah. I put mine on my Instagram. And so it was, again, really easy, like I use my Instagram almost everyday. [Laughter]

I: That's so cool.

S: So yeah ...

I: Did people respond to them who were your friends, not in your course?

S: They were like my least popular posts.

[Both laughing]

S: Yeah, they were not fun. And after the class ended, I deleted them. I was not about that. But yeah, so yeah. A lot of people, like, did tumblr posts, or they created a website, but I just did my Instagram.

I: Gotcha. Cool. Ok, thank you. So overall, you didn't take a strong impression away from the online component.

S: Yeah ...

I: You thought it was easy to use, it was ...

S: Yeah ...

I: Yeah, cool. Do you think there should have been any more than there were? That was kinda one part of the question.

S: Ah ... no. I think even like the Twitter thing was taking it a bit too far. I don't know if ... I didn't have Twitter, but I don't know if any of the other students engaged very heavily with it besides the people who, like, actually did it for the marks ...

I: Signed up ..

S: Yeah. So I'm not sure how effective that was. But yeah, I think, they're standard, yeah ...

I: OK, thanks. Alright the next question is what motivated you to take this course? You can cite multiple reasons if you have multiple.

S: Well, like I said before, I had taken the globalization, like the geography globalization course in high school, so I had been exposed to the material. I thought, why not? University probably has more information anyways. And also, I needed an extra course, so globalization was open.

I: [laughter] Cool. So, this is one part of your answer has already been answered in the question I'm about to ask, but did your course experience satisfy this logic that motivated you to enrol? In other words, did it deliver the experience you were expecting or hoping for?

S: Yeah, it definitely gave me more information than the high school course I had taken. And, like I said before, changed my perspective on how I thought about it, of globalization. And it also filled my course requirements. [Laughter]

I: [Laughter] Great, OK. Excellent. The next question is--we just have two more--how do you understand--this is a big question--how do you understand your own situation in our globalized world and its histories after taking the course? How would you describe your position in the world in terms of the global life and issues you've studied?

S: Yeah, so I thought about that a lot last semester because, like I mentioned, I am from Colombia.

I: Yeah...

S: But I am *here*. And my situation, if I was still living in Colombia, would be completely different than what it would be here. I wouldn't be, you know, experiencing all the benefits that Canada has to offer. And so I was very torn because, like I said as well, my culture and my people, and my people are very, very important to me. But I am *not* in their shoes, I am not experiencing what they are experiencing. And I have to basically come to terms with, oh yeah, the West is like destroying--like what I had thought--but I *am* part of the West. And I am reaping benefits from basically--what are those called?--like, transnational companies that, you know, make great products and services for, to offer us here, but they do so at the expense of the environment somewhere else. But then I had also--like I take, I use those products, I use those services. And then I also have this other part of me that synthesizes or connects with the fact that--wow--Colombia is one of those countries that are suffering because of this. But I am also taking part in some of things that make them suffer. So I have pretty much been stuck because I have *not* changed the way [laughter] I live, like I still, you know, drive a car almost everywhere. I use products from companies that don't have the greatest track record, but you know. And I still feel that ... I guess you would call it guilt for doing but it's

just *so* easy, *so* readily available. You can't, you can't go live live like someone who lives in less of a nation when everything you could possibly ever want or need is at the touch of a button. So it's hard to make that switch, but you know, you try, I guess.

I: So it sounds like you still feel anchored by your heritage and it kinda forces you to ask more questions about yourself, or to yourself, then maybe ...

I: Yeah...

S: ... someone who was born in Ontario or something.

S: Yeah, I think because I have a first hand view of what it's like to not live in the West, I have a lot of family in Colombia and I see their struggle, I see what they are going through, and comparing that to how I live is very clear and very present in my life.

I: Totally. Great, thank you. Last question: do you feel like your educational experience at your university more generally, so far, has been global, or helped you to become more of a global thinker, citizen, or individual? How so?

S: Mm ... global as in what I have been exposed to?

I: Anything really, right. So it could be a global thinker, global citizen, global individual. It could be the way that you engage in culture, in the world, in your own surroundings. It's kinda open to your interpretation, I think.

S: OK well, first of all, there is a lot more diversity at McMaster then there was at my high school in terms of where people are from, of course. I went to a high school in Burlington and Burlington is a very white city. Most of my classmates were white and going through there there were a lot of comments, I would say, in detriment to people of colour, or you know, ethnic people, and a lot of, I wouldn't say preference, but there was an obvious advantage that white kinds had over the rest of us. Like one experience--and it's dumb things, it's nothing like supper harmful--but like in my high school we would do a concert for Christmas break. And I wanted to do a Spanish song one time, and the lady who was running it, one of the teachers, she's like "I don't think you should do a Spanish song, like most of these kids won't even understand what you're saying." And I'm like, "excuse me? Ok ... *alright* ..."

I: [Laughter] You're like, "it's music, they can understand..."

S: Exactly! Exactly. Like just enjoy it. Dance! But definitely seeing how much more accepting people are when there are a good mix of different ethnicities and different backgrounds. And how people change. Because a lot of my high school classmates went to McMaster. And you can definitely see it in their attitudes, the way they don't behave how they did in high school anymore.

I: Interesting. OK, great. Is there anything else that kind of--so this question is motivated partly by the university itself kinda committing to becoming a more global campus environment and a more global education environment. So, yeah I'm just wondering if there are things that feel like they are part of the general environment that make you feel connected to a global identity in any way?

S: ... I guess ...

I: You don't have to say yes. It's OK if you don't think so.

S: All I can think of is when we had our club fest, or whatever it was, there was a lot of clubs dedicated to, you know, helping a drought in Honduras, or you know, making, or raising money for

sick kids in ... I don't know, some country around the world. I guess that's the only thing that would come to mind. But like very generally, like the atmosphere, like you can be like whoever you want, and McMaster will be like, "awesome!" That's just how I feel.

I: Cool. OK, great. Thank you. Finally, is there anything that you want to add, or do you want to return to anything else that you've said before.

S: No... basically we covered everything pretty well.

I: Ok, thank you so much.

S: Of course.

I: I'm going to stop the recording ... one second ...

[END]

M4

I: Alright so just a couple of things for you to know before I ask for your consent. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You can decide to stop at any time...even partway through the interview for whatever reason or up until September 30, 2018. If you decide to stop participating, there will be no consequences to you. If you decide to stop, I will ask you how you would like me to handle the data collected up to that point. This could include returning it to you, destroying it, or using the data collected up to that point. During the interview, if you don't want to answer some of the questions you don't have to... so you can opt out of a specific question or however many but you can still be in the study. And that's it. So the consent questions for you are; At this point do you have any questions or would you like any additional details?

S: Uh no... I don't have any questions and I think I'm good.

I: Great thank you. Do you agree that the interview can be audio recorded?

S: Yes I do.

I: Thanks. Do you agree to have your responses used for future related projects? That's probably not going to happen but I am required to ask you.

S: Yes I do.

I: OK thanks. And do you agree to participate in this study knowing that you can withdraw at any point with no consequences to you?

S: Yes I do.

I: Great. And finally before we begin would you like to receive a summary of the study's results

Ph.D. Thesis - S. D'Adamo; McMaster University - English and Cultural Studies
when they're finished? And if so, at what email or mailing address would you like to receive them?

S: Um yeah...I wouldn't mind at the same email address that you have for me.

I: Great...OK. Will do. Just so you know, typically the interview has been taking about 30-45 minutes so you might want to take a break, get some water or something. So I might ask you periodically if you need a break. But feel free to say so if you want that for yourself.

S: OK.

I: Cool. If there's a specific question that you don't want to answer, just skip it. That's fine.

S: OK.

I: So the first question is pretty straightforward. It's just information about you. What is your age now?

S: I'm eighteen years old.

I: OK. And what program of study are you pursuing if you know already? And what year of your degree are you in?

S: So I'm going into second year and I'm pursuing Economics at McMaster.

I: Great. And what city and country are you from?

S: Well I was born in Iran and I emigrated to Canada when I was about five years old.

I: Great thank you. And in Canada have you been in the Ontario region?

S: Yes I've lived in London Ontario.

I: That's fine. Great, thank you. So the next three questions really are just to kind of get you to speak from whatever comes to mind; speak from your knowledge, there's no right answer. Just say whatever you're thinking.

S: OK.

I: So the next question is – how would you define globalization and the concept of global citizenship?

S: I would define globalization as more of an economic sort of thing where I would see orders coming down for trade and money. And I would define a global citizen as someone who believes that they don't have a duty to their specific country but they have a duty to humans as a whole and everyone around the globe.

I: Great thank you. The next question is to try to get you to kind of free associate a little bit – so whatever comes into your head. What associations or images does the adjective “global” summon to mind?

S: When I think of global I think of the UN symbol, the little blue globe symbol. And it kind of reminds me of global organizations like the monetary fund and things such as that.

I: Great. The next question is a little more connected to the course. So has your understanding of these terms - "globalization, global citizenship or global" changed or evolved because of taking this course? If yes.....

S: Oh yeah! Definitely yeah.

I: How did they evolve?

S: Well, when I first started the class or before we really got into the topics I didn't know much about globalization. I just assumed that it was this topic where we we're all eventually going to become one nation or something like that. There is only this global government or somehow I thought that was the idea behind it. But thanks to this class I have a much deeper understanding of how complex globalization really is and all the different factors that go into it.

I: Great...OK thank you. So let's talk a little more actually about some of the content you studied in the course. Can you tell me about a specific text or concept that you encountered in the course that made a strong impression on you? Why do you think that experience matters to your understanding of the global?

S: Well one thing that really resonated with me was learning about the faults of voluntourism and how we have young people my age going over to different countries and really doing things that they're not qualified to do. And how there's a lot of problems with that. There are different organizations that kind of organize what happens to folks who volunteer. It is really kind of corrupt and it is not really helping those developing countries to get out of their current situation. It could in some circumstances make it much worse. So that really resonated with me because I've never thought that way before.

I: So you just thought that people are doing good works?

S: Yeah, I just thought what the media conveyed...you see those ads on kids' breaks going over to different countries and take pictures....the whole thing with the social media. That affects everything.

I: OK great....that's interesting. OK the next question is similar but maybe you will have the same answers. Or maybe you have a different answer too. Was there a text or concept that you found particularly difficult or surprising? What did you take away from this new difficult or surprising knowledge about global life or issues?

S: Something I found difficult...I found it difficult to grasp/not really difficult for the course....I found it was the whole idea of how politics play into globalization and how the different left/right wing lean towards globalization. It was kind of hard for me to grasp that as sometimes both sides are pro-globalization and then sometimes are against it. So where do we go from here? So is there a solution to the problem because there are so many global problems that we are dealing with, no one has a solution and we just keep adding more problems onto them.

I: Yeah. So do you think that if you took an additional course on that subject it might help? Maybe part of it is that this course was an introductory level?

S: Yeah I think that definitely. I am very interested in politics so I feel like if I took more courses my understanding would be that much better.

I: Great...OK thank you. The next question is kind of an opportunity for you to be critical of the syllabus if you want to be. So were there any global concepts or texts in the course that you did not find useful and why do you think you came to this conclusion?

S: I would say that at the beginning of the course I felt we spent a lot of time defining globalization and I just found that kind of confusing. At first I was really confused because obviously there is no exact definition for the word globalization and in trying to pinpoint something it made it really vague. My understanding of it wasn't really furthered until the course went along. So I feel like maybe defining globalization would be better done at the end of the course rather than at the beginning.

I: That's interesting. So you felt like that having all these competing definitions just kind of obscured it even more. Instead of being like....?

S: Definitely. When I first came into the class I didn't really know what globalization was. And I don't think that really helped when we were trying to define it. I felt like that this was some vague concept that makes no sense at this point.

I: That's cool. So maybe you could've had a working definition at the beginning and then refined it as the course went on together as a class.

S: – That would've been better.

I: OK great...thank you. Is there anything that you did not study in the course that you wish had been on the syllabus? This might be a particular text, concept, topic or theme and if there is something, why do you think this would be important to add to a global studies course like this one?

S: I did take this course my first semester so I don't remember much but I think one complaint I had is that we didn't spend enough time covering global organizations. I feel like we could've spent more time talking about the UN and how it has a lot of faults in what it does.

I: Like those institutions and the drawbacks of them?

S: Uh huh.

I: That makes sense. Ok great. The next several questions are kind of more about what your classroom experience was like, what different components were involved in the time you were in class. So describe what your classroom time was like. For example, was it primarily lecture based, were there other kinds of activities mixed into the lecture, or was it discussion based? Did it vary throughout the semester or the term? Did you have a discussion session run by a TA, etc?

S: So we had two one hour lectures each week as well as one tutorial. And that tutorial was basically a discussion. So in the tutorial we would talk about the concept of the topic covered. I feel that the tutorial was the most interesting part of this course. We actually learned about the concepts. In corporate globalization you don't really understand it until you talk about it and you have discussions about it. So I felt like there should've been more tutorial time to talk about the concept.

I: Was there discussion during lecture at all to help do some of that?

S: Very little. I believe we had discussions maybe twice during the whole semester in lecture.

I: So you didn't have breakout group chats during lecture? It was mostly listening.

S: I think...like very little.

I: OK...thank you. We have like six more questions. How are you doing?

S: I'm doing great.

I: OK great...thank you. Maybe you spoke about this just now. Which kinds of learning experiences that you had in the course felt most valuable or enriching to you? Your answer could be focused on a particular activity, a particular assignment, a person, as well as anything you were assigned to do in the course?

S: I have two actually. So the first one was we had a final essay. And I enjoyed learning my essay. I chose the topic of talking about the World Cup FIFA organization and how there's this really sad whole single world cup which is actually good for that developing country's economy. But then my essay was based on how this is a fallacy as there's so many things wrong with it. I focused on the cup when it was held in Brazil in 2014. And I really enjoyed that essay and doing the research; I learned more about the Brazilian government and what had gone down. I think that another thing is that my prof. made a recommendation for a book when we were talking about global trade. And the book was THE SILK ROADS. I actually got that book and I'm reading that now. I'm still reading it because it's a really big book. But it's very interesting and I really enjoyed that recommendation that he gave as it really tied in with the course as well as fitting my interest.

I: That's great. In your final essay...nobody has talked to me about this that I've interviewed so far. I'm just curious to learn a little more if you don't mind. Was it a five page essay where you had to use a number of sources or was it just kind of open ended?

S: So we did have to do an annotated bibliography at first using proper sources. And then it was basically a concept you would enjoy during the course and you got to cover it. He did give a list of recommended topics and I picked from that list. And there were some who just picked their own.

I: Cool...OK great. Thank you. Next question is about any kind of online components of the course. First of all, were there any online components either within the classroom, during the classroom time or in your assignments or activities? And if there weren't, do you think engaging online could've improved your course experience? If there were, how would you describe your experience of these digital learning elements? Were they easy to use and interact with? Did you feel like they added a useful dimension to your learning experience or a difficult one, and why? I know there were a few different things because I have the syllabus so you can talk about any of those.

S: So I think that he had this ongoing assignment where you got to choose whether or not you wanted to do it. It was on twitter I believe that you got to tweet about the course, its topic and your opinions on what we were covering. But I don't think I engaged in that because I had other classes so I just forgot about it. I didn't engage in the online aspect of the course.

I: So you didn't read the feed or anything like that?

S: No I didn't.

I: It seems like people who were posting were probably the most engaged. I also know that you had blog posts to do?

S: Oh yeah...we did three blog posts. To be honest I kind of felt that these were pointless. I don't enjoy those that much.. personally I'm not the kind of person that enjoys blogs. I think that essays are more my thing because I'm into more formal public writing and I didn't like how it was informal.

I: Gotcha...OK great. I know that McMaster uses Avenue to Learn. Do you find that easy to use?

S: Yeah...I found that very easy to use.

I: The next question is....what motivated you to take this course? Feel free to cite multiple reasons if you have them.

S: Well to be honest with you, for Social Sciences at Mc the first year is very general but I knew going in that my interests are Economics with kind of a business section of that. And I didn't like the list and globalization seemed to be the most interesting one. I read the course description which seemed to suit my interest of Economics and Politics so I decided to take the course because of that.

I: OK great. Did your course experience satisfy this logic that motivated you to enroll? In other words, did it deliver the experience you were expecting or hoping for?

S: It definitely did. I am a lot more interested in globalization now. I know that McMaster has upper year Political Science courses that delve more into globalization. And I've decided to actually take those courses as electives.

I: OK...good for you. Here are the last two questions. These are a little more “zoomed out” to get you to reflect on yourself and how you think of yourself in a global environment. So how do you understand your own situation in our globalized world and its history after taking the course? How would you describe your position in the world in terms of the global life and issues that you've studied?

S: I think that my understanding of my position was definitely furthered...I feel like I do think about the global consequences and local actions. For example, when we vote for a certain politician here that does have effects throughout the world. As a result, I am much more careful with my decision making and how I view my actions. There are such things as global warming and housing; we talked about these topics. Obviously I do have an impact on that. I feel like I've become a little bit more eco-friendly since then....not too much but a little bit. So I feel like I do see the global consequences as a result of this course.

I: Great. Here's the last question. Do you feel like your educational experience at your university more generally, so far, has been global or helped you to become more of a global thinker, citizen or individual and how so?

S: I definitely do believe that. I think that McMaster is a really good institution and since I finished first year I have learned so much. We have such an impact on the world and there are so many things that we do have an effect on the world. We can also do things to help and recognize global problems.

I: Cool. If you don't mind me asking a followup question. Do you feel like your sense of that is coming mainly from your course experiences? Or are there other things that are part of your campus life that make you feel connected as a local activist that also stimulate you as a global person and that has this potential?

S: I would say that it is more my class experiences because that is the type of learner I am. I am part of MUN and also the debate clubs which I do feel like play a role. But I would cite mainly my classes as the reason.

I: Great...that's interesting to hear. That's it for questions. Do you have anything you would like to add like any observations of your own?

S: I don't think so. I wanted to do this project because I really did enjoy this course so I think it would be cool to be part of this survey.

I: Thank you...I really appreciate it. You're the fifth person that I've talked to from the course. Everyone's been really thoughtful and it's so nice to hear what students are thinking because we really don't take the time to do that very often. So it's really a pleasure for me as well. I really appreciate you being interested to help.

S: No problem. Thank you for your time.

I: Thank you....especially thank you. I will be in touch over email probably in the fall once the research has been finalized and written up. I will share the findings with you.

M5 (Written Responses)

1) Information about you: Your age now? What program of study are you pursuing, and what year of your degree are you in? What city and country are you from?

I am 18, 1st year Commerce student. I am from Wuhu, China.

2) How would you define globalization and the concept of global citizenship?

Globalization: a tendency that people and countries in the world are connected more closely than ever from political, economic, cultural perspectives

Global citizenship: a special citizenship that are not limited by nationalities

3) What associations or images does the adjective "global" summon to mind?

An earth with people from different cultural backgrounds eliminate culture gap and understand each other well

4) Has your understanding of these terms (“globalization,” “global citizenship,” “global”) changed or evolved because of taking this course? If yes, how so? If not, why do you think that is the case?

Yes, I used to think of those words only from the good side, but after taking the course, I found the negative effect that “globalization” and “global citizenship” brings

5) Let’s talk about some of the content you studied in the course. Can you tell me about a text and/or a concept you encountered in the course that made a strong impression on you? Why do you think that experience matters to your understanding of ‘the global’?

I remember there are pictures that professor showed us in a lecture that the big gap between the rich and the poor in China. Shanghai is a very international and modern city but there are some countrysides in China are still very very poor, people there living in a bad living condition. I was surprised because I thought China is developing very fast and there are some gap between the rich and the poor but is not that big.

6) Was there a text or concept that you found particularly difficult or surprising? What did you take away from this new difficult or surprising knowledge about global life or issues?

No, there was not any concept that I found it is particularly difficult and surprising.

7) Were there any ‘global’ concepts or texts in the course that you did not find useful? Why do you think you came to this conclusion?

Actually every concept and text in the course I found useful for me, all led me to think deeply. For example, about 911 attack, I watched a documentaries about it in details and wrote a blog about it. Very interesting topic and can be related to our daily life since terrorism power has been around the world. Also, volunteerism is a new concept for me. I knew the form of it does exist but I did not consider pros and cons behind it, what effects can be brought to the developing countries and people when volunteers leave?

8) Is there anything that you did not study in the course that you wish had been on the syllabus? This might be a particular text, concept, topic or theme. If so, why do think this would be important to add to a global studies course like the one you’ve taken?

Globalization is a popular topic but not a new one. It happened hundreds years ago. I remember prof talked a few transnational companies in class and some historical events but did not particularly introduce more of that parts. I want to know more about it and analyze that part because I think it is very important for studying globalization happening nowadays. Also, I would like to know more about global citizenship, how to do an alter global citizens , like how to avoid the disadvantages of it,

how to promote the concept. It is obvious opposite to nationalism, in my mind, nationalism brings conflicts between people. So how to promote the alter global citizenship is what I care about too.

9) Describe what your classroom time was like. For example: was it primarily lecture-based, were there other kinds of activities mixed into your class period, was it primarily discussion-based? Did it vary throughout the semester or term? Did you have a discussion section run by a TA? Etc.

Most of time we listened to prof to present and explain concepts and apply to actual cases, sometimes he would let us to discuss to our neighbours, or there were some guest speakers coming to present us a particular topic. There were a lot of discussion time in tutorials that ran by TA. Just about a topic each tourial, students can express their own opinions, which I really enjoyed.

10) Which kinds of learning experiences that you had in the course felt most valuable or enriching to you? Your answer could be focused on particular activities, assessments, or person(s), as well as on your engagement with any of assigned course materials.

In tutorials, we have a lot of time to talk freely about a particular topic, which I enjoyed the most. I like to write blogs, I wrote three in this course, about the connections between multicultural society and globalization, global erases local and dark side of globalization-September 11 attacks. I did a lot of research on each topic and really think a lot to relate them to my daily life. Here is the link if you want to see: <https://www.blogger.com/u/1/blogger.g?blogID=8658746945454987866#allposts>

11) Was there an online component to your course (either in your classroom time or in your assignments and activities)? If not, do you think engaging online could have improved your course experience, and why? If so, how would you describe your experience of these digital learning elements? For example, were they easy to navigate and interact with, did you feel like they added a useful or difficult dimension to your learning experience, and why?

I do not think this course need to be presented online, face to face lectures and tutorials are more useful and I really enjoy them

12) What motivated you to take this course? Feel free to cite multiple reasons if relevant.

Personally, I am so interested into globalization and the identity to be a global citizen. Even I want to minor globalization studies if possible. It becomes more and more important for everyone since the highly developing transportations and communication technologies. We must corporate to make more interests than making conflicts and wars. We have to learn how to get along with people with different cultural backgrounds and be open-minded.

13) Did your course experience satisfy this logic that motivated you to enroll? In other words, did it deliver the experience you were expecting or hoping for?

Yes, definitely! Requirements of research paper are quite flexible, giving students a big space to create new thoughts!

14) How do you understand your own situation in our globalized world and its histories after taking the course? How you would describe your position in the world, in terms of the global life and issues you've studied?

I would like to admit myself a global citizen, or at least I am working on it. My high school is an international one, so I experienced a lot from that and learned how to behaviour properly to show respect and make others who comes from a different cultural backgrounds to feel comfortable.

15) Do you feel like your educational experience at your university more generally has been global, or helped you to become more of a global thinker, citizen, or individual? How so?

Yes, McMaster University is very multicultural. The theme of my residence is global perspective, so I can feel more. As I always do, I would behaviour properly when communicating with someone from different country backgrounds and make friends from all over the world, which helps me think from different perspective and more open-minded.

FIU SYLLABI MATERIALS

BLACK POPULAR CULTURES: GLOBAL DIMENSIONS

FIU Go Global, "AFA 2004 Global Learning Course Assessment Matrix." Black Popular Cultures, Global Dimensions. August 31 2016, Florida International University, https://goglobal.fiu.edu/faculty-staff/syllabi-assessments/_assets/docs/afa_2004_gl_course_outcome_assessment_matrix_8.31.16docx.docx. Accessed July 20 2022. Course Assessment Matrix for Global Learning Outcomes.

GENDER VIOLENCE AND THE LAW: GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

FIU Go Global, "WST 4115 Global Learning Course Assessment Matrix." Gender Violence and the Law: Global Perspectives. Florida International University, https://goglobal.fiu.edu/faculty-staff/syllabi-assessments/_assets/docs/wst-genderviolencelaw-gl_assessmentmatrix.docx. Accessed July 20 2022. Course Assessment Matrix for Global Learning Outcomes.

GLOBAL ISSUES IN LITERATURE

FIU Go Global, "LIT 3671 Global Learning Course Assessment Matrix." Global Issues in Literature. September 15 2016, Florida International University, https://goglobal.fiu.edu/faculty-staff/syllabi-assessments/_assets/docs/lit-3671-gl_assessment_matrix_9.15.161.docx. Accessed July 20 2022. Course Assessment Matrix for Global Learning Outcomes.

HOW WE KNOW WHAT WE KNOW

FIU Go Global, "IDS 3309 Global Learning Course Assessment Matrix." How We Know What We Know. September 15 2016, Florida International University, https://goglobal.fiu.edu/faculty-staff/syllabi-assessments/_assets/docs/ids-3309_gl_course_assessment_matrix_9.15.16-1.docx. Accessed July 20 2022. Course Assessment Matrix for Global Learning Outcomes.

INTRODUCTION TO ANTHROPOLOGY

FIU Go Global, "ANT 2000 Global Learning Course Assessment Matrix." Introduction to Anthropology. August 31 2016, Florida International University, https://goglobal.fiu.edu/faculty-staff/syllabi-assessments/_assets/docs/ant2000-gl-learning-outcomes-matrix8.31.16.docx. Accessed July 20 2022. Course Assessment Matrix for Global Learning Outcomes.

INTRODUCTION TO SOCIOLOGY

FIU Go Global, "SYG 2000 Global Learning Course Assessment Matrix." Introduction to Sociology. September 6 2016, Florida International University, https://goglobal.fiu.edu/faculty-staff/syllabi-assessments/_assets/docs/syg-2000-gl-course-outcomes-assessment-matrix_9.6.16.docx. Accessed July 20 2022. Course Assessment Matrix for Global Learning Outcomes.

LGBT AND BEYOND: NON-NORMATIVE SEXUALITIES IN GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE

FIU Go Global, "WST 3641 Global Learning Course Assessment Matrix." Global Issues in Literature. September 6 2016, Florida International University, https://goglobal.fiu.edu/faculty-staff/syllabi-assessments/_assets/docs/wst-3641-gl_assessment_matrix_9.6.16_docx.docx. Accessed July 20 2022. Course Assessment Matrix for Global Learning Outcomes.

MCMASTER SYLLABI MATERIALS

GLOBALZN 1A03 - GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP

Stockdale, Liam. Syllabus for Global Citizenship. Fall 2017, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada. Publicly available online at the time of thesis submission.

https://globalization.mcmaster.ca/courses/global-citizenship/active-outline/@@display-file/outline_file/Globalzn%201A03%20Term%201%202017-18_L.%20Stockdale.pdf

GLOBALZN 3A03 - GLOBALIZATION, SOCIAL JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Butler, Paula. Syllabus for Globalization, Social Justice and Human Rights. Fall 2017, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada. Publicly available online at the time of thesis submission.

https://globalization.mcmaster.ca/courses/globalization-social-justice-and-human-rights/active-outline/@@display-file/outline_file/Globalzn%203A03%20Term%201%202017-18_Paula%20Butler.pdf