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Abstract
This research project explores how notions of Canadian exceptionalism are being challenged and/or reproduced in responses of students of seven Canadian universities to a survey related to internationalization of higher education. The study analyses data from surveys (n=1451) completed by undergraduate students in different disciplines collected between 2013 and 2015. This data is part of a larger database of surveys that was developed within the Ethical Internationalization in Higher Education (EIHE) research project (2012–2016).

This research adopts a mixed-methods approach to the analysis of quantitative and qualitative data. A post-representational approach to the methodology of social cartography is used to map two facets of the data. These facets are the general discursive field in which various exceptionalist tendencies are being contested and/or reproduced, and the multiple dimensions of articulations of exceptionalist tendencies.

Canadian exceptionalism is in this research understood as a complex set of self-constitutive discursive practices, policies, self-perceptions and assumptions that simultaneously affirm and construct an imaginary of Canadian society and Canadian nationals as morally, ethically and culturally superior by exalting both the nationals’ and the nation-state’s inherent character as already good global citizens. Exceptionalism is used as an umbrella term that joins together several problematic aspects of unexamined ennobled narratives about the nation and national subjects. In this research the concept of exceptionalism is developed by drawing on multiple critiques of different aspects of liberal subjectivities.

The findings suggest that exceptionalist tendencies and articulations can be observed in the responses of both international and Canadian students. They also suggest that while critical thinking and engagement with diversity are valued highly by almost all students, the responses in the survey exhibit a high level of ambivalence in terms of how (and to what extent) critical thinking is deployed, while diversity is often constructed in commodified ways that seem to indicate a desire for consumption of the Other’s difference for personal and/or national benefit.
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Tiivistelmä


Tutkimuksessa hyödynnetään monimenetelmällistä lähestymistapaa laadullisen ja määrällisen aineiston analyysiin. Aineistoa kartoitetaan kahdesta näkökulmasta jälkiedustuksellisen sosiaalisen kartografian avulla. Nämä näkökulmat ovat 1) yleinen diskursiivinen kenttä, jossa erilaisia poikkeuksellisuuden tendenssejä haastetaan ja/tai toisinnetaan ja 2) poikkeuksellisuuden tendenssien artikulaatiot ja niiden moninaiset ulottuvuudet.

Kanadalainen poikkeuksellisuus ymmärtetään tässä tutkimuksessa monimutkaiseksi rakennelmaaksi itseään toteutavia diskursiivisia käytäntöjä, toimintatapoja sekä ihmisten käsityksiä ja oletuksia itsestään, jotka samanaikaisesti vahvistavat ja rakentavat kuvitelmia kanadalaisesta yhteisöstä ja Kanadan kansalaisista moraalisesti, eettisesti ja kulttuurisesti ylempänä yleisön matkalla luonnosta hyvinä maailmankansalaisina. Poikkeuksellisuutta käytetään ylemmän tason tason terminä, joka nostaa esiin ongelmalisia näkökulmia tutkimattomia kansakuntia ja kansalaisia koskeviin yleemäisiin narratiiveihin. Poikkeuksellisuuden konseptia rakennetaan tässä tutkimuksessa viimeaikaisen liberaalin subjektiivisuuden eri näkökulmia koskevan kritiikan pohjalta.

Tulokset viittaavat siihen, että poikkeuksellisuuden tendenssejä ja artikulaatioita esiintyy sekä ulkomaisten että kanadalaisien opiskelijoiden vastauksissa. Vaikka tulosten perusteella lähes kaikki opiskelijat arvostavat vastauksistaan kriittistä ajattelua ja moninaisuuden kohtalosta, vastauksista välittyy hyvin ristiriittainen näkemys siitä, miten (ja missä määrin) kriittistä ajattelua lopulta hyödynnetään. Tällöin diversiteetti jäsentyy usein kulutushyödykkeen tavoin esittäen ilmeistä halua käyttää toisen erilaisuutta omaan ja/tai kansallisen edun hyväksi.
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1 Introduction

This research is embedded in the context of a larger project Ethical Internationalisation in Higher Education (EIHE) that has been funded by the Finnish Academy of Science and that ran between September 2012 and July 2016. The EIHE project included 23 universities from all continents, with the majority of the project partners coming from Europe and North America (Canada). The project aimed to address questions related to internationalization processes of higher education that focused on conceptualizations and understandings of difference, global citizenship and the potential for resistance and disruption of existing hegemonic patterns of knowledge production (Andreotti 2015).

The project recognized the increasing demands placed on universities by neoliberal market imperatives for employability, mobility and competitiveness as key influential factors that guide the processes of rapid internationalization. Of particular concern was the instrumentalization of civic imaginaries of international communities based on social responsibility, global citizenship and diversity for market purposes through a fusion of corporate and civic imaginaries of higher education (Slaughter & Leslie 1997, Slaughter & Rhoades 2004). The project team included research partners from very divergent theoretical and professional backgrounds, however the main theoretical framework of the project was grounded in postcolonial and decolonial theories (Bhabha 1994, Chakrabarty 2000, Mignolo 2002, Quijano 1999, Said 1978, Spivak 2002).

As the title suggests, this research aims to examine critically the responses of 1,451 students of seven Canadian universities to the EIHE survey on internationalization of higher education. It adopts a mixed-methods approach (Biesta 2010, Johnson & Onwuegbuzie 2004) to the analysis of quantitative (both demographic and content-based) and qualitative data with the purpose of exploring multiple dimensions of students’ perceptions on topics related to internationalization of higher education. The students’ perceptions under examination relate to (1) their understandings of the (public) role of university in society, the challenges and opportunities of internationalization, the various skills, dispositions, global themes and socio-political issues relevant to their field of study, as well as to (2) their self-perceptions and perceptions of Canada, Canadian society and Canadian higher education institutions in the context of increased internationalization, diversity and idea(l)s of global citizenship. Due to the structure of the survey, that contained both multiple choice and open-ended questions, the first set (1) of perceptions and understandings is analysed using standard statistical
methods for analysis of quantitative data, while the second set (2) is analysed and mapped using Rolland Paulston’s (Paulston 1994, 1996, 1999, Paulston & Liebman 1994, 1996) social cartography. The analysis of quantitative data, due to its complexity, comprises a significant part of this dissertation, and offers insights into the demographic structure of participating students and their understandings of the internationalization processes in relation to their respective fields of study and higher education in general. However, the main research focus, in methodological and theoretical sense, is on the analysis of qualitative data.

In relation to the qualitative data, the research pursues two objectives. First, it seeks to explore and to map the general discursive field in which students’ responses are articulated, using social cartography to map three main discursive orientations (liberal, neoliberal and critical) and their interstices that were identified within the EIHE project as operating within the broader imaginary on higher education (Andreotti et al. 2016). Second, it seeks to explore specific tendencies and assumptions, related to students’ self-perceptions and perceptions about Canada, Canadian society and its higher education institutions that gradually became visible through the process of multiple readings of data. In so doing, this research examines both the explicit cases of students’ responses that distinguish Canada as unique in relation to other countries, as well as the potential underlying assumptions behind responses that at first sight may not seem as informed by the notions of Canadian distinctiveness and/or superiority. In this study this latter stance is referred to as Canadian exceptionalism.

Canadian exceptionalism is thus understood as a complex set of self-constitutive discursive practices, policies, self-perceptions and assumptions that simultaneously affirm and construct an imaginary of Canadian society and Canadian nationals as morally, ethically and culturally superior by exalting both the nationals’ and the nation-state’s inherent character as already good global citizens. This ‘already good’ global citizenship is, in its Canadian iteration, associated with attributes such as global leadership, altruism, compassion, tolerance, openness, neutrality, hard work, peacekeeping, inclusion and social justice. While particular to discourse and narratives about Canada, its society, social institutions and national subjects, the research does not assume that articulations and assumptions of Canadian exceptionalism are a specific trait of Canadian nationals or residents.

Drawing on theories of modern social imaginaries (Steger 2008, Taylor 2004) it rather adopts the position that these assumptions and articulations are being already embedded in a dominant modern global imaginary (Steger 2008, Stein &
Andreotti 2016) that provides for their underlying and wide-spread general discursive framework (Andreotti et al. 2016, Stein & Andreotti 2016, see also: Stein et al. 2016b). Although these persistent, all-pervasive, and shared constructed perceptions about the nature of global relations and their corresponding social hierarchies “can be linked to the colonial myth of Western supremacy, [they are] reproduced not only by and in the West, but also by many across the globe” (Stein & Andreotti 2016: 229). As a specific articulation of Western (Northern) supremacy, embedded in the dominant modern global imaginary, Canadian exceptionalism is likewise considered to be circulated and affirmed by “many across the globe” (ibid.

Similarly, the research considers Canadian exceptionalism to be grounded in modern, liberal forms of subjectivity, which is a predominant forms of subjectivity in contemporary multi-cultural capitalist societies. This is why a psychoanalytical reading of data is adopted, in order to explore what kinds of unconscious motives, desires, and personal attachments could be considered as driving some of these specific articulations. This approach is grounded in the works of the authors, such as Bhabha (1984, 1994), Bonilla-Silva (2006), Jeffèress (2002, 2008, 2011, 2012), Kapoor (2014), Maldonado-Torres (2007), McGowan (2014), Thobani (2007) and Žižek (1989, 1991, 1997, 2002). Again, although particular to notions of Canadian exceptionalism, these specific articulations and assumptions are considered as embedded and informed by much broader (modern) structures of being that historically emerged through the unfolding of the twin project of modernity/coloniality (Bhabha 1994, Maldonado-Torres 2007, Sousa Santos 2007).

In this regard, the research is interested in making the familiar strange and the strange familiar by exploring which normalized and unexamined meta-narratives speak through the available data and why, rather than exploring the specific profiles or individual perspectives of students. In drawing attention to the ways in which personal experiences and interpretations are shaped and informed by deeper and unacknowledged layers of meaning that are historically and culturally situated, this research seeks to make these layers visible and to problematize their validity. In this sense, it questions the discursive constructions of the nation and the national subjects, starting with a sceptical stance in relation to the positive stereotypes of the benevolent Canadian national character. However, its aim is not to offer an authentic representation of Canadian students or universities. The methodological orientations, adopted in this study, aim to mobilize knowledge in ways that deepen and trouble current modes of conversation, challenging the possibilities for
constructing objective representations and desires for improvement through normative solutions.

Two key research questions lie at the heart of this study, one defined by the larger EIHE project, another by my own research interests. The first question, ‘How are liberal, neoliberal, and critical discursive orientations articulated in the responses of students of seven Canadian universities to qualitative questions?’ explores which of these main discursive orientations and their interstices prevail in students’ answers and which are less represented. It also explores which discursive orientations are (largely) absent from the answers, and which issues related to the subjects of internationalization of higher education, global citizenship and diversity are not being discussed and/or recognized. The development of this question and the corresponding analytical matrices were informed by the shared analytical tools developed in the main EIHE project.

The second question, ‘How are exceptionalist assumptions and tendencies contested and/or reproduced in students’ responses?’ explores how these assumptions and tendencies are articulated and/or contested differently within three main discursive orientations (liberal, neoliberal and critical) and their interstices. It also explores which exceptionalist tendencies and assumptions are present and which are absent from students’ responses, which could be found across the spectrum of orientations and which are re-articulated only in some, but contested or absent in others. As articulations of exceptionalism were not part of research focus of the EIHE project, the development of the second question and the corresponding social cartography were informed by my own research interests in this subject, spurred by the observable discursive patterns in the data, and theoretically grounded in critical scholarship on exceptionalism (e.g. Agamben 1998, Mitchell 2006, Loftsdóttir & Jensen 2012, Rastas 2012) and multiple critiques of modern, liberal subjectivities (e.g. Ahmed 2000, Balibar 1991, Bhabha 1994, Bonilla-Silva 2006, Jefferess 2011, Kapoor 2014, McAllan 2014, Thobani 2007, Žižek 1997, 2002).

1.1 Overview of the dissertation structure

This dissertation is organized into eight chapters. Chapter 1, this introduction, outlines the content of each chapter and introduces the general subject of research, the main research questions, and provides an overview of the key theoretical, methodological and analytical considerations. It is concluded by a presentation of
my contextual background and personal/professional orientation towards the
subject matter of this research.

Chapter 2 describes the general research context and the position of the
Canadian dataset within the broader EIHE project and within the processes of
internationalization of higher education in Canada. The chapter begins with the
presentation of the EIHE project, its aims and structure, and then proceeds with a
discussion of its theoretical and methodological framework. The chapter discusses
the relevance of the EIHE project for this research; it introduces the various modes
of inquiry developed within the project, and positions this research within its larger
framework. It also discusses different ways in which social cartography (Paulston
1996, 1999, Paulston & Liebman 1994) was used in the EIHE project.

By drawing on theorizations of social imaginaries (Steger 2008, Taylor 2004)
this chapter also conceptualizes the three main discursive orientations (and their
interstices) that were identified as operating under the framework of the modern
The discussion of the relationship between the EIHE project and this research is
followed by a discussion of internationalization policies and rationales that drive
internationalization processes in Canada. It draws on the policy analysis of
universities’ internationalization strategies and other corresponding documents,
developed with the EIHE project (Pashby 2016) and complements it with an
analysis of national policy documents (Department for Foreign Affairs, Trade and
Development 2013, 2014) and other relevant research (e.g. Association of

Chapter 3 outlines the theoretical framework of this research. The chapter is
divided into two main subchapters that theorize exceptionalism (as the main
theoretical concept and focus of this research) and different critiques of modern
(liberal) subjectivities (as prevailing forms of subjectivities today). This research
draws on multiple conceptualizations of exceptionalism (Agamben 1998, 2005,
Loftsdóttir & Jensen 2012, Mitchell 2006, Rastas 2012), however, the work of
Sunera Thobani (2007) provides the main framework under which Canadian
exceptionalism (in the critical interpretation of this term) was theorized in this
research. Thobani (2007) focuses on exploring what kinds of narratives and
constitutive myths have contributed to the process of nation-building in Canada and
continue to exert their influence today. Although Thobani herself does not use the
term exceptionalism, her definition of exaltedness informs my working definition
of exceptionalism, and I owe many of the self-ascribed attributes of the Canadian
national subject to her genealogy of their formation. The main conceptual
difference between the way exceptionalism is used in this research, and some of the other key related concepts, such as exaltedness (Thobani 2007) or benevolence (Jefferess 2002, 2008, 2011), is that this research assumes that exceptionalist discourse and its accompanying articulations, tendencies and dispositions can be shared and reproduced by Canadians and non-Canadians alike. Exceptionalism is considered as a set of characteristics, traits and dispositions, embedded in narratives that circulate within and outside of Canada, while notions such as exaltedness and benevolence are considered to circulate within Canada, as a trait of Canadian national subjects.


Chapter 4 presents the methodological orientation for this research. Following the initial presentation of main research questions and sub-questions, the chapter is again divided into two main subchapters. The first subchapter discusses the mixed methods approach to research in the social sciences, drawing on the work of Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) and critical considerations on the subject of mixed methods by Gert Biesta (2010). This subchapter also introduces the survey questionnaire and discusses which methods were used to analyse specific segments of the questionnaire and the rationale for their choice. The second subchapter introduces the method of social cartography as the main method for the analysis of the qualitative data in this study and the corresponding visualisation of the results. It begins by discussing the work by Rolland Paulston (1994, 1996, 1999, Paulston & Liebman 1994, 1996) as the main originator of social cartography and then expands on this discussion by reflecting on the recent post-representational debate in cartography (see Crampton 2003, Kitchin et al. 2011).
Rather than using social cartography as a representational cognitive map – in other words as a heuristic description of reality (discourse and discursive orientations in this specific case), this chapter thus seeks to theorize social cartography in a post-representational, performative sense. That is, as (i) a non-normative organisational tool that enables the quantification of qualitative data, and, as (ii) a mirror that denaturalizes what is perceived as normal and desirable and amplifies unflattering traits in order to open possibilities for different conversations and to make visible otherwise hidden assumptions and interpretations. In terms of analysing qualitative data, social cartography thus performs the dual function of being both the tool for analysis and interpretation of data and as a tool for the organisation and presentation of the results. Although quantification of qualitative data is not usually associated with non-normativity or post-representational readings of data, I do believe that the interpretative potential for deeper critical reflection offered by the adoption of such a methodological approach that is both theoretically informed, yet ultimately grounded in actual data, deserves to be tested and explored. While I cannot claim that this research managed to utilize the full potential of such a methodological/analytical approach, I do hope that it will provide enough interesting and above all different findings and interpretative possibilities to justify its adoption.

Chapter 5 is the first of the two chapters in which the student data is presented. The data used in this research is part of a larger database of student surveys, interviews, policy analyses, and case studies that was compiled in the EIHE project. In this specific study, I examine both quantitative and qualitative data in 1,451 surveys completed by undergraduate students in different disciplines collected from 2013 to 2015 in seven Canadian universities. This chapter presents the analysis of quantitative data, while Chapter 6 presents the analysis of qualitative data. It is divided into three subchapters, with the first subchapter presenting the basic demographic data, related to the gender, age, first language, family context, minority affiliation and socialization. The second subchapter offers a comparison between the family origins of students of Canadian universities and the family origins of students of universities from other countries that participated in the EIHE project with the purpose of providing a broader interpretative context of demographic analysis in the first subchapter. The third and final subchapter features an analysis of content-based quantitative data that seeks to explore students’ opinions on the internationalization of higher education, the social role of universities, their fields of study and what they value in their courses. The analysis of quantitative data serves predominantly the purpose of providing the necessary
context for the analysis of the qualitative data, which focuses on the subjects of exceptionalism and different discursive orientations that were observable in the data.

Chapter 6 presents the analysis of the qualitative data, using social cartography as its main analytical tool. This chapter adopts an analytical approach that quantifies the qualitative data with the purpose of making an initial comparison possible between different levels of representation of each of the three main discursive orientations (liberal, neoliberal and critical) and their respective interstices. The purpose of mapping the discourses is to explore to what extent and in what ways the three main discursive orientations (liberal, neoliberal, critical) and their interstices are represented in students’ responses to four open-ended questions. The analysis focuses on the qualitative components of these answers, but also quantifies the qualitative data in order to make a comparison between levels of representation of different discursive orientations possible. This chapter also explores how various articulations of Canadian exceptionalism are reflected differently within three main discursive orientations (liberal, neoliberal, critical) and their interstices. Apart from the mapping of students’ responses onto the main EIHE social cartography, Chapter 6 also discusses student response rates and explores the connections between the quantitative and qualitative components of open-ended questions the students answered in this study. The chapter concludes with an overview of the observable general traits in the analysis of qualitative data and discusses several caveats related to its multiple possible readings and interpretations.

Chapter 7 builds upon the analysis of the qualitative data in Chapter 6 and discusses, in more detail, some of the major exceptionalist tendencies, or specific articulations of exceptionalist discourse that were observable through the analysis. This chapter presents and discusses qualitative data through the use of AWESOME social cartography that was developed specifically for the purpose of mapping different articulations of exceptionalist discourse in students’ responses and grounded in a corresponding critical scholarship. AWESOME stands for: **Autoimmunity** (Derrida 2005, McAllan 2014); **Willful ignorance** (Alcoff 2007, Maldonado-Torres 2004, Tuana 2004, 2006); **Exaltedness** (Thobani 2007), **Subtle racism** (Balibar 1991, Bhabha 1994, Bonilla-Silva 2006, Goldberg 2009, Jeffress 2002, 2008, 2011, Maldonado-Torres 2004, 2007); **Opportunist inclusion** (Balibar 1991, Thobani 2007, Stewart 2014); **Minimization of issues** (Balibar 1991, Bonilla-Silva 2006, Goldberg 2002) and **Extraction/consumption of otherness** (Bauman 1995, Comaroff & Comaroff 2009, Lofts dóttir 2015). While the list of these
tendencies/articulations should not be considered as exhaustive or definitive, it is used in this research as an analytical and visualisation tool for the main characteristics of these different articulations of exceptionalist discourse. This chapter also aims to discuss (through theory) some of the (un)acknowledged personal and collective desires, investments, perceptions and attachments that could be seen as influencing or instigating specific articulations of exceptionalism. In this regard the AWESOME cartography is used as a tool for discussion of not just the manifest content of the students’ answers, but also of discursive silences, absences and of what may be informing them.

The concluding Chapter 8 highlights some of the most relevant findings and extends the discussion initiated in the previous chapter(s). It attempts to weave together the main observations from the analyses of the quantitative and qualitative data and to open-up some further questions that would hopefully contribute to the on-going debate on this subject. The conclusion begins by recalling the main research questions and methodological approaches used to engage with them, and by summarizing the general findings of the analyses of the quantitative and qualitative data. It then proceeds to focus on two (arguably) most significant findings that were observable in the analysis – the ambivalent relation of students towards critical thinking, and the fact that exceptionalist discourse was adopted by all groups of students, regardless of them coming from families of Canadian, non-Canadian, partially-Canadian or otherwise minoritised origins. The chapter concludes with a reflection on the research proceedings and by outlining some of the ambitions for future engagement with this subject.

### 1.2 Scope and limitations of this study

Specific research assignments with the EIHE project were distributed to a group of researchers that participated in the project in various capacities. As the project featured six separate, but related modes of inquiry (literature review, policy analysis, case studies, semi-structured interviews and two different surveys) that were conducted in parallel, this research represents merely a fraction of the whole body of research, conducted within the project. Its ambition is to explore in detail exclusively the data available from Canadian universities’ students’ survey, and to situate the analysis within historic, political and cultural context of Canada as a modern, colonial, multi-cultural, liberal, capitalist, settler community. Therefore, the theoretical and methodological approaches adopted here, as well as corresponding spatial limitations, necessitate considerable restrictions in terms of
cross-linking the findings of this research with research from other datasets or modes of inquiry, in particular, since much of the research will continue to be published in the upcoming years. Still, where necessary, and where possible, this research does draw on findings of other researchers in the project, as in the case of policy analysis (Pashby 2016), or in the case of outlining the main discursive orientations, conceptualized within the EIHE project (e.g. Andreotti 2011a, Andreotti et al. 2016, Stein & Andreotti 2016).

Although a full comparison with other datasets (especially of qualitative data) was not developed due to considerations related to size, available resources and timing, this research does include a partial comparative analysis of selected demographic parameters between data from Canadian universities and other participating countries, in order to make possible a very brief and limited international comparison between demographic histories of settler and non-settler communities. As stated before, the main purpose of this research is not to offer an authentic representation of Canadian students or universities, but rather to question the very possibilities of constructing objective representations and to challenge the desires for normative solutions and epistemic security and safety, offered by objectivist/normative stances. It thus adopts a post-structuralist stance that sees both, the concrete articulations of specific discourses (in this case students’ responses), and their interpretations, as necessarily historically, politically and culturally situated, partial and provisional. In this sense, a theoretically informed and historically situated comparison with other countries, while it would certainly uncover nuanced differences between articulations of nation-specific exceptionalist discourses across the world, would require considerable effort, in order to be of use beyond the representational level of analysis. Such an effort would be all the greater, since, to the best of my knowledge, very few (if any) authors (outside the Nordic region) have used the concept of exceptionalism to engage in similar analyses in other countries. Hopefully such comparisons could be undertaken in the future, perhaps also by other EIHE researchers, currently looking at other national datasets.

1.3 Researcher’s background and position

With regards to my participation in the EIHE project, I joined the project as an associate researcher in January 2015 and have remained part of the project team until the project’s end. My responsibilities within the project have been mostly related to the analysis of student surveys that represented merely one of the various modes of inquiry that were developed within the EIHE project. In many ways I
could say that it was the data itself that drew my attention to what later became the main focus of my research – that is the subject of (Canadian) exceptionalism. Although I was transcribing data from different countries, the Canadian dataset was the largest and the one that I became, through the course of my work, the most familiar with. Coming from a personal background, shaped by significant changes in the geo-political realities of central Europe where I live, the data that I was transcribing presented me with an opportunity to explore and critically engage with worldviews and perceptions about the self, the state and the Other that seemed markedly different from the kind that I would consider to be prevailing in my immediate surroundings.

In the field of postcolonial and decolonial studies, social hierarchies of identities are considered important in terms of positionalities, vulnerabilities, and power relations; therefore it seems important to state that I can be described as a white, cis-male, heterosexual, Central European, working class individual. However, I would consider many other factors as likewise, or perhaps more pivotal, to shaping my personal and professional interests and theoretical orientation. Although I have never moved from the country of my birth, I have lived through two (or three) very different political realities, spending my early childhood in the multi-ethnic Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia, my formative years in the ‘independent’ nation-state of Slovenia (one of several ex-Yugoslav republics), and my adult life in the same country, but this time as part of the European Union. Having in a period of less than two decades witnessed the collapsing promises of both the self-managed socialism\(^1\) and (neo)liberal capitalism (in its state-bound and transnational iteration), with both their similarities, differences and extremes strongly articulated in such a short period of time, has made me, like many other people in my vicinity\(^2\), somewhat of a sceptic regarding humanity’s presumably inherent virtues, let alone those of nation-states and their ruling elites. In both cases the collapsing promises of (social) stability, progress and futurity resulted in (different) forms of violence. I believe the unsustainable and violent nature of

---

\(^1\) Self-management or self-governance was a specific form of socialist economic and political organisation that was developed in Yugoslavia that emphasized public (not state) ownership of resources and means of production (Kardelj 1977), that resulted in what Prout (1985) calls market socialism that was markedly different from the Soviet model.

\(^2\) Comparative studies of public perceptions by Jackson et al. (2011) and Mungiu-Pippidi et al. (2015) have shown that citizens of Eastern and Central European countries, and Slovenia in particular, consistently exhibit significantly lower levels of trust in the integrity of public institutions, such as national parliaments, national governments political parties and legal justice, than their counterparts from other European countries.
current dominant systems requires that we learn from past and present mistakes in order to face contemporary crises and enable different forms of co-existence to emerge. These experiences and aspirations were key in my choice of subject, theory and approach to the data analysed in this study.
2 Research context and the broader EIHE project

This chapter outlines the general research context and the position of the Canadian dataset within the broader EIHE project and within the processes of internationalization of higher education in Canada. The chapter begins with the presentation of the EIHE project, its aims and structure, and then proceeds with the discussion of its theoretical and methodological framework. The chapter discusses the relevance of the EIHE project for this research, it introduces the various modes of inquiry, developed within the project, and positions this research within its larger framework. It also discusses different ways in which social cartography (Paulston 1996, 1999, Paulston & Liebman 1994) was used in the EIHE project.

By drawing on theorizations of social imaginaries (Steger 2008, Taylor 2004) this chapter also conceptualizes the three main discursive orientations (and their interstices) that were identified as operating under the framework of the modern global imaginary in the context of higher education (Andreotti et al. 2016: 89–91). The discussion of the relationship between EIHE project and this research is followed by a discussion about internationalization policies and the rationales that drive internationalization processes in Canada. It draws on the policy analysis of universities’ internationalization strategies and other corresponding documents, developed with the EIHE project (Pashby 2016), and complements it with an analysis of national policy documents (Department for Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development 2013, 2014) and other relevant research (e.g. Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada 2014, Kunin 2012).

2.1 The EIHE project

The EIHE research project ran between September 2012 and July 2016, was funded by the Finnish Academy of Science and included 23 Universities from across the world. The project was coordinated by prof. Vanessa Andreotti and hosted by the Education, Ethics, Diversity and Globalization (EDGE) research group at the Faculty of Education at the University of Oulu.

The project recognized the increasing demands placed on the universities by neoliberal market imperatives for employability, mobility and competitiveness as key influential factors that guide the processes of rapid internationalization (Andreotti 2015). Of particular concern was the instrumentalization of the civic imaginaries of international communities based on social responsibility, global
citizenship and diversity for market purposes through a fusion of corporate and civic imaginaries of higher education (Slaughter & Leslie 1997, Slaughter & Rhoades 2004). The project aimed to address questions related to internationalization processes of higher education that focused on conceptualizations and understandings of difference, global citizenship and the potential for resistance and disruption of existing hegemonic patterns of knowledge production (Andreotti 2015).

2.1.1 Project background, aims and structure

Drawing on the work by Biesta (2007), Khoo (2011) and Simons and Masschelein (2009), the rationale for the project was established against the backdrop of rising concerns spurred by the intensification of political-economic crises across the globe related to the waning role of the university as a civic space and increasing pressure on the universities for internationalization of corporate/market interests. According to Andreotti (2011a: 1) these crises have:

intensified the drivers towards exploitative and profit-seeking unethical internationalization, while curtailing the resources and commitment towards sites for potentially ethical alternatives ... where our radical equality as political subjects is recognized.

The project recognized the demands placed on the universities by neoliberal market imperatives for employability, mobility and competitiveness as key influential factors that guide the processes of rapid internationalization (Andreotti 2015). Similar concerns to the ones of the EIHE project about the fusion of corporate and civic imaginaries of higher education, were recently raised by Watermayer (2015) through his study of higher education institutions in the UK. Watermayer (2015) suggests that academic commitment to social connectivity, public kinship and reciprocity is not motivated merely by selfless ideals of responsible and ethical citizenship, but rather by pragmatic concerns of economic accountability and occupational survival. And while those may be relevant to academics at the earlier stages of their careers, where they need to exhibit multiple skills and competences, public engagement can quickly become perceived as detrimental to career.

---

3 The study examined the influence of public engagement initiatives in the university’s transformation process by interviewing 40 UK academics, most of them certified as “Public Engagement Ambassadors” by the UK’s NCCPE – National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (Watermayer 2015).
progression (due its lack of academic prestige, compared to research orientation) and thus something to be avoided.

In this regard Watermayer (2015) joins the long rank of other scholars (Andreotti 2015, Bok 2003, Deem 2001, Deem & Brehoney 2005, Giroux 2014, Harris 2005, Rubins 2007, Slaughter & Rhoades 2004, Shore 2010) who have raised critical concerns over the public role of universities within the context of the neoliberal marketization of higher education and subsequent academic capitalism. In order to address these shared concerns, but with a particular focus on the internationalization processes within higher education, the EIHE project aimed to examine:

how epistemic difference, transnational literacy and notions of global citizenship and social responsibility are constructed in internationalization processes of higher education, including official policies as well as the perceptions of faculty, students and managers engaged with internationalization processes. (Andreotti 2011a: 1).

Since the construction of epistemic difference, transnational literacy and global citizenship through internationalization processes was the main focus of EIHE research, an outline of their conceptualizations – as they were used in the project (Andreotti 2011a: 1), is presented below. When I refer to these three concepts in my analysis and discussion of student data, I draw on the following conceptualizations developed within the project (Andreotti 2011a: 1):

- ‘Epistemic difference’ relates to forms of knowledge and subjectivity historically marginalized by oppositions created in academic contexts and academic knowledge production (Mignolo 2002).
- ‘Transnational literacy’ (Brydon 2004, Spivak 2002) is defined as a combination of knowledge about ‘glocal’ (Bauman 1998) flows and the ability to engage with otherness in hybrid epistemological spaces shaped by centre/periphery relationships.

The EIHE project featured six separate, but related modes of inquiry: (i) a review of existing literature on internationalization and education; (ii) a policy analysis of documents (strategies, position papers, internal documents, dedicated websites) related to the international engagement of partner universities; (iii) a set of semi-structured interviews, conducted with faculty members and administrative staff on the subject of internationalization; (iv) a student survey on internationalization and the role of higher education among students of partner universities; (v) a faculty survey on internationalization and the role of higher education among faculty members and project staff of partner universities; and (vi) case studies of educational policies and processes that exhibit potential to disrupt hegemonic processes of knowledge production. These six strands of research were conducted in parallel, employing social cartography (Andreotti et al. 2016) as a key methodology combined with other complementary methodological approaches.

The main output of the project was the creation of a database to be shared among the participant universities that contains all the data collected within the project. It is foreseen that the data may be made openly available also to other universities in the forthcoming years. The database contains a collection of relevant policy documents of partner universities, transcripts of the interviews conducted and all the data obtained through student and faculty surveys. Due to its size\(^4\) and the fact that a lot of data is in the form of open-ended answers, interview transcripts or thousands of pages of archived documentation, the project’s aim was mainly to collect the data and to carry out only partial or sample analyses of different datasets. Indeed, the amount of data available is likely to keep a group of dedicated researchers busy for a number of years to come.

2.1.2 Theoretical framework and key questions

The theoretical framing of the EIHE project was grounded in postcolonial and decolonial theories (Bhabha 1994, Chakrabarty 2000, Mignolo 2002, Quijano 1999, Said 1978, Spivak 2002) that the project partners considered to “offer a useful framework for understanding both the problems and opportunities for creative resistance generated by the imperatives of academic capitalism” (Andreotti 2011a:

\(^4\) For instance, student surveys were distributed to over 4,000 students.
3). Both bodies of theory claim that relations of domination, exploitation and division of the world that originate in the colonial past continue to be reproduced in today’s world through hegemonic patterns of knowledge production, whereby:

knowledge generated by those who have directly or indirectly benefitted from colonial processes, is still perceived to be the knowledge of most value and of global/universal relevance, while knowledge originating from formerly (or currently) colonized social groups is conceived as ‘culture’ (i.e. values, traditions and beliefs) with restricted local value (if any). (Andreotti 2011a: 4).

Very much in line with my own research interests the EIHE project was committed to exploring the potential for epistemic pluralism and the pitfalls of epistemic blindness in academia in general and in higher education in particular. The project utilized Sousa Santos’s (2001, 2007) metaphor of “abyssal thinking” as the point of departure towards exploring potentials for educational processes and practice that leads toward what Sousa Santos (2007) refers to as “egalitarian simultaneity”.

For Sousa Santos (2007: 45):

Modern Western thinking is an abyssal thinking. It consists of a system of visible and invisible distinctions, the invisible ones being the foundation of the visible ones. The division is such that ‘the other side of the line’ vanishes as reality becomes non-existent, and is indeed produced as non-existent. Non-existent means not existing in any relevant or comprehensible way of being. Whatever is produced as non-existent is radically excluded because it lies beyond the realm of what the accepted conception of inclusion considers to be its other. What most fundamentally characterizes abyssal thinking is thus the impossibility of the co-presence of the two sides of the line. To the extent that it prevails, this side of the line only prevails by exhausting the field of relevant reality. Beyond it, there is only non-existence, invisibility, non–dialectical absence.

The project aimed to explore the possibilities of re-orienting the internationalization process in higher education towards more ethically oriented internationalism (Andreotti 2011a). The ethical grounds for this orientation were to be built on egalitarian simultaneity and Souza Santos’s (2007: 72) conceptualization of incompleteness of all knowledge:
since no single type of knowledge can account for all possible interventions in the world, all of them are incomplete in different ways [hence] each knowledge is both insufficient and inter-dependent on other knowledges.

The idea of incompleteness, provisionality and socio-cultural construction of knowledge (Andreotti 2006) was one of the main assumptions that guided the project and its team from the onset. The project aimed to address 4 research questions related to internationalization processes of higher education that focused on conceptualizations and understandings of difference, global citizenship and potential for resistance and disruption of existing hegemonic patterns of knowledge production:

1. How is epistemic difference perceived in internationalization policies and initiatives in participating universities?
2. How is difference constructed and what value is attributed to it in terms of capacity for relevant knowledge production in institutional relations: between international and local faculty, international and local students, faculty and students, curriculum design, indigenous/aboriginal students, as well as international partnerships (e.g. the value attributed to allegedly global and local/national/indigenous knowledge systems)?
3. How is the role of the university, faculty and graduates perceived in terms of global citizenship ideals?
4. What kinds of educational policies and processes have the potential to resist and disrupt hegemonic patterns of knowledge production that restrict possibilities for ethical relationalities and solidarities in local and global academic spaces? (Andreotti 2011a: 3).

Articles by Andreotti et al. (2016) and Stein et al. (2016a) discuss these questions from various viewpoints. The findings and the outcomes of the project are contextually bound. They are tied to specific interpretations and realities of the participating universities. Indeed, one of the aims of the project (Andreotti 2011a: 2) was to “move beyond traditional academic divisions and create a mixed methods methodology that is both theoretically and methodologically rigorous”, and at the same time questioning the universalizing claims and ahistorical and depoliticized orientations of similar projects that have become mainstream. In this regard the researchers working on the project were – to various extents, committed to constantly questioning, re-examining and revealing their own contextual
situatedness within academia and the constraints of epistemic, political and economic frameworks that circumscribe the debates within higher education.

2.1.3 Methodology

The methodology employed to address the 4 project questions was essentially four-fold, consisting of: (i) (discursive) policy analysis; (ii) a mixed methods approach of qualitative and quantitative analysis; (iii) case studies; and (iv) a general social cartography used to provide cohesion and consistency in the project (Andreotti et al. 2016, Paulston 1999, Paulston & Liebman 1994, 1996).

According to Andreotti (2011a), question 1 (perceptions of epistemic difference in policy) and the policy dimension of question 3 (the role of university in light of global citizenship ideals) were to be addressed through discourse analysis, with a special emphasis on the analysis of colonial discourse (Said 1978, Loomba 1998). In this regard the project’s ambition was to explore the “intersections of ideas and institutions, knowledge and power that justify and maintain the dominance/hegemony of specific epistemologies and institutions” (Andreotti 2011a: 5). Question 2 (the construction of difference and value ascribed to differences among students and university staff) and the perceptual dimension of question 3 were to be addressed through a mixed methods approach that featured both qualitative and quantitative tools of data collection and analysis, while engaging with question 4 (alternative education practices and policies) through case studies involving the use of interviews, document analysis and ethnography (Andreotti 2011a). The methodological model of EIHE project is presented in Table 1 on the next page.
Table 1. EIHE methodological model (adapted from Andreotti 2011a: 6, published by permission from author).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central question</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How is epistemic difference perceived in internationalization policies and initiatives in the participating universities?</td>
<td>What value is attributed to difference and in what circumstances? How is internationalism justified and who are its actors? How is the supra-territorial role of the university and of its staff and graduates defined?</td>
<td>Discursive analysis of policy and promotional materials, interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How is difference constructed and what value is attributed to it in terms of capacity for relevant knowledge production in institutional relations: between international and local faculties, international and local students, faculty and students, curriculum choices, as well as international partnerships?</td>
<td>What counts as relevant knowledge? Whose knowledge counts? What value is attributed to knowledge perceived as global and/or local? Who is perceived as a legitimate knowledge producer? How do staff and students understand globalization and perceive their relationships and responsibility towards Others?</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative instrument (online survey)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How is the role of the university, faculty and graduates perceived in terms of global citizenship and social responsibility ideals?</td>
<td>Who is the agent of global citizenship and how are Others perceived in relation to this subject? How are development and poverty perceived, explained and/or justified? How does the university construct its role (and those of its graduates) in the world?</td>
<td>Quantitative and qualitative instrument (online survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What kinds of educational policies and processes have the potential to resist and disrupt hegemonic patterns of knowledge production that restrict possibilities for ethical relationalities and solidarities in local and global academic spaces?</td>
<td>What kinds of discourses/initiatives intend or have the potential to: Contest unethical forms of engagement with Others? Promote ethical globalism and epistemological pluralism? Fracture Euro-centred and/or neoliberal ideas of the university?</td>
<td>Discursive analysis of curriculum and qualitative instruments (interviews and ethnographic observations), case studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ In the original proposal, the student survey was supposed to be in form of an online document, however due to concerns related to low completion rates it was changed to a printed format.

This research on Canadian exceptionalism can thus, in the context of the EIHE project, be considered as being positioned predominantly at the intersection of question 2 on the construction of difference and question 3 on perceptions of higher education in the context of global citizenship and social responsibility, but not tied exclusively to their content. The main research questions of this study, presented in
the introduction, complement the research questions of the EIHE project. They cover to a large extent the same topics of exploring the self-perceptions of students, their institutions and their relationships towards Others. This research does not explore topics related to question 1 and question 4, save perhaps some tangential observations in the discussion of the data in Chapter 7 and in the concluding chapter, where I discuss the relevance of the key findings of this research for higher education.

As mentioned in the beginning of this subchapter, the methodology of EIHE project contained four major theoretical approaches – policy analyses, a mixed methods approach, case studies and social cartography. The discussion above presents a synthesized overview of how policy analysis, mixed methods and case studies were used to address the project questions. The main social cartography of the EIHE project is presented in the next subchapter.

### 2.1.4 Social cartography

This subchapter discusses the main social cartography of the EIHE project, and may be considered as an introduction to the main discussion on social cartography, presented in the Subchapter 4.2 of the chapter on methodology. Subchapter 4.2 presents both the methodological and conceptual background of social cartography, and discusses the (potentially) post-representational use of social cartography, as well as the different ways the cartography was used – both in the EIHE project and in this research. Particular attention dedicated to social cartography (compared to other methodological approaches used in EIHE) is solicited by the fact that social cartography is also used as the main methodology in this research. Within the framework of the EIHE project social cartographies were conceptualized as post-representational performative devices, while the general social cartography of the project served as the main theoretical and conceptual framework that brought together the diverse research backgrounds and orientations of the project partners (see also Subchapter 4.2.4).
Figure 1 presents the main mapping of different discursive orientations and their interstices in higher education. The map brings together in one visual representation the (i) onto-epistemic framework of the modern/colonial imaginary (illustrated by open brackets), that creates the boundary margins for the background of (ii) two overlapping corporate and civic imaginaries of higher education (grey background) against which (iii) three main discursive orientations and their (iv) four interstices can be mapped. The pluri-dimensionality of the visual space of the map enables the possibility of working with multiple contextual frameworks at the same time, while also providing a theorizing space where these multiple contextualizations and interpretations can be juxtaposed and differentiated.

Within the EIHE project and within this research the three main discursive orientations (liberal, neoliberal and critical) are conceptualized as operating with the framework of a shared, but contested global imaginary. The term itself is often associated with the work of Steger (2008) who conceptualized the modern global
imaginary as an omni-present emergent destabilizing force of the political ideologies and various –isms of the nation state.

The rising global imaginary finds its political articulation in the ideological claims of contemporary social elites who reside in the privileged spaces of our global cities and also fuels the hopes, disappointments, and demands of migrants who traverse national boundaries in search of their piece of the global promise. Thus, the global is nobody’s exclusive property. It inhabits class, race, and gender, but belongs to none of these. (Steger 2008: ix).

In this regard Steger builds upon Taylor’s (2004) conceptualization of social imaginaries that sees the social imaginary as the general framework of normal expectations, understandings and assumptions that frame our shared collective social existence. Steger’s work has been subjected to some critique (Kamola 2014) of conflating anti-colonial and colonial imaginaries, and it could further be argued that Taylor’s (2004) understanding of social imaginary is potentially conceptually broader, because it not only moves beyond the mainstream understandings of ideological dimension (much like Steger), but also emphasizes how social imaginaries condition our everyday, or ‘normal’ experience of the world:

the ways people “imagine” their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go between and their fellows, the expectations that are normally met and the deeper normative notions and images that underlie these expectations. (Taylor 2004: 23).

Following Taylor’s argument, social imaginaries can thus be seen as framing our spontaneous relationship to the world and to the people around us. Within the project framework and for the purpose of this research, the modern global/colonial imaginary is conceptualized as a (contested, but enduring) meta-narrative that “naturalizes Western/European domination and capitalist, colonial social relations and projects a local (Western/European) perspective as a universal blueprint for imagined global designs” Andreotti et al. (2016: 88). This conceptualization draws upon critiques that emphasize: (i) ahistorical and apolitical conceptualizations of poverty (Andreotti 2014, Biccum 2005, Kapoor 2014); (ii) presumption of single, unilinear path of human progress (Grosfoguel 2012, 2013, Mignolo 2007, 2011, Souza Santos 2007); and a (iii) continuation of colonial logic (Andreotti 2011b, Biccum 2005, Kapoor 2014).

In the context of higher education three main discursive orientations (liberal, neoliberal and critical) were identified as operating under the framework of the
modern global imaginary. Within a liberal discursive orientation universities are seen as committed to the public good and civic engagement, and higher education is seen as having an inherent value in the formation of national citizens committed to a singular ideal of progress, as well as conceptualization of humanity and vision of the future. A neoliberal discursive orientation is becoming more prominent under conditions of increased austerity and state defunding of higher education. This discursive orientation “commodifies knowledge, research, teaching and service, framing the core ‘business’ of the university as a provider of credentials, expert services and commercial innovations” (Andreotti et al. 2016: 90). In this discursive orientation international rankings are seen as defining the measure of success within the economy of prestige. Inversely, a critical discursive orientation seeks to challenge the processes of commodification and perpetuation of hegemony-seeking processes of knowledge production. According to Andreotti et al. (2016: 91):

> it highlights capitalist exploitation, processes of racialization and colonialism and other forms of oppression at work in seemingly benevolent and normalized patterns of thinking and behaviour. This configuration is also located within the civic university imaginary, emphasizing the need for the inclusion of more diverse voices, and for radical forms of democracy.

This orientation seeks to challenge the ongoing structural violence and inequality by arguing for different (strategic) interventions, such as advocating for the inclusion of more diverse voices, for radical forms of democracy, or by calling for accountability of universities towards marginalized populations (Andreotti et al. 2016: 91).
Fig. 2. Articulations of internationalization (Andreotti et al. 2016: 93, re-published under Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0).

Fig. 2 presents a mapping of three different articulations of the internationalization of higher education that are grounded in the three main discursive orientations – as mapped in Fig. 2. Andreotti et al. (2016: 93) refer to these three articulations as: internationalization for the global knowledge society, internationalization for the global public good, and anti-oppressive internationalization. Internationalization for the global knowledge society or global knowledge economy refers to an articulation, grounded in neoliberal discursive orientation, where, according to Andreotti et al. (2016: 92–93): “higher education is framed as a central element of economic growth and competitiveness ... emphasis is placed on preparing graduates with entrepreneurial skills and other human capital ... and faculty success is measured by quantifiable outputs.”

Int. for the global public good is grounded in the liberal discursive orientation, and emphasizes a need to make universities more inclusive and democratic, while sharing the neoliberal assumption that “largely presumes the universal use- and
exchange-value of Western knowledge” (Andreotti et al. 2016: 94). In this regard inclusion refers also to “a global expansion of social mobility and equal opportunity to access higher education” (ibid.), thus suggesting that “higher education (particularly in the Global North) is understood to play a vital and benevolent role in producing the global public goods of democracy, prosperity and knowledge.”

Both of these articulations could be seen situated within the modern global/colonial imaginary, while the third – anti oppressive internationalization, challenges its violent and unsustainable underpinnings, but remains (ontologically) contained within it. This articulation is informed by:

- anti-colonial, anti-imperial and anti-racist commitments. It challenges both the veracity of claims made by the global economy articulation that “jobs are universally accessible and the global economy is equitably structured” (Shahjahan 2013: 690), and also suggests that the global public good articulation’s emphasis on universal inclusion is a means of depoliticizing difference and demanding conformity with Western educational standards. This articulation is concerned with supporting and defending those who may be harmed by unethical internationalization programs and policies. (Andreotti et al. 2016: 94).

Referring back to the debate on post-representational (social) cartography, all three main articulations could be seen as operating on the same ontic level of the shared global imaginary, with the fourth articulation of relational trans-national localism attempting to break into different ground, by challenging (in various degrees) the ontological and epistemic assumptions of Western science and mainstream notions of progress, development and futurity. Andreotti et al. (2016: 94) refer to the location of this articulation on the map as:

- outside (or, at the edges) of the modern/colonial imaginary that frames the other three articulations, as it challenges what is currently possible within the logics and structures of most mainstream universities. There is a strong commitment to recognize complicity in the harmful practices identified by the anti-oppressive articulation, to disinvest in them, and to affirm relationships based on connections not mediated through them. Thus, this articulation replaces ‘internationalization’ with ‘trans-localism’, recognizing that interconnection and ethical obligations exceed the borders of the nation-state and the ont-epistemic grammar of modernity.
The relational trans-localism orientation could also serve as an example of what a mapping of discursive absence(s) might look like. As noted above, relational trans-localism challenges the possibilities of most mainstream academic environments, which means that the project team was unable to trace examples of such articulations among the partner universities, but had to resort to case studies of universities (and other international education organisations) that either ground their work in different (indigenous) ontologies or work outside or at the margins of mainstream academe. Articles by Stein et al. (2016a, 2016b) discuss these examples in more detail.

Within the theoretical framework of the project the ambition of the research team was to attempt not to conceptualize these orientations or articulations as closed and bound off categories, but as constantly shifting are re-articulating discursive practices, harbouring within their respective fields many different (and internally contested) approaches that overlap with other orientations in various ways and to various extent. In order words, a non-representational reading of this mapping would seem to suggest (among other things) that there is no singular neoliberal, liberal, critical or relational trans-localist orientation that could stand as definitive or uncontested, but that rather that the social cartography of the project aimed to produce theoretical and visual maps that can help develop more complex understandings and conversations on the subject(s) of internationalization(s).

The following two figures extend the current discussion of multiple readings by presenting examples of what a mapping or a discussion that works with contextualized signifiers/concepts and that opens up these signifiers to multiple interpretations and articulations might look like. Fig. 3 presents interpretations of signifiers at the interstice of two orientations, while Fig. 4 offers an example of how a single signifier could be interpreted differently in all three main orientations.
Fig. 3. Example of multiple readings 1: signifiers at the interstices 1, 2 and 3 (Andreotti et al. 2016: 92, re-published under Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0).

Signifiers that are positioned at the interstices between different main orientations are subject to ambivalent interpretations, where their positionality could be seen as enabling multiple strategic use of these signifiers and as being indicative of a power play between the orientations – each of them with their own agenda. In light of increasing neoliberal pressure towards “academic capitalism” (Deem 2001, Paasi 2005, Slaughter & Leslie 1997, Slaughter & Rhoades 2004) a demand for ‘research deliverables’ (especially in social sciences and humanities) has thus mobilized both liberal and neoliberal imaginaries to both justify a disinvestment in research without viable ‘commercial output’ and to “defend the humanities role in offering soft-skills for the market” (Andreotti et al. 2016: 92). It could be argued that to some extent the language employed to defend the social sciences and humanities (their role presented in their value for the market economy) is perhaps one of the better indicators of the extent of neoliberal discursive co-option. The critical-neoliberal interstice could be similarly seen as a place of ambivalence where ‘community engagement’ may be interpreted as either defending the interest of disadvantaged groups, subject to (systemic) exploitation or (inversely) to defend the entitlements of higher educations’ “clients and stakeholders ... as promotions of fairness and justice” (Andreotti et al. 2016: 92). While the liberal–critical interstice shows “a deeper recognition of injustices”, it could be seen as advocating
“institutional change based on personal (rather than systemic) choice or transformation” (ibid.). Alternatively, the chosen signifier could also be considered within the neoliberal-liberal interstice, where ‘intercultural education’ could be seen precisely in the light of ‘developing the soft-skills’ needed in a multicultural, globalized economy.

In this figure a single signifier is positioned at the interstice of all three main discursive orientations, each providing a different logic for its articulation, guided by a different interest. When speaking of increased ‘access’ to higher education this single signifier could refer to: (i) providing access to higher education under equal terms for everyone for increased social cohesion (liberal) – the underlying assumption being that a more educated society has less internal conflict; (ii) calls for pro-active inclusion in the system of higher education for marginalized groups, that have been (historically, systemically) disadvantaged; or (iii) to advocate increased (private) investment in higher education due to its economic return – in terms of increased employability and social mobility.
As examples from Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 seek to demonstrate, the maps produced using social cartography can be understood as “metaphorical devices that enable provisional visual depictions of differences between and within intellectual communities” (Andreotti et al. 2016: 86–87). The maps are thus not seen as (permanent) representations of reality, but as tools that enable “real-world interventions” (Sousa Santos 2007), and that “allow for multiple ways of seeing to be simultaneously acknowledged, affirmed and addressed in their inevitable particularity and partiality, without imposing demands for immediate resolution or consensus” (Andreotti et al. 2016: 87). Maps of social cartography are always context bound and subject to adaptation and reconfiguration. In this regard one of the greater gifts of social cartography seems to be its capacity to not only map multiple discourses and interpretations, but also to map the silences and absences in conversations that would otherwise remain unacknowledged – thus creating cognitive dissonance that makes previously impossible conversations possible.

This discussion of the main EIHE social cartography concludes the theoretical and methodological contextualization of my research within the broader umbrella project. The next subchapter builds upon this general context of the EIHE project and discusses more specifically the main characteristics and context of the Canadian dataset and the context of the internationalization of higher education in Canada.

2.2 Internationalization of higher education in Canada

This subchapter begins by presenting the main characteristics of the Canadian dataset and by discussing some of its comparative advantages over other available datasets. It then continues with the presentation of the policy framework and general context of the internationalization of higher education in Canada. In the second part, this subchapter explores what kinds of political and economic ambitions drive internationalization processes in Canada, what the impact of internationalization is on the Canadian economy, and what kinds of narratives about internationalization processes are recently being constructed. In this regard it pays particular attention to the fusion of liberal and neoliberal imaginaries that are observable both in the analysis of policy documents and in recent research on the impacts of internationalization.
2.2.1 The Canadian dataset

The Canadian students’ survey dataset was one of 11 national datasets received in the EIHE project. In several ways it would be possible to argue that Canada’s position in the process of data collection and analysis was somewhat dominant in comparison to other countries. Canada’s prominent position was reflected mostly in the sheer size of data available (both in terms of surveys completed and in terms of the policy documents available for analysis), the number of project partners that came from Canadian universities, and the fact the coordination of the project was split between researchers working both in Finland and in Canada. In terms of the student survey, the Canadian dataset with 1,451 surveys from 7 universities is by far the largest of the lot.

23 universities participated in the student survey and Canada was the country with the highest number of participating institutions. All other countries (Brazil, China, Finland, Ireland, Kenya, New Zealand, Slovakia, South Africa, Sweden and the UK) participated with either one or two institutions, with the only exception to this rule being the UK with four participating universities. Since on average the size of the Canadian dataset was about 3–4 times larger than that of the other countries this advantage significantly influenced my decision to choose Canada for three main reasons.

First was the obvious fact that more surveys simply mean more data to work on and thus allow for a more robust and nuanced analysis. As the qualitative answers to the survey were not long, and in many cases simply absent, it was even more important to choose a dataset that would not limit the research potential due to lack of available data.5

Second was the consideration that in countries with a smaller number of participating institutions it would be difficult to ensure the required level of anonymity (not necessarily of the students, but predominantly of the participating institutions), which would go not only against the ethical commitments of the project itself, but would also constitute a breach of ethical clearances granted to the research team by the ethical committees of all the participating universities.

The third advantage of the Canadian dataset is related to the fact that the participating universities are geographically spread across the entire country, which

5 The non-answered rate for specific qualitative (open-ended) questions (in the Canadian dataset) was up to 30 %, which considerably lowers the number of answers available for analysis. Although not all other countries featured such high levels of missing answers, Canada's dataset is still by far the largest, even when considering its relatively high level of missing answers.
allowed for some comparison between the universities also within their regional contexts. Such a comparison would be much more difficult or impossible in most of the other datasets.

2.2.2 The policy framework for internationalization of higher education in Canada

The policy analysis of internationalisation initiatives and processes that was completed within the EIHE project by Karen Pashby (2016) showed that Canada is (within the group of countries that participated in the project) among those whose institutions – both universities and respective government offices, invest most seriously in the internationalization of higher education. Pashby (2016: 13) outlines three major rationales for the increased internationalisation of the institutions that participated in the EIHE project, which were to: “impact the world, leverage and legitimize the work of the universities, and raise reputation.” While Canada is by no means an exception to these general orientations, it does stand out specifically in the extent to which internationalisation is already part of its higher education and national economy.

It would be difficult to single out one reason why this may be the case, but it seems that the current state of affairs in the internationalisation of higher education in Canada is tied to its geopolitical and historic context as an immigrant/settler community (Friesen 2007, Reitz 2004, Waters 2006) and a global ‘soft’ power (Potter 2008, Trilokekar 2010). It is also due to the propensity of neoliberal drives towards diversity for market/profit oriented purposes leading to increased demands for internationalisation (Altbach & Knight 2007, Anderson 2015, Department for Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development 2014, Kunin 2012, Pashby 2016, Weber 2007) and its rather unique constitutional order that authorizes each province to exclusively make laws in relation to education. In this regard Canada is one of the very few countries in the world that has no ministry of education (or its equivalent). This is somewhat unusual even in the context of other federal states, such as Australia, Brazil, Germany, India and the United States, but similar for instance to Belgium.

To compensate for this lack of coordination on the federal level Canadian universities established their own national organization to discuss common issues and challenges facing universities and to act as an interlocutor with the Canadian government (Friesen 2007: 4). The organisation was known since 1965 as the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), but was in 2015 rebranded as Universities Canada.
The impact of this, particularly on internationalization of higher education in Canada, can be seen for instance in the fact that the Canadian International Education Strategy – a key policy document to guide the internationalisation process in the country, was not compiled by a ministry of education (for the obvious lack of such an institution), nor by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, but instead by the Department for Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (DFATD) in 2014. The opening words by Ed Fast – at the time the Minister of International Trade, explicate why and to what extent the internationalization of higher education in Canada is embedded in the economic policy of the Canadian government and Canada’s ambitions in the global market:

- International education is critical to Canada’s success. In a highly competitive, knowledge-based global economy, ideas and innovation go hand in hand with job creation and economic growth. In short, international education is at the very heart of our current and future prosperity.
- International collaboration in higher education contributes to success on many levels – both domestically and globally. Inviting international students and researchers into Canada’s classrooms and laboratories, and helps create new jobs and opportunities for Canadians while addressing looming skills and labour shortages. Perhaps most importantly, international education fuels the people-to-people ties crucial to long-term success in an increasingly interconnected global economy. ...
- Canada’s International Education Strategy, a key element of the Global Markets Action Plan, is our blueprint to attract talent and prepare our country for the 21st century. With the support of all the players in the research and education fields – provinces and territories, educational institutions, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector – we can make Canada a world leader in international education and ensure our future prosperity.

As explained in the words of Minister Fast, the Canadian International Education Strategy is merely one of the elements of the Canadian Government’s Global Markets Action Plan, a policy document, adopted in 2013 as an action document that builds upon the Government of Canada 2007 Global Commerce Strategy and

---

7 This department is currently known as Global Affairs Canada - and is responsible for foreign relations, consular services, international trade, development and la Francophonie.

cross-country consultations [that] included the critical small and medium-sized enterprises, which are the backbone of our economy. We were guided by an advisory panel of leading business and industry leaders. The result is the new Global Markets Action Plan. (Department for Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development 2013: 4).

In terms of the internationalization of higher education, the Global Markets Action Plan suggests “attracting talent via education” (Department for Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development 2013: 11) and “the launch of an international education strategy to attract international students to Canada and entrench the ties of world-class Canadian educational institutions with their global counterparts” (Department for Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development 2013: 15). In the same document education is considered as one of key opportunities for Canada and for strengthening economic ties with the so-called ‘priority markets’.

This genealogy of recent policy developments shows how deeply the internationalization of higher education is embedded in Canada’s and Canada’s business’s economic interests. However, the benefits of internationalization far exceed the somewhat vague notions of attracting talent, strengthening the ties of Canadian universities and preparing Canadian citizens for the global marketplace (Department for Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development 2013, 2014). They are clearly visible in numbers. The report on the economic impact of international education in Canada, commissioned by DFATD and compiled by Roslyn Kunin & Associates, Inc. (RKA Inc.), leaves no doubt about the importance and immediate impact of internationalization on Canada’s economy:

We estimate that in 2010, international students in Canada spent in excess of $7.7 billion on tuition, accommodation and discretionary spending; created over 81,000 jobs; and generated more than $445 million in government revenue. ... Short term students who pursued language training also contributed an estimated $788 million to the Canadian economy. Overall, the total amount that international students spend in Canada ($8.0 billion) is greater than our export of unwrought aluminium ($6 billion), and even greater than our export of helicopters, airplanes and spacecraft ($6.9 billion) to all other countries. (Kunin 2012: iii).
When such a significant economic impact is coupled to universities’ ambition for recognition, higher ranking and international prestige, as evidenced in the analysis of policy documents on the internationalisation of the universities themselves (Pashby 2016), it is hardly surprising that the consulting agency RKA Inc. (Kunin 2012: iii) suggests to the Canadian government to:

[ens]ure that international students are recognized and supported commensurate to their importance to Canada relative to other similar sized exports of goods and services.

In a recent article on the state of internationalization in higher education in Canada, Anderson (2015: 167) suggests that while Canada has experienced a significant growth in the influx of international students – their number virtually doubled between 2000 and 2011 (from 89,532 to 178,491), this growth is perceived to be “moderate, and even disappointing or underutilized for some” (Anderson 2015: 179), especially when compared to other – mostly European countries. Drawing on his study of experiences of postgraduate international students, Anderson (2015: 179) suggests several improvements to existing practices that “should be appealing for costs-benefit purposes alone”, with the improved experience of international students translating into long-term “favourable reviews and reputations for their former programmes and universities”.

If researchers in the previous decade were still able to claim (Shubert, cited in Weber 2007: 41) that “the most positive feature of the Canadian panorama of internationalization, to date, is that it has been largely free of commercial motives that seem to be such prominent motivators in other countries,” recent developments in policy and discursive orientations substantially challenge the validity of such claims today.

Having said that, I do not wish to suggest that the predominance of market and profit-oriented imperatives in Canadian higher education is a recent development and occurrence. The work of several authors (Altbach & Knight 2007, Cudmore 2005, De Wit 1995, Knight 1997, Qiang 2003) suggests that this is not the case, however what seems to have happened is that with time the institutional discourse on higher education and accompanying policies have become more explicitly neoliberal and/or have undergone a fusion of liberal and neoliberal orientations. Pashby (2016: 7) suggests that:

---

8 In the same period the number of domestic students increased by 37 % (Anderson 2015: 167).
the neoliberal orientation operates within an economy of prestige where international rankings define measures of success. Income generation and branding become cornerstones of institutional survival, where, for example, the rush to increase international students is deployed both as an opportunity for business and for public relations discourses that add value to the university brand.

In this regard a desire for successful ‘branding’, of either the institution or the country itself, is likely to instrumentalize other (e.g. liberal) discourses to hide or conceal the profit-oriented motivation behind universities’ (and their representatives’) claims that internationalization is geared towards “preparing graduates who are internationally knowledgeable and interculturally competent” (Weber 2007: 41), led by “a belief that knowledge systems are or should be more international”, and translated into practices that are “preparing students who are aware of global issues and imbued with a global ethic” (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada 2007: 6).

A recent example of the fusion of liberal and neoliberal imaginaries can be seen in the AUCC’s (2014) Canada’s Universities in the World – AUCC Internationalization Survey. The survey acknowledges that:

universities are increasingly called upon to demonstrate their economic relevance to society, including through their internationalization activities; there is greater competition for prestige, funding and student recruitment among universities at both national and international levels. (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada 2014: 3).

However, the authors legitimize this process by outlining an understanding of internationalization that positions the neoliberal demands within what they refer to as “two traditionally academic motives” (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada 2014: 3) of:

creating globally aware graduates with skills suited to the jobs of today and tomorrow, and fostering globally connected research and scholarship. Other motives are more directly connected to national well-being and prosperity. University internationalization helps develop a globally competitive national labour force, and attracts international students who may become needed new citizens and workers.
When academia is constructed as being traditionally geared towards providing skills for the labour market, it is difficult not to claim that a neoliberal imaginary has not already completely overtaken the discursive space, especially since no other (public) role for universities (apart from its economic value) is even mentioned. Further, the suggestion that motives connected to national well-being and prosperity are somehow categorically different to these alleged ‘traditionally academic motives’, could be interpreted as constructing a false distinction between equipping learners with ‘skills suited to the jobs of today and tomorrow’ and ‘developing a globally competitive national labour force’ that simply is not there. It does not seem too imposing to suggest that the ‘jobs of today and tomorrow’ are within the context of globalized economies and are ‘jobs of a globally competitive national labour force’.

Andreotti et al. (2016: 89–90) discuss the subtleties of fusion of liberal and neoliberal imaginaries and point to a difference between a civic and corporate imaginary of higher education, where:

in the civic imaginary the worth of knowledge is measured by its use-value, that is, the usefulness of a particular service or product in meeting human needs, in the corporate imaginary, knowledge is measured by its exchange-value, that is, the exchange equivalent by which these products or services are compared to others in a capitalist market which indicates how much people are prepared to pay for or invest in them. Once exchange-value replaces use-value conceptualizations of knowledge, it becomes difficult to justify research, instruction, or other university activities that do not produce pre-defined ‘economically justifiable deliverables’.

Drawing from the main policy and strategic documents that shape the space of internationalization in Canada today, it seems fair to suggest that the neoliberal rationale for increased market competition has largely, if not completely, taken over the discursive space. While there is considerable scholarship available that theorizes different motivations and orientations for and within internationalization practice (Altbach & Knight 2007, Andreotti et al. 2016, Cudmore 2005, De Wit 1995, Knight 1997, Pashby 2016, Qiang 2003), the plurality of potential approaches (both already explored and the ones not yet attempted) does not seem to be reflected in current policy.

This subchapter presented some of the key policy documents and references that delineate the discursive space on internationalization in higher education in Canada with the purpose of discussing some of the recent trends in
internationalization, and thus contextualizing the research on discursive orientations of students of Canadian universities within the broader debate and discursive space that is to some extent already pre-established through institutional policy.

The next chapter temporarily departs from the context of higher education in Canada and presents the theoretical framework of my research, both in terms of conceptualizing Canadian exceptionalism as well as the larger body of critiques of modern and liberal subjectivities that inform my work. The first part introduces the theoretical concept of exceptionalism, its critical uses and the applicability of the concept in the context of higher education in Canada. At the end of this first part I return briefly to the subject matter of this subchapter to discuss some examples of Canadian exceptionalism in higher education. In the second part I present the multiple critiques of modern and liberal subjectivities and discuss in what way these critiques are relevant to the analysis of student data.
3 Theoretical framework

This chapter presents selected aspects of the works of several authors, engaged in critical enquiry, whose work was instrumental in designing not just the theoretical framework of this research, but has also significantly influenced the choice of appropriate methodology and interpretative possibilities adopted. The chapter is divided into two main subchapters that theorize exceptionalism (as the main theoretical concept and focus of this research) and different critiques of modern (liberal) subjectivities (as the prevailing forms of subjectivities today), which are understood to be main bearers of exceptionalist dispositions. While it would be possible to argue that the broad range of authors presented in this chapter constitutes a multitude of (potentially) mutually incompatible, conflictual and contradictory views (especially when considering the personal positions of some of the authors on specific topics), my ambition was not to develop a singular, unifying and all-encompassing perspective on the subject of (Canadian) exceptionalism, but rather to provide a broad interpretative range that would enable the elucidation of the main research questions from multiple perspectives. Further, this research seeks to explore how exceptionalist tendencies could be seen as reflective of, and embedded in, modern (liberal) forms of subjectivity. In this regard, I am less interested in the conflicts between various strands of critical theory (though I will attempt to acknowledge them as much as I can within the length of this chapter), but rather wish to explore how these diverse views can be used in complementary and mutually enriching ways.

3.1 Exceptionalism

As the main focus of this research is to explore various articulations of exceptionalist traits that could potentially be identified in the responses of students of Canadian universities, the concept of exceptionalism itself is central not only to the theoretical grounding of this work, but also significantly informs the chosen research methodology and the ensuing analyses of quantitative and qualitative data. In this subchapter various conceptualizations of exceptionalism are presented, with a special emphasis on the uses of exceptionalism in educational research, as well as critical uses of exceptionalism and Canadian exceptionalism. The first subchapter (3.1.1) theorizes exceptionalism mostly through the work of Giorgio Agamben (1998, 2005), as perhaps the most influential theorist of exceptionalism, together with Mitchell’s (2006) critique of his conceptualization. The second
subchapter (3.1.2) discusses critical uses of exceptionalism in education and draws predominantly on the work of authors associated with post-colonial or poststructuralist understandings of exceptionalism. The third subchapter (3.1.3) is dedicated to conceptualizing exceptionalism in Canada, drawing mostly on the work of Sunera Thobani (2007) and Homi Bhabha (1994). The last subchapter (3.1.4) presents an overview of some historic and recent examples of exceptionalist discourse, in particular in policy and higher education.

3.1.1 Theorizing exceptionalism or exceptionalism and the nation-state

Contributions to the theory of exceptionalism in the last two decades mostly came for the (comparative) law, history and political theory, where different national or regional exceptionalisms have been instrumentalized as affirmative explanatory concepts for particular (international) political, legal and social orientations of certain nation-states, most prominently the United States (e.g. Bell 1975, de Tocqueville et al. 2002, Huntington 2004, Lipset 1997, Madsen 1998, Koh 2003). In response to these more affirmative uses of exceptionalism other authors have employed exceptionalism as a pejorative concept that denotes a particular nation’s self-proclaimed exemption from the established rules and principles for the purpose of upholding its dominant (legal, political) status, especially in the international political arena, by resorting to various forms of violence, coercion and arbitrary non-adherence to legal obligations (e.g. Bacevich 2008, Hodgson 2009, Ignatieff (ed.) 2009, Sands 2006, Tyrell 1991, Zinn 2005).

The term exceptionalism has thus been used by different authors in quite divergent and often opposing or conflicting ways. The plurality of theoretical and conceptual notions associated with the term had been such that Nolte and Aust (2013: 409) claim that “there is no authoritative definition of ‘exceptionalism’ as a political or legal concept.” Critics of (American) exceptionalism (e.g. Hodgson 2009, Ignatieff 2009, Zinn 2005) have usually resorted to critiquing the moral or ethical grounds of exceptionalist narratives, citing examples of widespread violation of legal obligations and use of violence, without necessarily challenging the underlying assumption that the role and histories of certain countries are in certain ways authentically exceptional or “distinct” (Koh 2003: 1485). Other authors, such as Tyrell (1991) or Fernández-Amesto (2006), argue that all nations tend to perceive themselves as somehow exceptional, thus challenging the meaningfulness of the term itself. It could be said that exceptionalism in general
refers to an understanding or self-understanding (Nolte & Aust 2013: 411) that a particular culture, society, nation or phenomenon is somehow unique or exceptional and thus exempt from certain general rules and principles (e.g. Cairns 2001, Rastas 2012).

It is this (perceived and/or real) exception from general rules, principles or patterns of behaviour that constructs a certain nation (or any other entity) as ‘exceptional.’ Perhaps the most influential contribution to the theory of exception has been made by the political philosopher Giorgio Agamben in his two major works Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life (1998) and State of Exception (2005). In this subchapter Agamben’s work is presented in more detail, due to his significance to the field of studies related to exceptionalism. Critical (poststructuralist) uses of exceptionalism that inform the theoretical conceptualization of exceptionalism most deeply in this research, could be seen in many ways as developing through a critical response to Agamben’s theory. As these critical approaches are presented in a dedicated subchapter (3.1.3), this subchapter includes only critical reflection of Agamben’s own work, rather than a full presentation of these approaches.

Agamben, unlike the authors cited above, is not interested in exploring whether certain nations or states are more or less justifiably considered exceptional (in comparison to others), but rather sees the sovereign nation-state as fundamentally exceptional by its nature. However, in his understanding of the exceptional nature of a sovereign (modern) nation-state (Agamben 1998), this exceptional nature (of the state) is understood as the undisputed power of the sovereign to exclude (others), rather than being a virtue (or a lack thereof) of certain historically, politically or otherwise specific traits that belong exclusively only to some nation(s) and not to others.

For Agamben (1998: 15) this right to (arbitrarily) exclude (from law), is the constitutive right of the sovereign (state), which creates law by proclaiming exception or exemption from law. The following passage from early 20th century political theorist Carl Schmitt (cited in Agamben 1998: 15) perhaps best illustrates this relationship:

All law is “situational law.” The sovereign creates and guarantees the situation as a whole in its totality. He has the monopoly over the final decision. ... The exception is more interesting than the regular case. The latter proves nothing; the exception proves everything. The exception does not only confirm the rule; the rule as such lives off the exception alone.
In this regard it is possible to read Agamben as suggesting that all (sovereign) states are exceptional, or rather, exceptionalist, regardless of their (geo)political role. What sets Agamben apart from many other theorists of exceptionalism, is his focus on the way a modern nation-state functions as *internally* exceptionalist, either by excluding certain (groups of) people from its legal order, from the national body, or by proclaiming certain (temporary) conditions under which the rule of law can be suspended. Agamben constructs his theory of the state of exception around the concept of *homo sacer* (sacred man), a particularly ambivalent and “obscure figure of ancient Roman law, in which human life is included in the juridical order [ordinamento] solely in the form of its exclusion” (Agamben 1998: 12). According to Agamben (1998: 47) this man should not be sacrificed, yet he may be killed with impunity. For Agamben (1998: 52) *homo sacer* is excluded:

both from the *ius humanum* and from the *ius divinum*, both from the sphere of the profane and from that of the religious. The topological structure drawn by this double exception is that of a double exclusion and a double capture, which presents more than a mere analogy with the structure of the sovereign exception.

In Agamben, *homo sacer* is thus caught in a perennial limbo of being excluded both from the realm of the divine and of the human. In this way his double exclusion effectively turns *homo sacer* into a non-person, a being that exists only through its exclusion. And although he is doubly excluded, he remains also doubly included (in violence against him) by the very nature of his exclusion. Agamben discusses the nature of this double bind between *homo sacer* and the violence towards him that becomes permissible at moment of his exclusion, in the following words:

What defines the status of *homo sacer* is therefore not the originary ambivalence of the sacredness that is assumed to belong to him, but rather both the particular character of the double exclusion into which he is taken and the violence to which he finds himself exposed. This violence – the unsanctionable killing that, in his case, anyone may commit – is classifiable neither as sacrifice nor as homicide, neither as the execution of a condemnation to death nor as sacrilege. (Agamben 1998: 52–53).

A killing of *homo sacer* is thus not considered a crime neither under human law (homicide) nor under divine law (sacrilege) because *homo sacer* is excluded from both of these legal orders by law or by the sovereign that proclaims this law. For Agamben (1998: 52–54) the term *homo sacer* is considered as a synonym or as a stand-in expression for bare life, stripped of all political and sacred value and thus
fully exposed to potential (arbitrary) violence. If Agamben in Homo Sacer (Agamben 1998) endeavoured to show how the violent and fundamentally exclusive nature of sovereignty resulted in totalitarian regimes that spawned the holocaust, ethnic cleansing and concentration camps, in State of Exception (Agamben 2005) he takes things one step further and explores how exceptionalism could also be seen under liberal democratic governance, especially when a temporary suspense of law changes into a permanent state of affairs. In other words, if in the case of Homo Sacer (Agamben 1998) only *homines sacri* could be killed with impunity, while the majority of population (regular citizens) could be seen as untouched by this exception, and thus would largely enjoy the legal protection of the state/sovereign, in his book State of Exception (Agamben 2005) – referring to the ongoing state of emergency and multiple suspensions of law, declared in the US, following the attacks of 9/11 – Agamben (2005: 114–115) extends this category as potentially referring to anyone:

If it is true that the figure proposed by our age is that of an unsacrificeable life that has nevertheless become capable of being killed to an unprecedented degree, then the bare life of homo sacer concerns us in a special way. Sacredness is a line of flight still present in contemporary politics, a line that is as such moving into zones increasingly vast and dark, to the point of ultimately coinciding with the biological life itself of citizens. If today there is no longer any one clear figure of the sacred man, it is perhaps because we are all virtually *homines sacri*.

While such a conceptualization could be seen as a relevant and necessary warning against the (potentially) totalitarian and violent nature of modern (liberal) democracies, it nevertheless contains some assumptions that are very problematic from the point of view of critical race, feminist, queer and post-colonial scholarship. Some of these concerns will be discussed here, because the critical reflection of Agamben’s theory of exceptionalism is perhaps of even greater use and value to the kind of conceptualization of exceptionalism that is developed and used within the framework of this specific research, than Agamben’s work itself.

Agamben’s work has also been subjected to substantial critique regarding his (highly) contestable interpretation of both Aristotle (Finlayson 2010) and Foucault (Lemke 2005, Huysmans 2008, Oksala 2010, Ojakangas 2005) that are pivotal to his conceptualization of exceptionalism and to his understanding and interpretation of the historic development of the relationship between (bare) life and politics/sovereignty in Western legal and political thought. However, in this critical
reflection of Agamben’s work less attention is devoted to examining whether his conceptualization is legitimately grounded in the sources he draws on, but more to the problematic and unacknowledged assumptions that inform both his conceptualization and use of the concept of homo sacer. A critical reflection of Agamben’s conceptualization of *homo sacer* begins with the work Katharyn Mitchell (2006) that in her critique of Agamben offers a synthesis of some of the concerns raised by different authors from critical race, feminist and postcolonial theory. Mitchell (2006: 98) thus initially emphasizes that in order to:

truly understand ... how contemporary genocides and camps remain legitimate within democratic regimes, as well as to understand how sovereign states discriminate between an 'authentic life and a life lacking political value, we need to theorize biological constructions of difference and their connections to citizenship.

By emphasizing the biological construction of difference and the complicity of various 18th and 19th century ‘scientific’ theories of race in this project, Mitchell (*ibid.*) draws a very important demarcation line between what she refers to as feminist and poststructuralist conceptualizations of exceptionalism and that of Agamben. Instead of following Agamben’s suggestion that we are all potentially *homines sacri*, Mitchell (2006: 97) argues that it is necessary to draw attention to the embodied nature of exceptionalism and to explore how certain bodies (and not others) have been historically constructed as non-human or sub-human, and remain considered as such even today. Mitchell is very clear that in her view Agamben’s universalizing interpretation of *homines sacri* (as potentially referring to anyone) has deep ramifications in terms of obscuring and concealing the systematic, scientific and ongoing production of difference (for the purpose of justified exploitation and exclusion) in modern societies:

There are clear figures of sacred ‘man’ and it is not *man*. Some human beings are ontologically produced through scientific knowledge as different: as abnormal or subnormal. Their non-normality is literally inscribed in/on their bodies such that they cannot be considered interchangeable with others. (Mitchell 2006: 98).

For Mitchell (2006: 97–98) modern forms of sovereignty are fundamentally different from other pre-modern forms (such as Roman) “precisely because of the ways in which race, gender, science and citizenship became ontologically linked from the eighteenth century onwards.” Drawing on the works of Judith Butler (1990,
1993) and Nancy Leys Stepan (1998), she argues (Mitchell 2006: 97) that this ontological move is particular “to the 18th century and specific to the development of Western modernity.” For Leys Stepan (cited in Mitchell 2006: 97):

difference, a rendering of groups as distinct in their biology and differentiated from an implicit white, male norm. By being embodied as qualitatively different in their substantial natures – by creating group identities in difference – communities of individuals were placed outside the liberal universe of freedom, equality and rights. In effect, a theory of politics and rights was transformed into an argument about nature; equality under liberalism was taken to be a matter not of ethics, but of anatomy.

In this regard groups that are different and/or differentiated from the white, male norm, are seen as more fit or exclusively fit for the role of homines sacri in modern societies. For Mitchell (2006: 103) the modern homo sacer is “always already a woman”, insofar as ‘woman’ refers to “anybody scientifically constructed, classified and naturalized as different from universal, stripped-down individual of modernity.” Mitchell (2006: 98) further argues that in the neoliberal era modern figures of homines sacri are also “differentiated by the virtue of the associations made between their biological status and the associations of this status with particular places.” Together with a broad range of feminist and post-colonial scholars that explored such diverse topics as prostitution-free zones in Portland (Sanchez 2001, 2004), legal abandonment of women in Vancouver (Pratt 2005), the plight of Kurds in Turkey (Secor 2006), the state of exclusion of Palestinian men and women (Gregory 2004) or missing women from the maquiladora industry in Ciudad Juárez (Wright 2004), Mitchell explores how banishment of certain groups of people from citizenship and/or humanity, as well as from certain physical places – “to varying degrees, including to the extent of murder” (Mitchell 2006: 98) acts as an additional instrument of a double exclusion within modern forms of neoliberal governmentality.

In an addition to Mitchell’s critique of Agamben that emphasizes the embodied and spatialized dimension of modern figures of homines sacri, it would be also possible to argue that a critical reading of Agamben’s work also shows traces of one of the key elements that will later (in Subchapter 3.2.3) be discussed as essential in conceptualizing Canadian exceptionalism – that is: “benevolence” (Jefferess 2008, 2011). There seem to be at least two major points where one could assume that Agamben’s theory of exceptionalism is built upon the underlying
assumption of the inherently benevolent nature of ‘ordinary people’ or ‘regular citizens’, especially when contrasted to the explicit violence of the sovereign state.

First is the lack of appropriate acknowledgement of an embodied nature of *hominis sacri* in modern societies, as discussed by Mitchell. By claiming that today “we are virtually all *hominis sacri*” Agamben (2005: 15) seems to uphold a notion by which all people are potentially (and in equal measure) victims of the violent nature of the sovereign state. This seems to suggest a logically untenable position where violence is seen as attributed exclusively to the state, that can either punish, persecute, expel and/or exterminate its people, while these very people are seen as being somehow uninvolved in carrying out these acts of violence (except as victims), although the state is clearly constituted (if not necessarily directly governed) by the very population that makes up its register of citizens. And of which some are more eligible for the status of *homo sacer* than others, as Mitchell emphasized.

The second issue is related to the first and seems to point again to what could be read as another (logical) inconsistency in Agamben’s thoughts. In Homo Sacer (Agamben (1998: 53) claims that violence against *homo sacer* or his “unsanctionable killing” is something “that, in his case, *anyone* may commit” (Agamben 1998: 53, emphasis added). While in this sentence Agamben explicitly asserts that *anyone* can commit this act of violence (with impunity), an examination of the (national) subject’s role as an agent of this violent behaviour and a discussion of his complicity in the sovereign state’s (sanctioned) violence is virtually nowhere to be found in the rest of his (theoretical) work. In other words: while any person can kill the *homo sacer* it seems as if for Agamben only the state does the killing.

Critical scholars who examined Agamben’s relationship to Foucault (Lemke 2005, Huysmans 2008, Oksala 2010, Ojakangas 2005) seem to agree that Agamben has deeply understated or under-utilized key Foucauldian concepts of *biopolitics*, *governmentality* and *subjectification*, that complexify and entangle the relationship between the subject and the state, whereby sovereignty is seen as much more fluid and distributed than in Agamben’s more traditional (Schmittean) view, where it is seen as tied exclusively to the legal system and the nation-state. In the History of Sexuality Vol. I Foucault (1978: 88–89) warned that, “in political thought and analysis, we still have not cut off the head of the king,” and in this view suggested that we need to reconceptualise our understandings of power, state and sovereignty, with the latter being “questioned insofar as it is personified in a collective being and no longer a sovereign individual” (Foucault 1978: 89). It would be very difficult to argue that Agamben could be seen as following that suggestion. Instead
it seems more likely that Agamben’s theory of exceptionalism does not engage in challenging benevolent, innocent, non-violent, perhaps even victimized perceptions of the nature of the (national) subject, as do the critical approaches to exceptionalism that are discussed in Subchapter 3.1.2.

In spite of this, the contribution of Agamben’s work to this research remains highly valuable, since his conceptualisation of exceptionalism is one of the very few theoretical approaches to the subject that explores how certain (groups of) people are excluded from not just the benefits of basic legal protection against violence and death, but are even effectively denied their full human status by the nation state itself. In this regard Agamben’s work could be seen as exploring how exceptionalist ideas of arbitrary exclusion (of those considered unworthy) from the national body are inextricably tied to the very concept of the modern-nation state, both in terms of its articulations in totalitarian regimes of the 20th century and in 21st century liberal democracies.

Further his work offers an example of how excessive emphasis on the violence and injustice carried out by the state (systemic critique) could conceal the potentially violent and discriminatory behaviour of the (presumably innocent and benevolent) people and of our complicity in doing harm. As benevolence, non-violence, tolerance, peacefulness and other positive personal traits are often at the very heart of the exceptionalist narratives, that are presented in Subchapter 3.1.4, a critical reflection on Agamben’s theorizing of exceptionalism can serve as a welcome introduction to these (very different) understandings of exceptionalism.

To conclude, in this subchapter it was possible to observe how the term ‘exceptionalism’ could be seen as meaning very different things. It could: (i) refer to the exceptionalist nature of modern nation-states, that can arbitrarily exclude certain groups of people from their legal order or their national body (as both Agamben and Mitchell suggest); (ii) be used as a self-explanatory positive concept that justifies an exceptional position of certain countries of nations or (iii) be used as a subject of critique of precisely such exceptionalist narratives. In the next subchapters the discussion will extend beyond Agamben’s understanding of exceptionalism (i) as being tied to the idea of the modern nation-state, to explore exceptionalist conceptualizations or discourses (ii) that work predominately as narratives that elevate a certain nation or state above all others. In order to analyse these narratives, critical uses of exceptionalism (iii) will be introduced in Subchapter 3.1.2.
3.1.2 Critical uses of exceptionalism

This subchapter explores the work of (post-colonial) authors that critique exceptionalist discourses that are often found in the foundational myths of individual nation states. These myths are usually not merely stories of origin, but can largely be seen as operating through perpetuated (and historically modified) narratives that justify and construct a certain nation’s or state’s superior position in the world. This superiority is often (especially in terms of Nordic countries and Canada) not constructed as grounded in ‘hard’ political/economic/military/sovereign power, but in intrinsic ethic, moral and other personal virtues embodied in the members of the nation.

The work of the authors presented in this subchapter could be seen as moving beyond Agamben’s understanding of exceptionalism as a form of (legal) exercise of sovereignty, but also beyond Mitchell’s conceptualization of the embodied and spatialized dimensions of subjects deemed fit for the exercise of the state’s exceptionalist power. Unlike Agamben and Mitchell that both focused on the nature of the excluded subject (e.g. homo sacer), the authors in this subchapter focus on what kind of exceptionalist narratives construct a particular nation, or national subjects that are not the ones considered sub or non-human (such as homines sacri), but are rather inversely constructed as elevated above the rest of humanity.

To the best of my knowledge, the book Whiteness and Postcolonialism in the Nordic Region, edited by Loftsdóttir and Jensen (2012), is the only major work to date that engages comprehensively and exclusively with a post-colonial understanding of exceptionalism. In this book, several authors expose and challenge the foundational myths of different nation states within the Nordic region, as well as of the region itself. In her contribution to the book Anna Rastas (2012) discusses the self-constitutive function that exceptionalism performs in the process of nation-building. She directs her attention in particular to how exceptionalist dispositions and narratives foreclose any possibilities of that self-image being challenged from outside the national body by silencing the Others:

Finnish exceptionalism, the moral superiority that has enabled us to judge others and keep ourselves free of any ethical and moral judgements, is employed to keep control: to retain the power to stop others (especially ‘them’, immigrants) from saying what ‘we’ are like (or what we have been like), and from dictating what ‘we’ can and cannot say. (Rastas 2012: 100).
Since Rastas explores the articulations of Finnish exceptionalism in secondary-school school textbooks, her work holds special significance for the studies of exceptionalism in education. Rastas (2012: 96) observes that in the sections that discuss colonialism “the involvement of Finns in colonial enterprises is never discussed” and that “racism is dealt with as if it merely happened elsewhere ... but not really in Finland.” Rastas’ work could be considered as both exploring how exceptionalist articulations construct certain nations as morally or ethically superior, as well how these constructions operate (also) through “selective amnesias” (Rastas 2012: 98) or “willful ignorance” (Tuana 2006: 11, see also Maldonado-Torres 2004). By emphasizing the importance of discursive absences, Rastas’s work suggests a need for paying attention also to silences in the text and not merely to visibly exceptionalist discourse. More on how Rastas’ (2012) and Tuana’s (2006) contributions influenced the analytical approach, adopted in this research, is discussed in Subchapters 3.2.2 and 3.2.4.

Rastas’ contribution also highlights some of the potential misperceptions and/or misinterpretations that could emerge when researching exceptionalism: “Talking about Finnish exceptionalism does not mean that the ideas and national self-images, and the act of employing them as strategies for particular purposes, are exclusively Finnish” (Rastas 2012: 96). I read Rastas’s work as suggesting (at least) two general characteristics of exceptionalist discourse. First, that exceptionalism is not a kind of discourse that is particular only to certain nations (and not to others), and second, that exceptionalist narratives about a certain nation are not being reproduced solely by members of that nation, but also by others. In other words, all nations (perhaps even all ethnic groups) could potentially be considered as having some kind of exceptionalist discourse related with them. However, exceptionalist discourse should be understood as comprised of a broad range of narratives, discursive practices and strategies about a particular nation (State), rather than being a particular characteristic of the nation (State) in question. Although likely originating within a nation (as a self-referential myth of nation-building), exceptionalist discourse often ends up being replicated and re-articulated (differently) by the members and non-members of the nation alike. In terms of Canadian exceptionalism, some of the examples in Subchapter 3.1.4, as well as some of the students’ responses in Chapter 7, could be illustrative of this point.

While specific purpose of this research is not to compare articulations of exceptionalist discourse between different nations, certain notions of Canadian exceptionalism, articulated in the introduction, and presented in more detail in Subchapters 3.1.3 and 3.1.4, such as altruism, tolerance, neutrality, hard work,
peacefulness, inclusion and social justice, do resonate quite closely with observations of Loftsdóttir and Jensen (2012) on Nordic self-perceptions that construct the Nordic countries as “good global citizens, peace-loving, conflict-resolution orientated and rational” (Loftsdóttir & Jensen 2012: 2). In his exploration of the links between exceptionalist discourse and political interests of Nordic states, Browning (2007) explores how notions of Nordic exceptionalism should be considered key to the development of Nordic and national identities of Nordic states that have evolved through the Cold War era into what he refers to as a particular form of “nation branding” (Browning 2007: 27–28). He (ibid.) further argues that two key components of Nordic exceptionalism are that “peace loving and rational Nordics” are different from others (such as the ‘conflict prone’ Europe), and that the Nordic model has (in international politics) stood for “progress, modernisation and for being better than other models.”

Again, nation branding – like exceptionalism – is not something particular only to certain countries or nations, although the two concepts seem to be inextricably entwined. In his analysis of Canada’s national branding strategies and policy, Potter (2008: 73) suggests that: “For Canada, attention to developing this global brand or image is an essential part of its strategic equity.” When analysing exceptionalist narratives, and perhaps even more, when trying to understand their persistence and importance, it is crucial to bear in mind that exceptionalist narratives (in the function of nation branding) are often mobilized with an explicit or implicit purpose of building: “long term, positive relationships with external target audiences ... in support of national interests, be they political, commercial, or security-related” (Potter 2008: 73).

Subchapter 2.2.2 discussed the example of the Canadian International Education Strategy, which specifically highlighted the importance of attracting talented students to Canada and the substantial economic impact of internationalization. Successful nation branding could be seen as pivotal to the success of such endeavours. In his textbook on the strategies and practice of nation branding, Keith Dinnie (2015: 6) suggests that nations:

- are making increasingly conscious efforts to hone their country branding in recognition of the need to fulfil nationally important objectives in terms of trade investment and tourism. A further objective for many nations is talent attraction, whereby countries compete to attract higher education students and skilled workers.
The work of Potter (2008) and Dinnie (2015) could be taken as a warning sign to researchers that seek to map out (and potentially deconstruct) exceptionalist discourse or to explore the underlying assumptions that inform exceptionalist dispositions and tendencies. Their work explicates how affirmations of exceptionalism are inextricably entwined with political, economic and other kinds of national interests through the process of nation-branding. Attempts at deconstructing exceptionalist narratives could thus be perceived as threatening constructions of national identity and thus disruptive to “imagined” (Benedict 1987: 5) national homogeneity. While this is perhaps becoming less important under the context of multicultural transnational capitalism, the damaging of the ‘national brand’ by challenging (stereotypically) positive narratives could also be seen as a threat to the economic and political interests of countries or nations in question. In both cases repercussions against critique seem highly plausible. In light of neoliberal imaginaries that could be seen as already colonizing (or having already colonized) the internationalization process in higher education (in Canada), this spells grave concerns, as any research into exceptionalism could be perceived as threatening or damaging to the goals set out by the makers of policy.9 In other words: It could be seen as damaging the (precious) national brand, but only if also the State and its people are constructed as already corporatized, as already belonging to the brand.

3.1.3 Conceptualizing exceptionalism in Canada

Considering the double-bind between national (economic and political) interests and the upkeep and re-iteration of exceptionalist narratives discussed in the previous subchapter, it is probably not too surprising that when the term exceptionalism is applied in the Canadian context (either in research or in policy), it is almost exclusively deployed as an affirmative concept, exploring the uniqueness and success of either the various facets of Canadian multicultural society and its political system (Bloemraad 2012, Gaines 1999, Kazemipur 2006), or Canada’s peaceful and cooperative engagement in the international community (Chapnick 2006, Kymlicka 2003) – often in contrast with the U.S. The rare challenges to Canadian exceptionalism are framed as questioning more the degree and not so much the authenticity of Canadian exceptionalism (cf. Chapnick 2006, Kymlicka 2003).

9 For a discussion of various imaginaries in higher education see Subchapter 2.1.4.
However, that is not to say that critiques of exceptionalist discourse are absent from the Canadian context. They are certainly not, but most authors would employ different terminology to refer to particular notions of (presumed) exceptionalist national characteristics, such as benevolence (Jeffress 2008, 2011), compassion (Jeffress 2002), recognition (Coulthard 2007, 2014, Mackey 2002), or tolerance (Mackey 2002), or they might focus on different ways to challenge the complex project of (exceptionalist) nation-building (Thobani 2007). While thus to the best of my knowledge no critical use of exceptionalism, as a theoretical concept, had been deployed in the Canadian context, Sunera Thobani (2007) explores in detail how state policies and popular practices have exalted the Canadian national subject by ennobling “this subject’s humanity and sanctioned the elevation of its rights over and above that of the aboriginal and the immigrant” (Thobani 2007: 9). This subchapter focuses mostly on her work and the work of Homi Bhabha (1994) on the relational construction of cultural/colonial supremacy, while the contributions of other authors that address different aspects of Canadian exceptionalism (listed above) are addressed in Subchapters 3.2.1 and 3.2.3. In her genealogy of the construction of Canadian national subjectivities, instead of exceptionalism, Thobani (2007: 5) refers to “exaltation,” which for her is:

key to constitution of the national subject as a particular kind of human being, a member of a particular kind of community, and, hence, ontologically and existentially distinct from strangers to this community.

Thobani (2007) examines how the processes and practices of exaltation in Canada remain inextricably linked to the processes of nation-state building not just in the past, but also how they continue to shape Canada’s multicultural society today. Similarly to issues explored in the previous subchapter, Thobani draws several important parallels between the processes of exaltation or ennobling the Canadian national subject’s humanity and the economic and political interests of both the Canadian state and its people. Thobani’s work challenges the prevailing notions of Canadian society as open, tolerant and virtually free of racism, by precisely exploring the deeply racialized and supremacist roots of the notions of tolerance, pluralism, and racial innocence (Thobani 2007: 154). Drawing on Ahmed (2000) and Bannerji (1995, 2000), she examines how multiculturalism had been instrumental for reconstituting and reconfiguring whiteness in a historically new version of tolerant, cosmopolitan whiteness (Thobani 2007: 147). According to Thobani (2007: 147), adopting multiculturalism and its politics of inclusion and managed diversity, helped rescue “Euro/white supremacy” by constituting:
white subjects ... as tolerant and respectful of difference and diversity, while non-white people were instead constructed as perpetually and irremediably monocultural, in need of being taught the virtues of tolerance and cosmopolitanism under white supervision.

Although Thobani herself does not use the term exceptionalism, her definition of exaltedness informs my working definition of exceptionalism and I owe many of the self-ascribed attributes of the Canadian national subject to her genealogy of their formation. For Thobani (2007) these attributes are constructed through binary oppositions that constitute and exalt the benevolent ‘progressive’ national subject in relation to its excluded, inferior and ‘backward’ Other.

The national is law-abiding where the outsider is susceptible to lawlessness; the national is compassionate where the outsider has a tendency to resort to deceit to gain access to valuable resources; the national is tolerant of cultural diversity where the outsider is intolerant, placing loyalty to ties of kin and clan above all else; and, more recently, the national is supportive of gender equality where the outsider is irremediably patriarchal. (Thobani 2007: 5).

Drawing on (Lacanian) psychoanalysis Bhabha (1994) suggests that, in order for the self to sustain its entitlement to and enjoyment of superiority, it necessarily has to construct ambivalent narratives about the Other, where the Other is repeatedly constructed as both an innocent and helpless victim in need of salvation (thus offering the self a chance at redemption), and at the same time as constant threat (to the self’s privileged position). For Bhabha (1994), what terrifies the exalted self the most is the potential equality of the Other. In order for the self and the Other to remain relationally bound to each-other, to keep being co-constructed, this equality needs to be negated and subverted at all costs.

In this regard Bhabha’s (1994) work implies that, contrary to popular perception, discrimination and racism are not rooted in ignorance, lack of knowledge and negative or false perceptions of the Other, but rather in sub-conscious attachments to exalted (superior) status of the self that is grounded on the continuous upkeep of ambivalent (both positive and negative) narratives about the Other. The implication for anti-racist strategies based on the popular conception of racism as ignorance (that fail to take into account notions of privilege and power), is that any attempts at addressing the problem of racism through (often essentialist) knowledge about the Other, are likely going to lead to a reinforcement of exaltedness or exceptionalism, rather than to deconstruction of racist discourse.
and/or racist stances. This elevation of the already ennobled national subject could be seen yet again as being re-affirmed precisely through acts of benevolence, inclusion and self-declared openness that construct and re-centre the white/liberal subject as a saviour, and that construct the Other as ‘opportunity’ for redemption.

Bhabha’s insight is particularly relevant for any critical conceptualization of exceptionalism, because he explores the issue of personal attachment of the self to a positive self-image that can seemingly only be maintained through the self’s denigration of the Other. If as described in the previous subchapter the affirmation of exceptionalist articulations could be seen as coherent or congruous with national (economic and political) interests, Bhabha’s work could be read as suggesting that affirming exceptionalist traits or attitudes is also not just in the interest of the nation, but also of the self. To be more precise, according to Bhabha (1994), (unconscious) affirmations of exceptionalism are not merely in the self’s interest, but are above all constitutive of it. Again, this is highly problematic, because any attempts at deconstruction of national exceptionalist narratives will likely be perceived by (at least some of) the national subject(s) as a direct threat to their personal identity or as an attack on them-selves. It is difficult to imagine how such deconstruction might be attempted, without being perceived as personally insulting or injurious.

My working conceptualization of exceptionalism thus refers to the veiled violence, made both possible and invisible by the notions of benevolence, openness and gestures of inclusion. As presented in the introduction (Chapter 1), the (unconscious) attachment to exceptionalist narratives is rooted in desires for neutrality, innocence, self-affirmation and progress achieved through totalizing forms of knowledge production (Ahenakew et al. 2014: 217), deliberation, and representation. It involves perceived entitlements to immunity (McAllan 2014), privilege (Kapoor 2014, Thobani 2007), self-transparency, and autonomy (Andreotti 2011b). In the context of exceptionalism in Canada, I use some historical and recent examples of exceptionalist articulations in (higher education in) Canada to pose one of the two main research questions: How are exceptionalist assumptions and tendencies contested and/or reproduced in students’ responses? The next subchapter presents these examples.

3.1.4 Articulations of Canadian exceptionalism (in higher education)

This subchapter presents some examples of various articulations of Canadian exceptionalism, both in recent times and in the past, that offer a brief genealogical or historical overview, that enables us to see how articulations of exceptionalism
have changed over time. In the first part of this subchapter historic examples and examples from national policy are presented – drawing largely on the collection of exceptionalist articulations gathered in Thobani’s (2007) book. The second part presents examples that pertain specifically to recent articulations of exceptionalism in higher education. The list of examples begins with the words of J.S. Woodsworth, one of the founders of the Canadian New Democratic Party.10

We, in Canada, have certain more or less clearly defined ideals of national well-being. These ideals must never be lost sight of. Non-ideal elements there must be, but they should be capable of assimilation. Essentially non-assimilable elements are clearly detrimental to our highest national development, and hence should be vigorously excluded. (Woodsworth 1909: 278).

It is possible to observe how articulations of exceptionalism in the beginning of the 20th century still remained overtly tied to the power of the nation-state to exclude ‘vigorously’ the elements it deems unfit for assimilation or incorporation into the national body (as conceptualized by Agamben). The uninhibited exceptionalist rhetoric of both Woodsworth and Philips Brooks (that Woodsworth extensively drew on) below would today likely be dismissed as being too messianic, militant or simply out of place. Further they would probably be considered as damaging for the effective functioning of a (neo)liberal multicultural capitalist society.

No nation, as no man has a right to take possession of a choice bit of God's earth, to exclude the foreigner from its territory, that it may live more comfortably and be a little more at peace. But if to this particular nation there has been given the development of a certain part of God's earth for universal purposes; if the world, in the great march of centuries, is going to be richer for the development of a certain national character, built up by a larger type of manhood here, then for the world's sake, for the sake of every nation that would pour in upon it that which would disturb that development, we have a right to stand guard over it. (Brooks, cited in Woodsworth 1909: 277–278).

However, while the language of exceptionalism has over the course of the century certainly developed greater finesse and subtlety of articulation than the one present

---

10 J.S. Woodsworth was one of the pioneers of social democratic movement in Canada. He is well known for his charitable work, pacifist attitude and as a leader of worker's rights movement. His commitment to social justice got him elected as the 1st leader of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, a democratic socialist party that later became known as the New Democratic Party (NDP), of which he was a founder (McNaught 2001).
in the writings of Woodsworth and Brooks, one could argue that the ideas guiding modern articulations of exceptionalism still have much in common with their historic predecessors.

- We have inherent strengths as a people of wealth and talent who have forged a community of interests, express a humane set of values, know the struggle to assert and maintain a sense of independence and understand the benefits of working in collegial fashion. In a survey of forty-four countries, with thirty-eight thousand respondents, Canadians showed the highest level of satisfaction with their lives and the general direction of their country. There was not the degree of angst over crime, corruption and the state of public services as in other countries, nor by a long chalk the level of animus against immigration found virtually everywhere else. These characteristics, particularly the latter, translate into real strengths for Canada in pursuing a role in the world.

- Canadians are on the road to global citizenship. Increasingly in work, travel, education and in personal and political engagement the world is our precinct, with international trade, finance, technology and business driving much of our global interests. But there is also a political, cultural and even moral dimension to our emerging role in global society. (Axworthy 2003, cited in Thobani 2007: 3).

- Undeniably, the ‘social safety net’ we built over the past several decades helped make Canada one of the world’s most successful countries, rich in prosperity and opportunity. Programs such as unemployment insurance, social assistance and social services, child benefits, universal pensions and a national network of widely accessible colleges and universities have made our nation a beacon of civilized values. Those values of compassion, ensuring the basic necessities of food and shelter for all, and sharing opportunity are at the heart of the social security system we’ve inherited. (Human Resources Development Canada 1994, cited in Thobani 2007: 105).

In these more recent articulations we can observe how a certain nation’s ‘ideals’, ‘inherent strengths as people of wealth and talent’, ‘richness in prosperity and opportunity’ and ‘values of compassion and sharing opportunity’ are through an exceptionalist discourse projected as attributes that construct this nation as

---

11 Lloyd Axworthy served as a Minister of Foreign Affairs, Minister of Labour and Minister of Employment and Immigration under the two Cabinets of Jean Chrétien, as a Minister of Employment and Immigration and Minister of Transport under the government of Pierre Trudeau, and was a Nobel Peace Prize nominee in 1997 (WFM n.d.).
exceptional and unique, but of universal worth for humanity. In this regard the exalted nation could be seen as being constructed as the leading example for the rest of the World to follow. Whether that is referred to as ‘development of a certain part of the world for universal purposes’, or as a ‘moral dimension to our emerging role in global society’ the underlying assumption seems to be that this particular nation is ‘a beacon of civilized values.’ The veiled racism in this example of exceptionalist discourse thus does not seem to be manifested so much in negative representations of the Other, but through the exaltation of the national Self over and above anyone else. It could also be argued that the exalted statues of the national Self, that in multicultural capitalist societies is constructed as inclusive and available for adoption, makes it very appealing also for people coming to Canada to identify with. The conversation recorded below is from a collection of Rhoda Howard-Hassman’s (2003: 41–42) interviews with 78 Canadian civic leaders (not all of whom were born in Canada):

Almost all the civic leaders, whether immigrant or native-born, thought that it was important for people in Canada to feel Canadian. Feeling Canadian, they said, gave people a sense of community, a sense of belonging, and a feeling of loyalty to the country. ‘I think all people need a source of grounding. We need some sort of safety, [a] safe place we can ... retreat to ... I think you do need ... a country that you feel home in, you can say “Yes, I live in Canada, I belong in Canada, it’s where I’m comfortable, it’s where I belong, it’s where I feel home, it’s where I feel that my neighbours are people that I’m comfortable having as neighbours,”’ said Bob. Sarah, like Bob born in Canada, and of British extraction, agreed: ‘If you live in Canada and you are Canadian and you don’t feel Canadian, then you’re feeling alienated or left out or excluded ... and that is not a good thing ... [P]eople need to feel that they’re part of the country.’ Without a feeling of being Canadian, citizens would not want to contribute to the community or to change things that might need changing. As Catherine, who was born in Canada and identified her ethnicity as Canadian, said, ‘I think it makes you a better Canadian if you care about the country. If you care about the values we have or changing something that needs improving. If you don’t care about it, then you’re not going to work to change it.

This general self-image of Canadians as “very good people” (Howard-Hassman 2003: 40) or as people one would be “comfortable having as neighbours” could be seen as contributing very positively not just to the sense of national belonging and social cohesion, but also as being reflected in the narratives about the Canadian
higher education environment, where Canadian students are portrayed as more ‘aware’ and ‘ethical’ than students in other countries.

Britta Baron, vice-provost and associate vice-president, international, at the University of Alberta, commented that Canada is very much influenced by the liberal arts paradigm of global citizenship, i.e., preparing students who are aware of global issues and imbued with a global ethic. She contrasted this with underlying drivers shaping internationalization efforts – and students’ interests – in other countries. In the United States, students who go abroad to study tend to seek self-fulfilment and a more sophisticated personal enrichment from internationalization. In Europe, students going abroad are focused on professional advancement and personal competitive advantage. (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada 2007: 6).

A rather frequent trait of Canadian exceptionalism seems to be also an emphasis on comparison with the United States that we can observe not only in the example above, but also in the quote below. However this time, the description of Canadian educational commitments towards “compassion and understanding of the other on the path to one’s own self-realization” comes from Paul Shaker (2010: 31), former dean of Simon Fraser University, who in his article Preserving Canadian Exceptionalism (2010), explicitly states his US origin, before outlining the differences between US and Canada:

There is magical thinking and there is critical thinking, and Canada tilts more toward the latter than does the United States. ... Our educational practices in Canada deserve some credit for this difference in people’s quality of cognition. Discipline in thought and argument are the result of challenging interactions, particularly in school settings where the curriculum is designed to elicit such development. Other contributing factors include the quality of the teacher’s critical thinking, his or her perseverance in pressing analyses forward, an interactive and individualized classroom environment, and the habit of carefully listening to and accounting for the challenges of others. This last trait is one Americans notice in Canada: audiences here listen attentively and in silence. They show a striking openness to the words of the other that embodies a commitment to learning, even at the expense of some egoistic discomfort. Short-term pain for the ego can introduce long term gain for the self – the self being our higher order personality, called in spiritual terms the soul. (Shaker 2010: 32).
In brief, Canadian students in higher education are, in this example of exceptionalist narrative, constructed not merely as being more ethical and globally aware, but are also seen as possessing a different, more critical ‘quality of cognition’ to their US counterparts and ‘embodying a commitment to learning’ that offers long term-benefits for their ‘higher order personality.’ This selection of examples of exceptionalist articulations is concluded by two very specific cases that – unlike all others so far, seem to be aimed precisely at denying the connection between Canada’s commitment to increased internationalization of higher education and the underlying economic drives that are spelled out so explicitly in the *Canadian International Education Strategy* (presented in Subchapter 2.2), as well as in the policy documents of individual universities (Pashby 2016).

- By a slender thread, a non-commercial narrative holds sway in Canada and defines a set of values that protect the mass of citizens. Our teachers are vital to the telling of this story. If we are fortunate, the slender thread will hold and strengthen, and Canada’s worldview will spread across North America. (Shaker 2010: 35).
- Adrian Shubert (2004), Associate VP International at York University concluded that the most positive feature of the Canadian panorama of internationalization, to date, is that it has been largely free of commercial motives that seem to be such prominent motivators in other countries such as Australia. (Weber 2007: 41).

In the next subchapter that introduces the various critiques of modern and liberal subjectivities, special attention will be dedicated (also) to subject of denial as a necessary and constitutive element of not just exceptionalist discourse, but also of the modern subject him/herself.

### 3.2 Critiques of modern and liberal subjectivities

This subchapter introduces various critiques of modern and liberal subjectivities that extend the theoretical discussion on exceptionalism presented in previous subchapters. The authors presented in this subchapter explore from various angles why it is so difficult for modern (liberal) subjects not to behave in ways that would reproduce racialized hierarchical structures of privilege and power. Subchapter 3.2.1 on new, subtle forms of racism, explores first the historical links between the emergence of modernity, liberalism and (scientific) racism, before proceeding to explore how in contemporary societies subtler forms of racism that substitute
nature for culture emerged in response to changing historical contexts. Subchapter 3.2.2 explores in more detail the role of denial (of racism, privilege, structural injustices, inequalities and violence) in preserving the existing relations of power, privilege and (racialized) hierarchies. Subchapter 3.2.3 explores libidinal attachments to structures of violence, oppression and exploitation and introduces some key psychoanalytical concepts such as enjoyment and symptom that can help understand unconscious motivations and drives that might be considered as self-sabotaging the various attempts at deconstruction of structural injustices. Further, this subchapter explores how notions of benevolence, compassion and care could be interpreted as predominantly re-affirming and re-centring the positive self-image crafting of the (benevolent) subject, rather than acting as means of deeper engagement with structural injustices.

3.2.1 Subtle racisms or new forms of (cultural) racism

This subchapter begins with an exploration of the historicity of liberal political thought, the emergence of (modern) forms of liberal subjectivities and the parallel evolution of racist theories and racialized structures of social hierarchies. The two main authors presented in this subchapter (Balibar and Bonilla-Silva) argue from different standpoints that racism in modern (multicultural) capitalist societies is taking new, subtler forms of articulation, but that these new forms remain mired in racialized theories of difference that draw their origin back to the Enrichment era and that were cotemporal to the emergence of liberal political thought. The persistence and “progression” (Balibar 1991: 9) of racism and racialized relations, practices and policies is understood by these scholars not as an aberration of the imperfect functioning of liberal ideals (Balibar 1991, Bonilla-Silva 2006, Losurdo 2006), processes of modern subjectification (Bhabha 1994), capitalist modes of production (Appadurai 2006, Balibar 1991); and/or nation state formation (Appadurai 2006, Balibar 1991, Goldberg 2002, 2009), but rather as a necessary, consequential and historically conditioned outcome of these processes. However, in order to remain effective as a tool of social control and for the reproduction of structural inequalities and injustices, modern forms of racism(s) have to be concealed, denied and/or “naturalized” (Bonilla Silva 2006: 28).

Balibar (1991), Bonilla-Silva (2006) and Losurdo (2011) trace the origin of modern, subtle forms of racism to the emergence of universalizing ideals of Enlightenment-based liberalism or liberal humanism. Bonilla Silva (2002: 26) argues that “the central component of any dominant racial ideology [are] its frames
For Bonilla Silva (ibid.) the four frames that circumscribe modern racial ideologies and thus our understanding and relations towards racism and racialization are “abstract liberalism, naturalization, cultural racism, and minimization of racism.” Although all four frames should be considered of importance for understanding modern articulations of subtle racism, this subchapter will dedicate most attention to the Bonilla-Silva’s concept of abstract liberalism and his critical reflection of the history of modern liberal and humanist idea(l)s. The reason for this lies in the suggestion that Enlightenment-based liberal humanism (or liberalism) today presents arguably the most universally promoted, wide-spread (and perhaps somewhat critically under-examined) meta-narrative that frames and thus conditions our understandings of race and racism. Although Bonilla Silva refers to all four tenets mentioned above as frames, it could be argued that naturalization, cultural racism and minimization of racism are perhaps better considered as (unconscious) strategies, through which racism and racialized relations are reinforced, rather than meta-narratives that frame our understandings. Some such strategies (in forms of auto-immunities and willful ignorance) will be discussed in the ensuing Subchapter 3.2.2., but this subchapter will explore the historic origins of liberal idea(l)s and their conjuncture in more detail with the emergence of modern (neo)liberal capitalist state. Bonilla-Silva (2006: 26) himself contends that “of the four frames, abstract liberalism is the most important, as it constitutes the foundation of the new racial ideology.” However, in order to offer some historic context of liberalist tradition as a necessary predecessor to what Bonilla-Silva (2006: 26) refers as contemporary “abstract liberalism”, a condensed and selective discussion of circumstances that pertain to the co-emergence of (scientific) racism that informed many key liberal idea(l)s is presented below.

Drawing on the examples from the writings of some of the founding figures of the 18th and 19th century Enlightenment and liberal movement, such as Kant, Voltaire, Jefferson and Stuart Mill – Bonilla-Silva (2006: 26–27) discusses the racialized origins of liberal tradition, whereby only white (male) persons were considered human enough to be eligible for the status of citizen and accompanying political and human rights. A similar point is raised also by Linda Alcoff (1996: 205) in her discussion of Western liberal/rational epistemologies of “real knowledge” as being based on the perspective of gendered, racialized, socially located (bourgeois) subject.

Racial difference was used by many classical liberal political philosophers (including Locke, Jefferson, Franklin, Washington and Stuart Mill among others)
as an objective (scientific) and reason for perpetuation and defence of racial policies, such as slavery, genocide of indigenous people (in particular Native Americans) and colonial exploitation (Bonilla Silva 2006, Losurdo 2011), and occasionally for what was considered at the time – their own benefit. In his *Liberalism – A Counter History*, Domenico Losurdo (2011: 69), explores in detail the “twin birth of liberalism and racial slavery,” where he extensively documents the writings of key classical liberal thinkers on the subject of race and European/white supremacy. The following lines from John Stuart Mill (cited in Losurdo 2011: 225) could be considered as representative of the kind of ideas that informed much of classical liberalism and Enlightenment thinking:

Despotism is a legitimate mode of government in dealing with barbarians, provided the end be their improvement, and the means justified by actually effecting that end. Liberty, as a principle, has no application to any state of things anterior to the time when mankind has become capable of being improved by free and equal discussion. Until then, there is nothing for them but implicit obedience to an Akbar or a Charlemagne, if they are so fortunate as to find one.

Similarly to Kant’s (cited in Bonilla-Silva 2006: 27) claim that that the differences between black and white people were “to be as great in regard to mental capacities as in colour,” many liberal thinkers and leading philosophers of the era supported the idea that only (male) members of the white race had exclusive right to decide and guide the future of members of (their and) other races, either for the benefit of (meritocratic) civilizational progress as such (Jeffersonian idea that “cream rises to the top”) or, more paradoxically, for the particular benefit of subjugated races (as suggested by John Stuart Mill). Bonilla-Silva (2006: 27) reminds us that while we often discuss “the merits of liberal humanism as it pertains to current debates about race-based policies [and] multiculturalism”, we often remain oblivious to the “the fact that *European humanism* (and liberalism) *usually meant that only Europeans were human*.” In such cases liberal values and principles of governance were/are considered as suspendible or inapplicable to non-white people, arguably even for their own benefit of more expedient progress and development. Together with racialized origins of liberal tradition, Bonilla-Silva (2006: 26–27) also considers the influence of emerging capitalist modes of production that corresponded to the special needs of the new ruling class, bourgeoisie, on classical liberal thinking:
When the bourgeoisie lauded freedom, they meant “free trade, free selling and buying”; when they applauded “individualism,” they had in mind “the bourgeois ... the middle-class owner of property”; The ideas of religious liberty and freedom of conscience merely gave expression to the sway of free competition. Hence, classical liberalism was the philosophy of a nascent class that as an aspiring ruling class expressed its needs (political as well as economic) as general societal goals.

Surprisingly, the father of liberal economic theory, Adam Smith, often associated at least partially with the less salutary effects of modern (neo)liberal capitalism, opposed (racialized) slavery – in contrast to many of his more celebrated and admired political/philosophical contemporaries. In what could be considered an astonishing, if somewhat controversial, example of poignant social critique of predominant modes of governance and economic production at the time, Smith (cited in Losurdo 2011: 6) argued that:

Slavery could be more easily abolished under a 'despotic government' than a 'free government', with its representative bodies exclusively reserved in practice for white property-owners. In such circumstances, the condition of the black slaves was desperate: 'every law is made by their masters, who will never pass anything prejudicial to themselves'. Hence '[t]he freedom of the free was the cause of the great oppression of the slaves ... And as they are the most numerous part of mankind, no human person will wish for liberty in a country where this institution is established.'

A historical contextualization of liberalism and liberal political tradition could thus be considered as suggesting strong links between the emergence of (scientific or biological) racism, capitalist modes of production and the liberal political project. And while it would be difficult to argue that a 'despotic government’ could be considered as a necessarily better or a more just alternative to parliamentary democracies of past and present eras, considerations, such as Smith’s, remain a valuable and relevant reminder of the fact that institutionalized ‘democratic’ representation does not in itself guarantee abolishment or the non-existence of deep structural inequalities and injustices. Further, I wish to join Bonilla-Silva (2006: 27) in specifically expressing that “my intent here is not to vilify the founders of liberalism, but [merely] to point out that modernity, liberalism, and racial exclusion were all part of the same historical movement.”
In order to explore how some of the premises of liberal tradition are rearticulated (in the US) today “to rationalize racially unfair situations” Bonilla-Silva (2006: 28) introduces (among others) the term “abstract liberalism” that refers to “using ideas associated with political liberalism and economic liberalism in an abstract manner to explain racial matters.” In practical terms the idea of abstract liberalism refers to situations and practices where “whites can appear ‘reasonable’ and even ‘moral’, while opposing almost all practical approaches to deal with the facto racial inequality” (Bonilla-Silva 2006: 28). Bonilla-Silva cites several examples where a re-framing of race-related issues in the language of liberalism serves this purpose. Thus for instance the under-representation of people of colour in certain jobs, schools, institutions (and leading positions) is occasionally explained through an abstract utilization of idea of ‘equal opportunity’ that presupposes meritocratic ways of defending (white) privilege that assume equal starting basis for ‘fair competition’ (Bonilla-Silva 2006: 31–34).

Further, the emphasis on “individual choice”, is considered as justification for “the whites having the right of choosing to live in segregated [and/or gentrified] neighbourhoods or sending children to segregated schools [or schools considered ‘better’]” (Bonilla-Silva 2006: 28). Similarly, and perhaps more intimately, the idea of ‘individual choice’ could be seen as resonating also through preferential choice of partners and friends of the same skin colour. Often such choices are re-interpreted through discursive practices of “naturalization” that employ specific phraseology that seeks to “normalize events or actions that could otherwise be interpreted as racially motivated ... or racist” (Bonilla-Silva 2006: 37). Other strategies that mask and conceal the racialized structure of social relations also include the displacement of biological racism with cultural racism, where people of non-European ancestry are considered inferior due to their invariably ‘backward’ or ‘immoral’ cultural background13, and general minimization of the importance of race thesis, where negative effects of racialization are seen as unfortunate, particular or soon to be abolished remnants from the past. The combined (unconscious and denied) deployment of these strategies for Bonilla-Silva (2006: 211) contributes to a formation of “racism without racists” or colour-blind racism, where:

---

12 Examples of such phrases could be: ‘That is just the way things are’ or ‘That is natural’ or ‘That is simply normal’.

13 As argued also by Bhabha (1994) and Thobani (2007) in Subchapter 3.1.3.
Modern racial ideology does not thrive on the ugliness of the past or on the language and tropes typical of slavery and Jim Crow. Today there is a sanitized, colour-blind way of calling minorities niggers, Spics, or Chinks. ... Whites believe minorities have the opportunities to succeed and that, if they do not, it is because they do not try hard. And if minorities dare talk about discrimination, they are rebuked with statements such as “Discrimination ended in the sixties, man” or “You guys are hypersensitive.”

Similarly, in his research on new forms of racism (in Europe and France) Balibar (1991: 20–21) proposes that we are witnessing an insurgence of “neo-racism” or “racism without races” where the category of immigration increasingly serves as a “substitute for race and a solvent of ‘class consciousness’”. In this regard Balibar develops two key arguments; the first is related to the role that various forms of racism play in constituting closed-off communities, such as (presumably homogenous) nations, the second is related to the substitution of biological heredity with insurmountable cultural differences as the source and rationale for new differential racism.

Much like Appadurai (2006) – who explores how racialized nationalism is mobilized through narratives of majoritization and minoritization in what are often considered democratic, inclusive and liberal nation-states, when the sovereignty of state and homogeneity of the nation are threatened by globalized neo-liberal erosion of traditional instruments of political power – Balibar (1991) also explores the inextricable link between racialized narratives and nationalism. For Balibar (1991: 17) racism is a “true total social phenomenon” that not only inscribes itself in practices, discourses and representations, but also organizes and segregates groups or social bodies around the stigmata of otherness or difference. In this regard racism is considered indispensable for the creation of racialized communities (nations) as it provides the appropriate explanation required for the social cohesion of the ‘selected nation’ against its externalized Other. Balibar (1991: 18) argues that “racist theories are indispensible in the formation of the racist community.” While Bonilla-Silva (2006) argues that these theories originate predominantly in the discourse of (bourgeois) elites, Balibar argues that they could also be seen as emerging from “spontaneous theorization” (Balibar 1991: 19) of dominated classes. Balibar explores how theories of academic racism in different, often benevolent, guises and the “spontaneous theorization of the masses” (ibid.) are motivated and driven by two key factors: (i) a misrecognition of the origins and agents of violence (usually ascribed to individuals and groups outside the racialized national body),
and by (ii) a “will to know, a violent desire for immediate knowledge of social relations.” For Balibar (1991: 19) these two function are mutually sustaining as they emerge from the “distressing enigma” of collective violence that “require[s] an urgent explanation for it[self].”

Although Balibar recognizes the problematic aspect of the “will to know” (ibid.) that seems to imply an understanding of the relational nature of the construction of the self and Other that is similar to Bhabha’s. His concept of misrecognition would likely be seen from Bhabha’s perspective as somewhat ‘misrecognizing’ the root causes of racism, as it implies that it is false knowledge or a lack of knowledge about the origins of violence that drives its perpetuation and the participation of people in it.14 Regardless of this critique, Balibar’s work can offer relevant insight into how (academic) knowledge (production), rather than being a safeguard against violence, racism and exploitation, can effectively contribute to their perpetuation:

[H]istorically effective racist ideologues have always developed 'democratic' doctrines which are immediately intelligible to the masses and apparently suited from the outset to their supposed low level of intelligence, even when elaborating elitist themes. In other words, they have produced doctrines capable of providing immediate interpretative keys not only to what individuals are experiencing but to what they are in the social world. (Balibar 1991: 19).

Although Balibar acknowledges the positive contributions of theories of cultural difference, oriented towards recognition of equality and diversity of all cultures against various hegemonic, imperialist and outright ethnocidal policies (cf. Taylor’s (1994) Politics of recognition), his main argument is that theories of cultural differentiation have often been instrumentalized in ways that replace nature and biology as sources of hierarchical stratification with culture that “can also function like a nature” (Balibar 1991: 22). He argues that in such ways theories of cultural differentiation “function as a way of locking individuals and groups into a genealogy, into a determination that is immutable and intangible in origin” (ibid.).15 This displacement in turn leads to the creation of assumptions that “insurmountable cultural difference is our ‘natural milieu’, the atmosphere indispensable to us if we

14 Žižek (2002) and Kapoor (2014), whose work is presented in more detail in Subchapter 3.2.3 would also likely argue that knowing the origins of violence does not automatically translate in its abandon, as we often enjoy precisely that, which if forbidden and/or transgressive.

15 Bonilla-Silva (2006) makes a similar argument in his work on displacement of biological with cultural racism.
are to breathe the air of history” and that “the abolition of that difference will necessary give rise to defensive reactions, ‘interethnic’ conflicts and a general rise in aggressiveness” (ibid.).

Although it would (from a liberal/multiculturalist perspective) probably be possible to interpret Balibar’s argument as an invitation to some kind of totalitarian homogenizing practices that would obliterate (cultural) differences for the purpose of establishing universal equality, I read Balibar as hinting at a more complex and potentially irreconcilable dilemma of the relationship between equality and (cultural) difference. I take Balibar as suggesting that “insurmountable cultural differences” act as necessary glue for social cohesion and our existential orientations (what individuals are in the social world) that through a “combination of practices, discourses and representations in a network of affective stereotypes ... enable us to give an account of the formation of a racist community” (Balibar 1991: 18). In other words, in order to know our place in the world and retain ontological and existential stability, we need a differentiated Other, against whom we can form our (group and individual) identity. Bhabha (1994) would probably refer to these policies and practices of “stranger making” (Nicolson et al. 2016, see also Ahmed 2012) as resulting from the (perceived) threatening equality of the Other.

In this regard theories, policies and practices of cultural differentiation or ‘stranger making’ (as beneficial and benevolent as they may be) could be read as mechanisms that ultimately foreclose any possibility of genuine equality of the Other, where the Other can choose between remaining either permanently and continuously ‘differentiated’ and thus never equal (as Bhabha suggests), or assimilated and integrated in ways that are “presented as progress, as an emancipation, a conceding of rights”, as Balibar (1991: 25) claims. For Balibar (1991: 22) theories of cultural differentiation – through displacement of nature of culture, lead towards a theory of “‘race relations’ within society, which naturalizes not racial belonging but racist conduct”, where “differentialist racism” (Balibar 1991: 22) presents a new form of:

meta-racism or what we might call a 'second position' racism, which presents itself as having drawn the lessons from the conflict between racism and anti-racism, as a politically operational theory of the causes of social aggression.

Balibar (ibid.) sees this “differential racism” as working through notions of “tolerance thresholds”, maintaining “cultural distance” and acting “in accordance with the postulate that individuals are the exclusive heirs and bearers of a single culture.” These differentiating strategies create new hierarchies of cultural worth,
where “minoritised” (Appadurai 2006) individuals and groups (within a certain national body) are classified according to their “greater or lesser aptitude for – or resistance to assimilation” (Balibar 1991: 24). Paradoxically again, we can observe the many conundrums and complexities at work in these differentiating strategies, where (cultural) difference can be used as either an external reference point for national and self-determination (through practices of ‘stranger making’) that contributes to the creation of the illusion of national homogeneity, or as an internal tool for measuring the success of this illusion crafted through evaluating assimilating/integrating capacities of individuals and groups – already present on the territory of the nation-state.

Similarly to Thobani’s (2007) argument on Euro/white supremacy (presented in Subchapter 3.1.3), Balibar (1991: 25) argues that “a ‘logically coherent’ differential racism would be uniformly conservative, arguing for the fixity of all cultures,” however, in its attempt to protect:

> European culture and the European way of life from Third-Worldization ... it immediately reintroduces the old distinction between 'closed' and 'open', 'static' and 'enterprising', 'cold' and 'hot', 'gregarious' and 'individualistic' societies – a distinction which, in its turn, brings into play all the ambiguity of the notion of culture.

Thus it seems that Balibar’s exploration of new forms of subtle racism, articulated through practices and theories of (positive) cultural differentiation leads us to a place, where these new forms of racism manifest themselves through a (re)construction of imaginaries where certain (European) nations/cultures are constructed as more open, tolerant, and diverse than other (non-European) nations/cultures that are seen as invariably closed, static and homogenous. Said by Balibar (1991: 25):

> Behind this situation lie barely reworked variants of the idea that historical cultures of humanity can be divided into two main groups, the one assumed to be universalistic and progressive, the other supposed irremediably particularistic and primitive.

On the subject of the politics of differentiation or multiculturalism in Canada, some liberal critiques of liberal multiculturalism, such as the highly influential Charles Taylor’s Politics of recognition (1994) argue that the negative aspects of hegemonic “difference-blind” liberalism (Taylor 1994: 40), grounded in its claims for “complete cultural neutrality”, can be mitigated through politics of recognition (of
diversity) that recognize equal worth of different cultures, rather attempting to impose Western universalizing idea(l)s upon them. However, other critical scholars such as Glen Coulthard (2007, 2014) and Eva Mackey (2002) have criticized (Taylor’s) politics of recognition for failing to address other, deeper, aspects of colonial encounters.16 According to Coulthard (2007), the politics of recognition fails to recognize the inextricable connection between colonialism and capitalism, where the politics of recognition allows for a recognition of diversity within a particular state, but assume that “any subaltern group that is granted [recognition] will thereby acquire a subordinate articulation with a capitalist state” (Day, cited in Coulthard 2007: 446). For Coulthard (2007: 447) this is highly problematic, especially in the Canadian context, since “historically, indigenous demands for cultural recognition have often been expressed in ways that have explicitly called into question the dominating nature of capitalist social relations and the state-form.” By not addressing the roots of socio-economic realities of exploitative colonial encounters, the politics of recognition are thus seen as failing to engage (or recognize) the underlying structural and systemic inequalities and violence.

Coulthard (2007, 2014) and Mackey (2002) are likewise critical of the cultural aspects of politics of recognition and representation. Mackey (2002) argues that notions of inclusion, representation, tolerance and multiculturalism should always be examined in light of power relations and in light of their contributions to the construction of (exceptionalist) national mythology, grounded in self-perceptions of benevolence, tolerance and innocence. Mackey devotes special attention to the ways the relationship between indigenous groups and mainstream or “Canadian-Canadians” (Mackey 2002: 3) has been historically constructed and how this construction helps to uphold the image of aboriginal people as “necessary players in nationalistic myths, [as] colourful recipients of benevolence, the necessary ‘others’ who reflect back white Canada’s self-image of tolerance” (Mackey 2002: 2). Mackey examines how the liberal notions of tolerance, inclusion and representation have been mobilised “to bolster and enable intolerance” (Mackey 2002: 7), how quickly they shift into their opposites, and how ultimately they fail to address the demands of indigenous people for real autonomy. Mackey also explores how the politics of multiculturalism in Canada elevates settler cultural difference (between Anglophone and Francophone settlers) and thus erases or silences the colonial difference of race. Eva Haque likewise explores how bilingualism influenced the development of the politics of multiculturalism in Canada, whereby language

---

16 See also the works of Sherene Razack (1998, 2002).
became the defining feature of nationhood and belonging (Haque 2012: 93). Haque (2012) traces the origins of policy on both bilingualism and multiculturalism to the work of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (the B and C Commission) and explores how the commission’s recommendations led to the establishment of a system of social categorization or hierarchical “racial ordering” (Haque 2012: 4) that on the grounds of language differentiated between the two founding races (English and French) and other ethnic groups that became merely “cultural groups.”

Coulthard similarly argues that strategies of recognition and representation (in Canada), rather than being genuinely emancipatory, lead to situations where indigenous people are always and unavoidably “constructed by colonial discourse” (Coulthard 2007: 453) and “imperial power structures” either with the purpose of assimilating or interpelling them. I read Coulthard’s understanding of interpellation in the Althusserian sense as an imposed ideological construction of individual subject’s identities. In this regard the politics of recognition (from the side of colonial state) are seen as debilitating the possibilities of empowerment of indigenous people through strategies of self-recognition (Coulthard 2007, 2014).

Much like in Subchapters 3.1.3 and 3.1.4 that discuss various articulations of Canadian exceptionalism, it would be thus possible to conclude that new forms of (differential) racism, as articulated by Balibar and others, manifest themselves predominantly through a construction of narratives about certain nations or cultures as being less racist or even non-racist – compared to others. In these subtler forms of racism, the insistence on diversity and differentiation could be seen as a new strategy of (re)constructing superiority and homogeneity of ‘superficially’ diverse and thus presumably more ‘progressive’ nations or groups (against their less diverse and open counter-parts), in which ‘objectively’ established insistence on cultural difference(s) replaces biological constructions of race as a mechanism of organising social hierarchies. Thus in contemporary liberal (multicultural) societies ‘without racists and without race’, colour-blindness (Bonilla-Silva 2006) and other (unconscious) strategies or naturalization and minimization of racism are usually considered a sign of the absence of racism, rather than a sign of denial of a racially conditioned history and present. The denial of not just racism, but of multiple structural inequalities and positions of privilege, is the subject for the next subchapter.
3.2.2 Auto-immunities, willful ignorance and forgetfulness

Critical race (Mills 2007) and feminist scholars (Alcoff 2007, Tuana 2004, 2006) have theorized “ignorance as more than a mere absence of knowledge” (Gilson 2015: 228), thus challenging mainstream (liberal) assumptions that whatever injustices, inequalities and violence we (still) face in contemporary societies, could be resolved with better and more knowledge about them, rather than by addressing the power relations and our personal collective investments in their perpetuation, as suggested by various authors throughout this chapter. In this subchapter auto-immunities (Derrida 2005, McAllan 2013), wilful ignorance (Tuana 2006) and forgetfulness (Maldonado-Torres 2004) are considered a mutually complementary triad that can help us understand, why and how denial operates both consciously and unconsciously, “blinding” (Maldonado-Torres 2004, Mignolo 2011) us to darker aspects of modernity and modern subjectivities.

In her article Speculum of Ignorance Tuana (2006) proposes a taxonomy of difference that outlines four different types of ignorance: (i) knowing that we do not know, but not caring to know – because an increase in knowledge is not linked to our current interests, (ii) we do not even know that we do not know – our current interests, beliefs, knowledge prevent us from knowing certain things, (iii) they do not want us to know – systematic cultivation of ignorance of certain groups by different stakeholders in positions of power and (iv) willful ignorance or “they [we] do not know and they [we] do not want to know” (Tuana 2006: 10). Tuana (2006: 11) refers to willful ignorance as:

a systematic process of self-deception, a willful embrace of ignorance that infects those who are in positions of privilege, an active ignoring of the oppression of others and one’s role in that exploitation.

What sets wilful ignorance apart from Tuana’s other types of ignorance, especially Tuana’s second and third type, where in both cases we ‘do not know that we do not know’ either because our current interests and epistemic positioning prevents us from knowing, or we are prevented from knowing by those in positions of power, is the continuous insistence on not knowing, potentially even after we learn that we do not know. Tuana (2006: 10–11) argues that this kind of ignorance is not passive but requires “many acts and negligences” and is “an achievement that has to be managed.” In psychoanalytic terms it would be possible to argue that willful
ignorance already betrays the existence of (denied) knowledge, or at the very least some assumptions about it and (suppressed) awareness of it.17

If that is indeed the case, if “forgetfulness” (Maldonado-Torres 2004: 10) and “will-to-ignorance”18, could be shown as operating consistently even among various fields of critical theory – and Maldonado-Torres seems to provide ample evidence for the case, then it should not be surprising if wilful ignorance as a strategy of denial of racialized hierarchical structures that uphold various positions of privilege and superiority, could be traced also to everyday relations and practices between less ‘critically-oriented’ individuals.

Another concept that could be helpful in elucidating how structures of (racialized) privilege maintain their stability and continuity through practices of (unconscious) denial is autoimmunity. Autoimmunity is a term that Derrida used extensively in his later work, and some authors say it is his most important and difficult to define term (Matthews 2013). In one of his later interviews, Derrida (in Borradori 2003: 94) describes autoimmunity as “that strange behaviour where a living being, in quasi-suicidal fashion, ‘itself’ works to destroy its own protection, to immunize itself against its ‘own’ immunity.” However, Derrida’s conceptualization extends beyond the biological or physiological understanding of autoimmunity as a system of physical self-destruction. In Rogues: Two Essays on Reason, Derrida outlines a much more nuanced conceptualization of autoimmunity, where the emphasis is evidently not on the body, but on the self that seeks to immunize itself against itself:

[autoimmunity] consists not only in compromising oneself [s’auto-entamer] but in compromising the self, the autos--and thus ipseity. It consists not only in committing suicide but in compromising sui- or self-referentiality, the self or sui- of suicide itself. Autoimmunity is more or less suicidal, but, more seriously still, it threatens always to rob suicide itself of its meaning and supposed integrity. (Derrida 2005: 45).

Different readers of Derrida have interpreted autoimmunity in different ways and related to different topics, such as the global political crisis (Esposito 2008, 2011),

---

17 In certain ways the concept of wilful ignorance could be considered as elucidating the fundamental Lacanian (2002) understanding that the (modern) subject is always fundamentally split (divided between his conscious ego and the unconscious) and that this split is irreducible and cannot be healed. Lacan conceptualized the subject as the very split between truth and knowledge, where language is seen as introducing the barrier that prevents the meeting between the two ‘avatars’.

18 Maldonado-Torres’s term bares close conceptual resemblance to Tuana’s (2006: 11) “willful ignorance”.
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drawing on Derridean autoimmunity and exploring the colonial practices in Australia, Fiona McAllan (2014: 168–169) writes about self-colonisation as a process that “includes the affect upon the coloniser as a result of enacting the colonising relation upon the other” where “guilt and fear … further the disconnection from the self, the land and the other.” Taking the argument of denial or racialized relations, presented by other authors in this and the previous subchapter, a step further, McAllan (2014: 169) argues that autoimmunity works as a mechanism that facilitates “denial of relational ontology” or “interrelatedness of intersubjectivity.” In other words, autoimmunity is not mere denial as such, but is rather:

a repression of denial that the colonial [presumably] sovereign [subject] engages in as it violently appropriates the other/others in this relation (utilising strong reason). This is denial therefore of the actual ontology of the self-other relation, and its interdependency with the other. (McAllan 2014: 170).

Autoimmunity could thus be considered as necessary for the upkeep of the idea of the individual, sovereign subject, which is at heart of the modernist (liberal) project. However, the assumption of (individual) sovereignty is conditioned by a constitutive denial of (non-Enlightenment based) relational ontologies that assume interdependence and intersubjectivity at the expense of the (presumed) sovereignty of the modern subject. From a relational perspective, autoimmunity is harmful not just for the colonised, but for the coloniser as well, as it impedes his/her capacity for relationality and intersubjectivity and this leads to increasing alienation, harm of the Other and self-harm. Further, autoimmunity is from this perspective also seen as feeding itself as the accumulation of “unprocessed guilt and denial” increases each time the colonising relation is enacted against the colonised (McAllan 2014: 174). This accumulation in turn leads to a situation where:

The more the colonising relation is enacted, the more self-colonising takes hold as interentity responsibility is ignored. With increasing denial about the interentity affects operating within this subordinating relation upon the other, there is less opportunity for awareness of interentity relatedness, and subsequently increasingly less engagement with responsibility regarding the impossible structure of individual emplacement. (McAllan 2014: 174–175).
Autoimmunity is thus from a relational perspective understood as a mechanism that in its attempt to protect the untenable sovereignty and control of the individualized self, engages in increasing distancing from the Other and, consequently, also in distancing from itself (as in relational ontologies any entity is always considered as embedded in intersubjective or interentity relations). For McAllan (2014: 181) the fear of loss of sovereignty and control, the fear or being re-embedded (or remembered of being primordially already embedded) in interentital emplacement leads to an autoimmunizing, self-cannibalising reaction, where “the cannibal is unable to recognize itself in its consumption of the other, and neither in the self-cannibalising that this colonising spirit ensures for itself.” Instead, the colonising self, in order to preserve its positive and innocent self-image, projects this threat to its sovereignty upon an externalised Other.

For the purpose of this work, drawing mostly on McAllan and her reading of Derrida, but also on Thobani, Balibar and Bhabha, autoimmunity is thus conceptualized as a self-defence mechanism that enables the crafting and maintaining of a benevolent, innocent, even victimized self-image of the privileged modern subject(s) through a projected reversal of systemic hierarchies and power relations. This discursive reversal is often performed by a rejection of (immunization against) critique through claims of aggression, violence, disrespect, reverse racism, irrelevance, incomprehensibility, arrogance, insolence and ungratefulness from the threatening Other.

To conclude, if willful ignorance could be considered an act of denial of complicity and/or the incapacity to register (systemic) violence and/or injustices, autoimmunity could be seen as a self-colonising process of subversion (even perversion) of critique in a way that re-positions the privileged (colonising) subject by destroying references to his positionality and constructing himself as powerless, victimized, threatened, and oppressed by the vilified Other.

### 3.2.3 Affluence, charity, complicity and self-actualisation through multi-cultural capitalism

If the previous subchapter concluded with a discussion of self-harm mechanisms that modern subjects employ in order to maintain (illusions) of sovereignty, innocence and individualized control, this subchapter discusses the various (unconscious) strategies of self-actualisation of modern subjects in multicultural capitalist societies that could likewise be considered as different kinds of avoidance strategies against engagement with relationality and complicity. Although very
different in their respective fields of interest, all of the authors in this subchapter adopt a critical approach against the assumed benevolence and openness of liberal multiculturalist ideals of acceptance, tolerance and compassion. Building upon the critiques of liberal and humanist idea(l)s, presented in Subchapter 3.2.1, and extending the argument on the active denial of complicity in reproduction of systemic harm, advanced in Subchapter 3.2.2, this subchapter begins with a selective overview of Žižek’s critique of liberal multicultural capitalism and introduces the subject of *enjoyment* (*jouissance*) that is central to Žižekian thought.¹⁹

The first part explores Žižek’s (1998) argument on the totality of ideological immersion in multicultural capitalism, where capitalism is constructed as the only ‘objectively’ available socio-economic alternative today and where disruptive political gestures are no longer possible. The second part explores Ilan Kapoor’s (2014) critique of development(alist) discourse as one of the main discursive orientations that shapes relations between (and within) societies and their people. This part focuses on Kapoor’s discussion of the unconscious of development, the enjoyment that we derive from our libidinal investments in hierarchical relations (between global North and South) and consequent attachments to various forms of perpetuation of capitalist exploitation and structural injustices. The last part includes an overview of David Jefferess’ work on the discourse of benevolence and compassion (in Canada) that, according to Jefferess (2008, 2011), makes possible the denial of complicity in systemic exploitation and violence (as discussed also by Kapoor). For Jefferess (2002), this contributes to a construction of Canadian identity as “humane and compassionate” global citizens that respond affectionately to the needs of the “helpless” Third World Other.

The discussion on Žižek’s critique of multicultural capitalism begins with a selective overview of two key concepts that are central to Žižekian thought and whose influence can be traced both in the works of Kapoor and Jefferess. These are the notions of the political, enjoyment and symptom. Considering Žižek’s very prolific intellectual output – he published over 40 books in English language alone, any attempt at trying to capture the full nuance and complexity of even such a

---

¹⁹ Although I consider Maldonado-Torres’ (2004) critique of Žižek as epistemically racist and manifestly exclusivist, both relevant and well grounded, I also believe that his work on the subject of enjoyment and his critique of multicultural capitalism merits inclusion in this chapter, as it helps bringing in a much needed psychanalytical insight to the critiques of modern subjectivities which was under-represented by the other authors, presented in the previous two subchapters.
limited number of his main concepts should be considered as necessarily partial and incomplete.

Drawing on Rancière (1995), and his work that explores the gaps between formal democracy and the economic realities of exploitation and domination, Žižek (1998: 997) suggests that in today’s time of “postmodern postpolitics”, the possibilities for (genuine) political (action) have been foreclosed by various strategies and techniques that aim to “gentrify the properly traumatic dimension of the political” (Žižek 1998: 992). According to Žižek (1998: 991–992) the strategies and techniques of governance that prevail in liberal democracies, result in a development of para-politics, or “attempt[s] to depoliticize politics”, where genuine political action is no longer possible. While such a claim may seem at first unusual, given the large number of political actors, political parties and policies being developed, it should be read through a Žižekian understanding of the term political, as both universalizing and fundamentally disruptive of the existing social order, that is presented in more detail below. For Žižek (1998: 988–989) the political is thus invariably linked to a conflict that:

involves the tension between the structured social body, where each part has its place, and the part of no-part, which unsettles this order on account of the empty principle of universality, of the principled equality of all men qua speaking beings, what Étienne Balibar calls égaliberté. Politics proper thus always involves a kind of short circuit between the universal and the particular; it involves the paradox of the singular that appears as a stand-in for the universal, destabilizing the “natural functional order of relations in the social body.

Žižek traces the origins of political struggle to the claims of representation, made by the members of the ancient Greek demos that had no firmly established place in the social hierarchy. In this regard a genuine political action, or “politics proper” (Žižek 1998: 989), could be seen as emerging only in the very rare (revolutionary) historic circumstances, where those excluded from the social order, make claims not only of self-representation, but claim to represent all of humanity (on the principles of égaliberté), or all the people. Žižek (1998: 988) offers this kind of reading of the Greek demos’ claims: “we – the ‘nothing’, not counted in the order – are the people, we are all, against others that stand for their particular privileged interest.”

Political for Žižek (1998: 991) is thus not a place of organized, regulated political struggle in a representational space that upholds the existing social
structures, it is rather the opposite – the political is always disruptive of the existing social order. For Žižek (1998: 991–992) the entire (Western/European) history of political thought and political history has been nothing else but an ongoing attempt at a disavowal and regulation of the destabilizing power of the political by various means such as by fixing the rules of political competition and regulated representation in parliamentary democracies. In Žižek (1998), the role of those who are not part or are excluded from the social order is essential for the emergence of “politics proper”. This is because only they can make authentic, universalizing claims of representing all the people, unlike various other groups, whose particular interests have already been accounted for (to varying degrees) by the existing social order. Žižek (2008) is particularly critical of the way the concept of tolerance has been instrumentalized within the mainstream liberal imaginary for the de-politicization of struggles that, due to appropriation of tolerance in the process of the “culturalization of politics” (Žižek 2008: 660) can no longer develop their ‘proper’ political character. Žižek (2008: 660) argues, that their claims for political legitimacy get invariably translated into the de-politicized language of cultural difference:

political differences, differences conditioned by political inequality, economic exploitation, and so on, are naturalized and neutralized into cultural differences, different ways of life, which are something given, something that cannot be overcome, but must be merely tolerated.

For Žižek (2008) notions of tolerance and politics or ‘proper’ political struggle are seen as mutually exclusive, since “the cultivation of tolerance as a political end implicitly constitutes a rejection of politics as a domain in which conflict can be productively articulated and addressed” (Žižek 2008: 660). This pacification of conflict, grounded in otherwise legitimate claims for justice, equality and/or emancipation is for Žižek (1998, 2008) through the politics of tolerance (and inclusion) at the heart of the de-politicizing strategies of multicultural capitalism. The importance of antagonism and universalizing claims of an excluded or subordinated Other/social group that are constitutive of the political, has for Žižek (1998: 1002) been drowned out in liberal democracies through a precise “cataloguing” of problems of each social group and subgroup and corresponding affirmative/restorative measures that make any universalizing claims of a particular group not only impossible, but frustratingly empty.
The post-political liberal establishment not only fully acknowledges the gap between a mere formal equality and its actualization or implementation, it not only recognizes the exclusionary logic of the false ideological universality, but it even actively fights this logic by applying to it a vast legal/psychological/sociological network of measures, from identifying the specific problems of each group and subgroup (not only homosexuals but African American lesbians, African American lesbian mothers, African American single unemployed lesbian mothers, and so on) to proposing a set of measures (affirmative action, for example) to amend the wrong. However, what such a tolerant procedure prevents is the gesture of politicization proper: although the difficulties of being an African American single unemployed lesbian mother are adequately catalogued, including even the category's most specific features, the concerned subject nonetheless somehow feels that there is something wrong and frustrating in this very effort to render justice for her specific predicament. What she is deprived of is the possibility of the metaphoric elevation of her specific wrong into the stand-in for the universal wrong. (Žižek 1998: 1001–1002).

For Žižek (1998: 991–992) this foreclosure of the political through the politics of tolerance and recognition is a not conscious act, but merely one of the unconsciously driven possible defensive responses against the traumatic experience of the destabilizing nature of the political. In this regard globalized, multicultural societies could be seen when working towards recognition of rights of particular groups as being particular, foreclosing on their potentially disruptive universalizing claims, thus pacifying, subordinating and controlling them. For Žižek (1998: 997) globalization is “precisely the name for emerging post-political logic that progressively precludes the dimension of universality at work in politicization proper”. Žižek (ibid.) warns that we should not conflate globalization with universalization. Universalizing claims for Žižek (1998: 989) are expressed when an excluded or subordinated group:

- not only demands to be heard on an equal footing with the ruling oligarchy or aristocracy (that is, to be recognized as a partner in political dialogue and the exercise of power) but, even more, presents itself as the immediate embodiment of society as such, in its universality, against the particular power interests of aristocracy or oligarchy. This identification of the nonpart with the whole, of the part of society with no properly defined place (or which resists
its allocated subordinated place) with the universal, is the elementary gesture of politicization, discernible in all great democratic events.

However, Žižek (1998) has not only discussed how the particular can act as a stand-in for the universal and thus create a disruption in the predominant social order, but has, through an analysis of the relationship between the universal and the “typical” (Žižek 1997), also shown how the particular can be appropriated to inversely re-assert a particular ideology. Using the example of public discourse on African-American single-mothers in the US Žižek (1997: 29) shows how the particular case of “single black mother” is silently conceived as “typical” of social welfare and what is what is wrong with it. According to Žižek (1997: 29):

- a particular content which is promulgated as ‘typical’ of the universal notion, is the element of fantasy, of the phantasmatic background support of the universal ideological notion. To put it in Kantian terms, it plays the role of ‘transcendental schematism’, translating the empty universal concept into a notion which directly relates and applies to our ‘actual experience’.

For Žižek (1997: 29) the particular elevated to the level of typical may serve the dominant ideology in justifying its inherent violence and exploitation through constructing an image of a poor, lazy, incompetent persona that feeds off the system, while not contributing her share to society. Usually it is the suppressed individuals that represent different ethnical, language, sexual, religious etc. minorities from the lower strata of the society (the Other), that serve as constitutive scapegoats in the dominant public discourses for what Žižek (ibid.) calls the “universality of modern social Evil.” Accordingly, the ambivalence of the link between the universal and the particular suggests an obscured political struggle for ideological hegemony. Drawing on Laclau (1996) Žižek (1997: 29) asserts that:

- the universal results from a constitutive split in which the negation of a particular identity transforms this identity in the symbol of identity and fullness as such: the Universal acquires concrete existence when some particular content starts to function as its stand-in.

The particular (or the Other) could in Žižek thus be seen as serving a double (triple) role within liberal multicultural capitalist ideology. First, the affirmation of the particularity of the particular is used to foreclose any attempts at politicization with its universalizing and disrupting tendencies. Secondly, the particular elevated to the level of the typical, serves as a scapegoat for all social ailments, thus re-directing
public attention away from inherent systemic injustices, exploitation and violence. 
Thirdly (and much more obscurely), the critical, particular as modernity’s co-opted and civilized Other, is by being given a voice (freedom of speech) and necessary protection (freedom after speech) likewise catalogued and re-asserted or re-affirmed as being particular and thus incapacitated in terms of providing a fundamentally disruptive critique. Had the critique not been co-opted and ‘civilized’ it would have been repressed or rather denied through the claim of incomprehensibility or irrelevance (as discussed in Subchapter 3.2.2), appropriately catalogued and stored away – after it was ‘heard’. Therefore, any critique that seems possible within modern multicultural capitalism, including this research, should be considered as a necessarily non-disruptive, self-referential one.

Using an example from the war on Iraq Žižek (2007: n.p.) discusses the complicity of critique in what he calls a “strange symbiotic relationship between power and resistance”. The most important lesson to be drawn from the protests against the Iraq war was for Žižek not the act of protesting itself or the ineffectiveness of the protests in preventing the war, but rather the fact that those in power handily abused the protests (the critique) to legitimise the war. Žižek quotes George Bush’s statement to the protestors as a case in point of the co-option of critique:

You see, this is what we are fighting for, so that what people are doing here – protesting against their government policy – will be possible also in Iraq. (Žižek 2007: n.p.)

According to Žižek (ibid.) the protests also served the purpose of “the protesters saving their beautiful souls” – the dissatisfaction with government policy was publicly expressed and their effort was admired and acknowledged as legitimate even by those in power, that easily subverted its original message and affirmed the superiority of the liberal ideological credo. This example could be seen as challenging the mainstream understanding of political activism as potentially disruptive to the existing global order. Instead, Žižek (2007) suggests that activism could rather be seen as (unwittingly) affirming it, since disruptive political gestures could be seen as no longer possible in the affirmative, anti-antagonistic liberal post-political space, as suggested by his earlier work (Žižek 1998).

Thus far the arguments, presented by Žižek could be summarized as follows: (i) disruptive political gestures could only emerge from those excluded from the general social order, because only their claims could be considered as universal – that is not defending any particular interest; (ii) such gestures are no longer possible
within multicultural capitalist societies, due to their politics of inclusion and tolerance that insist on particularism; (iii) the particular (groups) elevated to the status of the ‘typical’ serve as appropriate scapegoats that divert public attention away from inherent systemic injustice, exploitation and violence; (iv) (critical) political activism, rather than being disruptive, is often (unwittingly) supportive of dominant ideologies.

Before proceeding further with the discussion of enjoyment as a political factor, it is perhaps worthwhile to note that Žižek’s universalizing claims and suggestions are taken in this research as theoretically productive, in the sense that they provide an argument for the difficulty (if not outright impossibility) of disruptive political agency, however beyond that scope it would be difficult to argue for universalism, especially in light of challenges and violence produced by different (even the most benevolent) universalizing tendencies. Further, it should be noted that Žižek only conceptualizes antagonistic political struggle, leaving other political strategies, such as various articulations of agonistic agency, unexamined.

Drawing on Lacanian psychoanalysis, Žižek (1989, 1991) makes a distinction between pleasure and enjoyment that clarifies his understanding of enjoyment. While pleasure is derived from (the use of) things directly, enjoyment (jouissance) can only be experienced indirectly, or as by-product of some other action. According to Lacan (cited in Kapoor 2014: 1128) enjoyment is derived from the “excessive satisfaction we get from doing something transgressive, irrational or even wrong.” In this regard the concept of enjoyment could be considered as suggesting that we do certain things not “despite the fact that they are dangerous [or violent], but because they are” (Kapoor 2014: 1128). While in psychoanalytic terms pleasure is experienced consciously, enjoyment is not, and indeed the promise of fulfilment through enjoyment, through some excessive gesture that would fill the lack, experienced due to “separation from the primordial (m)Other” (ibid.), is never delivered. McGowan (2004: 5–6) further suggests that enjoyment does not depend on the content of any given act, but rather on the form in which we experience it. Using the example of watching pornography on the Internet he shows that is not the sexually explicit content that provides enjoyment (the content may however provide pleasure), but rather the form of the act: “hooked on to a computer, in isolation from the rest of the world” (McGowan 2004: 6).

Kapoor (2014: 1128) contends that Žižek’s significant contribution to political theory “has been to make the notion of jouissance a political factor, showing how it is a crucial ingredient in the formation of political community and identity.” Among various examples of how enjoyment functions within a political context
Kapoor (2014: 1128) lists the “the enjoyment and thrill that may bind us against an external enemy,” or the “deep comfort people get from following (bureaucratic or religious) rituals.”

Jouissance elucidates why people become so attached to cultural values and socio-political systems, and why power can turn out to be so intractable, persistent and enduring. One has trouble giving up such things as racism, materialism, sexism or religious fundamentalism because one enjoys them; they give one a certain sense of stability and fulfilment, despite the fact that (and sometimes because) one may well know they can be pernicious and cruel. (Kapoor 2014: 1129).

Kapoor (2014) discusses three examples of how enjoyment and our libidinal attachments circumscribe our political and existential ambitions in modern societies. First is our attachment to capitalist modes of production that persist in spite of the fact that capitalism has been severely critiqued regarding its role in reproducing socio-economic inequalities and environmental degradation. Second is the persistence of nationalism and the necessity of “scapegoating” (Kapoor 2014: 1130) the Other for the purpose of (positively) constructing national identity. Third is the relationship between racism and the enviousness of the Other’s (perceived) enjoyment. As Kapoor draws heavily on Žižek (and to some extent on McGowan), his work will be discussed in parallel with these two authors, beginning with Kapoor’s understanding of the relationship between capitalism and enjoyment in both its benefits and its inherent violence and exploitation. According to Kapoor (2014: 1129), regardless of multiple and persistent critiques, capitalism remains the only “available economic horizon today, whether in the global North or in the South.” One of the main reasons why capitalism has been so successful in colonizing our socio-economic imaginaries lies for Kapoor in our enjoyment of it.

People enjoy capitalism. We are libidinally bound to it because we get so much from it – cars TVs, houses, nice clothes, cheap fast-food, iPhones, etc. And capitalism, especially in its latest neoliberal phase, has been very effective in appealing to our passions. It is able to exploit what Lacanians see as our deep-seated sense of lack/loss, enabling us to fill such lack through consumerism and materialism. This means that we cannot easily postpone capitalism, since it promises to heal our ontological wound. Late capitalism’s productive engine thus depends on enjoyment-as-excess; its strength and
success hinge on the extent to which it can elevate jouissance ‘into the very principle of social life’. (Kapoor 2014: 1129).

Although Kapoor (2014), Žižek (1997) and McGowan (2004) all agree that capitalism is unable to deliver on this promise of existential fulfilment in terms of providing enduring satisfaction, this failure is not itself problematic, but rather constitutive and essential both to the capitalist project and to our enjoyment of it. In Kapoor’s words (2014: 1129): “if an end to dissatisfaction were possible, that would spell the end of the global capitalist system.” In order to clarify, how we can continue enjoying something that never fully delivers on its promise, but instead offers newer and newer failed attempts at providing satisfaction, it should be recalled that enjoyment is an unconscious process, that provides pleasure (for lack of a better word) precisely through the failure of delivery, or as McGowan (2004: 7) would put it: “the barrier to enjoyment is essential to the experience of it. In fact, what we enjoy is the barrier itself.” In other words: the willingness to share in the capitalist fantasy is a result of the enjoyment that the participation provides. However, that enjoyment is not a direct consequence of a fulfilment of desire, but it is rather derived from committing an act of transgression against the (moral) law (or super-ego) through excessive indulgence in consumerism and materialism.

For Žižek (1997) and Kapoor (2014), one of the constitutive parts of the capitalist fantasy is the notion that capitalism can (at least in theory) bring its own fantasy to life. Žižek (1997: 46) claims that in spite of an increasing number of exceptions (in forms of various excluded, subjugated, exploited and disenfranchised groups) – symptoms of the system, the immanent logic of capitalism is that “through appropriative measures ... this ‘exception[s]’ could be – in the long term and in principle, at least – abolished.” However, in psychoanalytic terms, when dealing with universalizing or totalizing principles, such as the ideal of universal social inclusion, human rights, equality (égaliberté) and continuous progress through liberal-capitalist modes of socio-economic organisation, the symptom is not something that could (or should) be abolished. It is rather an element which “has to remain an exception, that is, the point of suspension of the universal principle: if the universal principle were to apply also to this point, the universal system itself would disintegrate” (Žižek 1997: 46). Drawing on Hegel’s Philosophy of Right, Žižek (1997: 46) discusses how today’s “‘exceptions’ – the homeless, the ghettoized, the permanently unemployed – are the symptom of the late capitalist universal system, a growing and permanent reminder of how the immanent logic of capitalism works.”
The issue of various excluded and disenfranchised groups brings up Kapoor’s (2014) second and third points of discussion – that is the persistence of nationalism and racism and the role of enjoyment in their perpetuation. For Kapoor (2014: 1130):

nationalism operates at the libidinal level (i.e. at the level of our ‘guts’, hearts, affect), engaging our sense of belonging, community and pride. It relies on the (fantasmatic) promise of full enjoyment, which once again helps to explain the secret of its persistence.

Bridging the postcolonial scholarship of Fanon (1963, 1967) and psychoanalysis of Žižek (1989), Kapoor (2014: 1130) argues that the success of the nation building process depends on a particular nation’s capacity to construct itself as “unique”. For Kapoor (ibid.) it is this “uniqueness that provides people with an ecstatic sense of unity and togetherness (i.e. jouissance).” In a manner, similar to the arguments proposed by Thobani (2007) and Bhabha (1994), presented in Subchapters 3.1.3 and 3.2.1, and other scholars from postcolonial, feminist and critical race theory, Kapoor (ibid.) considers the process of the construction of a nation as largely dependent upon “scapegoating” the Other (non-members of the nation). In psychoanalytic terms the very idea of national identity and togetherness is fictitious “masking the lack and instability at the heart of every identity” (Kapoor 2014: 1130). Thus, when “things go wrong and this sense of national togetherness is threatened ... scapegoating allows the nation to avoid confronting its own inadequacies or contradictions by projecting them onto a stereotypical Other” (ibid.).

Further, for Kapoor (2014: 1130) the racialized nature of relationship between White people and people of colour is constructed upon the Fanonian premise of ‘White man’ as the “universal subject or master signifier” to the extent that “being Black (or a person of colour) is only meaningful in relation to whiteness.” Similar to other post-colonial and critical race authors, albeit through the Lacanian conceptualization of lack, Kapoor (ibid.) contends that “whiteness has been constructed as the promise of being less lacking, that is more human and more whole.” For Kalpana Sheshadri-Crooks (2002: 4) – another source of influence for Kapoor, whiteness refers to:

a master signifier (without a signified) that establishes a structure of relations, a signifying chain that through a process of inclusions and exclusions constitutes a pattern for organizing human difference. This chain provides
subjects with certain symbolic positions such as “black,” “white,” “Asian,” etc., in relation to the master signifier. “Race,” in other words, is a system of categorization that once it has been organized shapes human difference in certain seemingly predetermined ways.

Due to constructed or perceived superiority, with which the concept of whiteness is imbued, both people of colour and white people, according to Sheshadri-Crooks (2002), (unconsciously) desire whiteness, regardless of whether they consider race to be a mere social construction or not. The racialized nature of whiteness:

offers the prestige of being better and superior; it is the promise of being more human, more full, less lacking. The possibility of this enjoyment is at the core of “race.” But enjoyment or jouissance is, we may recall, pure unpleasure. The possibility of enjoyment held out by Whiteness is also horrific as it implies the annihilation of difference. (Sheshadri-Crooks 2002: 7).

In relation to the subject of difference it would make sense to recall Bhabha’s (1984, 1994) concept of ambivalence (discussed in Subchapter 3.1.3) between the self and the Other, which refers to a constant interplay of positive and negative stereotypes about the Other, with the equality of Other considered as the most terrifying threat to the (constructed) superiority of the self. When the Other begins to be perceived as a threat to the superiority of the (white) self, the Other becomes a potential target of annihilation (in Sheshadri-Crooks). Kapoor (2014) turns to Žižek and his association of racist/racialized enjoyment with envy, to discuss the complex relationship between affirmation/construction of difference (as a source of racialized enjoyment) and the need for its annihilation (because of its potential threat to narratives of superiority).

In this regard, Žižek and Kapoor could be interpreted as drawing attention to the possibility that not only do we take pleasure in the direct material benefits of capitalism, but we also enjoy the effects of its violence, such as the sense of superiority, sovereignty, innocence and control. In this regard we have a vested interest in hierarchies of humanity and culture, manifested through nationalist and racist tendencies, obscured by multiculturalist rhetoric, but enacted in capitalism’s name.

Similarly, Appadurai (2006) argues that when the Other is perceived to enjoy something he or she does not deserve, in a context where the nation state is perceived to be threatened, ethnocidal tendencies emerge. Appadurai argues that the narratives of the nation depend on two tenets; the homogeneity of the ethnos and
the sovereignty of the nation state. When financial capitalism threatens the sovereignty of the nation state, creating a context for austerity, deregulation and loss of perceived entitlements; and when immigration threatens the perceived homogeneity of the ethnos, immigrants and ‘cultural traitors’ are scapegoated as the source of the problem.

Further, the implications of psychoanalytical insight could also be interpreted in a way that suggests that not only our enjoyment, but also our critiques of the system (e.g. Žižek’s example of anti-war protests) are already circumscribed by our unconscious attachments to our futurity in the system, to the continuity of the system as it is. Said by Kapoor (2014: 1127):

What psychoanalysis adds to the postmodern understanding of binary construction [of global North vs. global South] is the dimension of the Real, which shows up here in the form of the blind spot – the element of self-limitation that one cannot really come to terms with, so one averts it by (unconsciously) projecting it onto the Other.

Although psychoanalytical insights, such as those of Žižek and Kapoor, could be seen as significantly enriching the debate on the nature of relationship between the (liberal) modern subject and the Other, especially through a post-colonial optic, it should be noted that this theory is not without its shortcomings. Some of its central propositions, such as the Oedipus complex, the invariably masculinized nature of both Lacanian and Freudian subject and the lack of attention given to its embodied nature, have been subject to much critique by various feminist (e.g. Braidotti 1994, 2013, Grosz 1994, 2002, Irigaray 1985a, 1985b, 1993) and post-structuralist authors (e.g. Deleuze & Guattari 1983, 1987) who argue for a more complex exploration of the relationship between the subject, the body, and consequently the emergence of lack and desire. However, as a comprehensive critique of psychoanalytical theory (be it of Freud, Lacan or Žižek) far exceeds the scope of this work, the final part of this subchapter focuses on the work of David Jefferess (2002, 2008, 2012), whose work could be considered as exemplifying how lack (a key Lacanian concept) – that although useful in terms of illustrating the construction of social/racialized hierarchies – runs the risk of reproducing the narratives about the Other as permanently (more) lacking.20 Although Jefferess

20 In Jefferess’s work, lack is not used as psychoanalytical concept, rather he explores how the Other is constructed as permanently lacking and in need of salvation and help from the benevolent and charitable (Canadian) subject. In this regard we could observe how the very idea that this (primordial) lack exists contributes to the creation of social and racialized hierarchies where some are seen as more lacking than
does not argue for a critique of the psychoanalytical concept of lack, he discusses how discourses of benevolence, charity and on the other hand lack, as well as marginalization, or even barbarism, operate in conjuncture, self-constituting each other.

The issue of projected narratives about the Other (also discussed by other authors, presented in this and in previous subchapters), has been taken up by Jefferess through the analysis of media, such as documentary films (Jefferess 2011), news media representations of external Others (Jefferess 2002), global citizenship policy (2008) and the work of charitable social enterprises (2012). In his article on the popular Canadian social enterprise Me to We, Jefferess (2012) explores the notion of lack in its double dimension. On one side, the Other is presented through the narratives by the founders of this movement presented as constantly lacking. Thus for instance countries in Africa and their social problems, such as poverty, are presented as the Other’s lack, lacking development, government support, education, health care and other aspects of development. This framing of lack obscures historic, (colonial) economic and political reasons that have contributed significantly to the current inequalities and injustices and continue to reproduce them. In this way Jefferess’ work could be seen as related to the problem of willful ignorance and autoimmunity, discussed in Subchapter 3.2.2.

However, Jefferess also explores how a different kind of lack is attributed to the Canadian young people, involved in the Me to We enterprise, by the founders of the project. Drawing on the works of Ahmed (2010) and Chouliaraki (2010), Jefferess (2012: 21) argues that acts of benevolence, charity, and of “making a difference” provide a “means of being: good, happy or fulfilled.” In this regard personal happiness (the filling of lack) is achieved by altruistic behaviour:

benevolent action is marketed as the source of fulfilment; people make the sacrifice of giving to others not because they are compelled to or because they feel guilty, but because it gives them pleasure. (Jefferess 2012: 21).

Jefferess’ critique thus seems to suggest that what are often perceived as altruistic gestures, benefvolent in their visible manifestations, are promoted by the founders and often understood and represented by the participants in the Me to We programmes as a tool for personal growth and fulfilment, where personal happiness

other others. While for instance Sheshadri-Crooks (2002), Kapoor (2014), Žižek (1997) and other authors have explored out how and why these hierarchies are constructed, less attention has been devoted to how the concept of lack (be it psychoanalytical or not) is constitutive of the hierarchies they are critiquing.
(rather than struggle against systemic or structural injustices) is seen as the ultimate goal of the endeavour:

By lamenting what they call the “rich-but-poor phenomenon,” the Kielburgers present the materially privileged as having an obligation to be happy, which, ostensibly can (only) be achieved through philanthropy, and more specifically by affiliation with “Me to We”. The Kielburgers’ council that “happiness comes not so much from achieving your goals as from having the right ones.” ... Like other individualized discourses of therapy and moral progression, the sort of change that the “Me to We” style promises is centred on the personal and the self rather than systems or structures. (Jefferess 2012: 21–22).

The founders of Me to We thus seem to be cognizant of or subscribe to a view that recognizes a certain existential lack, or “existential poverty” (Andreotti 2016: 3), yet this lack this is not interpreted as resulting from alienation due to (excessive) privilege or a commodified existential orientation, but rather as resulting from a lack of the chance to exercise a philanthropic agency that would lead to personal self-realization and thus happiness. For Jefferess (2012: 19) the appeal of the Me to We enterprise is dependent on “corporate-consumer affiliation and ..., the autonomous individual subject who is distinguished by their desire to transcend affluence without giving it up.” In this regard, the celebration of personal goodness and benevolence is seen as the remedy for the felt existential emptiness (Kielburger & Kielburger, cited in Jefferess 2012: 25): “A sure sign of a successful project is that it’s enjoyable. So make it fun and celebrate, celebrate, celebrate your achievements.”

The example of the Me to We enterprise is not Jefferess’ only venture into exploring how notions of benevolence, compassion and kindness are related to the construction of narratives about Canada and its people – always in relation to its ‘external’ Other. In his documentary analysis, Jefferess (2012) extends Thobani’s (2007) discussion on the construction of white supremacy through narratives of tolerance and respect (presented in Subchapter 3.1.3), and argues that benevolence is more than just a concept related to whiteness, but is above all a “signature of modernity” in the sense that “tolerance and pluralism can also be seen as associated with a sense of the modern that is not always confined to whiteness/Westernness” (Jefferess 2012: 91). For Jefferess (ibid.), benevolence is one of the key tenets of modern subjects that articulates “the recognition of the dignity of the unfortunate Other as human – not regardless of race, but as if the history of race and racism does not exist.” In this regard benevolent agency could be seen as kind of safeguard
mechanism that forecloses the opening of troubling and disturbing narratives about past and present systemic injustices and that in “the recognition of one’s complicity in a structure that produces inequality; rather than fortune, one must recognize how they are a beneficiary of a system” (Jefferess 2012: 24). Further, it could be argued that modern notions of benevolence as the charitable behaviour of the privileged against the exploited echoes the classical liberal and racialized notion of the (uncivilized) Other that needs to be helped and improved by any means possible, as discussed in Subchapter 3.2.1.

Affirming the importance of acknowledging complicity in terms of breaking with such notions of the Other, as well as with “seemingly straightforward accounts of resistance and domination” Fiona Probyn-Rapsey (2007: 65) explores how complicity could be re-thought “as a methodology, as a practice and theory of ethical engagement with others” in ways that would shift critical vocabularies “towards a more tangled sideways reading of complicity as a condition of relations and encounters between Others.” For Probyn-Rapsey (2007: 80) complicity has the capacity to “disable oppositional conviction oriented critique because of the complex interrelationships it brings about”, which could be read as suggesting that acknowledgement of complicity has the potential to open different, more complex horizons of (critical) engagement that move both beyond paternalistic/colonial discourse and identity-based, oppositional critique. In her understanding complicity “points to a critic’s proximity to colonialism rather than separation from it” (Probyn-Rapsey 2007: 78), which necessarily complexifies the role of critical theory (and engagement) as the recognition of complicity, does not necessarily mean that “the critic gains proximity to all Others ... they may well be further separated by it, rather than joined together in a kind of community of the complicit.”

The subject of complicity takes us back to the questions of the difficultness in addressing personal and collective attachments and investments in racialized hierarchies of privilege and power, on which our positive-self-image (Jefferess 2012), our material benefits (Kapoor 2014) and the very existence of our racialized social communities (Balibar 1991) depend. While Kapoor (2014) and Žižek (1997) argue that we cannot transcend capitalism, because we enjoy it – both its direct material benefits and its violence – Jefferess (2012) extends their argument and discusses how the pleasure principle is at work also in (seemingly) benevolent behaviour and the unwillingness to give up one’s privilege (desire to transcend affluence without giving it up). However, there seems to be more than Žižekian enjoyment (and pleasure) that make genuinely disruptive/critical gestures very difficult, if not impossible in modern capitalist societies. McAllan (2014) and
Tuana (2006), whose work was presented in Subchapter 3.2.2, argued that willful ignorance and autoimmunity are actively maintained processes that prevent us from knowing that, which we do not want to know. Alternatively, it could be argued that such stances are indicative of the fact that, on a sub-conscious or semi-conscious level, we already know quite well the things we pretend not to know. McAllan (2014) specifically emphasized fear and guilt as being the main driving forces that sustain the autoimmune processes, while the work of Probyn-Rapsey (2007) could be seen as indicative of deeper challenges, related to the subject of the recognition of complicity, whereby gestures of recognition are not seen as automatically translatable into relations that would transcend the colonizer/colonized (self/Other) dichotomy. The authors, presented in various subchapters of this chapter (including Bhabha, Thobani and others) could thus be seen as illustrating different perspectives on a very wide range of unconscious attachments, investments and other mechanisms that make it very difficult (if not impossible) for us to disruptively engage with structures that make possible their perpetuation.

Drawing on the work of the authors, presented in this chapter, there will be a discussion of exceptionalist articulations that could be found in students’ open-ended responses, utilising a form of AWESOME social cartography that constitutes the larger part of Chapter 7. While the list of various exceptionalist traits and discursive characteristics, observable in students’ answers, and joined together under the acronym AWESOME, is neither exhaustive nor definitive, it is used in this research as an analytical tool that attempts to both capture the main concerns (and conceptual work) of the authors, presented in this chapter, and the realities of the students’ responses. The seven main attributes/traits that were identified, are thus: Auto-immunity; Willful ignorance; Exaltedness; Subtle racism; Opportunist inclusion; Minimization of issues; and Extraction/consumption of otherness, or AWESOME. The outline of the AWESOME social cartography, used in this research, concludes this theoretical chapter. Chapter 4, dedicated specifically to methodology, presents the mixed methods methodology of EIHE and discusses the use of social cartographies as a research methodology.

21 The method of social cartography is presented in more detail in Subchapter 4.2, while the uses of social cartography in this research are discussed specifically in Subchapter 4.2.5.
4 Methodology

This chapter presents the methodological framework for this research. The chapter is divided into two main subchapters. The first subchapter discusses the mixed methods approach to research in social sciences, drawing on the work of Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) and critical considerations on the subject of mixed methods by Gert Biesta (2010). The first subchapter also introduces the survey questionnaire and discusses which methods were used to analyse specific segments of the questionnaire and the rationale for their choice. The second subchapter introduces the method of social cartography as the main method for the analysis of the qualitative data in this study and the corresponding visualisation of the results. The second subchapter introduces the works of Rolland Paulston (1994, 1996, 1999, Paulston & Liebman 1994, 1996) as the main originator of social cartography, before proceeding to discussing the recent post-representational debate in cartography (see Crampton 2003, Kitchin et al. 2011). The concluding subchapter discusses how social cartography is used in this research, and how it was used in the broader EIHE project. The methodology, presented in this chapter was developed in coherence with methodological demands of the main research questions and sub questions, presented below.

The main research questions of the study are:

1. How are liberal, neoliberal and critical discursive orientations articulated in the responses of students of 7 Canadian universities to qualitative questions?
2. How are exceptionalist assumptions and tendencies contested and/or reproduced in students’ responses?

Sub questions related to the main questions are:

a) What is the frequency of the three main discursive orientations (liberal, neoliberal, critical) and their interstices in the qualitative data? Which orientations dominate the discourse, which are represented to a lesser degree and which are absent?

b) How are exceptionalist assumptions and tendencies articulated or contested differently within three main discursive orientations (liberal, neoliberal, critical) and their interstices? Which attributes are present in the data and which are absent?
c) Which exceptionalist tendencies and assumptions could be found across the spectrum of orientations and which are re-articulated only in some, but contested or absent in others?

Before proceeding to discussing the methodology used to explore these questions, I would like to clarify how some of the key terms such as discourse, discursive orientation and articulation are understood in this text. Drawing on Paulston’s (1996) and more significantly on Weedon’s (1987) interpretation of (Foucauldian) discourse, the latter is here understood as:

ways of constituting knowledge, together with the social practices, forms of subjectivity and power relations which inhere in such knowledges and relations between them. Discourses are more than ways of thinking and producing meaning. They constitute the ‘nature’ of the body, unconscious and conscious mind and emotional life of the subjects they seek to govern. (Weedon 1987: 108).

Due to an understanding of discourse as more than just systems of thought, but as also as ways of constituting knowledge whose influence extends for Weedon (ibid.) also to the unconscious mind and to the emotional life of subjects, this research adopts a psychoanalytical reading of the text, grounded in the works of the authors presented in the previous chapter (e.g. Bhabha 1994, Jefferess 2012, Kapoor 2014, Thobani 2007, Žižek 1991, 1997) in order to explore what kinds of unconscious motives, desires, and personal attachments could be considered as driving some of the specific articulations.

Discursive orientations (introduced in Subchapter 2.1.4.) are understood here as specific kinds (or categories) of discourse (liberal, neoliberal, critical) that were first conceptualized within the EIHE project, following a preliminary literature and policy review and later observed in the students’ responses. The term ‘articulation’ refers to concrete examples of discursive orientations and/or exceptionalist tendencies. It refers to concrete students’ responses (their text), in which different exceptionalist tendencies or traits could be either manifest expressed or merely implied.

4.1 Mixed methods approach

This research adopts a mixed methods approach to research, as outlined and argued for by Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004). Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004: 14)
argue for mixed methods research as “the natural complement to traditional qualitative and quantitative research.” They consider a mixed methods approach as bridging the gap between paradigmatic differences between qualitative and quantitative research. They also advocate an approach that should be mindful of certain similarities between both of these paradigms, insofar as both methodologies describe data, construct explanatory arguments and “speculate about why the outcomes they observed happened as they did” (Sechrest & Sidani, cited in Johnson & Onwuegbuzie 2004: 15). Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (ibid.) argue that because today’s research world is “becoming increasingly interdisciplinary, complex and dynamic”, researchers today need a solid understanding of various research methods and need to develop a capacity to use them in mutually complementary ways, in order to “facilitate communication, promote collaboration and to provide superior research.” They argue for a pragmatic, non-purist (in the sense of methodological monism), question-driven approach to research where “researchers mix and match design components that offer the best chance of answering their specific questions.” For Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004: 15):

> differences in epistemological beliefs (such as a difference in beliefs about the appropriate logic of justification) should not prevent a qualitative researcher from utilizing data collection methods more typically associated with quantitative research, and vice versa.

In their critique of positivist reductionism, they (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie 2004: 16) adopt a post-positivist stance that considers “the conduct of fully objective and value-free research” a “myth, even though the regulatory ideal of objectivity can be a useful one.” They equally renounce a stance of strong (or absolute) relativism and argue instead in favour of a “soft relativist” position that for them (ibid.) “refers to a respect and interest in understanding and depicting individual and social group differences (i.e., their different perspectives) and a respect for democratic approaches to group opinion and value selection.” In terms of qualitative research, they (ibid.) list several potential problems resulting from researchers’ tendencies to inscribe their own “highly idiosyncratic opinions ... into a report”, not paying “due attention to providing an adequate rationale for interpretation of their data” and not subjecting their qualitative methods of analysis to “public inspection.”

In an attempt to keep Johnson’s and Onwuegbuzie’s concerns in mind, this research hopes to address them by explicating in detail the research methods used

---

22 Biesta’s (2010) critique about the use of term paradigm is presented below.
and to provide specific logic and analytical matrices related to each of the 4 open-ended (qualitative) questions that are analysed. In this chapter a general methodological interpretative matrix for qualitative data is presented in Subchapter 4.2.5, with Subchapters 4.2.1–4.2.3 explicating in detail the method of social cartography as the central methodological tool for the analysis of qualitative data and presentation of results. Question specific analytical (interpretative) matrices are presented in Chapter 6, before the analysis of answers to each of the four open-ended questions. Apart from subjecting this research to a standard process of examination, valid for a PhD thesis, the summary of the research (including methodology and samples of interpretation of results) was sent to EIHE project partners, specifically to the group of scholars that work in Canadian universities, in order to receive feedback and to check if the interpretations, presented here, are considered as well grounded and relevant also in the research community.

Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004: 17–18) further argue that what makes the mixed methods research specific – compared to other kinds of research that are centred around a specific method and/or epistemology, is the primacy of the research question in dictating the choice of appropriate method(ologie)s that offer the best chance to “obtain useful answers.” In this regard, Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004: 17) refer to mixed methods research as:

the class of research where the researcher mixes or combines quantitative and qualitative research techniques, methods, approaches, concepts or language into a single study. Philosophically, it is the “third wave” or third research movement, a movement that moves past the paradigm wars by offering a logical and practical alternative. Philosophically, mixed research makes use of the pragmatic method and system of philosophy.

Drawing on Johnson and Turner (2003) they propose that the fundamental principle of mixed methods research is related to the capacity of the researcher to “collect multiple data using different strategies, approaches, and methods in such a way that the resulting mixture or combination is likely to result in complementary strengths and non-overlapping weaknesses” (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie 2004: 17). For them (ibid.) “the effective use of this principle is a major source of justification for mixed methods research because the product will be superior to monomethod studies.” The following paragraphs present first what kind of data was available for analysis and then describe the logic behind the choice of different methods used to analyse it in an attempt to provide the necessary methodological justification.
4.1.1 Presentation of the questionnaire and mixed methods, used in this research

As mentioned initially, the data for this research was obtained through the EIHE research project that featured six different modes of inquiry, of which the student survey on the internationalization of higher education (N=1451) was one of them.\textsuperscript{23} Although the survey was not developed specifically with the purpose of studying (Canadian) exceptionalism the answers to four open-ended questions provided ample example of text for exploring articulations of exceptionalism. However, as the survey featured different parts, with both qualitative and quantitative data, a comprehensive analysis necessitated the use of different methods for analysis. An overview of the structure of the questionnaire is presented below, while the full questionnaire is available in the appendix.

Part A of the questionnaire featured three sets of questions related to the students’ views on the social role of higher education and the internationalization of higher education. Answers in part A were of multiple-choice type and in total 92 variables. Separated in these, three major sets were available for analysis. The first set asked the students the extent to which they agreed/disagreed with various statements related to: a) importance of universities to wider society, b) opportunities offered to students by the internationalization of universities and c) potential challenges that the internationalization of universities poses. The second set asked the students which items they consider important for their field of study or academic discipline. This set also included three subsets, related to: a) skills and dispositions relevant to their field of study, b) global themes relevant to their field of study and c) social and political issues relevant to their field of study. The third and final set asked the students what kinds of learning they value in their courses and contained no subsets.

Part B of the questionnaire featured questions related to students’ demographics, such as age and gender, family origin, first language, minority affiliation and previous experiences with travel and diversity in their social milieu. Part B (like part A) also contained quantitative data.

Part C featured four open-ended questions on the topics of the effect of internationalization on society, perceptions on and idea(les) of global citizenship, potential challenges for international students and students with diverse backgrounds at their institution and the value of diversity in their university

\textsuperscript{23} See Subchapter 2.1.1 for more details.
experience. The answers to these four questions represent the qualitative data that was available for analysis.

Although the main purpose of this research is to explore different articulations of Canadian exceptionalism in students’ responses and how these articulations manifest themselves in three main different discursive orientations (liberal, neoliberal, critical) and their interstices, quantitative data was also analysed with the purpose of providing the necessary (social and personal) background context of the students, who participated in the survey. In this regard it was both the research questions and the nature of data that necessitated the choice of a mixed methods approach. Quantitative data from Part A and Part B of the questionnaire was analysed using standard statistical methods for analysis and comparison (SPSS software), while qualitative data from part C was analysed using both critical/poststructuralist discourse analysis of social cartography (presented in more detail in Subchapter 4.2.5) and using complementary quantification processes that enabled some general comparison between representation rates of different orientations and their interstices. The quantification process itself is explained in more detail in Subchapter 4.2.5.

4.1.2 (Critical) reflections on the position of this research in the mixed methods debate

Although Johnson’s and Onwuegbuzie’s conceptualization of mixed methods approach presents the overall framework of this approach within this research, Biesta’s (2010) work on pragmatism and philosophical foundations of mixed methods research provides some further conceptual clarity related to mainstream understandings of mixed methods research, such as the one proposed above. Biesta (2010: 96) argues that while “the pragmatic justification for a mixed methods approach is fairly unproblematic”, since it is related to utility of means or methods used for research, “things become more complicated when the claim for everyday pragmatism is taken as an argument for philosophical pragmatism to the extent that the latter is seen as the philosophical ‘paradigm’ for mixed methods research.”

Biesta argues that apart from Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, other key authors in mixed methods research, such as Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998, 2010), seem to champion the idea that philosophical pragmatism should be seen as providing the necessary philosophical grounding for mixed methods research. Drawing extensively on Dewey (and other scholars of philosophical pragmatism), (Biesta 2010: 97) argues that pragmatism (understood as philosophical pragmatism) above
all “should not be understood as a philosophical position ..., but rather as a set of philosophical tools that can be used to address problems.” Biesta (ibid.) sees one of the key problems in this regard in Dewey’s contention is that in philosophical pragmatism, one of the central concepts is that “engagement in philosophical activity should be done to address problems, not to build systems.”

For this reason, Biesta (2010: 97) argues that philosophical pragmatism cannot be considered as “a paradigmatic underpinning or wholesale justification of mixed methods research, but rather a set of insights that can help us to have a more precise discussion about the strengths and weaknesses of mixed methods approaches.” In an attempt to add more nuance and precision to the debate on a mixed methods approach, Biesta argues that it is important to clear out some conceptual inconsistencies and confusion, related to the way the mixed methods approach is usually conceptualized. He (Biesta 2010: 98–99) talks of “unhelpful concepts” used in the mixed methods theory that are in his opinion not precise enough, and thus could due their lack of precision lead to potential misunderstandings and increased (unnecessary) conflict between representatives of different “paradigms” – a concept he likewise problematizes. Biesta (2010: 98) argues that the very distinction between qualitative and quantitative research is a problematic (or an unhelpful) one:

The simple problem here is that research in itself can be neither qualitative nor quantitative; only data can properly be said to be qualitative or quantitative. Data can either be quantities (expressed in numbers) or qualities (usually expressed in text, although numbers can be used to stand for qualities as well). The problem is that in many discussions, the notions of qualitative research and quantitative research stand for much more than just the kind of data being used.

For Biesta (ibid.) such distinctions are not merely imprecise, but “unhelpful”, because the arguments between proponents of different approaches are “precisely not [about] the nature of the data being used but bigger issues such as views about the nature of reality, the limits of knowledge, or the purpose and politics of research.” In relation to that Biesta is also critical of the use of the term paradigm and positivism that are often used in ways that suggest clustering different approaches that do not necessarily fit together, and suggest adherence exclusively to one approach (or paradigm) and/or are used pejoratively, neither of which could be in Biesta’s (2010: 99) terms seen as contributing to a “meaningful discussion,” mostly due to the imprecision of their use. In order to circumvent these problems, Biesta
proposes to look at seven different levels in the debate on the mixed methods research, related to data, methods, design, epistemology, ontology, purposes of research and practical roles of research. In the following paragraphs I discuss this research through/with Biesta (2010) in order to explicate in detail its situatedness in the mixed methods debate.

On the subject of data, Biesta (2010: 101) suggests that a mixed methods approach would simply make use of both numbers and text, which this research does. Discussing methods, Biesta proposes that a mixed methods approach refers to both data collection and data interpretation. For this standpoint a mixed methods approach would, for instance, use statistical tools to analyse questionnaires and interpretative approaches to analyse data obtained through interviews. Since the survey data available here features both multiple choice and open-ended answers and both kinds of answers were analysed using different methods (statistical analysis and discourse analysis), it could be classified as mixed methods research in that regard.

Regarding research design Biesta (2010: 101) makes a distinction between “interventionalist” and “non-interventionalist designs”, of which experimental designs fall into the first category and naturalistic designs into the second. Biesta argues that from a pragmatic perspective a combination of the two approaches is not in itself problematic, as long it is clearly defined which parts of the research follow one approach and which the other. However, he raises doubts whether it is at all possible to make a clear-cut distinction between the two, arguing that from the point of view of philosophical pragmatism only interventionalist designs are possible. In light of Sousa Santos’s argument (2015: 201) that all knowledge is situated, partial, provisional and insufficient, and should thus be considered not in the sense of “knowledge-as-a-representation-of-reality” but instead as “knowledge-as-an-intervention-in-reality” and further in the light of my ambition to use social cartography as a post-representational tool this research adopts an interventionalist stance, although I would not necessarily consider the very basic statistical analysis (such as for instance, age and gender distribution) as interventionalist.24 Further, Since Sousa Santos’s work had inspired the EIHE project team since the very beginning, it would be possible to argue that such a generally interventionalist stance or understanding was present also at the time of developing the survey. However, this research is considered here as interventionalist, only in the sense that it joins Biesta’s argument that essentially non-interventionalist approaches are not

---

24 The subject of post-representational social cartography is discussed in more detail in Subchapter 4.2.2.
really possible. It should however not be taken as interventionalist in the sense that
the survey intended to provide a stimulus that would provoke (or not) a certain
response from the students. No such intentions were made, although every survey
necessarily through its structure and language influences its own results.

At the level of epistemology, Biesta (2010: 101–102) makes several nuanced
comments about what is for him an impossible incompatibility of different
epistemological approaches (within one study). Rather than solving the dilemma
between objectivist and subjectivist approaches, Biesta proposes that we should
look at the question of epistemology separately when examining the design of the
research and the justification of one’s research. Biesta (2010: 101) offers a
practical example by suggesting that we should not assume that “research which
uses numbers is necessarily ... objectivist.” Although Biesta provides compelling
arguments why objectivist and subjectivist approaches are incompatible, I would
consider this research as adopting a position that, although considers processes of
knowledge production as necessarily partial, situated, provisional and insufficient,
it attempts to ground its interpretation of results in as much theoretical foundation
as possible, with the purpose of perhaps not providing objectivity, but at least
consistency and plurality of interpretation – as contestable as that of course may
be. Whether that violates the “principle of incompatibility” (Biesta 2010: 102) is
open to discussion.

On the subject of ontological assumptions, Biesta (2010: 102) makes a similar
distinction to the one on the subject of epistemology. For Biesta (ibid.) two main
groups of ontological assumptions could be categorized as belonging to either those
associated with a “mechanistic ontology” and those associated with a “social
ontology”, where the first assumes a deterministic perspective of the world of cause
and effect, while the second one sees the world as a “world of meaning and
interpretation.” Biesta argues that the main implication for research of these two
ontologies lies in their focus on either causes of certain actions or events or on their
meaning. Drawing on complexity theory, Biesta (2010: 103) argues that
deterministic causality “is likely to occur only in small, closed systems”, rather than
in more complex and open, such as biological and social ones. In this regard this
research is certainly interested in the meaning and interpretation of students’
responses, however it also aims to explore the (non-deterministic, non-physical)

25 I assume here that Johnson’s and Onwuegbuzie’s (2004: 16) spectrum of strong vs. soft relativism
could be seen as outlining broadly the same stance(s), as Biesta’s spectrum of approaches that emphasize
that all knowledge holds at least some subjective element to it.
causes – in the sense of personal and collective investments in exceptionalist tendencies that are articulated through the answers. Similarly to the discussion on epistemology above, I believe it is open to interpretation whether such an approach could be seen as adopting ontological stances that are incommensurable, or whether perhaps the line between mechanistic and social ontologies (let alone any other) is not as clearly definable as it would seem at the first sight.

Regarding purposes of research, Biesta (2010: 103–104) differentiates between what he calls “research that seeks to explain and research that seeks to understand.” The first attempts to “identify causes, factors, or correlations, and through this, generate knowledge that can be used to influence the course of future events,” while the second aims to “generate understanding through an articulation of the intentions and reasons for action” (Biesta 2010: 104). Although Biesta suggests that the purposes of research should be considered separately from the discussion on ontology, I think that in certain ways this research is likewise positioned in a similarly ambiguous place to the discussion on ontology above, where it aims to understand, while looking also for causes that are not of a deterministic nature. Biesta himself outlines such a possibility, suggesting we need interpretation to make sense of correlations that we find, thus advocating a need for a social rather than mechanistic ontology.

Finally, Biesta (2010: 104) also discusses the practical role of research, where he discusses the relationship between research and practice, and more specifically on how research translates or transforms itself into practice. Biesta (ibid.) proposes a distinction between research that aims to provide “means, techniques and technologies that practitioners can use to achieve their ends” and research “that provides practitioners with different ways of seeing and understanding practice.” Biesta (ibid.) refers to the first as technical and to the other as the cultural role of research, by which these two are not necessarily clearly delineated in the sense that a research that brings a deeper understanding can likewise contribute to a (perhaps even larger) change in practice. Again, the intention of this research is by no means to provide any practical guidance or suggestions for change, but rather to attempt precisely “a different way of seeing.” This different way of seeing should help us to frame our common sense as potentially reflecting something that we may not be aware of. How such a different view may be potentially developed through the use of social cartography is discussed in the next subchapter.
4.2 Social cartography

This subchapter introduces the concept of social cartography (Paulston 1994, Paulston & Liebman 1994), its multiple uses, and possible interpretations. The conceptual discussion is followed by a presentation on how social cartography was used in the EIHE project (Andreotti et al. 2016) and how the EIHE general social cartography is used in this research for the purpose of mapping different discursive orientations in students’ answers. This subchapter is concluded with the presentation of the AWESOME cartography that was developed specifically for this research as a performative tool that aims to open up debate on re-articulation and contestation of Canadian exceptionalism as mapped in the students’ responses.

4.2.1 Paulston’s social cartography

The conceptualization of social cartography owes the most to the work of Rolland Paulston (1993, 1994, 1996, 1999, 2000) and his colleague Martin Liebman (Liebman & Paulston 1994, Paulston & Liebman 1994, 1996) that sought not only to theorize social cartography, but also developed very comprehensive, divergent and elaborate maps of various theoretical and paradigmatic orientations that they found to be operating with the field of comparative and international education (Paulston & Liebman 1994: 224).26

Drawing heavily on the work of critical cartographers, such as Harley (1988, 1989) and Soja (1989), Paulston sought to ingrate Foucauldian poststructuralist comparative analysis (Paulston 2000: 5) or his “genealogical approach to pattern texts as theoretical windows opening to multiple realities” (Paulston 1999: 442) into a textual mapping practice that could be used in comparative education.

Paulston and Liebman (1994: 216) understood the postmodern turn (of Foucault and Lyotard) that “calls for deconstructing those universal metanarratives of social valuation common to the modernist era, meta-narratives seen as totalizing, standardizing, and predominating” as an invitation to “comparative fields to expand their knowledge bases through an appropriate, thoughtful, and skilful development and application of social maps.” For Paulston and Liebman (ibid.) the postmodern turn “opens the way to social mapping exercises.”

26 For good examples of complex cartographies see Paulston and Liebman (1994: 224, Fig. 2) or Paulston (1999: 445, Fig. 2).
The impetus for introducing poststructuralist textual analysis into comparative education studies emerged out of an engagement with a concern of developing “a visual dialogue as a way of communicating how we see the social changes developing in the world around us” (Paulston & Liebman 1994: 215). Paulston and Liebman (1994: 215) were thus concerned with the question:

How might comparative researchers enhance the presentation of their findings, particularly when their findings focus on the postmodern diffusion of heterogeneous orientations?

20 years later this question remains as relevant as before, or perhaps even more so due to the increased complexity of different theoretical approaches and orientations that have emerged since. One of the reasons why social cartography was chosen as the general methodological framework of the EIHE project and why it is essential also for this research (the details of both are explained in the subsequent subchapters) is precisely the concern for a better or ‘enhanced’ presentation of the research findings. However, the term ‘findings’ is employed here very tentatively, since the other guiding concern was to gesture a move beyond the representational use of mappings and cartography as much as that might be possible.

Ever since its original conceptualization social cartography has been called upon to perform a very difficult balancing act that necessitates a continuous oscillation between seemingly irreconcilable and opposing demands for ‘enhanced’ or effective, intelligible, sensible presentation of data (that almost by its nature calls for some sort of essentialism and/or objectification) and the poststructuralist / postmodernist insistence on multiple realities, context-dependency, rejection of “universal or hegemonic knowledge” (Paulston 1999: 440), assertion of the “need for critical antihegemonic pluralism”, problematization of “all knowledge claims”, and the subsequent end of objectivity that “reject[s] the basic language and realist assumptions of the modern age” (Paulston 1999: 444).

As shown below Paulston was very cognizant of this dilemma and was quick to spot the contradictions between the message of postmodernist suggestions, and the text the authors used to convey it. This excerpt from Val Rust’s 1991 presidential address that Paulston (Paulston 1999: 444, Paulston & Liebman 1994: 216) took as an entry point for social cartography into comparative education studies, may serve as case in point:

We comparative educators must discuss the opportunities of the incipient age ... We must define more clearly the metanarratives that have driven our field ...
we must engage in the critical task of disassembling those narratives because they define what comparativists find acceptable ... we must increase our attention to small narratives ... we must learn to balance high and popular culture. (Rust, cited in Paulston 1999: 446).

In many ways Rust’s text exemplifies the unavoidable oscillation between determinism/essentialism and deconstruction that can likewise be seen as permeating both Paulston’s work and this research. When Rust suggests that we have to both define more clearly our metanarratives and at the same time disassemble these very narratives his words (perhaps undeliberately) point right at the heart of the problem. In a comment to this text, Paulston (1999: 446) suggests that:

letting go of modernity's language, let alone its essentialist and instrumental vision, is more easily advocated than achieved. Despite the contradictions between his text and his message, Rust's pioneering call to move away from a universal belief system toward a plurality of belief systems remains timely and exciting.

In his work, Paulston can be seen as embracing or playing with both sides of the essentialist/non-essentialist coin. In his more ‘playful or non-essentialist guise’ he proposes that the maps produced using social cartography can be conceptualized as “mental constructs” (Paulston & Liebman 1994: 225) that:

portray the mapper’s perceptions of the social world, locating in it multiple and diverse intellectual communities, leaving to the reader not a truth but a cognitive art, the artist’s scholarship resulting in a cultural portrait.

In this regard Paulston and Liebman’s conceptualization draws on Baudrillard’s (1990) work and proposes that maps are constructs or unique objects that originate in their creator’s knowledge and her/his “perceptions of the social world” (ibid.). However, considered being both (a form of) art and having a life (of their own), maps can be seen as part of Baudrillard’s (cited in Paulston & Liebman 1994: 225) “artistic enterprise”, whereby maps are understood as “descriptive systems consisting of a collection of knowledge objects around a point where forms connect themselves according to an internal rule of play.” In other words, maps could be seen as possessing a form of intrinsic agency that is not completely independent of the intention of the creator (the author) and the reader, but nevertheless transcends both.
Their performative function is enacted through a mutually dependent interaction of this trio and it is not possible for the cartographer to determine (or predict with certainty) how the map will be interpreted by the reader, much like an artist cannot determine the response of the audience to her/his work. In this regard maps speak, in a way similar to how a work of art speaks. An art work’s expressive form is not bound to the artist’s (or cartographer’s) intention and will necessarily elude her/his purpose. If we were to extend this analogy further, it may even be possible to suggest that the quality of art can be seen (to some extent) as manifested precisely in the plurality of responses it provokes, and so may be the quality of the map. To risk a maxim: the more interpretations the map makes possible, the better the map. Of course this applies only to poststructuralist or postmodernist conceptualizations of maps. If we were for instance asked to navigate a ship to a given port, we would certainly choose the map with the smallest possible range of interpretations (or be guided by a satellite navigation system). However, if we wish to sail into the unknown or if we can muster the courage to let the map take us where it wants to ... then such mapping can lead to unknown and uncharted waters.

However, conceptualizing maps as forms of cognitive art, is not the only way Paulston avails of them. In an inverse move, in a flip of the non-essentialist/essentialist coin that would probably surprise Baudrillard himself, Paulston in some of his mappings seems to deliberately forget Baudrillard and artistic interpretations of maps in favour of Foucault, especially when it comes to preparations for robust and analytical discourse mapping that exchanges the open ended road for a very straightforward and linear path.27

However, this straightforwardness and linearity are for Paulston (1999: 452–453) necessary to make visible or to construct Foucauldian heterotopic mapping spaces that are “simultaneously mythic and real spaces of everyday life capable of juxtaposing in a single place a great variety of different sites which in themselves may be incompatible.” The method itself is for Paulston (1999: 453) productive or generative of this space:

[T]his tangled and interconnected mapping, or Deleuzian rhizome, of knowledge positions and relations can be seen as a metaphor of the debate, as

---

27 The pun was completely unintended, but it emerged spontaneously out of reference to Sylvère Lotringer’s (2006) text Forget Baudrillard, that emerged as a response to Baudrillard’s (1976) Forget Foucault, arguably Baudrillard’s most (in)famous in which he harshly criticized Foucault’s work. Again we could observe playfulness in Paulston’s adoption of both Baudrillard and Foucault’s textual analysis – a gesture that would be probably considered an act of heresy by strong advocates of both respective authors.
a heuristic approach, and as a real site of paralogy and postmodern process. It can also be seen as a useful new spatial tool specifically created to give visual form to the growing complexity of knowledge work today. Where Pablo Picasso with analytical cubism made it possible to represent many sides of an object at the same time, social cartography also creates something in the very act of depiction. This is not simply a fragile synthesis, but a new way of looking at the world and, equivalently, a new aspect of the world at which to look.

Paulston was constantly trying to open up multiple interpretations of how maps work and how certain interpretations, or ways of “looking at the world” (ibid.), are rendered (im)possible through the mapping exercise itself. He also explores which discourses or facts are rendered (in)visible and how maps invariably end up misrepresenting that, which they are trying to map. Regardless of such a deconstructivist (post-structuralist, post-modernist) stance, he proposed “to the horror of [his] postmodernist colleagues” a very linear 5-steps “cookbook” approach (Paulston 1999: 453–454) to textual mapping:

1. Choose the issue or debate to be mapped.
2. Select the widest possible range of texts that construct this debate and, with close reading, translate their defining rhetorical characteristics, ideas, and worldviews.
3. Identify the range of positions in the intertextual mix. ...
4. Identify the textual communities that share a way of seeing and communicating reality. ...
5. Field test the map with the individuals or knowledge communities involved. Share the conflicting interpretations and remap as desired.

Paulston’s ‘recipe’ can be taken as a very practical and concise methodological suggestion for mapping different discursive orientations, especially when considered in conjunction with some of his other suggestions, such as that texts need to “be allowed to speak for themselves, to tell with the use of quotes, their own stories” (Paulston 1999: 439), or that the author has to:

explicate what point of view he is using in his study, to disclose the interrelations of the field or site itself, and to convey something of the personal or professional experiences that have led her or him to choose a particular point of view. (Paulston 1999: 454).

Paulston’s normative methodological suggestions may at first sight seem incommensurable with his open-ended conceptualization of maps as “cognitive art”, but his suggestions can be considered problematic only when incommensurability
or irreconcilability themselves are seen as problematic – in the sense that they prevent a “Hegelian synthesis where opposition can be transcended by correct ideas or a more logical argument” (Paulston 1999: 447). Where no such closure is demanded, when consistency in not equated with repetitive sameness, but with a commitment to deeper exploration (of unknown terrain), then incommensurability is not a problem, it is rather a pre-requisite.

In other words, while it would be possible to interpret Paulston’s adoption of incommensurable methods and approaches as a sign of inconsistency between his theoretic conceptualization of social cartography and its practical implementation, it can also be seen as a necessarily imperfect, provisional and contingent, but playful attempt at performing the balancing act of oscillation between representation and deconstruction. His reference to scholars Robin Usher and Richard Edwards (1994) indicates that he had some sympathy for their “ludic or playful approach so as better to avoid creating the monster of a new postmodern metanarrative” (Paulston 1999: 446). For Paulston (ibid.) Usher and Edwards “side with Jacques Derrida in a desire to dissolve binary oppositions, to argue that education like power is neither inherently repressive nor liberatory, but perhaps both-or neither.”

It is perhaps them that capture the challenges of moving to and from representational and deconstructive mappings in finest detail, when they argue for “an education of resistance to disrupt metanarrative power” (Paulston 1999: 467). If there is anything that potentially sets social cartography apart from other methods of inquiry and representation, it is precisely social cartography’s potential to disrupt the metanarratives and to open that which was already thought to be known and defined to multiple re-interpretations and renegotiations – to render the familiar strange. However, we should not forget that the depth of this opening depends on the collaborative effort of the cartographer, the map and reader. If one link is missing, it is very difficult to imagine that the remaining two could somehow accomplish the task on their own.

Before moving further with a discussion on how social cartography might be situated in the broader debate on modern, post-modern and post-representational cartography, I use the words of Usher and Edwards (cited in Paulston 1999: 477) to conclude this subchapter:

[I]t is in disrupting the exercise of power rather than in seeking to overcome it, that resistance can take form. The postmodern moment can enable us to transgress the boundaries of modernity rather than be contained within them.
Resistance and transgressions, rather than emancipation, signify the possibilities for challenging dominant forms of power. It is analogous to Gramsci’s war of manoeuvre rather than the war of attrition. And it is a war without end, a constant refusal of mastery, and of being mastered.

4.2.2 Social cartography and post-representational turn(ings) in social cartography

This subchapter proposes to use the term post-representational turnings, instead of post-representational turn, in order to emphasize that post-representationality could be seen as a plurality of ongoing and never-ending process of re-examining our relations with process(es) of knowledge production as authors/readers of maps/cartographies, rather than as a singular (historic) event (that can be accomplished), and beyond which cartography will become post-representational.

Several authors (e.g. Azócar Fernández & Buchroithner 2014, Casebeer 2016, Kitchin 2008, Kitchin et al. 2011, Pickles 2004), developed different mappings and histories of the cartographic discipline that offer complementary (and broadly similar) views on theoretical orientations and practices within cartography. Being mindful of their respective differences, it seems fair to suggest that there exists an underlying agreement between the authors referenced above, that in general different approaches to cartography could be seen as belonging essentially to three major groups: modern, post-modern and post-representational. Although the subsequent mapping of individual authors within these three over-arching groups is subject to much debate.

In order to proceed with the discussion on the position of social cartography in the broader cartographic debate, I start with a mapping of different orientations in cartography, as proposed by Azócar Fernández and Buchroithner (2014). I then continue with presenting some of the major differences between the modern, post-modern and post-representational orientations, pivoting the discussion around the work of J.B. Harley (1988, 1989, 1990) and the critique surrounding it. I conclude with a discussion on the implications of debate on post-representational cartography for social cartography.

The work of Azócar Fernández and Buchroithner (2014) draws on scholarship of several key authors, such as “Kitchin et. al. (2009) ... Jeremy Crampton, Emanuela Casti and Veronica della Dora” (Azócar Fernández & Buchroithner 2014: 88), and could thus been seen as offering a comprehensive and insightful entry point into the post-representational debate that can help us see the diversity inherent
in cartographic practice and theory. Azócar Fernández and Buchroithner (2014: 89) propose that there are three main groups of conceptualizations of maps in cartography – these are modern, post-modern and post-representational. Authors in the first group consider maps as objective, scientific representations of truth that are transparent and ideologically neutral (Azócar Fernández & Buchroithner 2014: 89). Authors in the second group see maps either as ideologically laden representations or cultural texts (e.g. Harley 1989), as (social) constructions that produce the world (e.g. Wood & Fels 2008), as fluid objects, always in the making, as historical products (e.g. Crampton 2003) or as other forms of non-objective representations (Azócar Fernández & Buchroithner 2014: 89). Authors in the third, post-representational group, see maps as either inscriptions – that is unstable and complex texts (e.g. Pickles 2004), or as spatial practices that do work in the world, or as suites of cultural practices that involves actions and affects (e.g. Kitchin & Dodge 2007) (Azócar Fernández & Buchroithner 2014: 89).

As shown by Azócar Fernández and Buchroithner (2014) and Kitchin et al. (2011), the general field of cartography is replete with divergent understandings of what maps are and how their conceptualization and use bears upon the relationship between the cartographer, the map, the reader and the world. Further their detailed analysis shows that there is no singular understanding of what modern, post-modern and post-representational cartography might be, but rather that these broader designations could more appropriately be considered as (occasionally overlapping) umbrella terms that refer to a plethora of different and not necessarily mutually reconcilable approaches.

Harley (1989), who is considered by many (e.g. Azócar Fernández 2012, Casebeer 2015, Crampton 2001, Crampton & Krygier 2005, Kitchin et al. 2011, Paulston & Liebman 1994) as one of the pioneers of critical/postmodern cartography, as well as a major source of influence for Paulston (1993, Paulston & Liebman 1994) and a key figure in the discussion below, is usually seen as associated with post-modern cartography.28 This same label is likewise applied to many other authors, whose work evolved through a critical engagement with Harley’s work and whose conceptualization of maps are in many ways incommensurable with Harley’s social constructivism. Since much of postmodern and post-representational cartography developed as an extension and/or critique of Harley’s (1988, 1989) seminal work, I follow Kitchin et al. (2011) in choosing

---

28 For a comprehensive mapping of key authors and orientation in cartography see Azócar Fernández and Buchroithner’s Paradigms in Cartography (2014: 89, Table 6.1).
Harley and the debate surrounding his work as a practical way of how to conceptualize and (provisionally and contestably) delineate the differences between modern, post-modern and post-representational cartography.

In late 1980s, Harley began to challenge the predominant modernist doctrine of the time that saw maps as objective, scientific representations of reality, where the map was simply an “intermediary between the cartographer and the user” that “communicate[d] information from cartographer to the user” (Crampton 2001: 237). Instead of upholding the modernist conceptualization of maps as truths and of being concerned with “map effectiveness” – that is the way maps “capture and portray relevant information in a way that the map and the reader can analyse and interpret” (Kitchin et al. 2011: 5), Harley began to “question how mapping operated as powerful discourse” (Kitchin et al. 2011: 9). Crampton (2001: 238) suggests that:

Harley began to trace out the relationships of political interests, power, and the hidden agendas of maps: the ‘second text within the map.’ ... For Harley, maps do not communicate so much as provide a powerful rhetoric, and therefore can be critically examined as texts themselves.

Harley’s ambition was to deconstruct the map, “to read between the lines of the map – in the margins of the text – and through its tropes” with the purpose of “discover[ing] the silences and contradictions that challenge the apparent honesty of the image” (Harley 1989: 3, emphasis added). In order to perform this deconstruction, Harley (1989: 3–14) proposed to:

– use Foucauldian ‘archaeology’ that unearths the hidden and unacknowledged histories of knowledge production and epistemic origins, discussing both the techniques and the cultural/social context of mapping,
– consider maps as texts – which enables the use of Derridean and Barthesian textual analysis, conceptualizing maps as socially constructed texts, that can be interpreted in various ways, and whose origin cannot be traced back to a single sovereign mind or subject,
– consider how maps work in society as a form of power-knowledge, either as exercised by map patrons (sponsors of map making) or through cartographers themselves, whereby this power remains embedded in the map.

According to Kitchin et al. (2011: 9) Harley proposed to research the different roles that maps play in different societies and how “maps often reinforce the status quo of the interests of the powerful.” Harley (1989) drew extensively on Foucault and argued that mapping was not a neutral, objective process, but rather an endeavour
laden with power. Pivotal to his theory (Harley 1988, 1989, 1990) was the contention that the process of mapping entails not only revealing knowledge or information, but is above all a process of creating knowledge. For Harley, maps were not value-free, but rather imbued with the values and judgements of their authors and the cultural and historical context under which they were created. Kitchin et al. (2011) note that for Harley:

Maps are typically the products of privileged and formalized knowledges and they also tend to produce certain kinds of knowledge about the world. And in this sense, maps are the products of power and they produce power. In contrast to the scientific view that positions maps in essentialist terms, Harley cast maps as social constructions; as expressions of power/knowledge. (Kitchin et al. 2011: 9, emphasis added.)

Crampton (2001: 240) notes that in a 1992 revision of his 1989 article Deconstructing the Map, Harley already began to refer to a: “‘crisis of representation’ familiar to critical human geographers, by destabilizing language, fragmenting the subject and politicizing our relationship to the ‘other’.” In Harley’s own words:

Cartography has never been an autonomous and hermetic mode of knowledge, nor is it ever above the politics of knowledge. My key metaphor is that we should begin to deconstruct the map by challenging its assumed autonomy as a mode of representation. (Harley, cited in Crampton 2001: 240).

Harley’s work was subject to considerable critique by Wood (1993), Crampton (2001; 2003), Wood and Fels (2008), Kitchin et al. (2011) and other authors, interested in conceptualizing cartography beyond representation alone. Kitchin (2008: 2011) sums up the critique of Wood and Fels (2008), as arguing that for “Harley the map itself remains ideologically neutral, with ideology bound to the subject of the map and not the map itself.” Wood and Fels (2008: 190) challenge Harley’s understanding of maps as representing the world through an ideological frame, and propose instead that maps “create ideology” or “transform the world into ideology.” Crampton (2001: 242) further suggests that Harley misunderstood or misconstrued the works of Foucault and Derrida and that (due to his untimely death) he “offers no practical research agenda or critical framework which would subsume his empirical and theoretic work.” Kitchin et al. (2011: 11) claim that (according to Crampton) Harley’s writing “remained mired in the modernist conception of maps as documents charged with ‘confessing’ the truth of the landscape,” meaning that:
Harley believed that the truth of the landscape could still be revealed if one took account of the ideology inherent in the representation. ... Harley’s strategy was then to identify the politics of representation in order to circumnavigate them, (to reveal the truth lurking underneath), not fully appreciating, as with Foucault’s observations, that there is no escaping the entangling of power/knowledge. (Kitchin et al. 2011: 11)

Although Harley’s work provoked much critique, it has also helped to move the debate on post-representationality in cartography further – precisely because of its (necessary) imperfections. As critical as Crampton’s (2001; 2003) reflection on Harley may be, it was the very inconsistencies and paradoxes in Harley’s work that led him to “suggest a move from understanding cartography as a set of ontic knowledges to examining its ontological terms” (Kitchin et al. 2011: 11). I read the work of Crampton (2003) and Kitchin et al. (2011) as suggesting that this move could be considered as indicative of post-representational turnings in cartography.

While other authors offer different understandings of what might make cartography post-representational (see Azócar Fernández & Buchroithner (2014: 89), I focus here exclusively on the work of Crampton, because his attention is directed towards challenging mainstream understandings of (predominant) patterns of knowledge production – the ontology of cartography, or the way maps are in the world (Crampton 2003).29 Kitchin et al. (2011: 11) synthesise Crampton’s work in following words:

> Ontic knowledge consists of the examination of how a topic should proceed from within its own framework where the ontological assumptions about how the world can be known and measured are implicitly secure and beyond doubt (Crampton 2003). In other words, there is a core foundational knowledge – a taken for granted ontology – that unquestioningly underpins ontic knowledge. ... With respect to cartography this foundational ontology is that the world can be objectively and truthfully mapped using scientific techniques that capture and display spatial information. Cartography in these terms is purely technical and develops by asking self-referential, procedural questions.

---

29 Incidentally, Azócar Fernández and Buchroithner (2014), unlike for instance Kitchin et al. (2011), do not map Crampton’s work in the post-representational cartography, which seems to point to the ongoing debate and multiple understandings in cartography of what might classify a certain approach as post-representational.
of itself that aim to refine and improve how maps are designed and communicate.

Since Harley (1989) was more interested in exposing the ideology inherent in maps and “thus expose the truth hidden underneath” (Kitchin et al. 2011: 11), to show how maps are being dishonest, and how they ‘lie’, rather than questioning “the project of mapping per se”, Crampton (2003) and Kitchin et al. (2011) consider his deconstruction of maps to be ontic in its nature, as it “provided an epistemological avenue into the map, but still left open the question of the ontology of the map” (Crampton in Kitchin et al. 2011: 11). For Crampton (ibid.) “examining cartography ontologically consists of questioning the project of cartography itself.

While I cannot imagine what such an endeavour might entail in full depth, I would like to suggest that in the context of questioning the ontological grounds of cartography, and more specifically, of social cartography, a post-representational turning could be conceptualized as not being primarily interested in ‘better’ describing reality (modernist) or creating/constructing realities (post-modernist), but in mobilizing possibilities for different realities (post-representationality). In other words, a post-representational cartography could be seen as being interested in shifting the ways people relate to knowledge, identity and understanding, thus creating opportunities for different conversations in the field and different ways of being in the world. In many ways interest could be seen as the key term in this re-conceptualization, because it refers to a re-orientation of the purpose of cartography that has traditionally been about describing the world. In this regard, a post-representational turning would require us to re-imagine, not only what cartography is (how we should do it), but above all what is it for. Post-representationality in this regard could thus be seen as letting go of a need or of a desire to describe/represent reality – the ontological ground of cartography.

It could be argued that when Paulston and Liebman (1994) conceptualized maps as cognitive art, their gesture was similar to Crampton’s attempt to open up the ontological possibilities of cartography and hinted at this kind of reconfiguration of the relationships between maps and their authors and readers. It may be that their emphasis on the art-like nature of maps sought to open alternative or previously impossible means of knowledge production that would expand, (but not replace) – as suggested by Epstein and Carroll (2005, 2011) – cartography’s foundational self-perception as a purely “technical” (Kitchin et al. 2011: 11) or representative discipline. A closer reading of Harley (1989: 3) seems to suggest a similar concern:
We begin to learn that cartographic facts are only facts within a specific cultural perspective. We start to understand how maps, like art, far from being "a transparent opening to the world," are but "a particular human way ... of looking at the world."

In this regard the works of both Paulston and Harley (and their subsequent critics) could be seen as offering us important insights into the challenges and difficulty of attempting to move beyond our hidden and unacknowledged ontological assumptions. As suggested by critical reflections on their work, both authors struggled to bring their vision to life as best as they could, but were met with considerable obstacles on the way – as we all are. Learning from our collective challenges in this regard seems to suggest that we can hardly over-estimate the depth and impact of our (collective) socialization into normative and representational patterns of knowledge production and of our everyday or ‘normal’ (representational/descriptive/narrativized) relationship with the world. In this regard, when conceptualizing and using potentially post-representational approaches, it seems prudent to remain mindful that challenging our ontological assumptions about the world is tantamount to nothing less than challenging our ‘common sense’ or our ‘normal’ way of thinking and being in the world.

I believe that it would be interesting to see how Paulston himself would see social cartography in the light of this debate on post-representational turnings, especially since his work could be seen as having modern (methodology of data collection, language of writing), post-modern (discourse analysis and his broader theoretical framework) and post-representational (the performative dimensions of his cognitive art – mappings) tendencies. Although he referred to his work as post-modern social cartography (Paulston & Liebman 1994), his (later) work (Paulston 1999: 446) seems to display both his refusal to settle for a particular post-modern paradigm and/or to align himself with some “monster of a new postmodern metanarrative,” and an acknowledgement of the challenges of (unintentional) modernist tendencies – especially when he states, “letting go of modernity's language, let alone its essentialist and instrumental vision, is more easily advocated than achieved” (ibid.). This seems to suggest that a concern for post-representationality guided at least some aspects of Paulston’s work.30

In a similar way Harley’s work has been seen as essentially modernist by Crampton (2003), classified as post-modern by Azócar Fernández and

---

30 Unfortunately, Paulston’s untimely death prevented him to participate more fully in the post-representational debate in cartography that began to gain momentum at the time of his passing.
Buchroithner (2014), contentiously in-between by Kitchin et al. (2011) and self-referenced by Harley (cited in Crampton 2001: 240) as engaging with “representational crisis” and “challenging [the map’s] assumed autonomy as a mode of representation.” I take these multiple readings of Paulston and Harley as teaching us that it does not matter much (in the post-representational sense) whether their work was essentially modernist, post-modernist or post-presentational or whether we have ‘properly’ classified them. What seems to be more important is that these multiple readings seem to suggest that we do not have to know what they were nor agree on the impact and purpose of their work, in order to appreciate and learn from their contributions – however, how much we might learn from them (and what kind of things) would depend a lot on the way we approach them.

To conclude, I would like to suggest that, at least in my view, this kind of a shift in reading could be seen as resonating with Crampton’s (2003: 57) suggestion that we should move beyond a “critique of existing maps” towards “a more sweeping project of examining and breaking through the boundaries of how maps are, and our projects and practices with them.” In the next subchapter, instead of suggesting a way or the way how or what such a ‘sweeping project’ might look like, I wish to offer a few thoughts that sketch my current understanding of post-representational social cartography and the challenges and paradoxes related to its (potentially) post-representational use.

4.2.3 The cartographer, the reader and the map in (potentially) post-representational (social) cartography

In my current understanding post-representational (social) cartography could hardly have emerged through developing ‘better’ or more post/non-representational maps alone, although we can improve our mapping practice and employ (especially visual) aids or other approaches that might help us diffuse fixed meanings and help us loosen (relax) and open up constricted meta-narratives and interpretations. But perhaps even more important than improving this art of mapping could be the task of cultivating (encouraging to grow) a different relationship to maps and mapping among the readers (and authors/cartographers).

In this sense, no cartographer can realistically expect that simply making a map, labelling it ‘post-representational’ and insisting that it should be taken as such also by others, will make it happen. Post-representationality does not seem to work like that. Post-representationality tends to constantly elude control and will refuse containment and this very elusiveness could be seen as both its greatest challenge.
and its greatest gift. In this regard, post-representational cartography could be seen as one of the extremely few and precious theoretical orientations that might hold within them a potential to open a crack in the certainty of the Cartesian subject, shifting its attachments to relationship between knowledge, meaning making and reality itself.

In this way a post-representational turning seems to ultimately very much depend on (without being exclusively tied to) the willingness, ability and perseverance of the reader in changing his or her relationship with the map and processes of knowledge production. For it is above all the relationship that the reader establishes between her/himself, the map and what is considered to be real, that makes a certain map post-representational, not the map itself or the attempt of its creator. However, post-representational cartography, if done well, can invite the reader to gradually shift relationships away from being representational towards multiple interpretative readings that can hold incommensurable conceptualizations and understandings. In this regard post-representational cartography might be able to teach us how to hold and explore paradoxical differences without a need for their synthesis, reconciliation and/or annihilation.

On the other hand, there is no guarantee that such an invitation will be understood, welcomed or accepted. As Andreotti et al. (2016: 95–96) affirm, different projects partners in the EIHE project used the general cartographies of the project in both representational and post-representational ways for different purposes. Similarly, the discussion on various possible readings of Paulston (and Harley) seems to suggest that (post)representational readings could be seen as largely subjected to the discretion and intention of the reader. In a way it could be said that it is very much the reader’s response that ‘authorizes’ or ‘constructs’ a certain approach as post-representational. On the other hand, it could also be argued that the effectiveness of post-representational map depends upon the ability of the cartographer or the person using cartography to entice or indirectly persuade the reader to shift his relationship with knowledge and the text itself.

Following that, the maps presented in this research, the general cartographies of the EIHE project, and Paulston’s own work, can (indeed the invitation is that they should) at the same time (but not exclusively) be considered representational, mis-representational, non-representational, post-representational, or perhaps not maps at all, depending on how and why people want to use them. I firmly believe that it is absolutely legitimate to read these maps in all these (and other) ways. If maps are a form of cognitive art then there is no need for agreement. On the other hand, if there is agreement on their use and interpretation then maps cease to be
expressions of (cognitive) art and turn into mere inanimate objects that lose their power to engage us in dialogue and conversation. As soon as we agree on what a map represents, with what intention, and for what purpose, the map can no longer speak and ceases being art, it ceases being alive. That is the moment when maps die and become just inanimate stuff (on paper).  

4.2.4 Social cartography in the EIHE project

This subchapter presents an overview of the multiple ways in which social cartography was used in the EIHE project. Social cartography was adopted in the EIHE project with the purpose of providing a shared and general methodological framework that would be able to contain and take account of the diverse theoretical orientations and backgrounds of project partners. Since the theoretical background of this mapping, the discussion of the main orientations (liberal, neoliberal, critical) and the conceptualization of the global imaginary are presented in more detail in Subchapter 2.1.4, I would like to restrict my discussion here merely to the way this mapping, and others that emerged from it, were used (not conceptualized) in the EIHE project.

Within EIHE social cartography a tool was used that on the one hand made possible both the mapping of multiple discourses in higher education, their absences, but also created openings for different readings of key concepts/signifiers. These different readings in turn enabled conversations that troubled, complexified and challenged the existing and/or more ‘mainstream’ understandings of the concepts/signifiers in question.

The overall theoretical framework of the project was “grounded on a discursive strand of postcolonial theory informed by poststructuralism, in particular the work of Spivak (2012)” and “informed by Sousa Santos’s (2007) critique of ‘abyssal thinking’ and his conceptualization of ecologies of knowledge” (Andreotti et al. 2016: 86). Both of these main orientations articulate a need to address the complex double binds of knowledges and ignorance, and to explore the complicity of critical scholarship in re-producing unacknowledged (and potentially harmful) ontic/epistemic assumptions, and to work through the paradoxes, complementarities and insufficiencies of different (competing and complementary) theoretical orientations. According to Andreotti et al. (2016: 86), within the
“uneasy context of competing and complementary forms of critique within a singular large research team, the methodology of social cartography helped to ‘trouble tidy binaries’ and to ‘deliberately hold together necessary incompatibilities’.”

Social cartography in this regard could be seen as not merely providing a common methodological framework for the project, but perhaps even more importantly as providing the necessary framework within which researchers from different backgrounds were able to bring to the table their respective differences without a need of reconciling them, rather holding them in a shared space of productive incommensurability and/or complementarity. In other words, it could be argued that social cartography was instrumental in helping the project team develop a shared, non-consensus based work ethic that sought to explore both the gifts and the limitations of various theoretical backgrounds represented in the project.

Further, social cartography also served as a complementary approach to the (more traditional) mixed methods research (policy analysis, discourse analysis, qualitative and quantitative surveys, interviews, case studies) that were employed within EIHE. “It both enriched our data analysis and helped to ensure attentiveness to our diverse aims and interests for the project” (Andreotti et al. 2016: 87). The outline of different ways in which social cartography was used within the EIHE project seems to suggest, that the role of social cartography within EIHE was above all a performative one. While the use of social cartography has certainly enabled the project team to deepen or ‘enrich’ the multiple analyses, it has above all helped the team to develop and maintain productive and collaborative research atmosphere that was able to hold together and work with the team members different (and potentially incommensurable) theoretical backgrounds – without the need to reconcile them.

The next subchapter discusses the multiple use of social cartography in this research. It begins with a discussion on how the main EIHE cartography influenced the analytical framework of this research in terms of categorizing/mapping qualitative data and then continues with a discussion on the use of social cartography in performative or non-representational ways.

4.2.5 Social cartography in this research

Social cartography has been employed in this research with a dual purpose. This subchapter discusses first the use of social cartography of the main EIHE project as a non-normative organizing tool that made possible a mapping and clustering of
qualitative data into categories that enabled mutual comparison. In the second part it conceptualizes social cartography as a mirror that denaturalizes what is perceived as normal and desirable and amplifies unflattering traits in order to open possibilities for different conversations to take place and to make visible otherwise hidden assumptions and interpretations.

As discussed in Subchapter 2.1.4 the main map of EIHE social cartography consisted of three main discursive orientations (liberal, neoliberal and critical) and their interstices (see Fig. 5 below). This main map was used as a tool to categorize open-ended questions according to their affinity with one (or more) of these orientations. All 1,451 surveys were mapped separately for each of the four questions, which allowed for a more nuanced analysis compared to a clustering of answers to all the open ended questions under one rubric. In this, the analysis tried to follow Paulston’s (1996: 439) suggestion to “read written and figural text, not authors.”

Fig. 5. Map of main discursive orientations and their interstices. (Andreotti et al. 2016: 91, re-published under Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0).
Following a preliminary reading of all the answers with the purpose of sketching the discursive range of data, an analytical matrix was synthesized according to the observed indicators of each of the main orientations and various interstices. The observed indicators suggested an addition of relational-critical and relational-liberal categories which were not part of original EIHE map. An orientation of relational trans-localism was conceptualized by project researchers (Stein et al. 2016a), with an accompanying suggestion that it is highly unlikely that such an orientation could operate within mainstream university framework. Very few answers were classified as belonging to the relational-liberal interstice, even scarcer were those can be considered as potentially relational-critical. No answers that would be considered as indicative of a (potential) relational main orientation nor of relational-neoliberal interstice were observed. In this regard it is only possible to suggest that such discursive orientations are potentially possible, however they were not visible in the data – at least not in the way these orientations and interstices were conceptualized in this research.

The general analytical matrix contains a set of general traits for each of the main orientations and their interstices. Question-specific matrices with indicators that specifically relate to each of the questions were developed as specific analytical tools. The general matrix that presents the main conceptual framework is presented in Table 2 on the next page, while more nuanced question-specific matrices are presented in Subchapter 6.1 where answers to each of the 4 open ended questions are analysed individually in order to enable a closer reading from the analytical tool and the answers themselves.
Table 2. General analytical matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Neoliberal</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on improving Canadian society, social benefits, cultural diversity, mutual benefit, values oriented, rationality, neutrality, tolerance, acceptance.</td>
<td>Emphasis on individual gain, personal growth, self-centredness, economic growth, individual, corporate or economic benefit.</td>
<td>Systemic critique, critical self-reflection, recognition of complicity, emphasis on exploitation, power relations, recognition of various types of hegemony, violence, complicity, coloniality, imperialism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neoliberal-liberal</th>
<th>Liberal-critical</th>
<th>Neoliberal-critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual benefit for the benefit of society (economy) and vice-versa.</td>
<td>Advocates personal transformation, individual change agency, emphasis on cultural aspects of hegemony (racism, prejudices), no recognition of economic/political dominance, exploitation.</td>
<td>Emphasis on economy, career threats, job loss, loss of privilege for local students, hosting society, reduces quality/relevance of education, int. students, professors, workers seen as malfunctioning or maladjusted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neoliberal-liberal-critical</th>
<th>Relational-critical</th>
<th>Relational-liberal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internally contested, ambiguous answers. Example: Recognition of (systemic) injustices coupled to exoticization of int. students.</td>
<td>Recognition of a need for a deep political and existential re-orientation.</td>
<td>Recognition of a need for existential re-orientation interpreted as increased empathy, compassion (lacking systemic political analysis).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the process of mapping the students’ responses is here referred to as a categorization that resulted in the quantification of the answers, this categorization and quantification process should be considered as on the one hand being theoretically informed, but also partial, provisional and situated. This suggestion underscores a post-structuralist epistemological orientation where it is assumed that due to the ambivalent nature of language, interpretations can never be neutral, objective or unbiased, because they are always already socially, culturally and historically situated (Chouliraki & Fairclough 1999, Luke 1995, 1997, Jorgensen & Philips 2002). However, in order to ensure the trustworthiness (Guba 1981, Krefting 1991, Shenton 2004) of the interpretation of the data and to exercise self-reflexivity in the analysis, the answers were re-examined several times over a period of 6 months and ambiguities and multiple interpretations were discussed with project partners and fellow researchers, following Paulston’s (1999: 454) suggestion on the methodological steps of social cartography. From a post-structuralist perspective, trustworthiness is achieved not when there is consensus.
of interpretations, but through systematic scrutiny and problematization of interpretations. In an attempt to comply with these principles, my research methodology included critical feedback sessions with Canadian scholars in the field of global citizenship education (GCE).

Even with those measures in place, this level of analysis (as all others) was not performed with the purpose of revealing objective scientific ‘truths’ about data, but with the purpose of opening the space for a more complex and nuanced discussion and exploration of paradoxes, conundrums and troubling questions related to unacknowledged (and hidden) exceptionalist assumptions in the answers of students and their relation to the processes involved in the internationalization of higher education. This concern inspired a reflection on how social cartography could be used as a performative post-representational tool that would open up such discussions.

Drawing upon the initial mapping of data on the EIHE cartography, a second, AWESOME cartography was developed with the purpose of focusing the analysis specifically on the various articulations of exceptionalist discourse that gradually began to emerge through the first rounds of data reading. Popkewtiz (2002: 19) suggests that “one can think of science as strategies that make the familiar strange, to think about the mysterious and unfamiliar, and to raise questions precisely about that which is taken-for granted.”32 Researchers in education recently employed such strategies in different (and contested) ways (e.g. Bastos 2002, de Jong et al. 2013, Kaomea 2003, Sikes 2003, Stouffel et al. 2004, Vrasidas 2001, Whitt 1993).

In this research the metaphor of a mirror that denaturalizes what is perceived as normal and desirable and amplifies unflattering traits seemed appropriate for the purpose. From a poststructuralist perspective there is no mirror that does not distort—i.e. no mirror can be seen as reflecting the truth of what it is showing. In this regard the mapping of answers using the AWESOME cartography was performed with the specific purpose of drawing attention precisely to the distortions and amplifications made visible by this mapping. AWESOME is an acronym that refers to different attributes/articulations of exceptionalism that were observable in the students’ responses. Each of these attributes was analysed separately and discussed within the theoretical framework. On the next page they are presented in their acronymic form:

32 According to Chandler (2002) the dictum of ‘making the familiar strange and the strange familiar’ has been attributed to the German poet Novalis (1772–1801, a.k.a. Friedrich von Hardenberg), who declared that the essence of romanticism was “to make the familiar strange, and the strange familiar” (cited in Chandler 2002: 211).
- **Auto-immunity** – a self-colonising process of subversion of critique in a way that repositions the privileged (colonising) subject by destroying references to his positionality and constructing himself as powerless, victimized, threatened and oppressed by the vilified other (Derrida 2005, McAllan 2014);

- **Willful ignorance** – active, but not necessarily conscious, refusal to learn about injustices and oppression directed against the other, and as epistemic and cognitive blindness that stems from the position of privilege of certain individuals or groups for the (unacknowledged) purpose of defending its privileged status (Alcoff 2007, Maldonado-Torres 2004, Tuana 2004, 2006);

- **Exaltedness** – constructing a particular nation or national subjects as superior to the rest of humanity. The national subject is constructed as an exalted member of a particular kind of community (nation) that is ontologically and existentially distinct from strangers to this community (Thobani 2007);


- **Opportunist inclusion** – the Other is welcomed and judged according to her/his (perceived) capacity to contribute to a growing national economy; according to his willingness to affirm and upkeep the national subject’s exalted status (Thobani 2007, Stewart 2014); and according to his/her aptitude for assimilation (Balibar 1991).

- **Minimization of issues** – attributing reported examples of discrimination, racism and other forms of violence/injustice to the misbehaviour of certain ‘bad’ individuals. Normalization of issues related to difference/diversity as a natural occurrence when facing a new environment, a new culture or a new language (Bonilla-Silva 2006), also “naturalization of racist conduct” (Balibar 1991, Goldberg 2002);

- **Extraction/consumption of otherness** – the Other is constructed as unconditionally and unquestionably available for the exalted subject’s project of self-actualization and personal growth through consumption (anthropophagy) of the Other’s difference (Bauman 1995, Comaroff & Comaroff 2009, Loftsdóttir 2015).

In order to make clear the interplay between theoretical framework presented above and the analysis of data available, I wish to explain the process through which
AWESOME cartography was developed. The cartography was developed using both inductive and deductive thinking (Snape & Spencer 2003), and although analysis of qualitative data is “often seen as inductive approach, it is not a singularly defining characteristic of qualitative research” (Snape & Spencer 2003: 14). Several authors (e.g. Strauss 1987, Snape & Spencer 2003, Reichertz 2004) agree that it is both desirable and largely unavoidable to apply both inductive and deductive approaches in qualitative research. Being mindful of the consideration that observing data through an a priori established theoretical framework could lead towards (likely unacknowledged) desires to selectively choose/interpret the data to ‘fit’ the framework, my ambition was not to construct an objectivist (or un-theorized) interpretative framework that would be exclusively inductive, but rather to develop a framework that grew out continuous negotiations and adaptations between data and theory.\footnote{From a post-structuralist perspective such an attempt would be considered impossible, as we already always have certain (pre-cognitive) assumptions about the data. Even more positivism-oriented theorists of qualitative analysis, such as Strauss (1987: 12), would argue that “insights, hunches, generative questions which constitute [inquiry] come from ... experience with this kind of phenomenon before – whether the experience is personal, or derives more ‘professionally’ from actual exploratory research into the phenomenon, or from ... theoretical sensitivity because of the researcher’s knowledge of technical literature.”} I would also consider the approach adopted here as different from – but related to – abductive reasoning, which seeks to establish relationships between a (cause) and b (effect) that are sufficient, but not necessary conditions, in other words that seek to find the simplest and most likely explanation for a given phenomenon (see for instance: Hobbs et al. 1988, Pierce 1998). Hobbs et al. (1988: 95) refer to abductive inference as “inference to the best explanation”, while Pierce sometimes calls it “nothing but guessing” (Pierce 1998: 107).

However, Pierce (1998: 205) does acknowledge that abduction plays a unique role in research that makes it stand out from both induction and deduction:

> The only thing that induction accomplishes is to determine the value of a quantity. It sets out with a theory and it measures the degree of concordance of that theory with fact. It can never originate any idea whatever. No more can deduction. All the ideas of science come to it by the way of abduction. Abduction consists in the studying of facts and devising a theory to explain them. Its only justification is that if we are ever to understand things at all, it must be in that way.

What the approach adopted here shares with abduction is that “it is motivated by the feeling that a theory is needed to explain the surprising facts” (Pierce 1998: 205).
While this approach makes use of all three logics (abduction, deduction and induction), it also seeks to depart from them and their accompanying positivist-objectivist stances. It attempts to do so by replacing a quest for truth or objectivism/truism for a quest for *amplifying and making visible unflattering traits* that are otherwise not discussed (or acknowledged), since they are challenging mainstream assumptions, (self-) perceptions, investments, entitlements and desires. As discussed in Subchapters 3.1.2, 3.1.3 and elsewhere in this text, it should be noted, that the upkeep of these assumptions, perceptions, investments, entitlements and desires that culminates in the crafting of positive (national) self-image, is not only required for maintaining the stability and ontological security of the (national) Self, but is also related to the political and economic imperatives of successful nation branding (Potter 2008, Dinnie 2015). Therefore, even when made visible, there will likely be high motivation (personal and collective) to render them invisible again, likely by challenging the objectivity/ neutrality/validity of the mapping.

Although achieving ‘objective’ representationality was not the guiding purpose of the proposed AWESOME cartography, as it is assumed that interpretations can never be neutral, objective or unbiased, I did try to meet the standards of trustworthiness and robustness that would correspond to those utilised in the mapping of data on the main EIHE cartography presented in the beginning of this subchapter. In order to achieve that two separate measures were undertaken. First measure avails itself of statistical (demographic) verification of exemplary answers used in the AWESOME cartography and is presented in Subchapter 7.1 of the chapter dedicated to this cartography, while the second measure explains the process of the mapping itself and is explicated in detail below.

While analysing data for the mapping onto the main EIHE cartography, certain answers that could be considered as the most visible manifestations of Canadian exceptionalism, such as: “Canada is accepting of all cultures and we are essentially known for that” (5ss026), “I believe this survey should be taken in other countries, since Canada as I see it has no problems with internationalization and diversity” (7ss002) or “This is Canada, we try and accommodate” (16ed078), caught my attention. I proceeded to take note of such answers and of others that could be considered as less manifestly exceptionalist. Upon developing a database of these answers, I began to cluster them into groups according to what I considered would be the various mechanisms and discursive strategies (such as self-congratulation,

---

34 The coding system of student responses is explained in Chapter 6.
denigration of others, different forms of denial, commodified relationality due to incapacity for empathy, and others) that modern (and increasingly narcissist) subjects would avail themselves of in order to protect their entitlements to positive (national) self-affirmation.35 In doing so, I drew on the works of authors, presented in Chapter 3, perhaps most notably on Balibar (1991), Tuana (2004, 2006), Thobani (2007) and Jeffress (2008, 2011, 2012). Where I felt that the observable traits had not been sufficiently theorized by authors already presented, specifically in the case of the very important and widely observable trait of consumption of otherness, I sought help from other sources (e.g. Bauman 1995, Comaroff & Comaroff 2009, Loftsdóttir 2015).

Once the categories were established and theorized, I tried to combine various synonyms for the observable traits to create an acronym that would be both theoretically (and empirically) sound as well as relatable to the subject. After considerable linguistic permutations and many abandoned attempts, the acronym AWESOME emerged. One of the reasons why AWESOME was used, and not some other word, is related to the observation that awesome seems to be one of the words most often associated with Canada online.36 With the framework established I combed the data again to look for examples of these traits that I could have missed in the first reading. As the database extended with the newly acquired examples, I then chose the examples that I considered most indicative of particular exceptionalist traits, while being mindful of the varying length of individual answers, therefore allowing for some variance in the number of examples used in each category. In total 93 examples were distributed over seven different categories, with the last one being split in two parts to account for observable variations related to this specific trait. While such a selection process cannot claim to be representative of the entire dataset, it hopefully represents a theoretically grounded and empirically derived mapping, a research-based cartography (or portrait) of observable exceptionalist traits.

Ultimately, as with any other map, AWESOME can only help us navigate in the terrain (articulations of exceptionalism) that is on the map. By doing so the AWESOME cartography runs several risks related to its ambition. I am only able to outline those that are currently visible to me as the cartographer, but I am sure

---

35 For more on the subject of narcissism (and education) see e.g. Žižek 1985, Godina 1990, Lasch 1991, Vodopivec Kolar 2010.

36 See, for example, Awesome Canada by Steve Webster (2013), 37 Reasons Canada is Awesome (CraveCanada n.d.), How Cool is Canada? Here Are 20 Reasons We’re Awesome by Doug Murray (n.d.), Top 10 reasons why Canada is Awesome (Frisk 2014), Vancouver is Awesome (Kronbauer 2008).
that there are many more. The first risk is creating a false image that there are no answers among students’ that would challenge exceptionalist assumptions – that there is no terrain beyond the map. That is of course not true, but the AWESOME map is only capable of mapping exceptionalist articulations and not non-exceptionalist answers. In this regard the first distortion of the AWESOME map is that it offers a selective mapping of a group of answers and presents them in a way that could be seen (misconstrued) as indicative of the entire dataset. In words of Kitchin et al. (2011: 9) mapping “always has a political purpose, and this interest often leads to people being pushed off the map.” While the AWESOME map (hopefully) does not push people off the map it certainly does not take account of a lot of the text. A second risk created by the AWESOME mapping is that it may create an assumption that the articulations of exceptionalism gathered under its acronym are exhaustive and that there are no other ways in which exceptionalism is articulated. In this regard the 7 groups of articulations that make up the acronym could be seen as a colour legend to the map, with each colour (group) emphasizing a different characteristic of the terrain. However, this map could be drawn with an entirely different legend, emphasizing other articulations or grouping them differently. Indeed AWESOME was chosen after a series of other possible groupings that would (if used) offer a differently distorted image. The third risk is related to the context of the terrain upon which exceptionalism was mapped. It may be, that a mapping of students’ responses that had not taken place in such a highly institutionalized context (such as the University), would have given completely different results or created very different impressions. So in this regard the value and relevance of the AWESOME mapping outside its given context is yet to be tested. It may or may not turn out to be useful for mapping the terrain of exceptionalism also elsewhere. The fourth risk is the somewhat misleading title of the map – Canadian exceptionalism. It would be possible to interpret this title as suggesting that Canadian exceptionalism is something that is particular to (white) Canadians, but the data shows that notions of Canadian exceptionalism are likewise manifested by international students and minorities alike – albeit in somewhat different (less manifest) ways.

And finally, one of main ontological assumptions of the AWESOME map is that there is something like Canadian exceptionalism to map in the first place. That this map has some terrain to chart. While a social constructivist could argue that the terrain of Canadian exceptionalism is in many ways constructed by the very map that maps it, my response would be that the map is charting only one interpretation of the implications of narratives grounded on Canadian nationalism.
In addition, a map should never be conflated with the terrain that it maps. The AWESOME map should thus be always read as inevitably partial, provisional and incomplete. It is as contestable and situated as any other mapping. My hope is that this map has the potential to help us navigate somewhere, with that somewhere being not where the terrain is familiar, but where the terrain is strange.
5 Analysis of quantitative data

This is the first of the two chapters in which the student data is presented. This chapter presents the analysis of quantitative data, while Chapter 6 presents the qualitative analysis. This chapter is divided into three subchapters. The first subchapter presents the basic demographic data, related to the gender, age, first language, family context, minority affiliation and socialization. The second subchapter offers a comparison between the family origins of students of Canadian universities and the family origins of students of universities from other countries that participated in the EIHE project with the purpose of providing a broader interpretative context of demographic analysis than in the first subchapter. The third and final subchapter features an analysis of content-based quantitative data that seeks to explore students’ opinions on the internationalization of higher education, the social role of universities, their field of study and what they value in their courses. Table 3 below shows the distribution of student cohorts, according to their field of study. The names of seven Canadian universities that participated in the survey have been anonymised as institutions A–G.

Table 3. Field of study by institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent group</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Social sciences, arts, humanities</th>
<th>Sciences, engineering</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution A</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution B</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution C</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution D</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution E</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution G</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>1,451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the universities that was included in the research was requested to provide two distinct subsets of data that would enable a comparison between a cohort of undergraduate students of education and a cohort of undergraduate students from other fields. Apart from institution B, all datasets include a set of at least 100 education students and at least a hundred students of some other orientation. In 4 out of 7 cases it was possible to compare the cohorts of students of education to

37 An exception to this rule was institution F with three sets.
students of sciences and/or engineering and in one case it was possible to compare between a cohort of education and a cohort of arts/social sciences. The analysis of data in this chapter offers a comparison between the participating institutions as well as indicates some general trends and tendencies that could be observed across the entire dataset.

5.1 Demographics

This subchapter features a presentation of variables related to gender, age, first language, family context, minority belonging and the socialization of students. The data in tables is presented in absolute numbers, while the corresponding charts present the data in relative terms. Tables are used to present more complex data, such as questions with many multiple answers, while the charts are used for simpler variables, overall distributions or specific cases that illustrate particularly interesting or unusual characteristics. The percentage rates in the accompanying text refer to a share of all answers (including missing ones), unless specified otherwise.

5.1.1 Gender and age

In this subchapter variables related to gender and age are analysed and compared between participating institutions. Both of the variables are presented in full in their respective charts, with the gender distribution first (see Fig. 6 on the next page), followed by the age distribution (Fig. 7). 61% of the respondents in the survey identified themselves as female, while 37% identified themselves as male. 1% of respondents chose the category other, while less than 1% did not provide any information regarding their sexual/gender identification. The difference in gender distribution was the highest in institutions A and E, where over 70% female respondents, while in institutions B and G the difference in proportion between male and female students was statistically insignificant. These two institutions were also the only ones in the set, where the number of male students was larger (albeit by a very small margin) than the number of females.
A significant majority of the surveyed undergraduate students (79%) reported being between 18–24 years old, which in this case refers to the generations that were born between 1991 and 1997. Students in the age categories of 25–30 years and over 30 years accounted for 12% and 5% respectively. The ‘oldest’ cohort in the set were students from institution E, where 35% of students were older than 24 years, while the ‘youngest’ group came from institution B, where only 4% were older than 25 years and no student was older than 30 years (the only such example in the dataset). 4% of the students did not provide a valid answer to this question. Fig. 7 on the next page presents the age-related data in more detail.
This concludes the initial presentation of general gender and age related data, while the next subchapter introduces a more complex set of data related to the first language of students.

### 5.1.2 First language

This subchapter presents the data related to self-declared first language of the students. Fig. 8 offers a visual representation of the overall set, while Fig. 9 offers a comparison between two institutions with the most and the least language diversity. In total, 48 languages were identified in the set. By far the largest group in the set are the students that reported English as their first language (74 %), followed by Chinese (6 %) and French (3 %). Most of the languages identified were various languages from the Asian continent (Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Punjabi and Urdu), with Arabic as the only Afro-Asian language,

---

38 Answers ‘Cantonese’, ‘Mandarin’ and ‘Chinese’ were collapsed under the rubric ‘Chinese’ due to the latter being an umbrella term for the first two and used often by the students themselves. A similar argument could be made for collapsing the languages of India under the same group (Urdu, Hindi, Punjabi and others), however as there is no common reference to an ‘Indian’ language – unlike Chinese, and since Urdu and Punjabi are also spoken in Pakistan, no such grouping was made. Had this grouping been made, the various languages of India would compose the third largest language group, outnumbering French.
and Spanish as the only European language (apart from English and French), with more than 10 representatives. In the case of Spanish it is possible that the students that chose this language do not have necessarily Spanish, but rather a Latin American origin. In general, it is possible to observe a considerable absence of non-Asian languages, although a more nuanced analysis suggests a presence of considerable linguistic diversity (contained within the category ‘other’), as discussed further below.

Your first language is...

![Pie chart showing the first languages spoken by respondents.](image)

Fig. 8. First language.

Fig. 8 shows the strong domination one single language (English) over the much more fragmented group of all other languages. Only languages with more than 10 respondents are shown in the figure, all others are collapsed under the rubric ‘other’. The actual diversity of languages is considerably greater than what Fig. 8 is able to capture visually. If we exclude the missing answers and the English language (as the dominant category) from the set, we are left with a group of 350 students (24 %) that share 48 (and potentially more) different languages between them. Subtracting from this number also the number of French speaking students (95 % of whom were born in Canada) and the French/English bilingual students, this number drops to 290. Bearing that in mind, we can say that on average there is one additional
language for every 6 non-primarily English and/or French speaking students in the dataset.

Such linguistic diversity seems quite remarkable, especially in comparison to some other countries in the dataset (see Subchapter 5.2). Most of the students (73 %) that are not primarily English or French speaking were not born in Canada, which means that they largely represent either international students or students whose families (recently) moved to Canada. In this regard this linguistic diversity seems to be a characteristic that is ‘imported’ from other countries and not something that would necessarily be present in the institutions without correspondingly high levels of internationalization and (recent) immigration.

The analysis thus suggests a stark difference between on one hand the unquestionable dominance (74 %) of one single first language (English) among the captured student population, in what is officially a bilingual country, and on the other hand a remarkable diversity of languages contained within the minority (24 %) of non-primarily English speakers. Again, this sub-group is in turn dominated by the Chinese language (almost 25 % of respondents), French (14 %) and the various languages of the Indian subcontinent.

Fig. 9. Linguistic diversity contrasts.

39 2 % of students did not respond to this question.
In order to demonstrate the spectrum of linguistic diversity among the institutions in the Canadian dataset, Fig. 9 features a comparison between two institutions with the least (institution A) and the most (institution G) linguistic diversity. Absolute numbers are used because many languages are represented by just a few speakers. In this regard we can see that only 9 students in institution A were not English or French speaking, while the number of such students in institution G is 92, or about ten times higher. Linguistic diversity, while strongly present in general, can thus also be seen to be largely absent from (at least) some universities.

French language is strongly present only in institution A (82% of all French speakers) and virtually absent in all others, while the largest share of Chinese speaking students (56%) is found in institution G. Interestingly, within this dataset, the French and Chinese languages could be seen as giving an impression of a certain degree of mutual exclusion, as no students reported French as their first language in institution G (which has the highest rate of Chinese speakers) and no students reported Chinese as their primary language in institution A (with the highest rate of French speakers). Institution A also exhibits the lowest levels of language diversity, with over 95% of respondents reporting one or both of official languages in Canada as their first language.40 In institution G such students represent only a marginal majority (51%), while in other institutions this response rate varied from 75% (institution C) to 84% (institution B). In the next subchapter on family context it will be possible to observe some similarities to the first language data distribution patterns presented in this subchapter.

5.1.3 Family context and residence

This subchapter presents first the data related to country of birth of respondents, their parents and grandparents – or in short, their family context. This is followed by a presentation of data related to current (temporary or permanent) residency status of students in the country. Data related to family context is presented in Table 4 and in Fig. 10, 11 and 12, while Fig. 13 presents data related to residency. Table 4 also features an added answer ‘neither parent was born in this country’ that was not an actual option of choice in the survey, but is included here as a calculated response, derived from the two answers in the second and third row of the table that relate to the country of origin of the students’ parents. In this regard, it likely

---

40 This includes the students from the category 'bilingual', because the analysis of raw data shows that actual languages contained within the bilingual category were English and French.
suggests a slight overestimation of the actual number, because it does not account for the missing or invalid answers. As 4.5% of students did not respond to the question related to their own birth, we estimate that the size of the error regarding the birth of their parents could be approximately the same.

Table 4. Family context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent group</th>
<th>Which statements reflect your family context in this country? Mark all that apply.</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Born in this country</td>
<td>Both parents born in this country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution A</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution B</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution C</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution D</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution E</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution F</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution G</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data on country of birth (family context) suggests that while 80% of students were born in Canada, only a half (56%) had both parents born in Canada and only a third (33%) responded to having all grandparents born in the country. This generational decrease is significant and could be potentially interpreted as being conditioned by Canada’s long history of settlement and immigration. The fact that half of the students’ parents were not born in Canada suggests that the flows of immigration still strongly influence the family origins of the university-attending population, either directly (20% of students were not born in Canada) or indirectly (48% of parents were not born in Canada). A full distribution of

---

41 These percentage rates apply to valid responses only, excluding missing answers, and are among the lowest in the entire EIHE dataset. For comparison: the corresponding averages for students of Finnish universities are: 99% (students), 96% (parents) and 92% (grandparents). See Subchapter 5.2 for a more detailed comparison with other countries.

42 4.5% of students did not provide an answer to this question, however it is very likely that an over-proportionate number of these students are of non-Canadian origin. See the discussion below Figure 5.5 for the explanation of the rationale for this assumption.

43 This share is an estimate, because it derives its total from ‘only one parent born in this country’ and ‘neither parent born in this country’ – with the number of the last being an estimated number.
students, related to their country of origin is presented in Fig. 10 below, while a
distribution of their parents’ origin is presented in Fig. 11.

Fig. 10. Birth country of students.

The share of students that were born in Canada ranges from 91 % (institution A) to
56 % (institution G). All other institutions converge closely around the country
average (76 %). Similarly, a share of non-Canadian born students ranges from 8 %
(institution A) to 33 % (institution G). In this regard it may be worth nothing that
in institution C, the number of students that were not born in Canada or did not
provide an answer (51), is exactly equal to the number of students who claimed that
none of their parents were born in Canada. An overview of Fig. 10 also shows that
institutions with higher linguistic diversity and a higher share of non-Canadian born
students also have a higher rate of missing answers (especially institutions C and
G). In this regard it would be possible to assume that an over-proportionate share
of the missing answers could be contributed to students of non-Canadian birth.
The share of students that had both parents born in the country ranges from 73% (institution A) to less than a third (29%) at institution G. Fig. 11 shows that in 4 out of seven institutions (B, D, E, G) at least half of the students had one or more parents that were not born in Canada, which is very high in comparison with other countries/institutions in the project (see Subchapter 5.2). The responses in category ‘only one parent born in this country’ show much less dispersion, ranging between 16% (institution A) and 6% (institution C).

Again, a significant difference emerges between institutions A and G in relation to the answers ‘neither parent born in this country’ and ‘all grandparents born in this country’. While only 12% of students in institution A indicated neither parent was born in Canada, almost two thirds (62%) of students in institution G indicated neither parent was of Canadian origin. The share of students whose parents are of exclusively non-Canadian origin remains high also in other institutions, ranging from 26% (institution C) to 42% (institution D). While the data in row 4 of Table 4 (neither parent born in this country) is only a calculated response (or informed estimate), it is telling that in total the number of students who (potentially) had none of their parents born in Canada (512) exceeds the number of students (451) who had all of their grandparents born within the country.

Institutions A and G define the opposites of the spectrum also regarding answers in the category ‘all grandparents born in this country’, ranging from 50%
(institution A) to 13 % (institution G). This share in other institutions ranges between 26 % (institution B) and 43 % (institution C). In this regard, institution A is the only institution in the set where at least half of the students had all grandparents born in the country, while in institution G, students with at least one grandparent born outside of Canada represent an overwhelming majority (87 %).

Fig. 12. Students’ ancestry.

Fig. 12 shows a comparison between the ratios of students with full Canadian ancestry (all grandparents born in Canada) and students without Canadian origins (neither parent born in Canada) and omits data on mixed origins that can be seen in Fig. 10. This comparison is based upon the assumption that if a student reported that neither of the parents was born in Canada, the same would largely apply to her/his grandparents as well. While this assumption cannot be confirmed directly (as there is no data available to support or refute it), it seems reasonable to assume such an interpretation, especially given Canada’s status as a settler and/or immigrant country. The purpose of this chart is to make more visible the differences between individual institutions regarding students’ family origins.

As Fig. 12 shows, if we compare the answers between the categories ‘neither parent born in this country’ and ‘all grandparents born in this country’ we can see that at institution G this difference between the two categories reaches a 5:1 ratio,

44 In the context of this study, ancestry is considered only within 1st (parents) and 2nd (grandparents) generation.
meaning that for every five students that had neither parent born in Canada there is one student whose grandparents were all born in Canada. In institution A, the ratio (1:4) is reversed, meaning that for every four students that had all grandparents born in Canada, there is one that had neither parent born in Canada. In this regard these two institutions can be seen as having completely different student populations – at least in relation to their family origins. Other institutions (with the potential exception of institution C) show a much more even distribution between students of Canadian/non Canadian origin. This image of ancestral diversity (or the lack of it) could be seen as reflecting the differences in diversity of first languages discussed in Subchapter 5.1.2 above, especially if we compare the difference between institutions A and G that are again the most divergent in the set. Fig. 13 below shows the distribution of permanent and temporary residents among the students.

![Students' residency](chart.png)

**Fig. 13. Students’ residency.**

In Fig. 13 the highest share of permanent residents can be observed in institution B (95 %), while the highest share of temporary residents is in institution G (26 %). Although the difference in the residency status of students among the participating university is visible, it is of relatively low magnitude, when compared to the other variables analysed above. Considering the fact that in the entire set 24 % of students reported that they were not born in Canada, only 10 % claimed to be temporary residents, while 2 % did not provide an answer and 88 % claimed to be permanent
residents. If we were to assume that international students have not been awarded a permanent residency status (given the legal requirements for permanent residency in Canada), then we could suggest that international students account for approximately 10% (and up to 12%) of the entire student population. Following the same assumption, we could then claim that the remaining 14% (out of 24%) of students that were not born in Canada have by the time of the survey already been awarded permanent residency and have likely immigrated to the country earlier (with their parents or otherwise). This discussion concludes this subchapter on the family origins of the students and their residential status. The next subchapter discusses minority affiliation, as self-declared by the students.

5.1.4 Minority affiliation

The survey allowed for the students to declare themselves as belonging or not belonging to ethnic, religious, language, socio-economic, sexual or other minorities with a choice of multiple possible answers. Fig. 14 in this subchapter presents the initial distribution between students that see themselves as belonging to at least one minority and those that do not see themselves as belonging to any minority group. Fig. 15 and Table 5 then present a more nuanced analysis that makes visible which minorities were reported by the students at each institution.

Fig. 14. Minority vs. majority.
Overall, 41% of all students identified themselves as belonging to at least one minority group, while 55% did not see themselves as belonging to any minority. 4% of respondents did not offer a valid set of answers to this question. Similarly to the data on first language and family origins, the largest difference in the set is again between institutions A and G. 64% of students in institution A did not see themselves as belonging to any minority, while in institution G only 42% respondents did not identify with any minority group. All the other institution clustered close to the national average (55%), with a range between 52% (institution B) and 61% (institution C). Institution G is the only institution in the dataset where the number of students that identified themselves as belonging to at least one minority group (54%) exceeds the number of students that did not identify with any minority (42%). In other words, in institution G minorities could be considered to constitute a majority. Fig. 15 below presents the distribution of students in terms of affiliation to different minorities.

Fig. 15. Different minorities.

Due to the complex nature of minority data, related to multiple choice answers there are two caveats to consider while reading this chart. First it should be noted that answers by students that do not associate themselves as belonging to any minority are omitted from this chart, thus creating a potentially false image regarding the respective shares of minorities, compared to all students at any institution. Second, given the multiple choice nature of the answers, this chart does not represent an
actual share of any given minority group within the ‘belongs to at least one minority’ group, because several students associate themselves as belonging to more than just one minority. Thus for instance a student could choose to belong to an ethnic, a religious and a language minority at the same time and his answers would count in each of these categories. In this regard Fig. 15 merely shows how many students affiliate themselves (non-exclusively) with a certain minority group at any given institution. For that purpose absolute numbers of students are also part of the columns, while the visualisation can give us some insight into which minority groups are more or less represented at each institution. Table 5 below presents the data in a non-visualized and more complex form.

Table 5. Different minorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent group</th>
<th>Ethnic minority</th>
<th>Religious minority</th>
<th>Language minority</th>
<th>Socio-economic status</th>
<th>Sexual identity</th>
<th>Another minority</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution A</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution B</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution D</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution E</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution F</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution G</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1,092/592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of data in Table 5 shows that on average students associate themselves as belonging to approximately 2 minorities (1,092/596=1.83). When choosing their affiliations, 23 % of students (337 out of 1451) saw themselves as belonging to an ethnic minority, 15 % to a religious one, 14 % to a language minority, 11 % to a socio-economic minority, 7 % to a sexual minority and 6 % to other minorities. An overview of Table 5 suggests, that each individual minority is represented the strongest in a different institution, for instance; ethnic minorities in institutions B and G, religious minorities in institutes E and F, language minorities in institutes G and A, socio-economic minorities in institutes F and G, sexual and other minorities in institutes D and F. In this regard it is worth remembering that the data set for institutions D and F was 10 % to 15 % larger than the other institutions with 221 and 229 respondents.
Again, institution A draws attention to itself in Table 5, especially in regard to its low number of students (low in the context of Canada) that see themselves as belonging to an ethnic or religious minority. Compared for instance to institutions B and G, institution A displays a very high level of ethnic homogeneity, while institution G is again seen as the most heterogeneous one. Of potential interest is also a comparison between data on first language and belonging to a language minority that shows some (unexpected) discrepancies. For instance, at institution A, 42 respondents indicated French as their first language and 9 other students noted other languages (apart from English), yet only 32 considered themselves as belonging to a language minority. In institution G, 92 students responded as not having English as a primary language (48 of those chose Chinese as primary), however when asked about their affiliation to a language minority, only 44 (less than a half) responded positively. In all other institutions the number of students that perceived themselves as belonging to a language minority was smaller than the number of students who did not indicate English (or French) as a primary language.

I am convinced that other interesting comparisons could be made and likely will be made by other researchers, however, as the topic of this research is predominantly Canadian exceptionalism, I conclude my analysis of the demographic data with this example. In this research the demographic data serves the purpose above all of introducing the basic (shared) characteristics of the target group, while at same providing an opportunity to map and sketch some of the parameters of cultural/international diversity in Canadian universities.

To conclude, the analysis of demographic data suggests a high level of diversity among the students captured in the survey in terms of language, family origins and belonging to different minority groups, but also suggests considerable differences in this regard between some institutions. In the next subchapter the results of the Canadian dataset related to family origins are compared to other national datasets in the wider EIHE project, which gives the level of diversity manifested in Canadian dataset some broader contextualization. This chapter is concluded with a subchapter that explores whether this ‘official’ or ‘visible’ diversity is also accompanied by a corresponding diversity in the students’ responses to content-based questions on internationalization of higher education. But before that, it is important to consider the Canadian dataset in an international context.
5.2 Canadian demographic data in comparison to other countries in the EIHE project

This subchapter presents a comparison between the family origins of students of Canadian universities and the family origins of students of universities from other countries that participated in the EIHE project. Data on the students’ family origins (Fig. 16) was chosen for this comparison as it is both indicative of the level of internationalization of the universities and the level of (ethnic, linguistic and other) diversity among the students. As there was no question in the dataset that would specifically enquire about the international status of the students, the data on the birth country of the students is (together with the data on residency) considered as indicative of both the number of international students and the number of students who have (recently) moved to the countries in the project. Since other demographic variables (such as first language and affiliation with various minority groups) are in many ways influenced by the students’ family origins, data on the students’ family origins was chosen as the most relevant variable for comparison between participating countries – also considering the very complex nature of responses related to language and minority affiliation. As this research is focused specifically on notions of Canadian exceptionalism, this comparison serves the purpose of contextualizing (the high level) of Canadian (demographic) diversity within the EIHE project. In order to historically contextualize the discussion, the comparison between the countries in the project is framed by some very brief references to the histories of migration (and subsequently diversity of origin) of the countries in question. Since the highly multicultural composition of Canadian society, together with the attitude of the Canadian state and Canadians towards multiculturalism, presents one of the foundations of Canadian exceptionalism (as discussed in Subchapter 3.1.4), this subchapter aims to explore to what extent Canada’s diversity is ‘exceptional’, in comparison to other project countries.
The presentation of data in Fig. 16 is organized in descending order according to the country of birth of students' grandparents. Such a presentation was chosen with the purpose to highlight the importance of Canada’s long history of immigration not just for diversity of students’ origins, but also for general population. The chart was compiled with an assumption that countries with longer histories of migration and (permanent) settlement, such as Canada, would be visibly more diverse also in terms of previous generations (grandparents), not just the recent ones (students and their parents). In this regard we can observe how in Fig. 16 settler countries with a strong history of (colonial) migration are among the ones where students report to have to lowest share of 'all grandparents born in this country'. Canada can be seen as leading the chart, being the country with the most diverse students' ancestry (both of parents and grandparents), although it is not the first in diversity when it comes to birth country of students themselves. The participating universities from Sweden and United Kingdom have a marginally lower share of students born in the country than Canadian universities, while the participating university from Ireland could be seen on par with Canada. However, the comparison between Ireland and Canada is perhaps the best example in the set of the difference between 'new' and 'old' diversity. While in both countries 80 % percent of students were born in the country, the difference in the origins of the parents and grandparents is much more significant. In Ireland there is no difference between the number of students (80 %)
who were born in Ireland and the ones whose parents (80%) and grandparents (80%) were born in Ireland. As unusual as this may sound, in the case of Ireland all students who were born in the country had 100% Irish roots (at least for the last two generations).

In the case of Canada, the situation is significantly different. Although 80% of the students of Canadian universities were born in Canada, only 56% (slightly more than a half) had parents who were both born in Canada and only 33% (a third) had grandparents who were all born in the country. While this difference is by itself remarkable, it should be considered also in the light of historic differences between the two countries. According to Glynn (2012), apart from recent years, Ireland was never a country of immigration, but quite the opposite a country of strong emigration – especially in the middle of the 19th century, during the period of the Great Famine, but also in consecutive waves during the 50s and 80s in the 20th century.45 On the other hand, Canada remained an immigrant / settler country throughout its entire history. Statistics Canada projects that, by 2031, almost one-half of the population over the age of 15 will not be born in Canada or will have at least one foreign-born parent (Malenfant et al. 2010: 1) and the data obtained from the students’ survey seems to be broadly supportive of that prediction.

When Canadian statistics are compared to Aotearoa / New Zealand – a country with a similar history of colonial settlement, differences – while still significant, become much smaller, and we can observe a similar pattern of a significantly smaller share of parents (68%) and grandparents (43%) to students (84%) that were born in country. A similar thing could be said about a comparison with South Africa – another country with a low share of all grandparents (54%) who were all born in the country. However, the history of (patterns of migration to) South Africa was markedly different from the Canadian one and the history in Aotearoa / New Zealand. According to the Institute of South African Race Relations (cited in Johnson 2009) after the end of apartheid in the 90s white people began to leave the country in large numbers, although the country itself remains attractive to people from other African countries. A very similar pattern could be observed in Kenya, also a former British colony, where almost all British settlers left soon after the country’s independence in 1964 (Kyle 1999). After the end of British colonial rule, Kenya never became a strong immigration destination (especially not in terms of higher education) and is today one of the countries with the least diversity of family

---

45 Since 1800, an estimated 10 million people left Ireland (Glynn 2012).
origins in the EIHE dataset. Although none of these 4 countries remains a colony today, the difference between South Africa and Kenya on one side and Canada and Aotearoa / New Zealand on the other, is that after the independence struggle, the governments in Kenya and South Africa were in the hands of representatives of the indigenous people of the country i.e. their constitutive Nations, unlike what happened in Canada and New Zealand, where the indigenous populations were never granted full sovereign rights over the state territory. In this regard, while all these 4 countries were once colonies, only Canada and New Zealand remain settler countries to this day, which could be considered as having a significant influence on the ongoing flows of migration and on the resulting diversity of origins of students and their families.

In light of these comparisons, the perception of how high the level of diversity (of family origins) is of Canadian students – or in other words – how 'exceptionally' multicultural is Canada, depends very much on what we compare the Canadian dataset to. If we compare the Canadian data to countries that never experienced significant immigration (such as Kenya, until recently) Finland, China, Slovakia) or to countries that were historically places of emigration (Ireland) then the diversity of family origins can be seen as 'exceptionally' high. However, when we consider the Canadian data in comparison to countries with similar colonial or settler history, such as Aotearoa / New Zealand, and if we consider the geographical size of the country, its subsequent abundance of natural resources and economic growth potential, that have all significantly influenced Canadian immigration policies (Head & Ries 1998, Kelley & Trebilcock 1998, Knowles 2016), then the exceptional nature of Canadian diversity seems to portray itself as a rather logical consequence of the specific needs of expansion-based settler communities. Similar patterns or immigration could thus be observed also in other countries with similar (colonial/settler) history. In this regard, Canadian multicultural diversity seems to be more a consequence of a specific set of historic, economic and political factors, as suggested by internationalization policy analysis in Subchapter 2.2, and by critics of multicultural capitalism in Subchapter 3.2.3, rather than it being merely a

---

46 According to International Organization for Migration (2015: 16), although hosting one of the largest refugee populations in Africa, international migrant population in the country is estimated at around two percent of entire population. Further, it should be mentioned that diversity of origin in the context of this study should not be taken as suggesting that there is no or little diversity within any country, and especially not in countries as multi-ethnic as Kenya. In this subchapter diversity is understood merely within the political framework of the nation state and as indicative of more (not manifest) diversity.

47 Unfortunately, within the EIHE project, there was no data available for Australia that could also be seen as sharing many colonial historic similarities.
reflection or a consequence of inherent Canadian openness towards difference and diversity, as suggested in the examples of exceptionalist narratives in Subchapter 3.1.4.

This discussion concludes the contextualization of the Canadian demographic data – in relation to other countries that participated in the EIHE project. The following subchapter presents an analysis of content-related quantitative data that offers further insight into the perceptions of students of Canadian universities on the subjects of internationalization and the role of higher education in society, which – among other topics, also includes their perceptions on diversity and difference – especially in terms of their perceived value within the context of higher education.

5.3 Analysis of content related quantitative data

This subchapter presents an analysis of content-based quantitative data that sought to explore students’ opinions on the internationalization of higher education, the social role of universities, their field of study and what they value in their courses. Since a complete report of all quantitative data is available as part of the general project, this study focuses only on the three most and three least preferred statements in each subset in order to highlight that the spread of variations of answers between institution is very small. As there was little variation in the hierarchies of preference among participating institutions I decided to focus on the most pronounced differences, highlighting the most/least favoured preferences of the students.

In total 92 statements (variables), divided into three different major clusters were available for analysis. The first cluster of questions asked the students to which extent they agreed/disagreed with various statements related to:

- importance of universities to wider society;
- opportunities offered to students by the internationalization of universities;
- potential challenges that internationalization of universities pose.

The second cluster asked the students which items they consider important for their field of study or academic discipline. This cluster also included three subsets, related to:

- skills and dispositions relevant to their field of study;
- global themes relevant to their field of study;
social and political issues relevant to their field of study.

The third and final cluster asked the students what kinds of learning they value in their courses and contained no subsets. The number of statements within individual subsets ranged from 6 to 23. The respondents were asked to assess all 92 available statements. In the first and in the third cluster the students were able to express their agreement or disagreement with each individual statements on a 4-point Likert scale. The available answers in the first and third cluster were: ‘strongly disagree’ (1), ‘disagree’ (2), ‘agree’ (3) and ‘strongly agree’ (4), while in the second cluster they were able to choose between four different levels of relevance, ranging from ‘non relevant’ (1) to ‘somewhat relevant’ (2), ‘relevant’ (3), and ‘very relevant’ (4). All three clusters also included optional answers ‘unsure’ and ‘no opinion’. These two answers are not part of the analysis, presented in this subchapter. In all the figures in this subchapter a value 4 represents the strongest agreement or highest relevance possible and value 1 the lowest. The values in the figures are the mean values related to each statement.

The presentation of the data is organized in seven separate figures that follow the sequence of questions (and subsets of answers) in the survey. For each of the seven subsets only the 3 most favoured and 3 least favoured statements (in the entire set) are presented. In order to capture more nuance in the answers, the figures are also colour coded in red and blue. The three different shades of red refer to three most favoured choices for each individual institution, while the 3 lowest values are presented in three different shades of blue. Three highest set means are coded in yellow, while the three lowest are coded purple. If the answers do not belong to either of these groups, the field remains white. This colour coding scheme was developed with the purpose of visually showing to what extent the hierarchies of preference overlap (or not) between individual institutions. The full colour legend is presented below in Fig. 17 and applies to all figures in this subchapter. Fig. 18 is analysed in way that explains the reading of the colour coding and data organisation in situ, while the analysis of the other figures is focused exclusively on the data.
Fig. 17. Colour coding legend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Corresponding colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest set means</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest set means</td>
<td>Purple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest value in row</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd highest value in row</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd highest value in row</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest value in row</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd lowest value in row</td>
<td>Cyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd lowest value in row</td>
<td>Magenta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned above, the example of Fig. 18 will be used initially to demonstrate the logic of the data organisation, which follows these 5 principles; (i) each figure features 6 variables – 3 with highest complete set means on the left (yellow) and 3 with the lowest complete set means (purple) on the right; (ii) the 3 variables on the

**Fig. 18. Importance of universities to society (set mean 3.14).**

Omitted from figure:

- enable the production of innovations for society (3.30)
- contribute to national culture (3.16)
- promote critical awareness of social problems (3.15)
- train a highly skilled workforce (3.14)
- contribute to democratic debate about the future (3.12)
- contribute to national economic growth (3.06)
- create spaces to challenge injustices (3.05).

As mentioned above, the example of Fig. 18 will be used initially to demonstrate the logic of the data organisation, which follows these 5 principles; (i) each figure features 6 variables – 3 with highest complete set means on the left (yellow) and 3 with the lowest complete set means (purple) on the right; (ii) the 3 variables on the
left are organised in descending order, while the 3 variables on the right are organised in ascending order; (iii) full description of answers (including the ones absent from the figure) are presented in the legend below each figure; (iv) each institution’s chosen answers are also represented by a colour that denotes either the 3 highest levels of agreement (3 hues of red) or 3 lowest levels of agreement (3 hues of blue); (v) if the mean value in any given cell does not represent either the ‘top 3’ or ‘flop 3’ the cell remains plain.

For example: in the case of Fig. 18 this colour coding would mean that in the case of institution A and B all 3 highest scoring and all 3 lowest scoring answers are captured in the figure, while for institution C only the 2 highest scoring (and all 3 lowest scoring) answers are present. In case of institution D only the first and the third most preferred answers are present, while the second most preferred answer is absent, and the first two least preferred answers are present, with the third least favoured absent. Still, we can observe that only 7 out 42 are left blank, meaning that this figure covers a majority of both the most and the least preferred answers. All the available answers are listed below each respective figure and they are organised according to the set means (averages).

Although it would be possible to choose more than just the 3 most/least favoured statements in larger subsets, a decision was made to keep the number down to 3 for each in order to ensure coherence of the analytical narrative. A detailed analysis of all other (50) statements is thus omitted from this text due to considerations about its size and relevance. Each figure in this is nevertheless accompanied by a full list of omitted available answers – with corresponding set mean values. This makes it is possible to see also for which answers the students’ opinions were less strong and which were the ones that were excluded from the figures by a thin margin. By taking account also of the omitted answers I attempt to follow the same research principles that that were outlined in the subchapter on the use of social cartography in this research (4.2.5). While this subchapter would likely not be considered as an exercise in social cartography (although it does map certain discursive orientations – at least indirectly) I believe that mapping absences is also important in quantitative analysis, occasionally even more so than mapping what is present.

48 Full comparative tables with all 92 variables are available as part of the EIHE data portfolio, but not as part of this text.
5.3.1 Cluster 1: Statements related to the social role of higher education and the internationalization of higher education

This subchapter presents data related to the social role of universities and the internationalization of higher education. The subchapter is divided into three subsets that explore: a) the importance of universities to wider society; b) the opportunities of internationalization for students; c) the challenges of internationalization. The main question for all three subsets was: To what extent do you agree with the following statements? Possible responses to this question were: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3) and strongly agree (4). Answers ‘unsure’ and ‘no opinion’, together with missing answers are not part of the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent group</th>
<th>Universities are important to broader society, because they...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1mf1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution A</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution B</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution C</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution D</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution E</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution F</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution G</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most favoured: 1 A1mf1 – contribute to scientific knowledge 2 A1mf2 – enable the discovery of facts 3 A1mf3 – develop rational thinking

Least favoured: 4 A1ff1 – provide effective solutions for social problems 5 A1ff2 – enable the development of comm. products 6 A1ff3 – build understandings that contribute to social harmony

Fig. 19. Importance of universities to society (set mean 3.14).

Omitted from figure:
- enable the production of innovations for society (3.30)
- contribute to national culture (3.16)
- promote critical awareness of social problems (3.15)
- train a highly skilled workforce (3.14)
- contribute to democratic debate about the future (3.12)
- contribute to national economic growth (3.06)
- create spaces to challenge injustices (3.05).

Fig. 19 shows that in the opinion of students the three most important contributions of universities to wider society are the university contribution to scientific...
knowledge, the development of rational thinking and the discovery of facts, while the three least important contributions are to provide effective solutions for social problems, to enable development of commercial products and to build understandings that contribute to social harmony. There is very little divergence between which are considered the most and least important contributions among individual institutions, especially when we consider the two most and two least favoured answers. 13 of the 14 possible top 2 positions are captured in the figure, meaning that there is a very high level of agreement among the students that the universities’ contributions to scientific knowledge and development of rational thinking are their most important roles. Similarly, there is no visible disagreement at the level of individual institutions that providing effective solutions for social problems and development of commercial products are the least important contributions of universities, as both of columns for these variables are filled exclusively with either the least of second least favourite choices. These two answers were also the only 2 answers in the group where the mean average of all seven institutions fell slightly below the level of general agreement (marked by the value 3.00). In other words, it seems that on average students consider the university to be important to the society in all of these ways, with the potential exception of to ‘provide effective solutions to social problems’ and to ‘enable the development of commercial products’.

All 3 most favoured answers could be seen as belonging to a common group of the production of objective, scientific knowledge and the encouragement of rational thinking. In this regard universities seem to be perceived as spaces that are valued for their production of a particular kind of knowledge which is considered objective or perhaps seen also as ‘politically and ideologically neutral’. The list of the least favoured answers seems to suggest that universities are not perceived as contributing to society so much in terms of production of (overtly) politically engaged or politicized knowledge. For instance, it would be possible to claim that the least favoured options are indicative of the three main discursive orientations that were identified as operating with the higher education system (liberal, neoliberal and critical) by the EIHE project. The least favoured option, to ‘provide effective solutions to social problems’ could be seen as indicative of a liberal orientation as similarly to the 3rd least favoured option, to ‘build understandings that contribute to social harmony’. The 2nd least favoured answer, to ‘enable the

49 For a more detailed discussion on these three main orientations in higher education see Subchapter 2.1.4 (EIHE social cartography).
development of commercial products’ and another low scoring answer, to ‘contribute to national economic growth’ could be seen as directly suggesting a neoliberal orientation, while another unfavourable answer, to ‘create spaces to challenge injustices’ could be seen as suggesting an engaged critical stance. According to the students these kind of contributions of the university to society are seen as the least important ones among the available answers.

It is interesting that students consider universities’ contribution to society as less (but still) important in terms of knowledge production that could be seen as manifestly related to all three main orientations – liberal, neoliberal and critical, albeit to a different degree. In terms of exploring the perceptions that relate to the production of knowledges that are perceived as neutral vs. more politically or discursively ‘charged’, the answer, to ‘enable the production of innovative solutions for society’ seems particularly poignant. This answer almost made it into the ‘top 3’ list (mean 3.30, threshold line 3.32) and indeed it was chosen as the second or third most favoured choice by students of 4 universities. While it is possible to interpret this answer in multiple ways (as referring to technological, social, product-related or other kind of innovation, development and production), one interpretation could be that although students did not appreciate the suggestion much that universities directly develop commercial products (manifest neoliberal orientation) they seemed much more supportive of the (likely seen as more ‘neutral’) idea of production of ‘innovations for society’. However, in light of an increasing neoliberal co-option of a higher-education discursive (and research agenda) space in Canada (as suggested by discussion in Subchapter 2.2.2), it is difficult not to suggest that in many ways the ‘production of innovations for society’ might be just a euphemism for ‘the development of commercial products,’ but constructed and re-articulated in what is perceived as the ideologically neutral language of science, technology and innovation. The considerable divergence in how students valued these two answers (they are quite on the opposite sides of the spectrum) seems to suggest that this potentially very strong link between ‘production of innovations’ and ‘development of commercial products’ was largely not made.

Finally, it is in this regard perhaps not too farfetched to suggest that it is through such (very likely unconscious) strategies of discursive ‘neutralization’, ‘objectification’ and ‘scientification’ by evoking the language of innovation and progress, that neoliberal or market-oriented discursive orientations are positing themselves as neutral, which in psychoanalytic terms is often referred to as the space of ideology at its purest.
A somewhat similar pattern could be seen emerging from the difference between how the answers, to ‘provide effective solutions for social problems’ and to ‘promote critical awareness of social problems’ were perceived. While ‘providing effective solutions for social problems’ was one of the two least favoured responses, students were in more agreement that universities are important because they ‘promote critical awareness of social problems.’ On one hand, this could be seen as to some extent resonating with the manifest (solutions for social problems) vs. latent or ‘scientized’ (critical awareness of social problems) dilemma encountered above, it could also be read as a kind of (liberal) critique of the university, where students seem to agree that universities do promote awareness of social problems, but are on the other hand found to be somewhat lacking in the actual or effective contributions to their resolution. Neither of these readings should be taken as conclusive, but it is with these thoughts in mind that the discussion of this set of answers is concluded. The next two sets of answers are related to the perceptions of students about potential opportunities and challenges related to the internationalization of universities.

**Fig. 20. Opportunities provided by internationalization (set mean 3.22).**

Omitted from figure:

- build international careers (3.32)
- develop intercultural competences (3.26)
- engage with perspectives from multiple social groups in courses (3.23)
- learn from instructors from different countries (3.22)
– understand global inequalities (3.20)
– become global leaders (3.19)
– become aware of global interdependence (3.17)
– critically analyse global issues (3.17).

The distribution of answers in Fig. 20 suggests that ‘participating in study abroad programmes’ is perceived as the biggest (best, most likely) opportunity for internationalization in all universities, followed by ‘learning from other students from different countries’ and ‘volunteering abroad’. ‘Building international careers’ missed the top 3 position by an insignificant (0.01) margin. Indeed, students in 4 out 7 universities (B, C, E, G) chose this answer as the third most important one and could be thus counted among the answers with the highest level of agreement. ‘Developing skills to reduce global inequalities’ seems to be broadly considered as the least likely opportunity of internationalization, followed closely by ‘comparing universities through global rankings’ and ‘learning new languages’.50 The answers, to ‘become aware of global interdependence’ and ‘critically analyse global issues’ also fell short of being included in the figure by a very small (0.03) margin. Similar to the first set of answers (in Fig. 19) we can again observe that there is a very high level of coherence in the choice of most/least preferred answers. The students of all universities chose the same most preferred answer, while their second choice was divided only between two answers. Similarly, they all chose the same least preferred answer, and in 6 out 7 cases the same second least preferred answer.

In general, it is possible to observe that all the answers to the question about opportunities of internationalization are clustered very closely together and distributed very evenly around the set mean (3.22), with very small differences between individual answers. This full set also displays the highest overall mean average (3.22) of all answers to any of the questions asked, meaning that on average students universally agreed that all of these opportunities were available (present, happening, possible) – the only question is to what (high) extent.51

50 In Fig. 20 institution C is coded as having the ‘the developing skills to reduce global inequalities’ as 2nd least favoured choice and ‘compare universities through global rankings’ as first, however the difference in means between these two answers is only visible on the level of the third decimal, which could be considered statistically completely negligible.
51 This could be also referred to as the highest average of the averages, meaning that students in this set of questions answered on average in the most like-minded way. For instance – the lowest mean among available answers was 3.00 (develop skill to reduce global inequality). Translated back into the answers available in the 4-point Likert scale an average value 3 means ‘I agree’.
However, in spite of these similarities we can still observe some, perhaps significant patterns. First is that all the answers in the most preferred group are of a kind that relate to learning experiences that are directly beneficial for the students themselves (study abroad, learning from others, volunteering).\textsuperscript{52} All of them could also be seen as relating to learning from ‘difference’ or from people and contexts that are out the everyday experience of students. ‘Building an international career’ and the ‘developing intercultural competences’ (4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} most preferred) option could also be seen as belonging to the same kind of orientations.

The group of less preferred or less relevant opportunities is potentially more diverse, but apart from ‘learn new languages’ does not seem to include any answer that would be of direct personal benefit to students, at least not in the sense of career building. While there are probably several reasons why students do not associate learning new languages with opportunities of internationalization as much as with some other opportunities, it is possible to suggest that at least partially the relatively low ranking of this answer could be explained by the dominance of the English language as the virtually single main language of instruction in all institutions, by the fact that most students are primarily English speaking (75\%) and that also most of exchange programmes are carried in English.\textsuperscript{53} In other words, unless students would specifically desire to learn a new language (apart from English), there is not much chance that they would learn a new language simply because of internationalization or exchange practices. Other answers among the less favoured group, such as the least favoured ‘develop skills to reduce global inequalities’ or the answer ‘become aware of global interdependence’ and ‘critically analyse global issues’ (4\textsuperscript{th} and 5\textsuperscript{th} least favoured) could all be seen as belonging to a group of answers that are related to social (and other types of) justice in a globalized society, where the emphasis is not on direct benefit for the student (like in the group of the most favoured answers), but is instead oriented towards shared social (or public) concerns.

Finally, the answer ‘compare universities through global rankings’ perhaps merits some closer attention, as it could be potentially considered as directly relevant to the students in terms of career building (which they listed as an

\textsuperscript{52} While it would difficult to argue that the only benefits of volunteering are those that accrue to the volunteers themselves, new learning experiences are often considered among the most important motivating reasons for volunteering (Hwang \textit{et al.} 2005).

\textsuperscript{53} Only 4 students reported French as the main language of instruction and 13 reported English in combination with an additional language. See Subchapter 5.1.2 for a more detailed analysis of first languages, spoken by the students.
important opportunity of internationalization), and is certainly considered as very relevant by the faculty members of the participating universities, as explained further below. This answer was chosen as the 2nd least important or relevant opportunity of internationalization by the students. However, in the survey of faculty members (n= 31) of participating universities, in a question that enquired about the rationale for internationalization at their institution, 73 % of faculty members strongly agreed that the rationale for internationalization was ‘increasing global prestige (e.g. rankings)’. Among 12 available answers in the faculty survey this particular answer, together with ‘generating income’, was by far the most agreed upon choice. A corresponding mean in the faculty survey was a very high 3.73, which is much higher than the 3.07 average in the student survey.54 It would be possible to interpret this difference as resonating with the actual ranking status of universities that partook in the EIHE project. None of the institutions is a high-ranking university (on an international scale), which could be reflected by the students’ perception that (their) universities’ rankings are not a particularly strong opportunity (for their career) in the context of internationalization, but may well be considered by the universities themselves as a means of improving their ranking status and prestige. Following this discussion on the perceptions of opportunities provided by internationalization Fig. 21 on the next page presents the data related to corresponding challenges.

54 A maximum value of 4 would mean that all respondents strongly agree that this answer is an important rationale for internationalization. In the case of the faculty survey 73% of respondents strongly agreed, 20 % agreed, while 3 percent (1 person) disagreed and 3 percent (1 person) were unsure. It is difficult to interpret such a response as indicating anything apart from the fact that faculty members perceive increased prestige (and income generation) as the sine qua non of internationalization processes.
Fig. 21. Challenges of internationalization (set mean 2.53).

Omitted from figure:

- more content is added to an already crowded curriculum (2.55)
- countries lose their strong students who move to other countries (2.49).

The set of answers related to the question about the challenge of internationalization is the second smallest set available for analysis with 8 answers and it also the set with lowest set mean (2.53) among all. In this regard, the first observation that could be made is that on average students saw the challenges of internationalization as less pronounced compared to the opportunities (set mean 3.22). Indeed, these two sets represent the set with lowest overall mean (challenges – 2.53) and the set with the highest (opportunities – 3.22) of all available sets. To some extent this could be interpreted as suggesting that students (in general) perceive internationalization as offering more opportunities than challenges – at least in the context of the answers the students were able to choose from.

The second observation is again related to the very strong coherence of answers among participant institutions – this time probably influenced as well by the smaller size of the set. Thus we can see that the students from 6 out 7 institutions chose ‘foreign students experience discrimination’ as the most likely challenge, while only students from institution G choose that answer as the second option to ‘universities accept students with poor language skills.’ At no university did the students choose an answer that would not be either ‘foreign students experience...
discrimination’, ‘universities accept students with poor languages skills’ or ‘other languages of instruction change to English’ as one of the three most favoured answers. In other words – there are no plain fields on the left hand side of Fig. 21, the three captured answers cover the full range of the most favoured answers.

Among the less favoured answers the students of all universities on average opted for the answer ‘local students are disadvantaged’ as the least likely challenge, while students of 5 out of 7 also chose the same second least favoured answer ‘only skills related to the international economy are valued’. These two answers, together with the third least favoured option (local and international students do not interact socially) are the first group of answers analysed so far that on average disagreed with a given statement more than agreed. It was not possible to suggest any conclusive interpretation of the students’ opinion on the remaining two answers ‘countries lose their strong students who move to other countries’ and ‘more content is added to already crowded curriculum’, as they converge too closely to the in-between (mean 2.50) position.

The third observation relative to this set is linked to case of institution G that was the only institution in the set where the acceptance of students with poor language skills seems to be of greatest concern for the respondents. As this is the institution with the highest level of reported linguistic (also family origin and minority) diversity in the set (see Subchapters 5.1.2, 5.1.3 and 5.1.4) a more detailed analysis was performed on this answer, and on the answer ‘foreign students experience discrimination’. In the first instance the students from institution G were differentiated into a group with English as a first language and in the second group that reported any other first language. Since English first speakers represented 51% of the entire population this effectively split the set in half. A comparison between the two groups did not reveal any significant difference in response rates regarding these two questions. The means of English as first language group were exactly 3.01 for both answers (discrimination and poor language skills), while the non-English first group mean for ‘foreign students experience discrimination’ was 2.87, while the mean for ‘universities accept students with poor language skills’ was 3.07. Although these differences are in general very small (4% and 2%), and likely negligible, it could still be seen as somewhat surprising that the group of students whose first language was not English perceived discrimination to foreign students as marginally less relevant and the acceptance of students with poor language skills as marginally more likely than the English speaking group (which contains

---

55 A mean of 2.50 would represent an even distribution of agreeing and disagreeing answers.
predominantly students of non-Canadian origin). A second analysis that sought to compare responses between temporary (considered indicative of specifically international students) and permanent residents showed even less difference between these two groups – although the population of temporary residents was much smaller (25% of all students) than the population of linguistic minorities. On the subject of discrimination, the respective means were 2.94 for temporary residents and 2.93 for students with permanent residency. In relation to the answer about poor language skills, the mean of students with temporary residency was 2.90 compared to 3.07 of the group with permanent residency. In this regard we are with little option but to conclude that differences in perceptions of discrimination of foreign students (and their language skills) between groups of temporary and permanent residency students are (at least at institution G) virtually non-existent.

The analysis of this set concludes with an observation that the answer ‘only skills related to international economy are valued’ was perceived by the students to be the 2nd least likely or least relevant challenge in the process of internationalization. This perception seems to be in stark contrast with official Canadian policy on internationalization (as presented in Subchapter 2.2.) where the main policy documents quite unquestionably specify that the main drivers for internationalization are strengthening Canada’s economic ties across the world, strengthening the direct economic impact of internationalization (as an export item) and encouraging the development of skills and knowledges that will strengthen Canadian competitiveness in the global market. It would be interesting to enquire what students perceive as ‘skills related to the international economy’ or how they understood this question in general (what it may mean that skills are valued and by whom), since they seem to agree in general that internationalization provides opportunities to ‘build international careers’, to ‘develop intercultural competences’, and to ‘become global leaders’. In all of these answers the number of agreeing answers significantly outweighed the number of disagreeing ones. While no such question was posed during the survey, the next cluster of questions and answers does explore which skills, dispositions, global themes and socio-political issues are relevant for their field or their academic discipline, thus offering at least some insight into what students perceive as valued (for their field and career), although the students (unlike policy makers) may not necessarily perceive their study or work as embedded in or influenced by the demands of the global market.
5.3.2 Cluster 2: Items (skills, dispositions, themes, issues) related to the students’ field of study or their academic discipline

This subchapter explores students’ perceptions on three different sets of items according to their relevance for the students’ field of study. The main question for this cluster was: To what extent do you consider the following items important to develop or to learn about in your field or academic discipline? The answers were organized in the following sets: a) Skills and dispositions relevant to my field of study; b) Global themes that are relevant to my field of study; c) Social and political issues relevant to my field of study. Although the question also featured an option of an additional open-ended answer, none of the 1,451 students decided to offer their own suggestion. Unlike in the previous subchapter where the students responded with various levels of agreement or disagreement, in this subchapter the possible answers were not relevant (1), somewhat relevant (2), relevant (3) and very relevant (4). This cluster of answers thus does not follow a Likert scale distribution as 3 of 4 answers suggest at least some level of relevance, with only one answer denoting the option of an item being irrelevant. Answers ‘unsure’ and ‘no opinion’, together with missing answers are not part of this analysis.

Fig. 22. Skills and dispositions relevant to the field of study (set mean 3.03).

56 The word ‘my’ in these cases refers to students'.
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In this set students had 10 skills/dispositions to grade according to their perceived relevance for their field of study. The relatively high set average (3.03) and the overview of means for individual answers suggests that students found most of the proposed skills and disposition as either relevant or very relevant. Only two answers could be considered of low relevance or potentially irrelevant to their field. These are ‘becoming an entrepreneur’ and ‘promoting innovation in the marketplace’. Given that fact that students of all universities on average chose ‘becoming an entrepreneur’ as the least relevant skill for their field of study and that 6 out 7 universities chose ‘promoting innovation in the marketplace’ as the 2nd least relevant skill – we can again observe the high level or similarity in the students’ perceptions between universities. Though it is possible to observe significant differences between individual universities regarding the absolute (means) values awarded to each skill/disposition, these differences do not translate into different hierarchies of preferences. The order of chosen skills is very similar, if not exactly the same among all the institutions. The pattern of similar or same preferential hierarchies / hierarchies of relevance can likewise be observed on the left side of figure where students of all institutions chose the same most relevant skill ‘thinking critically’. 5 out of 7 institutions chose ‘engaging with conflicting perspectives’ as the second most important skill and ‘considering the impact of my actions on society’ as the third. In one case the order of the second and third place was reversed. We can observe that only 5 cases (blank fields) of the three most/least relevant skills were not captured in this figure, which again suggests a very high level of similarity between hierarchies of relevance. The text below outlines a more detailed analysis of two variables that are furthest apart in the students’ hierarchies of relevance – ‘thinking critically’ and ‘becoming an entrepreneur’.

The relationship between these two skills or dispositions is interesting not just because it represents the two extremes of the hierarchy or spectrum of relevance, but also because it is potentially much more complex and ambiguous than it would appear at first glance, which merits further contextualization and exploration. The first observation that can be made about this relationship is that the difference (1.46) in average means (3.60 vs. 2.14) between these two answers is the largest in any of
the specific sets available for analysis (including the ones in other subchapters). Secondly, the ‘thinking critically’ answer is not the most preferred/relevant/agreed upon just in this set, but in the entire survey. If we were to risk any normative claims about the data available, it would be to say that students seem to agree universally that ‘thinking critically’ is the most important skill for their field of study. Only 5 students (0.3 %) in the entire survey (n=1,451) thought that ‘thinking critically’ was not relevant, 3.3 % saw it as somewhat relevant, 31.3 % as relevant and 63.2 % as very relevant. 0.9 % were unsure or had no opinion and 0.9 % did not answer. Of the 5 students who did not think critical thinking was relevant, only 1 was a student of education. All others seemed to think that critical thinking was at least somewhat, if not very relevant. Thirdly, in this particular set the skill/disposition of ‘analysing power relations’ was chosen as the third least relevant skill by the students followed closely by the skill/disposition of ‘questioning what I take for granted.’ Both of these skills/dispositions could be seen as indicative of critical thinking or even as pre-conditions for it, but students did not seem to think that they were as relevant as some other skills, such as ‘considering the impact of my actions’ and ‘making ethical decisions that benefit society.’ The difference between the high relevance attributed to skills that could be seen as oriented primarily towards personal benevolent agency, and the lesser perceived relevance of analysing power-relations and questioning personal (unacknowledged) assumptions, could be seen as suggesting an interpretative difference of ‘critical thinking’ between a liberal-critical and a critical orientation. As suggested in Subchapter 2.1.4, and discussed in more detail in Subchapter 6.1, a critical-liberal interstice is conceptualized (in this study) as emphasizing personal transformation and individual (benevolent) change agency, without recognition of systemic injustices and complicity, while a critical orientation is conceptualized as emphasizing a systemic critique, analysis of power relations, self-reflection and recognition of complicity.

The analysis of this set of answers, related to skills/dispositions relevant to students’ field of study, is concluded by some observations regarding the two skills/dispositions perceived as the least relevant – that is ‘becoming an entrepreneur’ and ‘promoting innovation in the marketplace’. The low level of relevance attributed to these two skills/disposition could be seen as congruous with similarly low levels of relevance attributed by students to virtually all other economy-related topics or issues throughout the survey, whether the subject was related to either (inter)national economy (‘trade barriers’, ‘corporate greed’, ‘economic growth’), development of commercial products (‘promoting innovation in the marketplace’, ‘how my field can generate profit’) or business success stories
‘learning from successful entrepreneurs’). The initial impression could thus be that students reject the market-oriented (neoliberal) narratives, or that they perceive them as irrelevant for their field or their personal career – especially since 57% of students in the survey are either education or social sciences/humanities students. However, rather than outrightly confirming this assumption, a more nuanced analysis of their answers seems to raise more questions about how students perceive their role in the job market and what they frame as ‘entrepreneurial skills’, ‘innovation’ or ‘marketplace’ in the context of their field of study and their personal careers, especially in the context of the increased commodification of education.

The analysis in Subchapter 5.3.2 showed, that when asked about potential opportunities of internationalization, the students emphasized most opportunities that could be interpreted as career building or developing career-related skills (participating in study abroad programmes, learning from students and instructors from other countries, volunteering, developing intercultural competences). Likewise, the answer, to ‘build international careers’ was highly (mean 3.32) agreed upon. As the analysis in part c below will show, students on average considered that ‘learning content that makes me competitive in the job market’ is relevant (mean 3.02). In this regard it could be suggested that while the students’ answers seem to suggest little or low interest (relevance of) in the subjects related to the economy or entrepreneurship (understood in the ‘classical’ business sense), they seem to be well aware of the kinds of skills and competences they would need to compete (globally) more successfully in their respective disciplines or that would enable their personal and professional growth. The related subject of the commodification of otherness for personal benefit is discussed in more depth in Chapters 6 and 7.

To summarize: while critical thinking is seemingly consensually considered by the students as the most relevant skill in their respective fields of study, when looking for manifestations or indications of critical thinking (outside its liberal framing) there is very little evidence to suggest its strong presence or high level of interest in ‘operationalized’ forms – such as analysis of power relations, recognition of personal complicity and systemic critique. Quite inversely, while students consider entrepreneurial (and other economy related) subjects or skills as least relevant for their field of study, they on the other hand seem to be very much interested in developing skills that would help them compete better in the ‘marketplace’ of their profession, such as intercultural competences, dealing with

57 The remaining 43% are science and/or engineering students. There are no students of business, economy or management in the survey.
conflicting positions, learning from students and instructors from other countries. This seems to suggest that the relationship between what students proclaim as relevant or important is not necessarily what seems to be reflected through their other answers. In other words, there seems to be considerable difference between what students say should be important (according to their perceptions) to their field of study (or career) and what they emphasize through their hierarchies of value and relevance. The discussion in the following part builds upon the analysis of the perceptions of skills/dispositions in this subchapter, and offers further insight into which global themes students consider as relevant to their fields of study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent group</th>
<th>Global themes that are relevant to my field of study:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution A</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution B</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution C</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution D</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution E</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution F</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution G</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 23. Relevant global themes (set mean 2.55).

Omitted from figure:
- discrimination (2.91)
- international cooperation (2.77)
- racism (2.77)
- poverty (2.72)
- gap between rich and poor (2.70)
- unequal relations of power (2.67)
- loss of jobs (2.57)
- waste of resources (2.55)
- international solidarity (2.51)
- government overspending (2.45)
- distribution of wealth (2.44)
- global mobility (2.42)
– over-consumption (2.41)
– disease epidemics (2.39)
– economic growth (2.38)
– climate change (2.32)
– corporate greed (2.22).

The set of answers related to global themes and their relevance to the students’ fields of study was the largest set in the survey with 23 available answers. In spite of this large choice, we can again observe a high level of similarity between the answers of students of individual institutions in relation to the 3 most and the 3 least relevant global themes. Only 6 fields in the figure are left blank, suggesting that even if the exact hierarchy of themes is not completely the same (ranks from 1 to 3 vary to some extent) there is very high agreement on which three themes are the most and least relevant. In fact, if we were not to consider institutions A and G, whose student populations were shown to be quite different from other universities’ students (see Subchapter 5.1), only 1 answer (third least relevant theme for institution D) would not be captured in Fig. 23. The relatively low average mean of the set (2.55), which is second lowest in the entire survey (after 2.53 in ‘challenges of internationalization’ set), and the subsequent analysis of individual global themes, suggests in general students consider most of the global themes as ‘somewhat relevant’ or ‘relevant’ but not ‘very relevant’.

A more detailed analysis of individual institutions and specifically the differentiation of students into groups according to their field of study shows a much higher level of difference in their answers, with very specific global themes emerging as much more or much less relevant than this overall analysis suggests. This more nuanced analysis will be presented in a separate article, following this research, but what can be observed already at this stage is that the three most relevant themes – access to education, technological advancements and human rights, could be seen as representing the three main groups of students captured by the survey, that is – students of education (access to education), science (technological advancements) and humanities/social sciences (human rights). They also seem to resonate very closely with the main Enlightenment-based ideals of modernity and with their emphasis on (the right to) universal education, (technological) progress and (individual) human rights.58

58 For a discussion of critiques of the modern liberal subjectivities see Subchapter 3.2.
On the other hand, global topics that have been the subject of a lot of ongoing (critical) attention from various scholars, political elites and the media, such as ‘trade barriers’, ‘terrorism’, ‘climate change’, ‘economic growth’ and others do not seem to be considered as particularly relevant for the students’ respective fields of study. As mentioned initially, apart from the 3 themes that were perceived as most relevant, none of the other options were awarded a high enough score to merit the average mark ‘relevant’ (mean 3), although some (such as discrimination – mean 2.91) could be considered close to that. This general dispersion of answers between specific field-related interests leading to the lower overall relevance of all proposed global themes, seems to suggest that in many ways the different fields of study or academic disciplines are still very much focusing rather exclusively on the subject-matter of their own domains, rather than considering or (seeing as relevant) the broader (global) implications of our collective (if compartmentalized) efforts or how the very framings and interests of specific disciplines are circumscribed and conditioned by the framings of a shared modern global imaginary – with all its impacts and consequences.59

![Image]

**Fig. 24. Social and political issues (set mean 2.93).**

With only 6 statements, the set of data related to social and political issues and their relevance to students’ fields of study is the smallest set of quantitative data in the entire survey. Apart from the already firmly established coherence between hierarchies of relevance between participating institutions, influenced perhaps in

---

59 For a discussion on the modern global imaginary see Subchapter 2.1.4.
the case also by the smallness of the set, we can observe also a relatively high range of difference between the most (‘how my field affects society’) and least (‘how my field can generate profit’) relevant issues.\textsuperscript{60} In a way this difference is very similar to what was possible to observe in the analysis of the first set of answers in this cluster (see Fig. 22). We can see again here how the economy or entrepreneurship related topics or issues (‘how my field can generate profit’ and ‘how rich countries influence poor countries’) are considered the least relevant by the students among all the available options. Also the creation of social inequalities (which could be considered as significantly conditioned by the functioning of the politico-economic system) is considered of smaller relevance than other socio-political issues. The issues gathered on the left (more relevant) side could be considered to be the ones that do not problematize or ‘expose’ the underlying systemic injustices or the complicity of higher education in the perpetuation of these injustices and violence. Inversely the issues on the right side of the figure seem to be of the kind that suggest that higher education could also be part of the profit-oriented agenda, and that there are very real differences between countries, resulting from (non-benevolent) power relations (rich vs. poor countries), and that social inequality is (somehow) actively constructed and not a ‘natural’ phenomenon, which could lead us to explore its root causes.

As this is the subchapter in the survey that most directly deals with power relations I will take the liberty to discuss the subject in more detail here, although I return to this discussion in the general context of this research in Chapter 6. The issues gathered on the left side could thus be seen as being framed in a language that could be considered devoid of such ‘politcized’ or ‘critical’ content and instead offers an ‘objectivist’, ‘neutralized’ (neo)liberal discourse that displaces certain (problematic, troubling, or uncomfortable) connections into epistemic non-existence (Sousa Santos 2001) or irrelevance. For instance, when students suggest that knowing ‘how their field affects society’ is of highest relevance for their discipline, this statement is met by a counter-statement on the other side of the relevance spectrum ‘how my field can generate profit.’ While this could be interpreted as a personal or manifest rejection of neoliberal imperatives for the commodification of knowledge, it could on the other hand also be interpreted to suggest that a crafting of positive narratives about themselves and (their role in) higher education as benevolent, objective, unbiased and oriented towards ethical

\textsuperscript{60} The only exception to this rule is the relatively high relevance of ‘how social inequalities are created’ to students of institution A.
agency, prevents the students from recognising or even considering their own role (and the role of their disciplines) in the overall framings of a neoliberal imaginary of higher education (as manifested by the policy papers presented in Subchapter 2.2) and that this is already at work. The question in this regard is not so much to what extent are students interested in (consciously) actively pursuing profit-oriented activities through their field of work and study, but rather to what extent they are able to perceive their fields as already influenced by profit-generating drivers. In this regard, the work of (for instance) an educator in an economic-growth and competition oriented educational system (such as the one described by the policy analysis (Pashby 2016) and the upcoming faculty survey) can hardly be seen as being outside profit-generating activities. Yet this is precisely how it must be seen, in order for the fusion of corporate and civic imaginaries to proceed unhindered.

Thus when students assert a high relevance of understanding to ‘how their field affects society’ it does not seem that they establish the connection that the ‘profit generation of their field’ is actually something that already belongs to the very category of their ‘field’s effect on society’, especially in the context of neoliberal drives for internationalization of higher education. In this way, we could risk an argument that a conceptualization or understanding of their field (and subsequently their work and their careers) as already participating (or operating within) a profit-oriented imaginary is impossible or detrimental to the preservation of a positive self-image and positive narratives of the exceptionally benevolent nature of (Canadian) public institutions (as outlined in Subchapter 3.1.4). The next oppositional duo of ‘how governments affect my field’ and ‘how rich countries influence poor countries’ could be interpreted as suggesting that a certain degree of either denial, incapacity or unwillingness to engage with the more troubling aspects of the countries’ inherent and exceptional benevolence seems to be at work. While students believe that the way ‘the governments affect their field’ is very relevant for their discipline, they do not seem to see the issue of ‘how rich countries affect poor countries’ as comparably relevant. But, as Canada is one of the richest countries in the world (and is even self-declared as such), the government that affects the students’ field and the government whose decisions affect poor countries, is essentially the same government.

---

61 As suggested by students answers in Subchapter 5.3.1 and also in the first part of this subchapter.
62 For more details see Subchapter 2.1.4
63 See Subchapter 2.2 and Subchapter 3.1.4 for examples of self-declaratory statements.
However, in the context of the predominant global imaginary that creates firmly established hierarchies of worth between different countries, cultures or nations (See Subchapter 2.1.4), and due to what could be termed as denial or failure to recognize the complex and complicit connections between the country’s various national and international policies, it is hardly surprising that the effects of the Canadian government’s policy somewhere outside national territory (especially on poor countries) are seen as less relevant. In this regard it is possible to argue that in order to preserve positive exceptionalist narratives about the self and the state it is necessary that such a hierarchy of relevance and worth is established. In terms of influence on higher education, it is necessary that the effects of ‘rich countries on poor countries’ through ‘trade barriers’, institutional support of ‘corporate greed’, policies on ‘climate change’, ‘global mobility’ or immigration policies, (lack of) ‘international solidarity’, - to name just a few from the long list of global themes (see Fig. 23), remain continuously irrelevant or less relevant to the various fields of study, including (perhaps most importantly) education.

The last remaining pair of socio-political issues ‘how academic knowledge can be biased’ and ‘how social inequalities are created’ could probably not be seen as being as closely infer-related as the two pairs of issues analysed above. However, it could be argued that social inequalities are also created through the marginalization of knowledges or through epistemic hegemony constructed by the very imperative of ‘objectivity’ and ‘scientific neutrality’ which is unable to recognize its own perpetually situated (and thus never neutral) position.64 However, as this subject touches upon the most fundamental perceptions of the role of higher education (and science) in society, and as the subject of knowledge production is also at the heart of multiple critiques of modern/liberal subjectivities (see Subchapter 3.2), the discussion on this issue takes place in chapter seven which discusses the implications of findings of this research for higher education.65 This concludes the subchapter that explored which kinds of items (skills, dispositions, global themes and socio-political issues) students perceive as relevant to their fields of study. The next subchapter offers an analysis of the last set of quantitative data and seeks to explore which kinds of subjects or approaches the students find valuable in their courses.

64 This subject is discussed in more detail in Subchapter 3.2 on the critiques of modern subjectivities and Subchapter 4.2.2 on the (post)representational turning(s) in social cartography.

65 In Subchapter 5.3.1, where students’ perceptions of the contributions of universities to wider society were analysed, students reported that to ‘contribute to scientific knowledge’, ‘develop rational thinking’ and ‘enable the discovery of facts’ were the universities most valuable contributions.
5.3.3 Cluster 3: Statements related to valuable course content

This subchapter contains only one set of data related to the course content or to educational approaches that the students may or may not consider as valuable for their courses. The students were asked to pronounce to what extent they agree or disagree with each of the statements. As in the first cluster of questions related to the social role of university and the effects in internationalization, the students were able to choose from the following answers on a 4-point Likert scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), agree (3), strongly agree (4). Again, the answers ‘unsure’ and ‘no opinion’ are not part of this analysis.

Fig. 25. Valuable course content (set mean 3.05).

Omitted from figure:
- learning about other cultures (3.26)
- having my views challenged (3.26)
- making up my own mind in courses (3.26)
- choosing what I learn (3.18)
- learning from people who have experienced injustices (3.11)
- debating course ideas (3.10)
- learning about how my lifestyle is related to global problems (3.03)
- learning content that makes me competitive in the job market (3.02)
- learning about how poorer countries can be helped to develop (2.90)
learning about the role my country has played in global injustices (2.90)
building consensus (2.84).

In this last set of quantitative questions, the students were asked to evaluate 18 statements related to the potential content of their courses or to various ways of learning that might be available to them. This is the only set that features an additional entry to the figure due to the fact that two responses shared the exactly same mean. These were the statements, ‘learning through the Arts’ and ‘learning from leaders of industry’. Most of the answers in this set (with the notable exception of ‘learning from successful young entrepreneurs’) converge very closely to the set mean (3.05), with very small differences in average values between individual statements. In spite of these small difference some patterns of clustering of answers could be observed. Perhaps the most obvious one again is the rejection of entrepreneurial content, this time exemplified by the statements ‘learning from successful young entrepreneurs’ (least favoured option) and ‘learning from leaders of industry (3rd least favoured option), although the students agreed that ‘learning content that makes me competitive in the job market’ was valuable. This could be interpreted as suggesting that the students’ perceptions of what is valuable for them in the sense of their own competitiveness, is not necessarily something that they could learn from ‘young entrepreneurs’, but perhaps from their ‘Others’ – as suggested in the next paragraph.

Namely, we can observe that all three statements that the students valued most highly could be seen as belonging to a common group of ‘learning from difference,’ indeed the word ‘different’ is present in all three answers – ‘having issues presented from different perspectives in my course’, ‘learning from people from completely different contexts’ and ‘learning from people who think differently from me’. It seems safe to consider the two answers that marginally (0.01 difference) fell short of inclusion in the figure – ‘learning about other cultures’ and ‘having my views challenged’ as largely belonging to the same group of answers. favouring statements that refer to learning from difference could be seen as largely consistent with previous expressed interest in ‘learning from students from other countries’ (Subchapter 5.3.1) and ‘engaging with conflicting perspectives’ or ‘working well with people from different countries’ (Subchapter 5.3.2). While such an emphasis on learning from difference could be read as both supporting the Canadian emphasis on the importance of multiculturalism and being rooted in the liberal discursive orientation, it also raises some questions whether this learning from others is not potentially also a sign of the (neoliberal) commodification and
consumption of otherness for personal growth and personal benefit, as conceptualized in the A.W.E.S.O.M.E cartography (Subchapter 4.2.5). Since the quantitative analysis has in general failed to demonstrate a specific interest of the students in deeper exploration of systemic (global) injustices (see Subchapter 5.3.2.), or more specifically the role of either students or the Canadian state in the reproduction of these global divisions, it is difficult to see how learning from difference could (by itself) be seen as indicative of an orientation towards shifting the existing power relations and systemic hierarchies. In other words, it is difficult to support a claim that the interest in learning from others is predominantly Other – rather than self-oriented.

Further, similarly to the discussion on the relatively low relevance attributed to the socio-political issue of ‘how rich countries influence poor countries’ in the previous subchapter, in this set of answers the statement ‘learning about the role my country has played in global injustices’ is among the lower scoring answers. The answer ‘learning about how my lifestyle is related to global problems’ was considered as slightly more relevant and resides firmly in the set average, however, depending on how students interpret the content of this statement it can either be seen as recognizing a certain degree of complicity in systemic harm or on the other hand (if taken in an over-simplified and unproblematic way) as supportive of benevolent or heroic agency through charitable behaviour, voluntarism and more ethical patterns of consumption. Either way the students did not consider that option to be among the most valuable ones, but was considered of average importance. This concludes the analysis of specific sets and clusters of quantitative data. The next subchapter offers a summary of cross-cutting findings, which concludes this chapter.

5.3.4 A summary overview of general observations on the content-based quantitative data

The analysis of the quantitative data shows a high level of convergence of answers among all participating institutions both on a general level, but also in the analysis of each individual subset. The differences that emerge are predominantly that of order, rather than rank, meaning that the students of the participating universities diverge primarily on to what extent they strongly agree or disagree with individual statements, but they do not diverge much on which these most or least favoured statements are.
The highest level of agreement on any given statement in all the sets is related to the relevance of critical thinking for the students’ field of study. Students of all seven institutions chose critical thinking as the single most important skill in their field of study and only 5 students (0.3 %) out of 1,451 thought that critical thinking was not relevant to their field. Similar convergences were found also on many other statements that the students chose as most or least relevant or with which they agreed or disagreed the most with. Thus, for instance students of all seven institutions agreed that the most important opportunity related to the internationalization of education were the ‘study abroad programmes’, while students in 6 out 7 institution considered that ‘discrimination of foreign students’ was the largest potential challenge for internationalization. Likewise, within all groups, the statement ‘how my field affects society’ was chosen as the most relevant socio-political issue.

In most cases the students also exhibited a high level of agreement in their disagreement, with again all seven groups choosing ‘developing skills to reduce global inequality’ as the least likely opportunity provided by internationalization or ‘disadvantaging local students’ as the least possible challenge related to internationalization. Similar patterns were found across the entire dataset, suggesting surprising similarities between students’ orientations and understandings of all participating universities. A simpler way to observe this similarity is to examine how very few fields were left uncoloured in the figures that presented the most and least favoured statements.

In order to test for consistency in the degree of similarity in the answers of the participating students, a more nuanced analysis of the two institutions (A and G) that were furthest apart was performed.66 This was chosen to specifically potentiate any existing differences in the hierarchies of value or relevance. The analysis showed that even the differences between two institutions that were furthest apart according to many (demographic and other) parameters were predominantly again just differences of order rather than of rank. Only by singling out specific subgroups based on their non-Canadian origin (temporary residence) did it become possible to register significant differences of rank as well. Looking for major differences in hierarchies of value and relevance between minority groups (or non-English/French group) and the majority population (not based on differences in residency) suggested only marginal (mostly negligible) influences. Similar results were found when looking for potential influences due to the level of education of

66 This analysis is part of the EIHE portfolio, but it is not an integral part of this dissertation.
the parents (primary carer) on content-based variables. The assumption that differences in socio-economic background (of which this was an indicator) should have a visible impact on the way students see the role of university and the internationalization of higher education were not confirmed.

Thus, even a detailed analysis was unable to demonstrate large-scale differences between students’ understandings of the social role of the university, the impact of internationalization or the skills and content relevant to their study among different subgroups of students who identified themselves as permanent residents of Canada. In many ways, the high level of similarity in the answers, not just between institutions, but also within them (between various subgroups), is probably one of the most important and surprising observations.

The second main observation is related to the complex and highly ambivalent relationship to the subject of critical thinking. While students seem to manifestly almost unanimously embrace critical thinking as the most important skill for their studies, they seemed to be much less inclined to favour other statements that could be considered as indicators of critical thinking, such as ‘analysing power relations’ or ‘questioning what they take for granted’. Neither did they consider subjects, such as ‘how rich countries influence poor countries’, ‘how social inequalities are created’ or ‘learning about the role my country played in global problems’ as very relevant.

The third and last main observation is related to similarly ambivalent nature of the relationship towards entrepreneurship and competitiveness in the job market. While the students consistently considered any manifest entrepreneurship or economy-oriented statements as among the least relevant for their studies, on the other hand they expressed considerable interest in their own careers and in developing skills that would help them be more competitive. However, it would seem that they do not perceive their career ambitions (and corresponding demands of the job market) as being entangled in the dominant entrepreneurial or corporate imaginary of higher education. To some extent this suggestion could also be seen as confirmed by the large differences between students’ perceptions of internationalization (as enabling learning experiences) and the policy documents (that emphasize economic expansion and strengthening Canada’s position in the world) that frame it. This summary concludes the analysis of quantitative data. The next chapter presents first the mapping of qualitative data onto the main EIHE social cartography, followed by an analysis of the qualitative data. A discussion on the intersections between quantitative and qualitative data is also presented in the next chapter.
6 Analysis of qualitative data

This chapter presents the analysis of the qualitative data of this study, using social cartography as the main analytical tool. This chapter adopts an analytical approach that quantifies the qualitative data with the purpose of making an initial comparison possible between different levels of representation of each of the 3 main discursive orientations (liberal, neoliberal, and critical) and their respective interstices.

The purpose of mapping the discourses is to explore to what extent and in what ways the 3 main discursive orientations (liberal, neoliberal, critical) and their interstices are represented in the students’ responses to 4 open-ended questions. The analysis focuses on the qualitative components of these answers, but also quantifies the qualitative data in order to make a comparison between levels of representation of different discursive orientations possible. This chapter also explores how various articulations of Canadian exceptionalism are reflected differently within three main discursive orientations (liberal, neoliberal, critical) and their interstices. This chapter is divided into 6 subchapters.

The first four subchapters (6.1–6.4) present the analysis of qualitative data and the mappings of students’ responses onto the main EIHE social cartography for each of the 4 questions. Subchapter 6.5 discusses student response rates and the quantitative components of students’ answers and explores the connections between the quantitative and qualitative components. The final subchapter (6.6) presents an overview of the observable general traits in the analysis of qualitative data and discusses several caveats related to its multiple possible readings and interpretations.

In this introduction to the analysis a reproduction of the main EIHE social cartography is made available below (Fig. 26) as a visual reminder of the different orientations and their interstices, according to which the qualitative data was quantified. Two additional interstices (liberal-relational and critical-relational) were added to the original cartography as (theoretical) possibilities that might be observable in the students’ responses.

67 For a discussion on the conceptualization of these orientations and their interstices, see Subchapter 2.1.4.
The 4 open-ended survey questions, whose answers are the subject of analysis in this subchapter are presented as titles of the first four subchapters. Each of these four subchapters features a presentation of a question-specific analytical matrix, examples of mapped data, and the results of the quantification process. In the analysis of Question 1 the answers belonging to each of the main orientations and interstices are discussed separately in order to offer an introduction into each of the categories, their conceptualizations and particularities. This makes this subchapter more extensive than others. In the subsequent subchapters related to Questions 2–4 an overall analysis is presented at the end of each subchapter and draws from all responses to the respective question.

The 6 letter coding of responses on all subchapters below is comprised of: (i) the letter code of the institution (A, B, C ... G); (ii) the two letter code for field of study (ED – education, SS – social sciences, EA – arts, SC – science and engineering); (iii) three numbers indicating the consecutive order of response in the set. For example, a response with a code: ASS057 refers to the 57th response in the group of social science at university A. The answers chosen as examples of each
category are also considered as representative of (but not defining) other answers in these categories. Missing answers, together with answers, considered unclassifiable, are not the subject of the analyses in these four subchapters, but are instead discussed in Subchapter 6.5.

6.1 Question 1: How does internationalization affect society in general?

The question ‘How does internationalization affect society in general?’ was the first in the series of 4 open-ended questions that were subject to a qualitative analysis and a subsequent quantification process. 937 answers were available for qualitative analysis and quantification. 356 students (24.5 %) did not provide an answer to this question and a further 158 (10.9 %) answers were considered unclassifiable. The missing and unclassifiable questions are discussed in more detail in Subchapter 6.5. The analytical matrix for the analysis is presented on the next page in Table 6, followed by a presentation of examples of students’ answers belonging to each category, together with a corresponding analysis of answers. The analytical matrix was synthesized from the students’ responses to this question and from the main characteristics of various orientation and interstices, which are conceptualized in Subchapter 4.2.5 that presents the general analytical matrix. The relational-critical and relational-liberal categories are (due to a general absence of answers that could be categorized as such) almost exclusively theoretical conceptualizations. This subchapter is concluded with the presentation of the results of the quantifying process.
Table 6. Analytical matrix for Question 1: How does internationalization affect society?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Neoliberal</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization brings about more acceptance and awareness. It contributes to greater equality, harmony and unity. It increases empathy, openness, tolerance, cooperation and peace. It brings about social cohesion, integration, equal rights. It increases knowledge and understanding (of others) and reduces racism, discrimination and lowers social barriers. Increased diversity and knowledge are inherently good.</td>
<td>Internationalization increases (desired) competition and efficiency in various areas. Int. enables study, work, and travel opportunities. Exposure to the world market is good for the economy. Int. is inevitable and desirable. Increased diversity, immigration and plurality of knowledges are good for positive image crafting (of the self and the nation) and/or good for economy. Diversity is commodified for personal or national benefit.</td>
<td>Internationalization is marred by unequal power relations. Rich countries exploit the poor. Internationalization contributes to social stratification. Recognition of multiple kinds of violence, systemic surveillance. Questioning of epistemic and normative grounds, recognition of complicity in harm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neoliberal-liberal</th>
<th>Liberal-critical</th>
<th>Neoliberal-critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization leads to a better society of increased opportunities (for everyone). Naturalization of positive/negative sides of naturalization. Internationalization is both good for the economy and helps lower discrimination in society. Internationalization increases knowledge that benefits both the self and the global society.</td>
<td>Emphasis on cultural aspects of hegemony, such as racism, and discrimination (on different grounds). Int. can be culturally positive, but creates economic fragility. Recognition of class conflict or social stratification – but framed as a religious or culture-related issue. Acknowledgment of exploitation coupled to benefits of diversity. Critique of ‘less liberal’ societies or cultures. Emphasis on a need for individual transformation.</td>
<td>Competition from low-wage countries threatens jobs in home country. Migrations are a threat to local population (in terms of jobs, social benefits or cultural incompatibility), international students are a threat to local students. Internationalization is desirable as long as it does not threaten personal privileges or the privilege of the country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neoliberal-liberal-critical</th>
<th>Relational-critical</th>
<th>Relational-liberal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization brings about greater diversity, more knowledge and more opportunities (positive), but people coming threaten local identity, economy and culture (negative).</td>
<td>Recognition of a need for a deep political and existential re-orientation.</td>
<td>Recognition of a need for existential re-orientation interpreted as a need for increased empathy, compassion (lacking systemic political analysis).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question-specific analytical matrices that were developed for mapping purposes (such as the one in Table 6) had to reach a level of considerable
complexity due to a large number of answers that were available for analysis (937 in this subchapter), as well as the broad range of answers, and the topics the answers covered. However, in spite of the effort to capture as much response diversity as possible, the matrices remain necessarily partial, provisional and incomplete. Examples of students’ responses that correspond to the main orientations and their interstices are presented below. Each category is presented together with an indication of how large the share of responses was in a given orientation in relation to all answers. The categories are presented in a descending order of their representative shares, from the most to the least represented ones. The representative examples that I provide in each category are used subsequently to discuss the category itself.

**Liberal orientation (34.8 %):**

“I believe creating a diverse society creates a rich culture. I fully support the “salad” theory in Canada that all minorities are seen, however better for the society.” (AED066)

“The more perspective people are exposed to the more tolerant and open-minded they will be allowing society to move to a more egalitarian society.” (ASS087)

“Increases the quality of life, especially for developing countries.” (GSC027)

“Depends on how culture are mixed. In Canada, it becomes more of a mosaic where cultures are able to keep their own identity. So while we can learn from one another, culture is still distinct and unique.” (GSC036)

“Diversity is positive and beneficial to society.” (FEA001)

“Society has recently been able to acknowledge other societies (especially modern societies acknowledge other societies). That can be attributed to the fact that internationalization has allowed that to be seen.” (FEA021)

“Less gaps between people naturally leads to less conflict. It may not be obvious but there is definitely less conflicts than in the past.” (FEA038)

“I don’t mind more people coming from different countries into our own, honestly. I find it positive more than anything because of the variety of people coming in.” (FSC022)
“Western globalization can connect the traditions and cultures of developing countries.” (DED035)

“People get chance to experience other cultures and gain knowledge. By sharing cultural values, goals and practices countries can become more familiar with each other and unite as a whole.” (FSC048)

“Internationalization plays an important role in learning and understanding different perspectives. Without it we will become a melting pot, something we must avoid.” (DED082)

“Love living in Canada – diverse cultures!” (DSC085)

“Diversity is a good thing for ALL!” (ESC072)

The liberal orientation is the most often articulated discursive orientation in this set of answers pertaining to the question on the impact of internationalization on society with more than a third of all responses. Within a liberal understanding, internationalization could be seen as being an inherently beneficial and benevolent process that contributes positively to the general well-being in society (AED066, FSC0222, FSC048, ESC072). While internationalization is considered as having a positive affect across the entire world, it may be occasionally considered especially beneficial for the ‘developing’ countries or the countries of the global South (GSC027, DED035). Within this understanding Canada is often presented as the country that could be considered a model example of successful internationalization and management of diversity (AED066, GSC036, DSC085). References to the Canadian “mosaic” or “salad bowl” are made (GSC036, AED066), occasionally in order to highlight the specificity of Canadian multiculturalism and its proclaimed emphasis on visibility and identity affirmation of minorities – as opposed to some other models that are perceived as less desired – such as the US “melting pot” idea (DED082). Exceptionalist articulations in this orientation thus seem to be focused predominantly on the inherent superiority of the Canadian multicultural society not just in comparison to less (ethnically) diverse communities, but also to countries with a different approach to managing multicultural tensions (superior mosaic vs. inferior melting pot). A liberal orientation in this regard could be seen as advocating a preservation of a strong sense of ethnic or cultural identity within the overall multicultural model.

In terms of the value of diversity of knowledge and knowledge production, the logic for supporting increased internationalization seems to rather closely follow
the formula: more diversity => more and different knowledge => more understanding => more tolerance, acceptance, and empathy => less racism, less discrimination, less conflict => more peaceful, more egalitarian and better functioning society (AED066, ASS087, FEA038, FRSC048). Both increased diversity of knowledge and (cultural/ethnic) diversity thus seem to be understood as inherently desirable, and conceptualized as unproblematic and ‘manageable’ for the common good. Within a liberal orientation increased diversity brought about by internationalization, together with internationalization itself seem to occupy a particular ontological status that either follows a fairly straightforward logic of justification (as presented above) or seems to eschew a need for any particular reason or justification, but is instead seen as an (unquestionable) goal in itself, as expressed by ESC072: “Diversity is a good thing for ALL!” In this regard the internationalization processes could be seen as somewhat tautologically framed as oriented towards increasing diversity as the final goal and as a kind of universal ‘panacea’ for all (ESC072) social ails. In both of these interpretations there seems to be little or no examination of the different (economic, political) vested interests that encourage increased internationalization (and diversity), instead the process seems to considered naturalized or part of (desired) social evolution (FEA021, FEA038, DED035).

Neoliberal-liberal interstice (27.6 %):

“It gives different perspectives and makes for a more diverse society. Diversity is good for social and personal growth.” (ASS060)

“Promotes understanding & learning of different cultures & customs. Exposes people to the problems faced by different communities. Acquire skills & knowledge possessed by other cultures & societies.” (GSC065)

“It helps the economy by balancing it out, bringing in better moral values which will benefit the society in the long run.” (FEA008)

“Internationalization is a great way to unite different societies and learn about different cultures. It also provides options for future development, to live, work and study globally without limits.” (FEA013)

“Internationalization is positive, because it promotes integration and a mix of culture. Expands on individuals’ knowledge of the world.” (ESC026)
“There are many issues with globalization and internationalization but given a lengthy chance at success, internationalization will reduce the gap between developing and developed countries.” (FEA035)

“I think we should all feel very lucky to attend such a diverse university. I believe we can learn a lot from international students and they can learn a lot from us.” (FEA045)

“I think everyone could benefit from getting educated on others views, religions, cultures. It contributes to less violent, more well-rounded, open individuals.” (FEA075)

“Learning and trying to understand difference in cultures and their political / economic standpoint offers solution to ongoing social problems in a global context.” (FEA088)

“It creates relations with people of other backgrounds and makes us realize how lucky we are here in Canada. It opens our eyes to the issues and differences in other parts of the world. Sometimes it creates opportunities to travel as well!” (FSC037)

The neoliberal-liberal interstice presents another major response group, with over a quarter of all answers. Unlike the purely liberal orientation that emphasizes the benefit of internationalization for society in general, the neoliberal-liberal interstice could be seen as blending liberal and neoliberal imaginaries and framing internationalization as beneficial to both the self (the individual) and society. Increased diversity brought about by internationalization is thus seen as contributing both to the personal growth of individuals and to the (economic) growth of society (ASS060, FEA013, ESC026). The personal growth (development) of an individual can also be seen as oriented towards a common benefit, not merely for personal gain (FEA075, GSC065). Internationalization could be considered either a win-win situation of mutually beneficial exchange (FEA045), or as a mechanism that spurs both appreciation of difference and gratitude for one’s (unexamined) privilege (FSC037, FEA045).

Exceptionalist tendencies in this articulation could be seen as encouraging the students to celebrate their privileged positions, rather than examining the structural hierarchies that uphold them. Further they seem to manifest themselves through a general tendency of the students to represent themselves as capable of only benevolent agency or in a way that suggests that with more knowledge, they will...
automatically transform themselves into more accepting, tolerant and less violent people (FEA075, FEA088). In this regard the consumption of difference (increased knowledge of the other) seems to be understood as contributing to personal growth, but that personal growth has a higher ethical purpose of benefitting the society or benefiting the other. Both of these tendencies (celebration of privilege and inherently benevolent agency) could be seen as operating within both liberal and neoliberal orientations, but expressed differently in each of them.

_Liberal-critical interstice (12.7 %):_

“Some people find it hard to accept the other people from their societies.” (CED007)

“While there are many positive aspects of internationalization I feel that there continue to be negatives, mostly associated with economics, our exploitation of resources, class divides, etc. All the social / cultural aspects are incredibly positive!” (ASS037)

“TNC jeopardizes the sovereignty of nations but to have multiple perspectives from different cultures is a positive.” (CED058)

“Culturally, internationalization is a good thing, exposing people to a wealth of new experiences, and helping intercultural understanding. Economically, internationalization and globalization create a fragile network of systems that rely on one another, and can easily fall apart.” (BSC019)

“Every country is starting to strive to become westernized like North America, though many can’t afford it. Important cultures, languages, traditions are lost in the process.” (GED034)

“Think it’s positive to learn about other cultures and be aware but also disagree with cultures trying to ‘westernize’ and be the same. I think it’s important to have differences.” (FEA096)

“It is great to know what societies can be mixed and live in one area, but there is still discrimination.” (FSC052)

“We should not internalize narratives of caricatures presented for us. To do so is to relinquish a vital aspect of identity. Identity must be in the hands of the individual.” (FSC076)
“When all values are brought into once place it can sometimes create conflict (I’m thinking about the classroom in particular). There needs to be some common ground for society to run without major problems. Such as sexual rights & freedoms are valued in Canada, but not in some places.” (FED020)

“I believe most people benefit from the exposure to different cultures, beliefs, values and ideas, but some people will never change – meaning that international students can be subjected to racism and discrimination.” (DED016)

“It’s difficult to embrace everyone’s difference.” (DED040)

“While cultural, economic and social exchange can benefit societies, often times individual cultures become lost in the ‘melting pot’. ” (FEA063)

“One could argue that internationalization actually reduces cultural differences, making a melting pot. Some people do find tensions from other cultures. Influx of population isn’t even to all countries ... not perfectly balanced.” (BSC038)

“Obvious growing pains include: racists, homogenization of culture / language. Fostering global understanding is a noble goal and should not be dissuaded.” (GSC024)

The liberal-critical interstice emphasizes and problematizes certain, mostly culture-related aspects of internationalization. A strong point of interest of this interstice seems to be related to questions of (cultural, ethnic, national) identity (FSC076, FEA096, GED034, FEA063) and the ambiguous nature of the relationship between economic and political liberalism (ASS037, CED058, FEA063, FEA034). Within this interstice there seem to be two main streams of understanding this relationship – either as politically (culturally) desirable and economically detrimental and/or dangerous (ASS037, CED058, BSC019) or as economically desirable – in terms of providing development and jobs, but culturally detrimental and/or dangerous, because it leads to a loss of diversity and identity (FEA063, FEA034). The biggest perceived danger of internationalization in this orientation seems to be related to homogenization and the loss of diversity.

While in the liberal-critical interstice there is considerable recognition of the danger of cultural hegemony (GED034, FEA096, FEA063), there is either no recognition of other types of systemic power-relations, or when there is, the potentially detrimental aspects of (economic) exploitation are offset by perceived
increases in cultural diversity (ASS037, CED058). However, it seems that this increase in diversity is considered as either only within the borders of Canadian state or as a form of diversity that is accessible to the students. It would be possible to conceptualize this category as either liberal-critical (emphasizing the benefits of economic development [in term of providing jobs], but critiquing the loss of diversity), or critical-liberal (critiquing political dominance and economic exploitation, but emphasizing the benefits of decreased discrimination). In this analysis both of these two types of answers are combined in this single rubric.

It is again possible to observe how exceptionalist tendencies are reproduced through the construction of a narrative about Canadian society as being more progressive and liberal than others (FED020), or by an interpretation of the “westernization” process as something that is desired by the other countries (GED034, FEA096), and not a process that could be potentially externally imposed (through cultural/media hegemony). Through the exceptionalist discourse this transfer of desire for being ‘western’ to other countries or societies, could be seen as preventing an acknowledgment of the complicity (of the West) in the loss of cultural diversity. Instead this loss of diversity is sometimes projected as being solely the responsibility of the Others, wanting to be westernized (GED034, FEA096), and who should not have that desire, because they “can’t afford it” (GED034). Such a gesture could be seen as making it possible to preserve a positive image of Canada and Canadians as generally encouraging and embracing diversity, while the suppression of diversity within the country through racist and discriminatory practices is something attributed to ‘malfunctioning’ individuals, or “some people” (DED016, CED007, BSC038), or (in terms of the international setting) to other societies or countries themselves. Further, we can observe references to concerns about the “melting pot” (FEA063, BSC038), which could be interpreted as resonating with an affirmation of the Canadian multicultural ‘mosaic’ being superior and desirable compared to the dangerous, identity erasing ‘melting pot’ (of the US), which was an observable trait also among examples of the liberal main orientation.

**Neoliberal orientation (7.4 %):**

“I can study abroad to become more employable here.” (AED052)

“Provides new perspectives and inclusion to an otherwise closed world. Without the rise of Liberal free trade countries would still be at odds with each
other competing against one another instead of cooperating. Internationalization creates goals and objectives.” (ASS023)

“I think it’s extremely important for people to experience all different cultures, backgrounds, upbringings, etc. in order to either realize your luck / appreciate your home, or to find another happiness. Internationalization keeps people level-headed and realistic.” (ASS092)

“Global economy improvement.” (GSC017)

“Gives everything context and perspective. Enables us to foresee possible changes in economy. Appreciation of our lifestyles.” (GSC077)

“Promotes trade and international relations. Keeps products cheaper and allows firms to specialize more often.” (FEA014)

“It affects it positively as people would be introduced to ideologies, religions, language and concepts that could better themselves.” (FEA057)

“Culture and internationalization are incredibly important to me and I would love to have an opportunity to live in and experience another culture.” (FEA061)

“Internationalization is beneficial for development of a country. It brings in new ideas, insights, and values to a new country that can help improve its current level of understanding. Economies boom, and those coming into a country are met with a new place to be, a better place even.” (FSC036)

“Internationalization = more understanding = better economy.” (ESC058)

With a neoliberal orientation internationalization seems to be predominantly or exclusively conceptualized as benefiting either the self (AED052, ASS092, FEA057, FEA061), the economy (ASS023, GSC017, FEA014, ESC058) or both (FSC036). Within a neoliberal understanding there seems to be no questioning of the potential drawback of growing economies, or of the benefits of the internationalization process as such. An important characteristic of this orientation – that is shared also in the liberal imaginary – seems to be the role of (expanded, realistic, objective, unbiased) knowledge as an instrument of self-improvement or economic growth (ASS023, ASS092, GSC077, FEA057, FSC036, ESC058). The difference between liberal and neoliberal orientation in this regard seems to be that in a liberal framing increased knowledge leads to more compassion, tolerance and understanding (thus reducing conflict), while in a neoliberal orientation it leads to
competitive advantages, new solutions and a more ‘realistic’ view of the world. Neither of these two orientations challenge the hegemonic patterns of knowledge production, nor do they seem to be able to imagine that knowledge might be considered hegemonic in the first place. An understanding of increased knowledge as meaning better, improved, more neutral and/or more objective knowledge, forecloses such a possibility.

It is perhaps in the relationship to knowledge that exceptionalist articulations are the most strongly, and on the other hand, most ‘invisibly’ articulated. By constructing the self as the bearer of objective, realistic and unbiased knowledge (ASS092, GSC077, FEA051), due to the self’s (exceptional) exposure to a high level of (cultural) diversity, the self can thus be seen as elevated to a position from where he observes and judges the world impartially, without (any longer) being able to recognize his own situatedness. In this regard, it would be even possible to risk an assumption that increased exposure to diversity could in such cases be seen as potentially harmful in terms of the capacity for acknowledging one’s ‘cultural or ideological bias.’ Due to a ‘more is better’ conceptualization of knowledge, an increased exposure to diversity might create an impression or an illusion that a) this bias can be transcended or undone and b) that this has already happened. This illusion of objectivity could (in extreme cases) lead to highly problematic interpretations of not just one’s own (presumably neutral) position, but also of historic trends and general understandings of relations between various parts of the world, such as: “Without the rise of Liberal free trade countries would still be at odds with each other competing against one another instead of cooperating” (ASS023). While this example should not be considered representative of the entire neoliberal orientation, but rather as neoliberal discourse driven to its (internally conflicted) extreme, I do believe that it does give us some sense of the spectrum of possible understandings of global affairs and internationalization that operate within this imaginary.

In terms of other exceptionalist articulations, it is also possible to observe a repetition of narratives that could be seen as celebrating one’s own privileged position (ASS092, GSC077), as in the neoliberal-liberal interstice, or as constructing the domestic country as a “better place” (FSC036).
Neoliberal-liberal-critical interstice (6.3 %):

“Mixed. Positively because people are more exposed to things in life and become more open minded + accepting. Negatively because foreigners sometimes take away jobs from the locals.” (AED100)

“I think that internationalization can have positive & negative influences. The idea of people from local areas not getting jobs is negative & the idea of more knowledge with diverse background is positive.” (ASS011)

“For foreigners take up Canadian jobs and places in school but provide nice cultural diversity. Should jobs in Canada be given to Canadians first?” (BSC053)

“Internationalization is positive in that it provides perspective on different culture and provides ways to be influenced positively. But it also impacts cultural identity in that countries like Canada have troubles defining their identity because of all the influence from other countries.” (GED067)

“I find it good to meet people from other countries but most of the time they stick to their own ethnic groups.” (GSC069)

“Positive: international trade can benefit many countries. Clearer global communication. International aid and mutual benefits from a variety of different things. Neg.: More marginalisation. More racism occurring / potentially racism. Can lead to more international disagreement / conflict / war.” (FEA005)

“Some immigrants do not contribute, cause crime or do not work. Yet others bring what they can offer to benefit our society and work like a model citizen. This the case most of the time.” (FEA011)

“I think it is a positive thing, yet people find a way to make it negative. Willing exchange of ideas is great. But then some people label that “cultural appropriation”, and what could be seen as a good thing becomes another conversation of privilege, whiteness etc.” (CSE020)

“Internationalization allows for society to be rich and diverse and gives us a chance to learn new cultures. However, it also allows other people from other cultures to come here and try to force their culture on us, while they themselves do not attempt to learn our culture.” (ESC019)
This category could be considered as drawing from all three main orientations and their interstices, but in different (not necessarily compatible) ways. In this regard the liberal – neoliberal – critical interstice could be seen as perhaps the most difficult in the conceptual sense, because it features answers that could not be seen as positioned between just the three main orientations, but more frequently between one main orientation and the interstice between the other two, or between various interstices. For instance, this category contains answers that have a neoliberal-critical and critical component (e.g. FEA011), a neoliberal, liberal, liberal critical and critical component (FEA005), liberal or liberal-neoliberal and neoliberal-critical component (GSC069, GED067, BSC053, ESC019), or any other possible permutation of the three main orientations and their interstices. Due to the diversity of possible combinations this category is internally the most contested as it often contains irreconcilable demands or concerns. The largest share of answers in this category could be seen as engaging with the dilemma of trying to reconcile the inherently positive value attributed to diversity in relation to a negative or exoticized image of international students and/or migrants as a threat to work and study privileges of local residents (AED100, ASS011, BSC053), and as a threat to local culture, society and/or national identity (FEA011, GED067, ESC019). Other possible entries include recognizing systemic violence (war), but also appreciating economic benefits of international trade (FEA005), recognizing the benefits of diverse knowledge(s), but a dismissal of the critique of cultural appropriation (CSE020) and other possible conundrums.

In terms of analysing exceptionalist tendencies this category could be seen as containing (among others) answers that relate to the ambivalent nature of narratives that construct the relationship between the self and the Other. In this regard it is possible to observe the recurring theme of trying to uphold the notion of (unquestionably) advocating diversity or seeing good in diversity, but then constructing the ‘diverse’ Other in (predominantly) negative terms. This constant affirmation of diversity could be at least partially attributed to the need for positive image crafting, where the self presents himself or herself as open, tolerant and accepting (AED100, BSC053, GSC069, CSE020), while the Other is presented either as an (existential) threat (AED100, BSC053), threatening national identity or social cohesion (GED067, FEA011, ESC019), or as an ungrateful recipient of the self’s attention (GSC069, CSE020). In this regard it could be suggested that the students’ positive self-image of openness, tolerance and inclusiveness, prevents them from considering their own descriptions of the Other or their relationship towards the Other as potentially racist or discriminatory. Although students’
responses often (also in the examples cited above – e.g. FEA005) suggest that discrimination is present (also in Canadian society) there is virtually no answer in the entire study where a student would refer to her or himself as (at least potentially) racist or discriminatory. Racist acts are always seen as being performed by someone else. In a very similar way exceptionalist tendencies could also be seen as operating in the relationship between the self and the Other in situations when the Other refuses to be co-opted or consumed for the self’s (or the national) benefit. In other words, when the self’s (unacknowledged) ‘right to consume’ the Other or the Other’s knowledge is challenged or refused (GSC069, CSE020), the responsibility for this unsuccessful consumption is attributed to the Other’s uncooperative nature (GSC069) or to the Other’s unjustified challenging of the self’s privilege of consumption (CSE 020). If we were to reframe this discussion in terms of a liberal and neoliberal-critical conundrum it would be possible to say that the answers gathered in this category seem to suggest that under certain conditions the (seemingly incompatible) liberal and neoliberal-critical (which could be potentially referred to also as neo-conservative) orientations act as mutually supportive narratives that uphold exceptionalist tendencies.

Neoliberal-critical interstice (5.9 %):

“Positive, able to meet people from different countries. Negative – too many international students is a problem.” (GED064)

“It’s a mixed opinion since it can affect positively or negatively. Like having illegal citizens from diff. country may cause problem.” (FEA020)

“Pros – business opportunities. Cons – loss of nationalism.” (FEA034)

“Some internationalization is good like getting to travel while in school, but it’s not fair to see if there are more international students here than people from Canada. Canadians shouldn’t be turned down if they have the same averages as international students.” (FSC001)

“When we let international students into our university it increases the competitive GPA. Because of this, some of the smart local students may not have a chance to attend a school or program in their own town, province, country. Also after completing degrees abroad some of the international students will return home leaving Canada with nobody educated in their field.” (FSC069)
“It is great to have people and countries coming together to further education and create more rounded individuals. However, not everyone can go abroad, so... where will the best schools be? That place will be bombarded with people from all over the world and the people actually living there will have nowhere to go.” (DED090)

“I think good things can come out of it and learn new things from others, getting beneficial contributions to society. But there are problems with international people pushing others out of the way. For example, when applying to universities and scholarships I had to compete with international students for a spot in my own country.” (DSC072)

“Local students are negatively affected. International students benefit.” (DED021)

“I feel like some people are privileged when they come here. Instead of mixing together some students get special classes (e.g. if they are aboriginal) that I can’t attend, but they can attend mine.” (CED001)

“It causes lower prices for imports, but when it comes here all wages become viewed as less when those people can do it. It’s good on the other side of the world, not here.” (ESC028)

“Takes away job, competition, but I’m all for capitalism and competition is best for consumers.” (ESC069)

In the neoliberal-critical interstice it is possible to observe the largest share of answers that discuss the economic challenges of internationalization and/or the perceived threats brought about by internationalization in terms of an increased inflow of employment seekers and/or international students. In contrast to the liberal-critical orientation, there seems to be no recognition of any negative impact of the globalized economy outside the national borders in the neoliberal-critical interstice. Quite the opposite, the positive effects of internationalization are seen as accruing to the “other side of the world” (ESC028) or to people (students, employment seekers, immigrants) from outside, coming to Canada (CED001, DED021, DSC072, FSC069, FSC001), while Canada or Canadian students are seen as experiencing predominantly the negative effects of internationalization, especially in terms of increased competition (GED064, FSC001, FSC069, DED090, DSC072, DED021, ESC028, ESC069). There seems to be a very low level of recognition of the complexity of internationalization in this orientation. Instead the
general impressions of internationalization seem to create an image where
Canadian nationals are constructed as bearing the brunt of internationalization,
while the non-Canadians reap the benefits. This is perhaps also the only orientation
that could be seen as predominantly (but not exclusively) challenging the
mainstream positive perceptions of increased diversity.

In terms of neoliberal imaginaries operating within higher education, students,
whose answers are part of this category seem to reject the ambitions of universities
interested in improvements in global rankings, as this is seen as attracting (too
many) international students with a higher Grade Point Average (GPA) that in turn
are seen as jeopardizing the admission possibilities of local students. When
exploring potential articulations of exceptionalist tendencies, it is possible to
observe how in this articulation Canada and Canadian residents are constructed as
the innocent victims of the internationalization process, which itself seems to be
understood as being directed towards increasing the privilege (of the already
privileged) non-Canadians. There is little or no acknowledgement of the fact that,
for instance, the Canadian government has over the decades consistently
encouraged immigration to Canada, precisely for economic reasons (that are in this
orientation considered as problematic today, but not in the past), and that according
to the demographic data (in Subchapter 5.1.3) only a third of all students had all
grandparents born in Canada and only 56 % claimed to have both parents of
Canadian origin.

This seems to suggest that although Canada is unquestionably a
settler/immigrant community, constructed over centuries of systematic immigration
(that continues until today), the respondents in this survey seem to hold a perception
of Canada and Canadians as ‘already always there’, or as ‘native’ to the country
rather than being themselves likewise settled there through immigration patterns of
their (recent) ancestors. Such narratives of ‘threatening foreigners’ could be seen
as helping to mask the country’s own (problematic) settler origins and help
maintain a sense of previous generations’ settlement as benevolent and
unthreatening to the other generations of (aboriginal) people that could be similarly
(and historically perhaps more justifiably) seen as likewise ‘already always there.’

**Critical orientation (5 %):**

“There are benefits to internationalization – greater access to education, travel,
etc. The problems I see though are in the hegemonic tendencies of ‘West is best’
– other languages, culture, ways of knowing are downplayed and minoritised
in favour of the West, commodity consumption, the “American Dream”. ” (AED070)

“There is definitely a fine line between providing a diverse + internationally related education by opening and admitting students from other countries and backgrounds and viewing these students as a business transaction that contribute to overall governmental investment to increase growth. ” (AED077)

“Depending on who you are and where you live. It positively affects most of North America and wealthy European States. Although it provides industry and a trading economy it also lengthens the space between rich & poor ... Karl Marx was on to something.” (ASS053)

“I just think that a wider awareness is sure to be a positive thing, but there are also issues in the power relationships between countries. Many countries are disadvantaged in international trade, and I believe it would be hypocritical to assume internationalization is solely a good thing because my country can benefit from it.” (ASS054)

“It’s important to see things from multiple perspectives in multiple settings. But people fall into the trap of comparing countries and which way is best.” (GED054)

“Prior structures of global relations & trade have left many countries disadvantaged & exploited – creating hostilities and lop-sided power dynamics that lead to animosity. At the same time, social spheres have greatly expanded and feelings of global awareness and comradery have spread further than ever.” (GSC076)

“Overall the effect of internationalization is positive. It connects the world, but it also causes some less developed regions to be taken advantage off, i.e. people working in factories in parts of the developing world.” (ESC087)

“Internationalization affects society positively in that it enables the sharing of ideas, culture, religions, knowledge etc. However, it affects society negatively when one culture/society views others as subordinate, therefore exploiting, persecuting or marginalizing them.” (FEA085)

“Internationalization has the power to both celebrate cultures + other ways of thinking as well as push a capitalist agenda by placing value on international
exchange instead of countries strengthening themselves internally the ways they want to.” (FEA084)

“Internationalization opens borders and options but risks homogenizing the world to a standard set by economic and political elites. The focus is on markets and money rather than human life. If there was less focus on economic utilities and more focus on social justice and social welfare I would be happier. When human life and survival becomes secondary to profit we are doomed as a species.” (DED066)

The critical orientation is among the three main discursive orientations (and their interstices) the one with the lowest level of representation. In this orientation students could be seen as recognizing multiple aspects of systemic injustice, related to: power relations (ASS054, GSC076, FEA084), recognition of existence of various elites or privileged communities (DED066, ASS053, ASS054), recognition of epistemic hegemony (AED070, GED054), exploitation (ESC087, GSC076), challenges to consumerist behaviour (DED066, AED070) and a growth-oriented economy (DED066, AED077). Although this category also features answers (FEA084, ESC087, AED070) that only critique some of the aspects of multiple hegemonies and/or injustices, while embracing others unexaminedly, these answers are featured here on the grounds that they seem to articulate some form of systemic critique, rather than individualize or externalize responsibilities, and this sets them apart from the liberal-critical and neoliberal-critical orientations. What seems to be generally absent even from this category, is a recognition of (personal) complicity in systemic harm. Apart from a very few examples that hint at such an understanding (ASS054), recognition of complicity is generally not to be found in the students’ responses, even in the critical orientation.

This could be seen as suggesting that even (complex) critical reflection is potentially unable to penetrate the (all) layers of positive image crafting that is one of the main characteristics of exceptionalist dispositions. In many ways it could be argued that it is precisely critical reflection that is the ultimate barrier against more troubling and uncomfortable acknowledgment of one’s own privileged position, because it is able to circumvent self-reflexivity and re-orient the critical focus exclusively on systemic critique. It is also questionable whether the recognition of patterns such ‘westernization’, ‘capitalist agenda’, ‘American dream’ and others by itself suggests that Canada is seen as participating in the reproduction of these patterns or perhaps suggests that the critique is more directed against Canada’s less celebrated neighbour, as suggested in other examples before. Further, none of the
answers in the rubric of critical orientation (or any other answer in the entire survey) questioned the concept of the nation-state, anthropocentrism or the role of higher education in reproducing hegemonic patterns of knowledge production. Except for one or two notable exceptions, there were also no challenges to the environmental sustainability of the current politico-economic system or the benevolence of personal agency of the respondents.

Relational-critical and relational-liberal interstices (0.5 %):

“Internationalization allows society to view different perspectives. This increases (hopefully) tolerance and understanding. It also forces us outside of our comfort and we can challenge our understanding of the world. I find North America to be fairly sheltered from the struggles of other nations. Internationalization hopefully leads to greater selflessness.” (DED060)

“One love.” (BSC004)

“I think internationalization increases awareness about other ways of being that are viable, it also increases awareness of our privileges and biases. It can greatly help reduce racism and prejudice around the world and gets the powerful to assist the powerless. However, sometimes countries over step their bounds and people get complexes, hurt more than help.” (EED019)

“Without exposure to other ways of life/knowing we will not adapt as a civilization. Outside views are very important.” (EED033)

The 4 examples featured here are the only examples that could potentially be seen as belonging to the relational (or relational-liberal) category that suggests a need for also re-imaging our existential (and not just our political) orientations. All of the answers gathered here seem to suggest a need for a different way of being in the world, or at the very least recognizing the existence of other ways of being. However, these other ways of being could also be seen as potentially interpreted in different and possibly exoticizing ways that suggest that other groups or cultures may hold the solution to our shared problems. Further, some of these answers could be seen supporting a somewhat naïve or charity-based orientation (EED019), while others present answers that could be interpreted in very different ways (BSC004). Finally, only one answer (in the entire survey) seemed to explicitly suggest that it may not assume an a priori benevolent agency of the self (DED060). The relational-critical or relational-liberal category was the last of the discursive
orientations and interstices, available for analysis. Fig. 27 below presents the overall distribution of the answers to Question 1. The corresponding analysis of the distribution of answers concludes this subchapter.

![Graph showing the distribution of answers](image)

**Fig. 27. How does internationalization affect society in general?**

More than a third (34.8 %) of the answers to Question 1 were categorized as belonging to the liberal orientation, a little over a quarter (27.6 %) to the liberal-neoliberal interstice and 12.8 % to the liberal-critical. Liberal, neoliberal and neoliberal-liberal categories, whose common characteristic is a general absence of any visible articulation of critical reflection, make up together 69.9 % of all answers. Among the critical responses the liberal-critical category (12.8 %) is the most prominent, with neoliberal-liberal-critical (6.3 %) coming in second and neoliberal-critical (5.8 %) as third. Critical (4.9 %) orientation that recognizes inherent systemic injustices and power relations, is the least represented category of the 3 main discursive orientations, and is also slightly less represented than various critical interstices. The (additional) relational-critical or relational-liberal interstices are almost completely absent, with 4 potential answers (0.5 %) in total.
6.2 Question 2: How do you imagine global citizens should think, relate and/or act in the world?

The question ‘How do you imagine global citizens should think, relate and/or act?’ was the second in the series of 4 open-ended questions. With 933 answers available it was the question with the lowest response rate. 431 students (29.7%) did not provide an answer to this question and a further 87 (6.0%) answers were considered unclassifiable. The analytical matrix for the analysis is presented on the next page (in Table 7), followed by a presentation of examples of students’ answers belonging to each category. The examples of answers are followed by figure Fig. 28 that presents the distribution of answers, according to the analytical matrix. Similarly to the analytical matrix in Subchapter 6.1, the analytical matrix presented on the next page was synthesized from the students’ responses to this question and from the main characteristics of various orientation and interstices, as conceptualized in Subchapter 4.2.5.
Table 7. Analytical matrix for Question 2: How do you imagine global citizens should think, relate and/or act?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Neoliberal</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global citizens should be mindful of others, generous, open minded, understanding, accepting and aware of global issues (and of their roots). They should act with empathy, patience, tolerance, without discrimination, judgement or cultural bias. They should be rational, respectful, welcoming and culture neutral.</td>
<td>Global citizens act in a utilitarian way, or however they like. They are well travelled and well cultured, well rounded, and world leaders. They are interested in travel and study abroad. They are interested in meeting people from other cultures and exploring the world for their own pleasure, entertainment or benefit.</td>
<td>Global citizens recognize complicity in systemic injustices, coloniality, and imperialism. They challenge the idea of global citizenship, recognize situatedness of GC ideals (such as human rights, sustainable development) and their contradictions. They recognize personal privilege, power relations and multiple forms of hegemony: epistemic, cultural, political and others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neoliberal-liberal</th>
<th>Liberal-critical</th>
<th>Neoliberal-critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global citizens combine personal benefit with global (social) benefit. They adapt well to new situations and assimilate or integrate, but remain aware of their identity. Prejudice, ethnic bias, and discrimination are an obstacle to effective work. Global citizenship is problem solving oriented, with ideals of leadership (also in terms of acceptance, open-mindedness, tolerance). Global citizenship is related to experiences abroad.</td>
<td>Global citizens strive for equality and non-discrimination through personal (heroic) protagonism. They bring about justice and peace and act as innocent, benevolent change agents. Their ambitions are not self, but world/social/Other oriented. They help the less fortunate ones and recognize the impact of their lifestyle on the world. Global citizens &quot;Think globally, and act locally.&quot; There is no visible recognition of systemic critique, critique of power relations and historicity of privilege.</td>
<td>Global citizens remain primarily national subjects, interested in the defending the interests of the nation-state, often against external threats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neoliberal-liberal-critical</th>
<th>Relational-critical</th>
<th>Relational-liberal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global citizens combine personal ambitions and/or are well travelled, with critical reflection and social orientation.</td>
<td>Emphasis on establishing relationship beyond knowledge, understanding and identity. Extending relationships beyond the human dimension.</td>
<td>Emphasis on establishing relationship beyond knowledge, understanding and identity, however these relationships remain anthropocentric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the categories presented above suggests a different kind of imagination or conceptualization of global citizenship or global citizenry emerging from the
students’ answers. In the examples below it will be possible to observe how understandings of global citizenship span a wide range of possibilities on the spectrum of self vs. Other-oriented conceptualizations and on the spectrum of ‘passive’ (emphasis on developing tolerance, understanding, acceptance) vs. ‘active’ (emphasis on social activism, volunteering, fighting against injustices) understandings of global citizenship. Examples are listed in the descending order according to the level of their representation.

**Liberal orientation (44.9 %):**

“Open, aware and understanding of others’ opinions, ideas and ways of life.” (DED002)

“Respect people regardless of gender, culture, religion and race.” (DED013)

“Be aware of global cultures and how they affect the global community, open minded to new ideas and opinions constantly being presented. You don’t have to agree, but you have to understand.” (BSC076)

“Understand many cultures in order to relate to as many people as possible, to be open-minded, broaden their knowledge about cultures and societies – be accustomed to the local area for maximum results.” (BSS050)

“Tolerant, understanding, sharing, kind.” (EED035)

“Try to understand other people’s views.” (FEA007)

“Caring, kind and open to different views, perspectives and ways of living.” (EED012)

“I am Canadian, but view myself as being open minded and accepting toward other nations / cultures.” (FEA024)

“Understand & respect cultures, but uphold basic human rights.” (GSC077)

“I think a global citizen is aware of other countries and learns from them but does not look to conquer them. Conquest is over. It’s part of history.” (AED056)

“I imagine myself as a global citizen because the country I live in is known for its multicultural, so people around me are mostly from different countries.” (ESC092)
Liberal-critical interstice (23 %):

“Global citizens should be aware of what is happening around the world and seek to help solve issues globally.” (CED004)

“Global citizens should work together for the better of society. E.g. to reduce Global warming and racism/prejudice against other cultures.” (CED018)

“Care for global issues, volunteer overseas, be aware of their contribution to society & the planet.” (FEA011)

“A global citizen should be aware of things happening around the world and should try to be actively involved in resolving global issues.” (AED094)

“A global citizen should be thinking about world-wide problems and working a lot to fix them.” (BSC066)

“As engaged, ethical and environmentally responsible citizens.” (EED021)

“Should try to spread correct knowledge of culture, get rid of stereotypes.” (BSC017)

“Pay attention to global issues and living more than just my own community in mind.” (BSC030)

Neoliberal-liberal interstice (21.1 %):

“Engage with other citizens around the world. Work, study, volunteer abroad.” (GED017)

“Understand multiculture and both benefit from and contribute to it.” (GSC047)

“They should feel welcome everywhere and not have any prejudice towards unfamiliar areas, cultures.” (AED097)

“A global citizen has to travel a lot, to be aware of what happens in the world each day and to be involved in “global life” by joining international organizations for example.” (ASS050)

“See value in knowing experiences of others, cooperate and communicate without prejudice, overcome barriers, such ethnic enclaves.” (BSS043)

“They all compare and share about their lifestyles.” (BSS053)
“Think of yourself not as a citizen of a country, don’t be overly patriotic.” (DSC017)

“They should interact and communicate with each other.” (DSC072)

“Be a positive role model for those who are new to the country and show others that these people aren’t bad like they may think.” (CED045)

“I have not had a chance to interact globally, however, if given the chance I would embrace it.” (CED098)

Neoliberal orientation (5 %):

“However they would like, everyone is open to their own opinion.” (FEA039)

“With internet media I believe everyone is entitled to be a global leader. They should be interested in global issues, because they can affect the country we live in.” (FSC040)

“I travelled from India to Tanzania and now finally settled in Canada (for now). I still want to explore more of Europe and Asia. I love learning about different cultures.” (ESC014)

“Not linked to one country or city. Travel a lot. Have a passion to travel & learn about new cultures.” (ESC069)

“Be advocates and represent their country well.” (CED028)

“I plan to travel outside this country to work and gain other cultural experiences.” (CED019)

“I’m not the majority here, so I would think fitting-in is the biggest thing for global citizens, so that you can get laid eventually. No one likes individualism.” (BSC002)

“However they like.” (GSC028)

“Global citizens should be open to new ideas, languages and experiences. You will not have the opportunity for new learning experiences, if you are unable to be open to the idea of new experiences.” (BSS082)

“I think this questions is difficult as I can’t think of an answer. People should act as they wish within social limits.” (BSS047)
“A global citizen should first take care of themselves. Afterwards they should interact and trade with whom they want. There shouldn’t be any stigma with working within or without any group.” (GSC018)

Critical orientation (3 %):

“The concept of global citizenship is to this point an option only open to those with the fortunate capacity to not be concerned with local needs.” (EED061)

“Global citizens should realise that if they do not care for their own places in the world & learn to create thriving sustainable communities, then they are bound to rely on exploitative unsustainable practices elsewhere.” (AED005)

“There needs to be a deep understanding of the history that made us the way we are.” (AED052)

“Act locally with global ethical consideration. Work hard to undo colonial oppression.” (GED035)

“I don’t know because I don’t know if I believe that the notion of global citizenship is a positive one.” (DED006)

“Global citizens should be aware of their own power and privilege or lack thereof and consider justice an important component, seek to resolve issues for equal benefit across groups.” (EED042)

“Being aware of who you are in relation to the world around you. Understand the privileges that we might have come from.” (EED045)

“Respectfully, don’t drag your culture around like privilege. Sometimes you must change & conform in order to learn + understand.” (FEA084)

“I’m not sure, because it depends on context. The role of global citizen varies by such individual local context, occupation & beliefs. There’s just too many variables to sum people into category “global citizen” without taking into consideration their local context.” (FEA085)

“The problem I see with globalization (and I recognize it is different from global citizen) is that it seems to profit the rich and make slaves of the rest. To be a global citizen would ask that I care for all of earth inhabitants in the same manner as I do for fellow Canadians. This is a tall order. I love Canada and feel that I need to focus my energies to this place where I live.” (EED017)
Relational-critical and relational-liberal interstices (1.9 %):

“Think globally! Everyone/thing is connected!” (EED033)
“I love people, all shapes, sizes, colours, abilities.” (EED049)
“Just be human.” (ESC044)
“Everyone acts as a global citizen, because we are all connected.” (ESC056)
“With love.” (ESC061)
“To love and respect each other, values, cultures, and our one Earth.” (DED007)
“Love your neighbour as yourself. We are all God’s children. This is not our true home.” (CED048)

Neoliberal-critical-liberal interstice (0.8 %):

“Harmonious, critical thinking, talking a lot.” (FEA097)
“They would always be conscious of the world around them. They would be well travelled and be able to think critically about global issues.” (FSC096)

Neoliberal-critical interstice (0.1 %):

“I live in Canada. I don’t need it to be sullied by Eastern Cultures.” (DSC041)

The example from the neoliberal critical category was the last in the list of examples related to different discursive orientations and their interstices. Fig. 28 on the next page summarizes the representation rates of different categories of responses and opens space for the general analysis of responses.
Fig. 28. How do you imagine global citizens should think, relate and/or act in the world?

Fig. 28 shows that almost half of the answers (44.9 %) were classified as belonging to a liberal orientation, with two other liberal interstices, liberal-critical (23 %) and liberal-neoliberal (21.1 %), in the position of 2nd and 3rd most commonly represented category. Together the liberal orientation and its accompanying interstices represent 89 % of all answers. 5 % of answers were classified as neoliberal, 3 % as critical 1.9 % as relational-critical or relational-liberal, 0.75 % as belonging to the liberal-neoliberal-critical interstice and 1 answer (0.1 %) as belonging to neoliberal-critical orientation.

Within the liberal orientation, which was the predominant category in responses to Question 2, most of the answers (DED002, DED013, BSC076, BSS050, EED035 and others) emphasized a need for openness, tolerance, respect, acceptance and understanding of people from other cultures, ethnic groups or parts of the world. In this orientation students seem to consider global citizens, or themselves, inasmuch as they identify with the concept, as being the (only) occupants of a locus of enunciation from where acceptance, tolerance, openness and understanding can be proclaimed and bestowed (conditionally) upon others. With a liberal orientation there seems to be no visible recognition of self-reflection or a recognition of the privileged position from where acceptance and tolerance are granted. In other words, a liberal orientation does not question the relationship or
power structures embedded in the dyads: accepting and accepted, tolerating and tolerated, understanding and understood. There seems to be little or no recognition of the possible need for either a potential reversal or reciprocity of these roles between the subject and his Other, nor for an establishment of relationships with the Other that are not mediated by an a priori fulfilment of the subject’s need for understanding (and thus control) of the Other’s otherness.

In terms of exceptionalist tendencies manifested in this orientation the students emphasize the inherently benevolent agency of global citizens, citing a great number of exceptionalist personal traits related to tolerance, compassion, understanding and Others (as discussed in Subchapter 3.1.4). As global citizens seem to be perceived as generally oriented towards common good, compassion and understanding, this a priori ‘goodness’ seems to act as an instrument of foreclosure against deeper self-reflection and exploration of systemic relations of privilege and power. It also seems to act as kind of a ‘passivizing’ instrument in which the subject does not seem to be required or invited to participate in the struggle against injustices beyond developing his/her own capacity for more understanding and tolerance. In the more extreme articulations, a renouncement of explicit violence seems to be enough for good global citizenship: “A global citizen is aware of other countries and learns from them, but does not look to conquer them.” (AED056).

There also seems to be no recognition of a potential need for an engagement with the Other that would question whether it is tolerance and understanding that the Other is looking for, or whether it is perhaps something else. Within a liberal (exceptionalist) framing, there seems to be no recognition of the Other’s potential of having a voice that would challenge the mainstream narratives. Instead the Other seems to be perceived (solely) as a willing dispenser of knowledge (about him/herself) that would help the subject to learn to tolerate and/or accept him/her better. In other words, within a liberal orientation there seems to be no visible reflection upon other concerns beyond personal benevolent agency, with that agency being restricted merely to the inter-cultural dimension of relationships. There is no mention of economic, political, legal nor environmental dimensions of global citizenship. The concerns are either not mentioned (an overwhelming majority of responses) or considered as belonging to the past: “Conquest is over. It’s part of history” (AED056) or to some other place: “I imagine myself as a global citizen because the country I live in is known for its multicultural [society], so people around me are mostly from different countries” (ESC092). In brief: whatever global issues they may be, they seem to be understood as largely belonging to either some other place and time, and not to the here and now. It seems
to be impossible to imagine Canada or Canadian students as being somehow involved in any less than desirable and benevolent global relations within a liberal (exceptionalist) narrative.

While the liberal-critical orientation does not seem to question the inherently benevolent nature of global citizens (or the country of their origin), nor explore issues beyond personal agency, it is possible to observe a certain shift from the more ‘passive’ role of developing tolerance, acceptance and understanding toward more ‘active’ participation in global issues. The awareness of responsibility of global citizens seems to be expanded beyond the immediate subject-Other relationship towards concerns of the globalized society, the environment, and of people in other countries. The answers in this orientation emphasize positive, activist agency (CED004, AED094, BSC066), such as volunteering (FEA011), engaging in various campaigns or struggles ranging from environmental issues (CED018, EED021) to the reduction of prejudice and racism (CED018, BSC017). Similar to exceptionalist tendencies in the liberal orientation, in the liberal-critical orientation there seems to be no visible reflection or consideration about the fact that proposed ‘activist’ solution, as understood by the subject, could, if left unexamined, (unintentionally) lead to a perpetuation of the existing power relations, rather than working towards their disassembly. In this regard the unexamined attitude towards the Other, in which the Other seems to remain silent and accessible to the (presumably benevolent) agency of the subject is now extended beyond the (originally) nation-state bound ‘passive’ acceptance and tolerance of otherness to the level of global activism.

A neoliberal-liberal orientation emphasises values which are very similar to the ones, expressed in the liberal orientation, but frames them also in relationship to personal benefit, where knowledge of the Other is seen as both benefiting society and the subject himself directly. Within this category many answers relate global citizenship to opportunities for travel (GED017, AED097, ASS050) and international exchange (GED017, BSS043, BSS053, DC072, CED098). Similar as above, global citizenship is presented as an unproblematic concept that can only contribute positively both to the society and to the personal interests of the individual. In his travels around the world, the global citizen (within a neoliberal-liberal understanding) does not seem to be interested in examining the privileged position that enables him to travel (almost) anywhere nor his right to be accepted (without invitation). Instead, the exceptional nature of his benevolent status, coupled to very limited or almost no restrictions on travel, seems to encourage him/her to “feel welcome everywhere” (AED097). For that welcome to be extended,
it should be sufficient that subject should have no “prejudice” (AED097, BSS043) or not to be “overly patriotic” (DSC017). However, there does not seem to be any particular evidence to suggest that what constitutes ‘prejudice’ or ‘overly patriotic behaviour’ is subject to anything but the subjects’ self-determination.

Although the neoliberal orientation was present to a much smaller extent (5 %) than the neoliberal-liberal interstice (21.1 %), the answers in this category express a similar emphasis on (unrestricted) travel for personal benefit (ESC014, ESC069, CED019), where gaining experience of otherness (ESC014, ESC069, CED019, DSS082) is considered a primary goal. Some of the answers suggest that there are no restrictions on the global citizen’s behaviour (GSC028, FEA039), save perhaps from some very general social or legal conventions (BSS047), while others conceptualize global citizenship as primarily concerned about potential benefits to the domestic nation-state (FSC040, CED028). Within a neoliberal orientation the world (outside the national borders) seems to be conceptualized as a place of potential learning, gaining experience and consumption of otherness for either personal benefit or the benefit of the nation-state of the subject. In terms of exceptionalist traits, this category perhaps exemplifies the strongest the unexamined notion of entitlement to global citizenship as an unquestionable and readily available opportunity for a commodified experience of otherness, where the subjects can behave “however they would like” (GSC028, FEA039), “act as they wish within social limits” (BSS047), “get laid eventually” (BSC002) and “first take care of themselves” (GSC019).

Within a critical orientation (3 %) it is possible to observe a recognition of existing power relations (EED042), exploitation (AED005, GED035, EED017), privilege (EED061, EED042, FEA084), and the historicity of current global state of affairs (AED052, GED035). Answers that question the mainstream benevolent conceptualization of global citizenship (EED061, DED006, FEA085, EED017) are also featured in this category. This sets this category apart from all other categories mentioned so far. However, even within a critical understanding, global citizenship seems to be understood as something that is seen as belonging (naturally) to certain (privileged) groups and not to others. In this regard, critical global citizenship is understood as deeply engaged with systemic injustices, however, this engagement is often conceptualized in form of (heroic) agency that is framed as unproblematic, due to greater awareness of systemic injustices and reflexivity of the subject’s privileged position. In this regard the critical orientation shares the liberal and liberal-critical assumption that more and better knowledge will lead to better and more just relations, predominantly without questioning the mediating role of
knowledge itself and without examining unacknowledged desires and existential attachments to systemic injustices and violence.

As the neoliberal-critical-liberal and neoliberal-critical categories contained only a few responses that make a more robust analysis impossible, the last words in this subchapter will be dedicated to the relational-critical or relational-liberal category. The answers in these two categories could be seen as challenging the prevailing assumptions that knowledge of the Other precedes the possibility of establishing relations, but rather emphasises the establishment of connections beyond or before knowledge, identity and understanding. Some of these answers could even be seen as potentially challenging the anthropocentric understanding of global citizenship (DED007, EED033, CED048). However as none of the answers in this category offered any kind of suggestion of awareness of either systemic injustice or personal complicity in harm, an approach to global citizenship, as conceptualized within this category, runs the risk of benevolently replicating unacknowledged and unexamined power relations in a similar way as the liberal-orientation or liberal-related interstices do.

6.3 Question 3: Apart from possible language difficulties, do international students or students with diverse backgrounds face challenges in your institution?

The question ‘Apart from possible language difficulties, do international students or students with diverse backgrounds face challenges in your institution?’ was the third open-ended question. 1,078 answers were available for analysis, making it the question with most valid answers. 329 students (22.7 %) did not provide an answer to this question and 44 (3.0 %) answers were considered unclassifiable. Following the sequence of presentation, established in Question 2, an analytical matrix for the analysis is presented first (in Table 8), followed by a presentation of examples of students’ answers belonging to each category. The examples of answers are followed by Fig. 29 that presents the distribution of answers according to the analytical matrix. The overall analysis of answers to this question is presented below the Fig. 29 and concludes this subchapter. Again, the relational-critical and relational-liberal categories are almost exclusively theoretical conceptualizations, as only 1 answer was categorized as belonging to these categories.
Table 8. Analytical matrix for Question 3: Apart from possible language difficulties, do international students or students with diverse backgrounds face challenges in your institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Neoliberal</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no problems, everyone is treated equally, and there is no discrimination and / or racism. Students get lots of support, they are well mixed and have lots of friends. Minor issues are quickly addressed. There cannot be any problem, because they came to Canada. People in Canada are very tolerant and accepting, eager to meet them. Any issues are often naturalized: such as a need for personal adjustment or culture shock. International students may be unsure of appropriate behaviour and social norms.</td>
<td>Focus on equal opportunities for education. International students face the same (educational) problems as everyone else, there are measures in place to help them succeed (carrier-wise). When there are any problems that they might face, these problems are good for them, because they help them grow and learn. They are here to provide diversity for Canadian students. Also includes answers that speak only about the self-interest of respondent.</td>
<td>Recognition of systemic injustices and systemic discrimination. Recognition of economic and social stratification, differences in tuition fees. Recognition of (epistemic) hegemony in universities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liberal-critical</th>
<th>Neoliberal-critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on external factors, such as weather, environment, climate, stress of moving to a new environment, culture shock, language (both seen as neutral/normalized) or trivial issues. International students lack appropriate knowledge (about procedural matters, legal system), and cultural awareness, they are seen as not (yet) adapted or integrated. Alternatively, there are no challenges or issues that the student would have personally witnessed.</td>
<td>Emphasis on cultural (religious, ethnic) aspects of discrimination and racism. However, racism and discrimination could only be transient and attributed to only some people. Some of the challenges are seen as happening only to certain individual students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neoliberal-liberal-critical</th>
<th>Relational-critical</th>
<th>Relational-liberal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International students self-segregate, but that could be due to lack of acceptance from domestic students. Emphasis on establishing relationship beyond knowledge, understanding and identity. Extending relationships beyond the human dimension.</td>
<td>Emphasis on establishing relationship beyond knowledge, understanding and identity.</td>
<td>Emphasis on establishing relationship beyond knowledge, understanding and identity, however these relationships remain anthropocentric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The examples of answers to Question 3 presented below are mostly related to the subject of racism and discrimination, with very few answers discussing challenges that would not be related to these issues. In comparison with other open-ended questions, answers to Question 3 exhibit perhaps the greatest degree of answers that could be considered as manifestly exceptionalist, especially in the liberal orientation, which was the most represented orientation and which begins the list of examples below.

Liberal orientation (31.5 %):

“I think my university is very welcoming to all students and offers a lot of extra help to anyone in need both academically and psychologically. There are also many clubs that anyone can join to expand their relationships and help them feel engaged in their education.” (DED045)

“I don’t think so because as is commonly known, Canada is a diverse country and therefore welcomes students from all backgrounds. Furthermore, the “University is a very accepting institution and allows for equal treatment of all students.” (FEA012)

“Treated equally. Canada has such a diverse culture to begin with that people usually don’t know if you are a Canadian citizen or not.” (FEA016)

“I see that universities, especially this one manages to promote a very positive space for diverse cultures. As a domestic, but non-Canadian student I am able to see both sides & both are very agreeable and very positive.” (FEA021)

“Everyone here seems to really promote equality and togetherness.” (FEA067)

“Canada is already so multicultural it could be odd if there weren’t people of all background making up a classroom.” (BSC060)

“I think national variety works well. Canada is so accepting.” (BSS027)

“I answered yes, but would to have had another option for “half-half”. Aside from language difficulties if international students come to Canada, I feel like because of our diversity that they would be able to fit in quickly. But if they go to a country that is not a diverse then they might have a harder time.” (BSS052)

“We are very accepting. We are already diverse, so visitors normally find people they can easily relate to.” (GSC077)
“Well built infrastructure and community is present to help such students embrace life at my institution.” (GSC014)

“People are so welcomed here and everyone want to get to know about them and their culture. They value who they are as people!” (AED003)

“This is Canada, we try and accommodate.” (EED078)

**Liberal-neoliberal interstice (27.1 %):**

“I think culture shock can pose huge challenges that can effect student ability on school. It may also have the effects of making them more focused.” (DED019)

“I am a student from a different background than the general populations and I certainly have faced challenges. Moving to a new place, you are not aware of the norms of that society and figuring them out can be somewhat challenging. However, it is not very difficult. It is only natural and can be easily overcome if you meet the right people.” (BSC025)

“I really don’t think so, because University prides itself on its diversity. But because I am not an international student, I really have no clue.” (CED039)

“They have to adjust to weather here.” (CSE043)

“Speak a different language that courses aren’t offered in, their culture may not be as widely celebrated.” (EED007)

“I haven’t witnessed an international student encounter issues and I’m friends with several, they enjoy the university and what it has to offer.” (FEA011)

“Uncertain, mainly the difficulties would lie in the language barrier as communication would limit their ability to learn or network.” (GSC040)

“Doesn’t it happen in all walks of life?” (GED083)

“They show us that not only our methods are functional but their methods are functional as well.” (AED081)

“Conforming to new societal customs and practices.” (EED026)

“They can face different culture practice difficulties, such as food.” (ESC092)
**Liberal-critical interstice (26.3 %):**

“I think they can face discrimination, but I think our society has become more open to accepting differences so I think it is now less likely.” (DED077)

“People with different religious views are discriminated against or not taken very seriously.” (CED015)

“I don’t really know the extent of their difficulty, but I can imagine culturally they would be judged.” (GED003)

“I’m sure racism plays a factor, but I haven’t seen it first hand.” (CED008)

“Racism, language barrier, exclusion.” (EED049)

“There will always be discrimination, we have to work to lessen it as much as possible.” (EED066)

“Adapting to cultural differences, feeling like an outsider. Having to face people who stereotype their culture, religion etc. Discrimination.” (AED072)

“Different values, therefore some teachers’ views conflict with theirs, especially in ethics, religion, etc.” (AED097)

“They may feel marginalized or lonely being a minority (if they are one).” (DED099)

“Some face racism and discrimination. By saying “Asian” in a different way may cause a harm in someone’s heart.” (FEA020)

“Yes and no. I feel like some international students still experience racism and discrimination but I would like to believe that majority feel safe and happy. I’m not sure about that though.” (FEA053)

“I am not one, so I can’t speak to their experience. But some people are ass holes, and I’m sure discrimination has been experienced on campus, however I can’t see it as the biggest issue here.” (FEA060)

**Critical orientation (4.9 %):**

“They are imposed with Western ideas.” (GED001)

“They are charged much more tuition & perceived by uni as $$. (e.g. the exploitative insurance health plan required).” (GED035)
“Racism, difficulties navigation new systems, economic, taxes, rules etc.” (DED024)

“Our society is founded on racism and inequality, even if we try to preach otherwise.” (DED075)

“Forcing them to change their names to something more relatable is BS!” (FEA078)

“Culture can be a huge obstacle for instance Japanese students may have difficulty in the ego-centric form of Canadian universities and their focus on individual achievement.” (FEA084)

“They enter the context of North America, which brings with it challenge of culture barriers. The frameworks of our knowledge and epistemology are quite different when compared to other nations. Also, paperwork is not fun for foreign students.” (CED048)

“The tuition is too high for such students. Educations should be an equal right to all students.” (EED071)

“Racism, Eurocentric perspectives in academia.” (EED054)

“Within the student body there is a lot of internalized racism, and many universities charge higher fees for identical services to int. students.” (FEA090)

Neoliberal-critical interstice (4.6 %):

“Too much money, too little class.” (GSC006)

“General culture shock. The Chinese kids in my dorm practically stay in their dorms 24/7 only leaving to pee and get water for their rice cookers. People like their homes, so encouraging them to go overseas can only do so much. They remain apart from everyone else still.” (DSC110)

“They tend to stick to themselves.” (BSC002)

“International students tend to stay together, because that makes them more comfortable. It also tends to be difficult for institutions to reach out to them.” (BSC067)

“Most people make their own problems.” (BSC074)
“Different cultural beliefs can be ‘backwards’ or ‘opposite’ from the majority and cause problems.” (CSC014)

“Some may not be ready to have a positive world view and they won’t change.” (EED067)

“They tend to isolate themselves even when we try to make an effort.” (FEA095)

“I live on residence and I feel that all international students stick together and to make an effort to make new friends.” (FSC008)

“I find that our international students from China almost only mingle with other students from China. They make little effort to mingle.” (AED023)

“They take our spots in education.” (ESC076)

Neoliberal orientation (3.3 %):

“No, I think it is strictly beneficial to the students from Canada, because they have the opportunity to meet people from around the world and learn about their culture.” (FEA051)

“Everyone faces challenges no matter if you are international or local students. International students most likely do not deal with the challenge of racism in University.” (FEA049)

“No, because they are here to learn.” (FSC029)

“They do not affect my learning most of the time, except when I am expected to work with them and there is a language/learning barrier.” (CED033)

“They are given equal opportunities to succeed.” (CED035)

“From an exchange student perspective there are opportunities for all. Resources are readily available for every circumstance that may arise. It is up to individual to utilise.” (ASS016)

“When I am with them, they feel right at home.” (FSC060)

“Although it’s a burden, I think it’s beneficial for them to learn and struggle to something new & challenging.” (FSC100)

“They have the same amount of education as us.” (BSS024)
“I have many new friends this year that are international or a different background to me.” (BSS028)

“It must be difficult to find yourself in a completely different context among people who have probably been socialized in a different way. It is important for these international students to remember that their perspectives provide a refreshing change of scenery for the other students.” (AED094)

Neoliberal-liberal-critical interstice (3 %):

“They face discrimination based on their cultural and language difficulties. They also have different experiences and learning styles that may make it difficult in an international context.” (GED067)

“Can’t join in a local group, if you’re not outgoing enough.” (GSC046)

“Cultural differences and relative confinement to the campus could have an isolating effect.” (DED006)

“International students tend to clique then face stereotypes.” (DED052)

“Many tend to depend on each other and rarely mix outside their circle of friends; they miss out on diversity and multiculturalism.” (FEA009)

“There is a bit of racism and social segregation. It could stem from the language barriers though. Because people who don’t speak English have a hard time mingling and then they just hang out with each other.” (FEA046)

“Likely culture shock and finding the peer groups. Real and perceived reaction is always present. I imagine teaching styles and student-teacher interactions are different there. They often stick together, but I imagine I would do the same thing – trying to break into a new culture would be exceptionally difficult.” (BSC054)

“I find international students at my institution tend to stick together rather than become friends with permanent students, but I think it is because permanent students have a hard time opening up to new people so I feel like international students do not fully expand in my institution.” (ASS049)

“Often keep to themselves, possibly don’t feel welcome?” (CED032)
Relational-critical and relational-liberal interstice (0.1 %):

“They are isolated from everyone they love.” (DSC090)

The single example that could be potentially classified in the relational-critical or relation-liberal category was the last in the list of examples related to different discursive orientations and their interstices in Question 3. Fig. 29 below summarizes the representation rates of different categories of responses and opens space for the general analysis of responses.

Fig. 29. Apart from possible language difficulties, do international students or students with diverse backgrounds face challenges at your institution?

The distribution of answers to Question 3 shows the most even distribution of answers between the three most represented orientations and interstices. Liberal (31.5 %), neoliberal-liberal (27.1 %) and liberal-critical (26.3 %) categories make up together an overwhelming majority (84.9 %) of responses. In this regard it is perhaps worth mentioning that the share of answers that lack any recognition of potential challenges or that consider these challenges as ‘normal’ challenges that people experience when they enter a new (cultural) environment amount to 66.5 % or two thirds of the responses. This number is comprised of added shares from liberal, liberal-neoliberal, neoliberal-critical and neoliberal categories. Although neoliberal-critical orientation recognizes certain challenges, the answers in this
category attribute the responsibility for any challenges exclusively to a lack of interest and deliberate self-segregation of groups of international students. Answers in the critical category that challenge the successful functioning of current models of internationalization and the management of diversity at universities or that discuss systemic imbalances (such as difference in tuition fees, epistemic hegemony, Eurocentrism and others), represent 4.9% of all responses.

The analysis of answers belonging to different orientations begins with a discussion of the liberal category that contains the largest body of answers. This category contains perhaps the largest share of manifestly exceptionalist answers among all the categories in the open-ended part of the survey. Similar to the neoliberal-liberal or liberal orientation, answers in this category deny any challenges related to discriminatory behaviour, either from the institutions, domestic students or the local population. The fact that students came to study to Canada (and not to some other country) is often (FEA012, FEA016, BSC060, BSS027, BSS052, EED078) taken as a credible and seemingly the only necessary reason to justify a complete absence of discrimination, racism or any other kind of unpleasant experience, related to the origin of the students. Local students and the general population are presented as welcoming and interested in the cultural variety of the international students (FEA012, FEA067, AED003). Canada seems in this regards to be perceived as an a priori accepting and welcoming country, with the national brand of Canada acting as a warrant of this acceptance: “[A]s is commonly known, Canada is a diverse country and therefore welcomes students from all backgrounds” (FEA012) or “This is Canada, we try and accommodate” (EED078). In this regard the presence of (ethnic, cultural) diversity seems to be considered proof of an absence of any kind of discrimination or racism (FEA012, FEA016, BSS027, BSS052, EED078).

Answers in the liberal-neoliberal category seem to suggest a very similar understanding, but place more emphasis on the students (initial) challenges that are related to adapting to the new environment. If there are any potential issues then they considered as resulting from culture shock or language barriers, which are considered ‘normal’. Similar to the liberal orientation, the answers in the liberal-neoliberal category do not seem to be able to imagine any kind of challenges that could result from either systemic imbalances or racist or discriminatory behaviour from the local or majority population. Occasionally challenges that students may face are trivialized, such as relating to weather (CSE043), food (ESC092), or the consideration the “Their culture may not be as widely celebrated” (EED007).
The liberal-critical interstice challenges the exceptionalist (exclusively) non-discriminatory and benevolent understandings of Canada and Canadians, by suggesting that there may be some incidents of racism and discriminatory behaviour. However, some of the answers seem to suggest that the students have not witnessed that personally (CED008), that the extent is unknown (GED003) or that improvement is underway (DED077, AED072). Among various reasons for discrimination, apart from the more general concept of ‘culture’, religion seems to play an important role (CED015, AED072, AED097). Further, some of the answers in this category seem to suggest that discrimination is done (merely) by some people (AED097, AED072, FEA060), and likewise experienced only by some international students (FEA020, FEA053), thus suggesting that there is no recognition of systemic racism or discrimination, indeed several answers directly suggest a hope that this is not the case (DED077, FEA020, FEA053). In this regard, it would be possible to suggest that while answers in the liberal-critical category challenge the exclusively benevolent perceptions of Canadian society as tolerant, accepting and non-discriminatory, on other hand they affirm exceptionalist discourse by projecting racist or discriminatory behaviour on ‘some people’, and by expressing an understanding or hope that this kind behaviour in an exception to the general rule, and by only considering visibly racist behaviour (such as discriminatory speech) rather than its more subtle, but potentially more widespread (yet unrecognized) expressions. Further it could be suggested that difference seem to be understood as some kind of a ‘trigger’ for discrimination and racism, rather than conceptualizing racist or discriminatory dispositions as the behavioural traits that also construct and emphasize difference.

Unlike the answers that constitute the liberal-critical interstice, the answers that were categorized as belonging to the critical orientation emphasize systemic discrimination, such as higher tuition fees (GED035, EED071), international students being perceived as ‘cash’ by the institutions (GED035), epistemic and/or cultural hegemony (GED001, CED084, EED054, CED048). In the case of the later students cite imposition of “Western ideas” (GED001), “Eurocentric perspectives in academia” (EED054) and “the ego-centric form of Canadian universities and their focus on individual achievement” (FEA084) among other possible articulations of hegemonic traits. In rare examples racism and inequality are considered as foundational to Canadian society (DED075), while some other students challenge the nature of some of the practices that are meant to contribute to better integration: “Forcing them to change their names to something more relatable is BS!” (FEA078). While some of critiques in this category seem to
directly challenge the benevolent exceptionalist narratives by questioning the very foundation of Canadian society (DED075), such examples are extremely rare and constitute a minority of responses in this category. The majority of the responses focus instead on critiques of the neoliberal imaginary of the university (related to tuition fees and commodification of knowledge) and epistemic hegemony that is considered to be at work in academia (GED001, CED084 EED054, CED048, FEA084). In this regard these answers remain focused on hegemonic traits related to knowledge production, but do not touch up other forms of discrimination or other challenges that the students may experience in their daily life, thus leaving the social aspect of discrimination/racism often (but not always) somewhat unexamined. In relation to the answers in the critical-liberal interstice that emphasize precisely the everyday (individualized) experiences of discrimination, the number of answers that discuss systemic (critical) rather than individually experienced (liberal-critical) forms of discrimination, is approximately five times smaller.

In a certain opposition to both the liberal-critical and critical categories, the answers grouped within the neoliberal-critical interstice (4.6 %) emphasize voluntary self-segregation of international students (DSC110, BSC002, BSC067, BSC074, AED023). Some of the answers employ openly racist remarks about students from other cultural backgrounds, using labelling such as “backwards” (CSC104) or “causing problems” (CSC104), or referring to them as “Too much money, too little class,” (GSC006). While these expressions of overt racism are rare, subtler articulations such as: “They make little effort to mingle” (AED023), “They tend to stick to themselves” (BSC002) or they “may not be ready to have a positive world view” (EED067), are much more frequent. In fact, ‘sticking together’ (BSC002, FSC008) and its various re-articulations (staying together, refusing to mingle and others) seem to be among the more widespread phrases to describe international students in this category. Exceptionalist traits that could be observed in the neoliberal-critical interstice, seem to suggest widespread (within this category) and commonly shared re-articulations of the exceptionalist narrative that constructs the benevolent national subject as (genuinely) reaching out towards the excluded Other, while the Other (ungratefully) rejects this welcoming gesture and instead prefers to remain self-interested, self-absorbed, a-social and introverted. Within the neoliberal-critical interstice it seems to be impossible to imagine the national subject (students, institutions) as anything but welcoming, however the Other seems to be portrayed as exclusively unworthy of this welcome and not being
capable of possessing any of the personal traits that the national subject would consider positive.

Answers gathered under the neoliberal orientation (3.3 %) emphasize equal opportunities (for success) of international and domestic students (CED035, ASS016, BSS024), and accentuate the respondents’ personal contribution to making international students feel welcome, or of his friendship towards them (FSC060, BSS028), or framing any arising challenges as actually beneficial to the international students, because these challenges are seen as providing extra motivation (FSC100). Further this group contains a considerable share of answers where international students are perceived merely in relation to the potential benefit they may provide to the local students (FEA051, CED033, AED094). In perhaps the most extreme articulation, any difficulties encountered by international students should be considered as redeemed by the realization: “that their perspectives provide a refreshing change of scenery for the other students” (AED094). Answers, such as this one could be seen as perhaps most explicitly accentuating the exceptionalist trait of the consumption or commodification of otherness for personal benefit and amusement. Further, there seem to be several respondents that failed to notice that the question was enquiring whether international students or students with diverse background experiences faced any challenges and not whether domestic students experience any challenges related to international students. Answers, such as: “No, I think it is strictly beneficial to the students from Canada, because they have the opportunity to meet people from around the world and learn about their culture,” (FEA051) seem to suggest a complete absence of any kind of consideration of international students, beyond their immediate impact on domestic students, thus seemingly again re-affirming the (extremely) exceptionalist optics, where the worth of the Other can only be measured against its direct contribution and value for the exceptional nation.

As only one answer (DEC090) was potentially classified as relational-liberal, the last part of the analysis in this subchapter is devoted to the neoliberal-liberal-critical interstice (2.9 %). Answers in this group consider the relationship between international and domestic students as mutually exclusive, with international students self-segregating. However, this self-segregation could be seen as either due to language barriers (FEA046, GED067), difficulty in adapting to a new environment (BSC054, GED067) or discrimination and stereotyping (GED067, DED052, FEA046), non-generalized personal traits (GSC046) or not feeling welcomed (CED032). Exceptionalist traits could be seen expressed in the feelings of sympathy for international students that due to their dependency on each other
“miss out on diversity and multiculturalism” (FEA009) or through the naturalization of segregation, as naturally resulting from the international students’ difficulties with the English language (FEA046, GED067).

As the general disposition towards diversity in the students’ responses seems to suggest that diversity has to be first exposed (commodified) and understood (consumed), before it can be accepted (e.g. “You don’t have to agree, but you have to understand.” (BSC076)), welcomed and tolerated, it is perhaps not surprising that answers that could be classified as relational-critical or relational-liberal and that would (potentially) emphasize the possibility of being-together before establishing mutual knowledge, understandings, identity (and language), are almost completely absent from the survey.

6.4 Question 4: Can diversity enrich your university experience?

‘Can diversity enrich your university experience?’ is the last of the 4 open-ended questions that are part of the qualitative analysis. 1,035 answers were analysed, 381 students (26.3 %) did not provide an answer to this question and 35 (2.4 %) answers were considered unclassifiable. Following the sequence of presentation, established in Questions 2 and 3, an analytical matrix for the analysis is presented first (in Table 9), followed by a presentation of examples of students’ answers belonging to each category. Fig. 30 that follows the list of examples, presents the distribution of answers according to the analytical matrix. The overall analysis of answers to this question is presented below figure Fig. 30 and concludes this subchapter. Relational-critical and relational-liberal categories are exclusively theoretical conceptualizations, as no answer was categorized as belonging to these categories.
### Table 9. Analytical matrix for Question 4: Can diversity enrich your university experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liberal</th>
<th>Neoliberal</th>
<th>Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More diversity is always good, diversity creates a better world and leads to more and better knowledge. It benefits society in general and local minorities in particular. Diversity leads to more balanced and unbiased opinions and creates unity. Emphasis on mutual learning that is good for everyone. Diversity is good by itself. Basic logic: More knowledge =&gt; better society. More exposure =&gt; better global citizen. More diversity =&gt; more understanding =&gt; more tolerance/acceptance.</td>
<td>Emphasis on personal growth, learning languages, acquiring skills and knowledge. Diversity makes possible a broader, better, exciting experience. Diversity is good for the economy and growth from the experience of others. Learning is understood as self-centred exercise for fun, pleasure and/or personal benefit. Basic logic: Diversity has to be managed and made available, so that it can be exploited through commodification of otherness.</td>
<td>Systemic critique of internationalization processes and diversity management. Recognition of tokenistic inclusion of diversity without ensuing deep exchange or learning. Recognition of epistemic hegemony and the uneven distribution of costs and benefits of diversity, through the relationship between ‘providers’ and ‘recipients’ of diversity. Recognition of power relations and multiple forms of privilege.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neoliberal-liberal</th>
<th>Liberal-critical</th>
<th>Neoliberal-critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to diversity people makes think more reasonably and realistically. Diversity is good for the students’ careers, which in turn benefits the society. Learn from others to appreciate your heritage and culture. Exoticization of others. Emphasizing personal virtues (of compassion and openness) for (assumed) benefit of others. Basic logic: More diversity =&gt; more knowledge =&gt; benefits both the individual and the society.</td>
<td>Focus on bursting cultural bubble, not systemic exploitation, violence, hegemony. Diverse perspectives challenge beliefs, expose the North America or Canadian bias cultural bias. Diversity helps develop critical thinking and provides motivation for help/charity, but this requires first an opening to diversity. No recognition of privilege/power relations.</td>
<td>Diversity is good, but there is a threat of over-internationalization. Diversity does not enrich students’ experience and does not benefit them. International students do not contribute much (or enough) and professors are difficult to understand. Diversity introduces conflicting values/beliefs. Diversity would be beneficial, but not enough is available and/or others do not offer enough diversity (for consumption).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neoliberal-liberal-critical</th>
<th>Relational-critical</th>
<th>Relational-liberal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting demands between liberal affirmation of diversity and neoliberal insistence on utility maximization and effectiveness. Recognition of tokenism, but interpreted as damaging the learning process of the student.</td>
<td>Emphasis on establishing relationship beyond knowledge, understanding and identity. Extending relationships beyond the human dimension.</td>
<td>Emphasis on establishing relationship beyond knowledge, understanding and identity, however these relationships remain anthropocentric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The answers to Question 4 could be considered as perhaps the most homogenous among the answers to the four open-ended questions. The examples listed below seem to suggest a wide-spread agreement about the benefit of (increased) diversity on the educational experience of the students. While it is possible to trace some nuances in the rationales that are supportive of diversity – as presented in the analytical matrix above, the vast majority of the answers seem to support the notion that diversity is inherently beneficial and enriching.

**Liberal-neoliberal interstice (62.6 %):**

“I think it’s important to learn from other cultures. Especially as a teacher being knowledgeable about other cultures is important for making all students feel welcome.” (FED012)

“Yes it can, because you are able to connect with people of different diversities allowing you to have more outside knowledge to place your thoughts.” (FSC069)

“More exposure to diverse community provides me the opportunity to embrace difference and become more familiar with others.” (DED023)

“I grew up in a diverse environment and as such have learned how to interact with hundreds of people while being aware and compassionate towards their situation.” (DED058)

“I think my diversity has helped me with my tolerance towards people, and my views in life.” (DED077)

“Especially in education, diversity is welcome. We will face it every day as teachers.” (AED001)

“Learning about other cultures open one’s mind. Without learning a bit of diversity we’d have zero idea how to react when faced with a new country/person from a different background.” (AED090)

“Learning about new people/cultures is always a good thing. It broadens your understanding of the world.” (AA068)

“Learning new things besides course curriculum.” (BSC072)

“More people, more minds!” (BSC079)
“Diversity brings new ideas and unique perspectives.” (BSC080)

“Diverse points of view enlarge one’s mind and expand one’s perspective. Learning to know my “other” helps me better know myself and generates respect for multiple way of knowing and being.” (EED017)

“Different perspectives, learning opportunities.” (EED031)

“Diversity has the power to enrich my university experience because it is an element I will be dealing with daily as a teacher & so the more exposure I get to it, the better.” (CED044)

“To even solidify one’s own identity, there has to be something to compare it to. Cooperative thinking from diverse backgrounds also creates better thought.” (CED046)

Liberal orientation (13 %):

“Different strokes for different folks, diversity is the spice of life, the answer is self-explanatory.” (DED009)

“Diversity can never be bad.” (DED052)

“Absolutely! Best-case-scenario these studies can be enriching for local and foreigners both to teach and learn about each other.” (DED066)

“Every culture has something to offer.” (ASS026)

“We can all learn from each other.” (BSC001)

“Diversity is good for everyone.” (BSS037)

“In order to understand about other ways of living we need to learn about them to appreciate them. Need to be open to different perspectives.” (EED007)

“Allows students to be exposed to more diversity which defines society. To be more tolerant.” (EED100)

“They come with a unique perspective and experiences that can be beneficial to other societies.” (EED093)

“Understanding + education reduce prejudice.” (EED101)
Neoliberal orientation (12.3 %):

“More knowledge to enter our campus increases the possibility for grants & gives multifaceted perspectives on the world around.” (FEA021)

“Learning will be more interesting and fulfilling from a variety of cultural backgrounds.” (FEA022)

“Taught to think in a way not commonly used to. Clearly develops your well rounded education a University degree promises.” (FEA075)

“Learn about different people/cultures/things from students from different parts of the world. → Help to expand my knowledge and experience more. → Makes me more interesting.” (FSC103)

“Yes, I have grown so much from studying abroad and having international friends.” (FEA091)

“Hearing from others who are different than you and think differently is essential in my opinion to personal growth.” (DED076)

“Knowing differences = knowledge = power.” (AED034)

“Cultural show is nice and it gives you contacts/friends that are different than your usual ones. It’s refreshing.” (AED050)

“So that you can travel and not pay for hotels.” (DED067)

“It can offer multiple viewpoints on topics and allow you to gain information that may be useful in terms of international jobs or dealing with international clients.” (BSC092)

“I went to Mexico for one semester and it completely enriched my experience by exposing me to so many new people + experiences.” (EED097)

Neoliberal-critical interstice (4.7 %):

“Yes. Being in humanities, it seems a lot of my professors/instructors are younger with less concrete/effective teaching methods. Which would be fine, if it weren’t so common.” (FEA025)

“As long as they are knowledgeable.” (FSC025)
“All teach the same material, none from their own cultural background.” (FSC064)

“To an extent, but sometimes it doesn’t focus enough on the Canadian content.” (DED071)

“As long as professors speak English fluently, they can introduce new perspectives to students. They can bring up topics otherwise not discussed.” (BSC023)

“Allows us to experience other cultures/increase our understanding of different types of people as long as instructors can still properly instruct in our language.” (BSC031)

“Canada is already civilise enough. Look at what is happening to England.” (BSS083)

“I prefer English speaking teachers because they’re much easier for me to understand.” (ESC031)

“I don’t like working in groups with others different from me as in language barriers (major) makes it harder for me to teach them and learn.” (ESC069)

“We’re in Canada, not China.” (GSC006)

Liberal-critical interstice (4.5 %):

“Shows us problems the rest of the world face, makes us realize what we have, makes us want to study, travel, volunteer abroad.” (FSC037)

“Unique perspectives encourage learning and critical thinking.” (FSC095)

“I believe everyone should have access to university to learn about themselves & others in a critical way.” (DED052)

“It allows us to have a new glance on the world, to not being ethnocentric. In this way we look at what we took for granted differently.” (ASS049)

“Reason being, students should realize that inside their own little bubble isn’t the only place you can live, get out there see how the other half of the world lives.” (ASS048)

“It’s good to see perspectives that challenge your beliefs.” (BSC013)
Critical orientation (1.8 %):

“Only meaning sharing is a worthwhile experience.” (FEA047)

“More perspectives, especially marginalized ones, allow students to challenge existing ideology and realize that we are often coerced into making judgement and decisions based on our cultural bias.” (FEA084)

“Yes, but I believe it must happen organically. I disagree that forced internation created valid discussion/change – since it’s often in a very controlled environment.” (DED014)

“Diversity can enrich our worldview & decentre our perception of ourselves as the most important.” (GED034)

“Hear silenced voices from less powerful groups.” (CED051)

Neoliberal-critical-liberal interstice (1 %):

“It just doesn’t necessarily enrich my education personally. It’s always nice meeting/being exposed to other cultures though.” (ASS040)

“Absolutely, diversity is something everyone can learn from. How other cultures operate and are structured, everyone can learn from other cultures. But this does not give good reason for over internationalization of universities.” (BSC034)

“In theory, yes. This requires actual interaction and not merely their token presence. Diversity for its own sake is pointless. Utility is derived from shown understanding and learning from negotiating, not just having different skin colours represented in the year book.” (BSC096)

Relational-critical and relational-liberal interstices (0 %):

Since no answers were categorized as belonging to either of these categories, the analysis in this subchapter discusses the 7 remaining orientations and interstices. Fig. 30 presents the distribution of answers according to the analytical matrix.
The distribution of answers in Fig. 30 shows the strong predominance of the liberal-neoliberal interstice (62.6 %) among responses to Question 4, followed by both of the main orientations that form this interstice liberal (13 %) and neoliberal (12.3 %). Other (critical) interstices were significantly less represented, with neoliberal-critical being the strongest (4.7 %) of the group, followed by liberal-critical (4.5 %) and the very rare critical (1.8 %) and liberal-neoliberal-critical interstices (1 %). It is interesting that the only question that is related directly to the students’ personal experience of university seems to show the biggest convergence of liberal and neoliberal orientations, which seems to resonate with concerns raised in Subchapter 2.1.4 about the possible convergence of liberal and neoliberal imaginaries of higher education. The liberal-neoliberal interstice, together with liberal and neoliberal orientations, account for 87.6 % of all answers. This is also the category where the smallest percent of answers was attributed to the critical category, which seems to suggest that diversity occupies a special place in the educational discourse and/or imaginary that seems to position it largely outside of domain of critical reflection. Due to the high level of similarity amongst the majority of answers to this question, as exemplified by the predominance of the neoliberal-liberal interstice (and its constitutive orientations), the discussion below focuses predominantly on exploring the understandings or relationships towards diversity that seem to be
operating across all orientations, rather than providing a specific, case to case analysis of individual orientations and their interstices.

A vast majority of the answers thus seems to suggest a perception of diversity as inherently beneficial or enriching whether for personal benefit (neoliberal), social benefit (liberal) or a combination of both (liberal-neoliberal). Further it should be also noted that the answers, gathered under the liberal-critical interstice do not challenge this assumption, but rather emphasize the more challenging aspects of learning from diversity, such as developing critical thinking (FSC095, DED052), incitement for activism (FSC037) challenging mainstream beliefs or ‘bursting the cultural bubble’ (ASS049, ASS048, BSC013). Similarly, the answers in the neoliberal-critical category do not necessarily challenge the beneficial nature of diversity for better knowledge production or for a more (personally) enriching university experience, but rather emphasize that there is not enough diversity present to make this enriching process possible, or that their engagement with diversity is mediated by certain (language) difficulties that make a better us of diversity difficult or impossible. Even in the critical orientation there seems to be an underlying assumption that more diversity leads to more ‘objective’ knowledge that uncovers systemic injustice, various ideologies or epistemic, cultural and other forms of hegemony. In this regard, while there are differences in understanding as to how diversity is beneficial, and for what and in what way, there seems to be very little or no challenge to the assumed relationship between more diversity and more and better knowledge.

In other words, virtually all of the answers to this question seem to support a notion of existence as mediated through knowledge and that this existence can be improved (made more just) through access to more and better knowledge, brought about by increased diversity. Translated into an exploration of exceptionalist discourse; this insistence on diversity and consequently more knowledge as being (the sole) contributors to not just an improved, but also potentially more just and less oppressive/hegemonic society, seems to suggest that there is very little or potentially no reflection on how the very attitude towards diversity could be operating in commodified-, self- or (multicultural) nation-serving ways. This lack of reflection seems to be present even (or especially) in those answers that emphasize the use of (learning from) diversity as a tool for personal growth, directed toward greater tolerance and/or acceptance, or as a tool for (personal) de-ideologization. In certain ways this seemingly universal attitude of students towards diversity could be seen as echoing Bhabha’s understanding of the ambivalent nature of the relationship between the self and the Other (presented in
Subchapter 3.2.1), where the two are trapped in a mutual double-bind, by which the self is only able to know him/herself through a continuous engagement with his/her Other.

Certain answers seem to describe this relationship directly: “Learning to know my ‘other’ helps me better know myself and generates respect from multiple ways of knowing and being” (EED017), “To even solidify one’s own identity, there has to be something to compare it to” (CED046) or “Hearing from others who are different from you and think differently is essential in my opinion to personal growth” (DED076). According to Bhabha (1994), a potential equality of the Other would jeopardize the continuation of this relationship of self-exploration through the consumption of otherness.

Further, the unexamined relationship between (more) diversity and (more and/or better) knowledge, leaves unexamined any irrational or non-rational dispositions towards diversity or otherness that could stem from unacknowledged desires, fears, attachments and fantasies, thus never examining whether the attitude of the subjects towards diversity (and otherness) is an ethical one, but rather seeming to suggest an assumption that it is such.

In brief: while there seems to be considerable difference in understandings about what diversity is capable of accomplishing, leading to either personal growth (DED023, DED058, DED077), direct personal benefit (FSC103, DED067, BSC092) a more open and accepting society (EED007, EED101, EED093), or less hegemonic relations (FEA084, GED034), there have been no (observable) challenges posed against a utilitarian or commodified understanding of diversity. Thus in virtually all the answers diversity is seen as serving a certain purpose, ranging from suggestions as concrete as enabling “travel and not pay[ing] for hotels” (DED067) to the more existential ones, such as diversity being considered “the spice of life” (DED009).

This subchapter concludes the series of analyses related to the four open-ended questions. The next subchapter discusses the relationship between the qualitative and quantitative components of the open-ended question, offers an overview of the general distribution of answers across all questions and discusses the subject of missing and unclassifiable answers.
6.5 The quantitative and qualitative components of open-ended questions and students’ response rates

As mentioned in the introduction to the qualitative analysis, each of the 4 open-ended questions presented above was accompanied by a corresponding quantitative (choice given) question. In the case of Question 1 – ‘How does internationalization affect society in general?’ the students were first able to choose between 5 pre- given (quantitative) options, followed by an invitation to explain their answer (qualitative answer). Question 2 – ‘How do you imagine global citizens should think, relate and/or act in the world?’ was preceded by a quantitative question: Do you see yourself as a global citizen? Question 3 – ‘Apart from possible language difficulties, do international students or students with diverse backgrounds face challenges in your institution?’ and Question 4 – ‘Can diversity enrich your university experience?’ also contained quantitative response options of ‘yes’ and ‘no’, before the students were invited to explain their quantitative choices. In this subchapter an analysis of these accompanying quantitative responses is made available in order to provide some additional context for the qualitative analysis.

Before proceeding to the analysis itself a visual reproduction of Question 1 is made available to demonstrate how these two components worked together in the actual survey. As the full questionnaire is available in the appendix, only one exemplary case is presented in Fig. 31 below.

Example:
12. How does Internationalization affect society in general?
Positively ........ □
Negatively........ □
Mixed............. □
Unclear ............. □
No opinion ...... □
12a. Please explain your answer to Question 12.
“Internationalization provides students with the opportunity to learn more about a specific discipline, to develop valuable life experiences and critical thinking skills.” [5SC008]

Fig. 31. Example of quantitative and qualitative components of open-ended questions

As it is possible to observe from the example in Fig. 31, the quantitative components of the open-ended question provided data that can give us some
general impression about students’ pre-dispositions towards the topic in question, but the quantitative part by itself could not capture the wide range of nuances and interpretative variety that was contained in the qualitative part. Table 10 below offers a presentation of all quantitative responses, as related to the four questions.

### Table 10. Response rates in quantitative responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available answers</th>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th>Question 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available answers</td>
<td>Response rates</td>
<td>Available answers</td>
<td>Response rates</td>
<td>Available answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positively</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negatively</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>No answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overview of responses in Table 10 seems to suggest that students in response to Question 1 in general share a positive disposition towards internationalization as 45.7% of respondents considered it as ‘positive’, which is very high compared to only 1.3% who considered internationalization to be explicitly negative. Approximately a third of the answers (33.2%) considered the effect of internationalization to be ‘mixed’, while 15.7% were either unsure or had no opinion. In relation to Question 2 almost 43.8% of the students considered themselves to be global citizens, 21.9% would ‘maybe’ consider themselves as such and 9.4% did not see themselves as global citizens. Approximately a fifth (20.6%) of the students were unsure or had no opinion. In response to Question 3, 63.1% of students thought that international students or students with diverse background do face certain challenges at the university, while 26.1% thought that no such challenges exist. When asked about the contribution of diversity to their education experience an overwhelming majority (87.3%) agreed that diversity enriches their experience and only 4.5% believed that diversity does not enrich their experience.

When we compare these results to the analysis of qualitative components in Subchapters 6.1–6.4, it is possible to observe a certain degree of coherence, but also some interesting discrepancies, between the results of the qualitative analysis, the quantified responses and the results in Table 10. For instance, in relation to Question 1 a general sense of a positive or unchallenging disposition towards
internationalization that was identified in the qualitative analysis seems to be confirmed with the overly positive attitudes towards internationalization, as suggested by the analysis of the quantitative component. While it would be more difficult to compare the responses to Question 2 – due to their rather different content, we could still suggest that the share of students that did not perceive themselves as global citizens or who chose the option ‘maybe’ (together 31.3 %) largely corresponds to the share of responses in the neoliberal-liberal and neoliberal categories (together 26.1 %) that emphasized the need for travel and international experience as kind of pre-condition for global citizenship.

Although ‘only’ 26.1 % of students in Question 3 responded that international students or students with diverse backgrounds face no challenges at their institutions and 63.1 % thought that challenges were present, the qualitative analysis suggests a rather different picture. Indeed, this relationship seems to be rather reversed in the qualitative part as a considerably lower share (33.3 %) of students responses were classified into categories that in general suggested different kinds of challenges are present (categories: liberal-critical, critical, liberal-neoliberal critical) and a majority of other answers (66.6 %) either suggested that no challenges were present, or that the challenge were minor, ‘natural’ or the students ‘own fault’, or that appropriate measure were available to mitigate them. In this regard a qualitative analysis is able to provide significantly more data related to this question and a very different general impression to the one provided by the quantitative component alone. It should further be noted that many of the respondents who chose ‘no’ in the quantitative part then did not provide an explanation for their answer. Still, it seems that the share (26.1 %) of students who could not imagine any challenges for international students or students with diverse backgrounds is quite high. This seems to affirm the general exceptionalist narrative under which any such challenges are likely to be considered largely impossible.

The overwhelmingly positive attitude towards diversity, as expressed in the quantitative component of Question 4, seems to be affirmed also by a similar attitude that could be observed in the responses of students to the qualitative part of the question. Incidentally, the share of students who did not think diversity enriches their experience (4.5 %) in the quantitative part could be seen as closely related to the share of responses in the neoliberal-critical category (4.7 %) who challenged the value of contributions by international students and professors to the learning process.

Of further interest is also the relationship between the share of missing answers in the quantitative and the qualitative part of the survey. Although the quantitative
and qualitative responses were part of the same questions, the response rates between these two groups of data vary significantly. Table 11 below presents a summary of qualitative response rates and enables a comparison of this data to the response rates in the quantitative part, as presented in Table 10.

### Table 11. Response rates for qualitative answers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Valid responses</th>
<th>Unclassifiable</th>
<th>No answer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 questions average</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the share of missing or invalid answers in the quantitative part was not very high (between 4 and 10.8 %), the response rate to the qualitative part was considerably lower. On average 25.8 % of students did not provide answers in that part of the survey. This completion rate may seem low in comparison, however, it is in several ways rather understandable given the overall length of the questionnaire (6 pages with 135 variables), and that the qualitative answers were featured on the last two pages and considering that their completion is much more demanding than ticking the boxes or filling in the circles in the quantitative part. Further, quantitative answers, such as ‘no opinion’, ‘unsure’ and ‘no’ (in Questions 3 and 4) elicited very little further response, compared to more affirmative quantitative choices.

In addition to the missing answers, some open-ended answers were very short, consisting perhaps of merely one or two words and were thus largely considered as unclassifiable, unless their content was very explicit. The group ‘unclassifiable’ contains also answers such as ‘I don’t know’ or ‘no opinion’ and answers that were comprised of over-generalizing statements such as ‘all things are good and bad’, ‘every coin has two sides’ and similar. With this contextualization of responses in mind, the last subchapter presents a summary of the main findings and suggests certain caveats related to the interpretation of the results.

#### 6.6 Main findings and interpretative caveats

This subchapter presents the main findings related to all four questions that were subject to qualitative analysis, followed by a discussion of some possible caveats.
related to the interpretation and classification of the data. In this regard, it presents
the final subchapter of this chapter and its aim is to offer both a general overview
of that analysis and to discuss previously unacknowledged interpretative
particularities. As an overview of the analysis of all four questions the following
main findings seem to suggest themselves:

- in 3 out of 4 questions the liberal orientation represented the largest share of
  responses, and in one example the neoliberal-liberal interstice represented the
  overwhelming majority of all responses;
- the liberal and neoliberal-liberal interstice are in general the most prominent
categories of answers;
- the critical orientation is the least represented of all three main orientations,
  with less than 5% of responses categorized as such in all 4 questions;
- the liberal-critical interstice is the third most represented category (after liberal
  and neoliberal-liberal), meaning that the liberal discursive orientation, with its
  accompanying interstices, is the predominant orientation in the students’
  responses;
- articulations of exceptionalism could be traced across virtually all categories
  in all questions, however the form of their expression varies significantly;
- all of the three main orientations and their interstices seem to share a common
  relationship to diversity and otherness, whereby this relationship is mediated
  and facilitated through knowledge about the Other;
- in this regard, a relationship with the Other seems to be possible only through
  increased knowledge about the Other which makes him or her more familiar,
  and thus more acceptable or tolerable to the subject;
- a general absence of answers that would articulate a (need for)
  recognition/conceptualization of relations beyond knowledge, understanding
  and identity (relational-critical and relational-liberal categories) seems to
  confirm these assumptions;
- examples of self-reflection where the students would critically examine their
  own relationship to the world, internationalization or engagement with
  (cultural) diversity are very rare;
- while there are a few examples of recognition of epistemic hegemony at work
  in higher education, there seem to be no such examples of recognition of
  ontological hegemony, especially not on an individual level;
- to some extent this lack of examining one’s ontological and epistemic grounds
could be seen as reflected in the unproblematic and non-challenging
conceptualization of diversity (and other knowledges) that are overwhelmingly understood as mere ‘additions’ rather than ‘disruption’ of the students existing knowledge;

– in this regard the answers in all orientations and their interstices seem to predominantly exhibit a commodified relationship towards diversity, albeit each for a different (and likely benevolent) purpose;

– this commodification of otherness for benevolent purposes seems to enable the preservation of positive self-image and affirms the exceptional narratives of Canadians as kind, open, tolerant, peaceful and understanding.

While the findings of the analysis seem to suggest that articulations of exceptionalist traits could generally be observed across the 3 main orientations and their interstices in all four open-ended questions, this should not be taken as suggesting that students’ answers explicitly affirm exceptionalist narratives. Quite inversely, such examples are quite rare, and a considerable majority of answers could be considered as not exhibiting any manifest articulations of exceptionalist discourse. However, since exceptionalism is conceptualized as a shared narrative about a certain group of people, a nation or a state, it seems necessary to consider the presence of exceptionalism in this shared or distributed context. Such a conceptualization seems to require an adoption of an analytical approach that dedicates the same level of attention not just to what was said, but also to discursive absences and silences. An attempt at such analysis is what this research is about. In many ways the analysis presented above is much more concerned with the shared absences and silences than with the presence of overtly exceptionalist discourse, such as could for example be traced in answers that emphasized the Canadian national brand as a warrant against any possible discrimination or emergence of racism.

As such, the quality of the analysis depends much more on the quality and robustness of the theoretical framework than it does on accurate or ‘representative’ interpretations of answers. The analysis of absences of silences depends on the capacity for interpretation of ‘what is not there’ and the success of this endeavour is dependent largely on the quality of theoretical conceptualization of exceptionalism. In the next chapter an interpretative discussion of answers, as made possible by the AWESOME cartography (presented in Subchapter 4.2.5), will hopefully provide some illustration of what kind of exceptional traits this research was able to observe and how these traits manifest themselves through various absences and silences.
Further it should be noted that although the main subject of this research is Canadian exceptionalism, the answers of the students seem to suggest that international and domestic students could be seen as co-creating this exceptionalist narrative, with few observable differences between the responses of these two groups. As stated in the introduction, Canadian exceptionalism should not be considered as something that belongs exclusively to Canadians or Canadian students, but rather as a discourse about Canada and its people that is co-constructed both inside and outside the Canadian national body. The largest observable difference between the two groups seems be that international students would probably refrain from using exceptionalist discourse that openly denigrates the Other, or use less manifestly exceptionalist discourse and articulations, although it is questionable whether such differences would still be observable after a certain period of time.

As exceptionalism is a theoretical concept that relates to another theoretical concept – the (national) subject, it should be especially emphasized that various articulations of exceptionalism observed in the (actual) responses of the students, should not be interpreted in a way that would suggest that particular students are more or less ‘exceptionalist’ than others, nor that the students, whose answers did not exhibit manifestly exceptionalist traits should considered as somehow not part of this narrative. Neither of these interpretations would do the students’ justice as the subject of the research was the omnipresent, shared (national) subject that ‘speaks’ or is articulated through the words and silences of all of us (Canadian or non-Canadian). Particular individuals that more or less share some of the subjects’ exceptionalist traits were thus seen merely in the role of a ‘proxy’ that helped map some of the subjects shared characteristics and traits.

Further, in reference to the discursive orientations, their interstices and subsequent categorization of answers, it should be again re-stated that these categorizations should be taken as provisional, temporary, context bound and contestable. Although, as mentioned in the methodological chapter in Subchapter 4.2.5, many precautions were taken to ensure the robustness and trustworthiness of the data, including multiple re-readings, re-assessments and consultations with projects partners, it is highly likely that another reading of data would produce a slightly different distribution of answers, especially among categories that are very close together, such as for instance liberal and the neoliberal-liberal interstice. My final concern is dedicated to the interpretations of answers that were in this research gathered under the neoliberal and neoliberal-critical categories. While it would be possibly fair to suggest that any openly discriminatory, racist or self-oriented
answers were gathered under these two categories, this should not be taken as suggesting that people that sympathize with any of these (political) orientations should be considered as somehow more selfish or racist. Such a result is not a result of a differentiation between ‘good’ liberal and ‘bad’ neoliberal political orientations, but a result of a conceptual differentiation that associated a liberal orientation with public benefit and social cohesion, while the neoliberal orientation is more associated with personal interest, competition and direct economic benefit. Hopefully this explanation should help to disperse any such considerations.
7 Discussion – AWESOME social cartography

This chapter builds upon the analysis of qualitative data in Chapter 6 and discusses some of the major exceptionalist tendencies or specific articulations of exceptionalist discourse that were observable through the analysis. This chapter presents and discusses the qualitative data through the use of the AWESOME social cartography that was developed specifically for the purpose of mapping different articulations of exceptionalist discourse in the students’ responses. As the conceptualization of the AWESOME cartography was presented in more detail in Subchapter 4.2.5 of the methodological chapter, this introduction only presents a brief summary of what AWESOME stands for and in what way it attempts to be used. More specific explanations of each group of exceptionalist tendencies/articulations are presented at the beginning of each of the subchapters that constitute this chapter.

Through multiple readings of the data, 7 major groups of exceptionalist tendencies or articulations of exceptionalist discourse were observed and brought together under the acronym AWESOME. AWESOME stands for; Auto-immunity; Willful ignorance; Exaltedness, Subtle racism, Opportunistic inclusion, Minimization of issues and Extraction/consumption of otherness. While the list of these tendencies/articulations should not be considered as exhaustive nor definitive, it is used here as an analytical and visualisation tool for the main characteristics of these different articulations of exceptionalist discourse. This chapter aims to discuss (through theory) also some of the (un)acknowledged personal and collective desires, investments, perceptions and attachments that could be seen as influencing or instigating specific articulations of exceptionalism. In this regard the AWESOME cartography is used as a tool for discussion of not just the manifest content of students’ answers, but also of discursive silences, absences and of what may be informing them.

Before proceeding to the discussion itself, I would wish to re-state again that the intention of this research is to use AWESOME in the metaphoric sense of a mirror that denaturalizes what is perceived as normal and desirable and amplifies unflattering traits. Further, this research adopts a poststructuralist stance that considers all mappings as invariably producing (different) distortions, which means that the ambition of AWESOME is not to produce a distortion-free mapping of the students’ answers (as this is considered an impossible task), but rather to draw attention precisely to the distortions and amplifications made visible by this mapping. As such it should be considered as theoretically informed, deducted from
actual students’ responses, but nevertheless situated, partially, provisionally and insufficiently. Further, the AWESOME mapping should be considered as neither exhaustive nor exclusivist, meaning that there are certainly also other exceptionalist traits that are not captured by this cartography and that although certain answers were mapped under some categories (and not others) that does not mean that they could not be considered as examples of multiple articulations (apart from the one where they are presented).

Although the AWESOME tool was developed through the analysis of concrete responses from the students of Canadian universities, the intention of using this cartography was not to create an image of an ‘average’ Canadian student or what kinds of self-perceptions, perceptions of Canada and/or people from other parts of the world such a student may hold. Although derived from concrete responses, I believe that this cartography can in fact tell us very little about individual students on whose answers it draws, as it focuses on meta-assumptions that can be consciously or unconsciously reproduced and/or contested by individuals. Likewise, it should be noted that the analysis of the qualitative data showed that an estimated 20% of responses came from students who were not born in Canada, and 48% had at least one parent who was not of Canadian origin. Although a more detailed comparison of answers between students who were born in Canada and those who were not (or had parents of non-Canadian origin) might have revealed further nuance in the responses between these two groups, this research was able to observe that, in general, exceptionalist enunciations about Canada, its institutions and people, come from both Canadian and non-Canadian students alike.

The analysis of core demographic parameters of responses, used as examples in the AWESOME cartography, presented in Subchapter 7.1 below, confirms that.

In this regard, the students’ responses seemed to have confirmed the initial assumption of this research that the discourse of Canadian exceptionalism is not necessarily an ‘exclusively’ Canadian ‘thing’, rather it is a kind of discourse that is shared not just between different groups of people within the country’s borders, but also beyond them. Thus the ambition of this analysis was to explore some shared patterns of discursive enunciations that seemed to be observable in the students’ answers without suggesting that only students (of Canadian origin) would share such exceptionalist perceptions or imaginaries, nor that students whose answers are used as examples are ‘more’ exceptionalist in their dispositions than any others. As such, and similarly to the previous analysis of main discursive orientations and interstices, it is not the students themselves who are the subject of this study, but rather the ways in which exceptionalist tendencies manifest themselves through
concrete, shared and/or patterned articulations that happen to be observable in their responses.

The first subchapter below presents an analysis of core demographic characteristics of those students, whose answers were chosen as examples for the AWESOME cartography, while all the ensuing subchapters begin with a theoretical introduction to the specific kind of exceptionalist articulation or tendency that was observed, followed by a few examples of responses that illustrate this tendency/articulation, and a discussion.

7.1 AWESOME demographic characteristics

This subchapter presents core demographic characteristics of students, whose answers are used in the subsequent subchapters as examples of specific exceptionalist articulations and/or tendencies. The purpose of this analysis is to address potential concerns raised about representational quality or trustworthiness of the examples used. Again, while this research makes no claim of objectivist representationality of the responses used, this subchapter makes visible the origins of students (and their parents), with the ambition to address some of this concerns. It presents demographic parameters related to gender, residency/birth country of students and the origin of their parents. It also presents the system of coding, used in the subsequent subchapters that can help the reader identify the demographic background of each example used. The demographic distribution of the 93 answers, used in this cartography, is presented in Table 12 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gender</th>
<th>students' origin / residence</th>
<th>parents origin†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43 % male</td>
<td>84 % born in Canada</td>
<td>59 % both born in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 % female</td>
<td>7 % permanent resident, but not born in Canada</td>
<td>8 % one born in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 % other</td>
<td>9 % non-permanent resident</td>
<td>29 % neither born in Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†4 % of students did not provide a valid answer to this question.

56 % of students identified themselves as female, 43 % as male and 1 % as other. The respective rates in the overall dataset are: 61 % female, 37 % male, 1 % other. 84 % of responses come from students that were born in Canada, 7 % from students that are permanent residents (but not born in Canada), and 9 % from students that are living in Canada temporarily. In the overall dataset 76 % claimed to be born in
Canada, with additional 12% claiming to be permanent residents (but not born in Canada). 10% of all students claimed non-permanent residency. Answers in the AWESOME cartography come from students, whose parents were in 59% of cases both born in Canada, in 8% only one parent was born in Canada, and in 33% neither of their parents was born in Canada. In the overall dataset, these rates are 52%, 12% and 31.5% respectively. In general, it is thus possible to observe that the differences between demographic characteristics of students, whose answers make up the list of examples in the AWESOME cartography, and those observed in the overall dataset, are not particularly large. 88% of all respondents were permanent residents of Canada in the overall set, while their representation rate in this cartography is 91%. Similarly 52% of all students had both parents of Canadian origin, while in this cartography 59% of answers come from students with both Canadian parents.

Specific demographic details are provided for each response, used in the subsequent subchapters, in the form of a three part code. First part of the code refers to gender, and is marked by letters F – female, M – male and O – other. The second part of the code refers to the origin and residence of students. The letter B stands for ‘born in Canada’, PR refers to ‘permanent resident’ (but not born in Canada), and NPR stands for ‘non-permanent resident’. The last part of the code refers to the origin of students’ parents. It uses the following abbreviations: BP – both parents born in Canada, OP – one parent born in Canada, NP – no parent born in Canada, N/A – not available. The two examples below illustrate the use of the code:

“Local students are negatively affected, international students benefit.”
(20ED021) M, B, BP

“Globalization and immigrants should be a separate issue. With such highly developed global network only a few representatives should be enough. Otherwise, immigrants cause friction; cultural/regional invasion and dominance, or discrimination from the locals.”
(14SC029) F, NPR, NP

The first statement refers to a: M – male student, B – born in Canada, with BP – both parents born in Canada. The second statement refers to a: F – female student, NPR – non-permanent resident, NP – neither parent born in Canada. While this coding system allows for an identification of students’ origins, I would encourage the reader to first look at the examples as a whole, and to look only secondarily at the origins of their authors. The reason for this suggestion lies in the ambition of

---

68 In the case of the overall dataset 4.5% of answers to this question were unavailable.
this research project to examine primarily the broader, meta-narratives, traits and dispositions that make-up Canadian exceptionalism, rather than to direct attention to individuals that may be articulating them. Hopefully, the coding system will not distract the reader from this main ambition, but will nevertheless provide additional information for those, interested in representational legitimacy and trustworthiness of examples chosen.

### 7.2 Autoimmunity

The first observable exceptionalist tendency – autoimmunity, is in this cartography understood as a self-colonising process of subversion of critique in a way that repositions the privileged (colonising) subject by destroying references to his positionality and constructing himself as powerless, victimized, threatened and oppressed by the vilified Other (Derrida 2005, McAllan 2014). More specifically, and drawing also on the works of Thobani (2007), Balibar (1991) and Bhabha (1994), autoimmunity is conceptualized as a self-defence mechanism that enables the crafting and maintaining of a benevolent, innocent, even victimized self-image of the privileged modern subject(s) through a projected reversal of systemic hierarchies, power relations and historicity of their contexts. This discursive reversal is often performed by a rejection of (immunization against) critique through claims of aggression, violence, disrespect, reverse racism, irrelevance, incomprehensibility, arrogance, insolence and ungratefulness from the threatening Other. Examples from data are listed below:

“I feel like some people are privileged when they come here. Instead of mixing together some students get special classes (e.g. If they are aboriginal) that I can't attend, but they can attend mine.” (7ED001) F, B, BP

“I find that immigrants come and how they behave is a lot more inconsiderate than people generally are in Canada. No big deal, just a small pet peeve.” (7SE030) F, B, BP

“I think [internationalization] is a positive thing, yet people find a way to make it negative. Willing exchange of ideas is great. But then some people label that “cultural appropriation”, and what could be seen as a good thing becomes another conversation of whiteness, privilege etc.” (7SE020) M, B, BP
“The original culture, agriculture and family of [this province] is not being studied or even recognized by immigrant students. Yet they choose to make the local or domestic persons ‘aware of their own culture’.” (7SE079) M, B, BP

“Internationalization allows for society to be rich and diverse and gives us a chance to learn new cultures. However, it also allows people from other cultures to come here and try to force their culture on us while they themselves do attempt to learn our culture.” (16BO019) F, B, BP

“[Internationalization] causes lower prices for imports, but when it comes here all wages become viewed all less when those people can do it. It's good on the other side of the world, not here.” (16BO027) M, B, BP

“Jobs are created in developing economies = good, jobs are outsourced from established economies = bad = mixed.” (20ED014) M, NPR, NP

“[Internationalization] provides new perspectives and inclusion to an otherwise closed world. Without the rise of Liberal free trade countries world still be at odds with each other competing against one another instead of cooperating. Internationalization creates goals and objectives.” (15SS023) M, B, OP

“Local students are negatively affected, international students benefit.” (20ED021) M, B, BP

What seems to be common to many of the answers in this group is that they seem to articulate a position and/or perception where the Canadian or ‘local’ culture and/or ways of life are seen as being under threat from ‘undesired’ external influences, in this regard the Canadian society is constructed as more open and multicultural – in comparison to the monocultural and ‘unadaptive’ and intrusive non-Canadians (16BO019, 7SE079, 7SE030). Such articulations seem to resonate with Thobani’s (2007: 5) perceptions about the exalted status of the Canadian national subjects, where “the national is law-abiding where the outsider is susceptible to lawlessness ... the national is tolerant of cultural diversity where the outsider is intolerant, placing loyalty to ties of kin and clan above all else.”

What seems to be absent from this group of answers – and to be more specific, from all 1,451 answers that were the subject of this study, is any kind of recognition that Canada (as we know it today) was established as a settler community that has through centuries of (mostly European) immigration likewise imposed its own (newly-constructed) culture upon the indigenous people of the land in ways that
several authors (Annett 2005, Chrisjohn et al. 1997, Churchill 2004, Davis & Zannis 1973, Grant 1996, Neu & Therrien 2003) refer to as “genocidal”. The report of Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015: 1) refers to the policy of Canadian state towards indigenous people as “cultural genocide”, whose purpose was to “eliminate Aboriginal governments; ignore Aboriginal rights; terminate the Treaties; and, through a process of assimilation, cause Aboriginal peoples to cease to exist as distinct legal, social, cultural, religious, and racial entities in Canada” (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada 2015: 1).

A key and “particularly distressing” role in this regard was attributed to residential schools, the last of which closed in 1996 (Anaya 2014: 4). UN Special rapporteur on the rights of indigenous people (Anaya 2014: 4) referred to Canadian history of relations with its own indigenous people as marred by:

notable episodes and patterns of devastating human rights violations, including the banning of expressions of indigenous culture and religious ceremonies; exclusion from voting, jury duty, and access to lawyers and Canadian courts for any grievances relating to land; the imposition, at times forcibly, of governance institutions; and policies of forced assimilation through the removal of children from indigenous communities and “enfranchisement” that stripped indigenous people of their aboriginal identity and membership.

The Special rapporteur also expressed an opinion that the consequences of these actions, carried under the Indian Act, “a rigidly paternalistic law at its inception, [that] continues to structure important aspects of Canada’s relationship with First Nations today” (Anaya 2014: 4). Although both of the reports are cited here predominantly with the purpose of contrasting the exceptionalist perceptions of Canadian society as inherently benevolent, open and uncoercive against very different (but unacknowledged) historic evidence, it is also possible to observe that

---

69 In a rather ambiguous and highly controversial introduction to the final report that had been subject to much debate, the authors could be understood as suggesting that Canada's treatment of indigenous was more than just ‘cultural’ genocide: “Physical genocide is the mass killing of the members of a targeted group, and biological genocide is the destruction of the group’s reproductive capacity. Cultural genocide is the destruction of those structures and practices that allow the group to continue as a group. States that engage in cultural genocide set out to destroy the political and social institutions of the targeted group. Land is seized, and populations are forcibly transferred and their movement is restricted. Languages are banned. Spiritual leaders are persecuted, spiritual practices are forbidden, and objects of spiritual value are confiscated and destroyed. And, most significantly to the issue at hand, families are disrupted to prevent the transmission of cultural values and identity from one generation to the next. In its dealing with Aboriginal people, Canada did all these things.” (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada 2015: 1).
in both of these official reports their authors strictly refrain from the use specific use of the term “genocide” or that they nowhere mention the child abuse and deliberate deaths that other authors – presumably less bound by demands of political ‘correctness’, provide evidence for. In this regard it would be possible to argue that autoimmunity (together with willful ignorance, discussed in the next subchapter) acts not merely as a safeguard in terms of maintaining a positive self-image of the national subjects (against their less ‘worthy’ Others), but can potentially have also very serious political and legal repercussions that enable both continuous exploitation and violence against those, deemed ‘unfit’ for inclusion in the national body, and further, prevent certain countries and individuals not merely with auto- but also with legal immunity (impunity) for what could be considered multiple (and evidenced) crimes against humanity, which takes us back to Agamben’s (1998) original understanding of exceptionalism in Homo Sacer as related to the condition of exception from law and impunity.

Again, I wish to emphasize that my purpose is not to focus on making students of Canadian universities accountable for the various atrocities of Canadian colonial heritage, but rather to draw on their answers to suggest that exceptionalist perceptions of Canada seem to prevent them from considering (and being mindful of) not only of the highly contested nature of ‘benevolence’ of Canadian society, but also of the historic fact that as a settler community, the Canadian nation state was (and continues to be) established through ongoing and deliberate destruction of whole nations that were there before the territorial maps of the Canadian state were drawn.

Negating, unknowing or refusing to know about the complex historic contexts that have led to the creation of modern nation states, especially the ones considered the most innocent, peaceful and benevolent can thus lead to highly contestable perceptions where aboriginal students are seen as “privileged” (7ED001) together with other international students (20ED021). Other examples of this kind of historic reversal of roles would also include perceptions of the impact of (economic) globalization that is now seen as either benefiting only the “other side of the world” (16BO027, also 20ED014), rather than also those countries (and their corporations) in whose interest it was promoted in the first place. Similarly, the (neo)liberal free trade doctrine is perceived as an instrument of improving cooperation between different countries (15SS023), rather than for instance leading to increased competition in what had been in theory historically and recently referred to as the “race to the bottom” from various standpoints (Davies & Vadlamannati 2013, Klein 1999, Polanyi 2001, Rudra 2008, Tonelson 2000). Many authors who critically
explore the processes of globalized economic liberalization (Hardt & Negri 2001, Klein 2007, Peet 2003, Stiglitz 2002) suggest that these processes were initiated by countries of the global North through institutions such as the World Trade Organisation (WTO), the Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAP) of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, with the clear ambition of benefiting from cheap resources and an under-paid workforce. The countries of the global North have, according to these authors, historically benefited from these processes and continue to do so through unfair terms of trade, low commodity prices, tax evasion, slave and child labour, corporate monopolies on concessions in third countries, loan interests and many other mechanisms.

While I do not wish to devalue the concerns of students about the negative effects of the globalized economy on their own communities (as capital interests certainly transcend national borders), I do believe that autoimmunity makes more complex understandings and analyses, where costs and benefits are considered in more depth and in their structural contexts, very difficult or impossible, because it forecloses the emergence of the very possibility of complexity with its insistence on the exclusive benevolence and innocence of both the State and the (national) self that is complemented by various strategies of vilification of Other(s). The next subchapter on wilful ignorance expands on the discussion of foreclosures and explores what kind of expressions of denial (rather than reversal) were observed in the students’ responses.

7.3 Wilful ignorance

As discussed in Subchapter 3.2.2 of the theoretical chapter, critical race (Mills 2007) and feminist scholars (Tuana 2004, 2006, Alcoff 2007) have theorized “ignorance as more than a mere absence of knowledge” (Gilson 2015: 228). Among her four different types of ignorance Tuana refers to wilful ignorance as “a systematic process of self-deception, a wilful embrace of ignorance that infects those who are in positions of privilege, an active ignoring of the oppression of others and one’s role in that exploitation” (Tuana 2006: 11).

Drawing on Tuana’s (2006: 11) “wilful ignorance”, Alcoff’s (2007: 40) “epistemologies of ignorance” and Maldonado-Torres’s (2004: 10) “will-to-ignorance”, wilful ignorance in this research is conceptualized as an active, but not necessarily conscious, refusal to learn about injustices and oppression directed against the other, and as epistemic and cognitive blindness that stems from the position of privilege of certain individuals or groups for the (unacknowledged)
purpose of defending its privileged status. In this regard a willfully ignorant subject cannot know, not just because he does not want to know, but because certain kinds of knowledge are seen as a threat to his privileged/exalted status.

Willful ignorance thus refers to an incapacity to hear, see or otherwise register/understand and engage with narratives, situations and encounters that disrupt the processes of positive and innocent image-crafting. This incapacity is not a result of intellectual inadequacy, but of cognitive dis-orientation. It has to be actively (subconsciously) constructed to ensure coherence and stability of the (exalted) self and is privileged/superior status. Tuana (2006: 1011) argues that this kind of ignorance is not passive but requires “many acts and negligences” and is “an achievement that has to be managed.” Examples:

“There is no racism here.” (7SE021) M, NPR, NP

“They fit in perfectly.” (14EA008) M, NPR, N/A

“No, I have seen no discrimination.” (14SC025) M, B, OP

“No other struggles that any other student wouldn’t face.” (5SC068) F, B, BP

“I am apathetic about this issue. I choose not to answer.” (5SC085) M, B, NP

“Western globalization can connect the traditions and culture of developing countries.” (20ED035) M, B, BP

“There seems to be a one way flow: North American ideas and values seem to dominate internationalization and very few ideas from other culture’s gain. However, I am unsure if this is true or just my own experience and if that is a bad thing or not.” (20ED052) M, B, BP

“As a science student I generally focus on memorizing fact so I spend very little time thinking about internationalization. I don’t really care about those sort of things which is why I chose to pursue science and poli. sci. or an arts degree. I’ll leave it to those who are actually interested in this stuff.” (20SC110) F, B, BP

“I think everything in my university is good. No racism to be specific.” (7SE029) F, NPR, NP

“There is a bit of racism and social segregation. It could stem from the language barriers though. Because people who don’t speak English have a
hard time mingling and then they just hang out with each other.” (14EA046) F, B, OP

“No, I think that is strictly beneficial to the students from Canada because they have the opportunity to meet people from around the world and learn about their culture.” (14EA051) F, B, BP

“No is my answer. I am international student, I have language as my single issue. Further: I am being respected all the time by students, professors and the institution.” (15ED084) F, NPR, NP

“International students tend to stay together because that tends to make them more comfortable. It also tends to be difficult for institutions to reach out to them.” (5SC067) M, B, NP

“I find this survey very thought provoking. I am in no way racist or culturally biased. But I struggle with the idea that people from their home country are being left without a higher education due to internationalization. There should be a line somewhere.” (5SC034) M, B, NP

The answers, gathered under the rubric ‘wilful ignorance’ could largely be considered as belonging to several related, but distinct clusters. The first is the cluster of answers that are characterised by a manifest denial of the possibility existence of any kind of (individual and/or systemic) discrimination, injustice, racism and/or violence in its multiple forms either by domestic students (7SE012, 14SC025, 5SC068, 7SE029, 5SC034, 14ES008), or by international students themselves (15ED084) – though the latter examples are considerably rarer. This group constitutes probably the largest single group of similar answers that could be found in the survey, especially, if we consider the fact that 26.1 % of students simply answered ‘no’ to the third open-ended question that asked whether international students or students from diverse background face any challenges at their institution. While it seems difficult to imagine that a more-in-depth discussion with students that chose this answer would not bring up at least some challenges (as mundane as they may be), this relatively high negative response rate could be

70 While it would be possible to argue that an ‘external’ voice, such as that of international students, could be taken as a ‘proof’ of the non-existence of any kind of discrimination, prejudice or otherwise racialized behaviour, it should be re-stated that notions of Canadian exceptionalism should not be seen as belonging exclusively to Canadians. Further, it should be also taken into account that responses (such as the one cited here) come likely from students of European origin – at least judging by their reported first languages and minority affiliations.
seen as indicative of the general importance that (wilful and/or unintentional) ignorances play in shaping students’ perceptions about how students from other countries/backgrounds are being treated.\textsuperscript{71}

Another significant cluster seems to be constituted by answers that do recognize some of the potential issues related to internationalization, discrimination, racism, segregation and other similar subjects, but in the same breath seek to ‘conceal’ them with what could be termed ‘unpersuasive’ explanations, such as racism, caused by “language barriers” (14EA046), ‘voluntary’ segregation of students that is “more comfortable” (5SC067), North American hegemony as potentially merely a personal “experience” and not necessarily a “bad thing” (20ED052), perceptions of Western globalization as “connect[ing] the traditions and culture of developing countries” (20ED035) or alternatively, a complete re-articulation of the question in terms of personal/national benefit (14EA051), which seems to suggest that what was ignored is not merely the potential existence of any issues, but the very point of the question itself. Recalling Tuana’s (2006: 11) understanding of wilful ignorance as “active ignoring” it would be probably possible to argue that some of the discursive strategies, used in the answers within this cluster could be considered as indicative of just such practices of ‘active ignoring’ or conscious re-articulation or recognized issues.

The third and smallest cluster refers to questions where students explicitly state their lack of interest in the subject, or where in other words they ‘admit’ that they do “not care about those sort of things” (20SC110) or are “apathetic about the issue” (5SC085). Although not many answers were observed that could be seen as belonging to this cluster they are particularly relevant for this discussion, not because they could be seen as direct ‘confessions’ of a lack of a certain kind knowledge or a lack of interest, but perhaps rather as the inverse; they could be seen as examples of denial that takes shape (and persists) in the form of admitting denial by referring to an alleged (but not necessarily true) lack of knowledge and/or interest. In this regard a rather large number of answers, in which students cited a lack of knowledge about international students in their institution as reason for not answering the question, could potentially be considered as broadly belonging to this same category.

\textsuperscript{71} From a psychoanalytical view the authenticity or unintentionality of ignorances could often be considered as questionable, as knowledge could be merely deeply suppressed and thus willfully ignored (but necessarily unrecognized as such).
7.4 Exaltedness

Exaltedness refers to constructing a particular nation or national subject as superior to the rest of humanity. The national subject is constructed as an exalted member of a particular kind of community (nation) that is ontologically and existentially distinct from strangers to this community. The term “exalted subject” was coined by Sunera Thobani (2007: 9) to describe specifically the Canadian national subject as having his humanity elevated “over and above that of the Aboriginal and the immigrant.” Although Thobani’s work is specifically focused on the Canadian context, it would be difficult to argue that exaltedness, much like exceptionalism in general, could be considered an exclusively Canadian trait or particularity. In this research exaltedness is understood as being constructed through various narratives and discursive practices/strategies that emphasize the nation’s purported exceptional and inherent capacity for openness, kindness, tolerance, generosity, acceptance, benevolence, innocence, understanding, goodness, politeness, respect for diversity, demonstrable lack of prejudice or any other inherently positive traits.

In her discussions with 78 Canadian civil leaders Rhoda Howard-Hassman (2003: 39–40) sums up the following self-reported characteristics of Canadians:

[T]he Canadian character is quite admirable. Canadians are characterized by moderation, compromise, and tolerance. Canadians are also cautious, conservative, and slow to anger. ... Canadians, in the view of the Hamilton civic leaders, are friendly, gentle, and kind people, respectful of others and especially of those who are different. ... Thus, the Canadian self-image is of ‘very good people.’

While only particular individuals in an exalted nation may exhibit personality traits that do not correspond to this image, in ‘othered’ cultures or groups only exceptional individuals are seen as potentially possessing (some of) these ‘very good’ traits. Examples:

“I believe the University is a great place for international students. I think a contributing factor is A) the fact that we are Canada B) the fact that there are SO many international students.” (14SC004) F, B, BP

“Canada is accepting of all cultures and we are essentially known for that. It’s good to know people from around the World.” (5SS026) F, B, BP
“I love Canada, and the University, but I believe this survey should be taken in other countries, since Canada as I see it has no problems with internationalization and diversity.” (7SS002) F, B, NP

“I don’t think so because as is commonly known, Canada is a diverse country and therefore welcomes students from all backgrounds. Furthermore, the University is a very accepting institution and allows for equal treatment of all students.” (14EA012) F, B, NP

“This is Canada, we try and accommodate.” (16ED078) M, B, BP

“Aside from language difficulties if international students come to Canada, I feel like because of our diversity that they would be able to fit in quickly. But if they go to a country that is not a diverse then they might have a harder time.” (5SS050) M, PR, NP

“I think this University is unique for their accommodating nature for international students to adapt.” (15SS092) F, B, BP

“We are very accepting. We are already diverse, so visitors normally find people they can easily relate to.” (19SC077) M, PR, NP

“I think national variety works well. Canada is so accepting.” (5SS026) F, B, BP

“Internationalization allows people to understand how valued culture is. Canada is already full of immigrants as we all are already used to socializing with people from other backgrounds.” (14SC101) M, PR, NP

“Being Canadian I can go almost anywhere but I try to be respectful as I expect foreigners to be with my country.” (14EA018) F, B, BP

“I am Canadian, but view myself as being open minded and accepting toward other nations / cultures.” (14EA024) F, B, BP

“Specifically within our institution I think that there are many friendly, welcoming and helpful people. However, culture shock and adaptation varies on a personal level. I feel our school has the tools and resources to minimize this shock.” (15SS038) F, NPR, BP

“We become a very accepting and inclusive school. We allow for everyone to feel comfortable & included.” (15ED026, emphasis added) F, B, BP
This group of answers could be considered as the group with the most manifest expressions of Canadian exceptionalism, where the very idea of Canada or Canadianness is often explicitly considered as a self-evident and self-explanatory principle for the inherent benevolence, tolerance and acceptance of both the state, its institutions and its nation (14SC004, 5SS026, 7SS002, 14ES012, 16ED072, 5SS050, 5SS026, 14SC101). Thus Canadian Universities in these answers are seen as “a great place for international students” (14SC004), because “we are Canada” (14SC004), “Canada is so accepting of all cultures” (5SS026), “Canada is a diverse country and therefore welcomes students from all backgrounds” (14EA012), “this is Canada, we try and accommodate” (16ED078) and other similar self-referential explanations.

Two inter-related lines of reasoning seem to permeate many of the answers in this category. The first line seems to be indicative of what in psychoanalytic terms could be termed as the ‘logocentric fantasy’ of Cartesian subjects that is grounded in the assumptions of self-transparency and of authentic self-articulation through the construction of narratives about the self (and the Other) through totalizing forms of knowledge production (Andreotti 2014, Maldonado-Torres 2007, Mignolo 2007). However, according to Lacan (in Žižek 2000: 39), the “Cartesian cogito is the subject of the Unconscious”, which for Žižek (2000: 40) means that the subject’s phenomenal self-experience is inaccessible, making complete self-transparency very difficult, if not impossible. This however does not prevent the Cartesian subject to behave as if he were self-transparent.

For both Lacan (in Žižek 2000) and Žižek (2000) it is fantasy, and not either ‘objective’ or ‘subjective’ reality, that is the domain of existence of the Cartesian subject. As such, this fantasy cannot be undone within what is ontologically accessible to the Cartesian subject, because it is fundamentally suppressed. In other words, when we are referring to ourselves as tolerant, understanding, open, benevolent (or whatever else), we say much more about how we see ourselves and how we would like others to see us, rather than about how we are. In Lacanian terms, such narratives about our (projected) selves help us maintain a positive self-image (i.e. fantasy) about who we are and how we behave and/or relate to others, but do very little (or nothing) to make us such, or in other words, to bring this fantasy to life. Quite inversely, they could in many ways be seen as-counter measures that prevent potentially deeper and more equivocal relations, precisely because they construct normative perceptions (and standards) of depth, authenticity and equality in the ways we relate to each other as already there, foreclosing on the possibilities of both challenging these pre-conceptions and assumptions and of the
possibilities from more equivocal co-construction of the terms of encounter by both the self and the Other.

The second main line of reasoning seems to be related to the assumption that the inherent cultural diversity of Canada (which the analysis of quantitative data seemed to confirm in certain ways, but not in others)\(^{72}\) is already proof of both an exceptional, potentially even flawless multicultural society that “has no problems” (7SS002) and “is accepting of all cultures” (5SS026), its welcoming institutions (14SS004, 14SS012, 15SS092, 15SS038), and the inherently friendly, helpful, open and welcoming nature of its people (19SC077, 15SS038, 16ED078, 14SC101). This kind of reasoning seems to follow a kind of ‘more is better’ cultural logic, where a bigger ‘collection’ of people from various origins seems to be considered as proof of a better quality of their relations and also of the authenticity of mutual respect, understanding and general equality. However much of the discourse on diversity is built around the idea/concept of acceptance/welcoming, which, rather than being an expression of equality, seems to denote a hierarchical relationship between those who are in the position of being accepting (due to their presumed inherent capacity for tolerance and understanding) and those that are accepted (in spite of them being constructed as different from the national subjects). Occasionally, certain answers contain slips of tongue (15ED026, see also 14SC058 and 5SS083 in the next subchapter) that express the hierarchical nature of this relationship directly, but more often it is hidden behind the rhetoric of tolerance and acceptance. This kind of relationships could perhaps be understood as a subtler articulation of Woodsworth’s (1909: 278) claim about “ideal” and “not-ideal elements” that “should be capable of assimilation” cited in Subchapter 3.1.4., with the ideal ones being understood of course as Canadian national subjects.

Further, by considering the ambivalent nature of the colonial encounter between the self and the Other, as argued for by Bhabha (1984, 1994), these gestures of acceptance, tolerance and welcoming could be seen as contributing to the construction of national subjects’ superior humanity, first in comparison with those deemed worthy of his acceptance, but secondly, and even much more so, with those deemed unworthy or undeserving, but nevertheless accepted and/or tolerated by the benevolent subject and/or State. Such a construction of the relationship

\(^{72}\) This statement refers to, on one side, very high levels of linguistic diversity, diversity of family origins and minority affiliations that were observable in students’ responses, and on the other side a demonstrable lack of diversity in value orientations and hierarchies of worth observed in the significant majority of students’ content-based answers that seem to suggest a remarkable level of homogeneity/similarity in terms of shared values, interests and orientations.
between the national subjects and the Other, could be seen as likewise largely resonating with Thobani’s (2007) critique of (Canadian) multiculturalism as a ‘rescue mechanism’ for Euro/white supremacy, where:

white subjects [are constructed] as tolerant and respectful of difference and diversity, while non-white people were instead constructed as perpetually and irremediably monocultural, in need of being taught the virtues of tolerance and cosmopolitanism under white supervision. (Thobani 2007: 147).

The next subchapter on subtle racism, together with Subchapter 7.7 on extraction of otherness, takes this debate further by discussing some concrete examples of exceptionalist articulations, where international students are described as “keep[ing] to themselves” (5SC002), “not willing to socialize” (5SS075), “not mak[ing] conversation despite the efforts of [domestic students]” (5SS054) and other similar statements. The conditionality of inclusion, that seems embedded in the very concepts of tolerance/acceptance and grounded in the construction (and emphasizing) of difference between the (national) subjects and their Other(s), will be discussed in more detail in Subchapter 7.5, with the unexamined normativity or ‘normality’ of this conditionality as the main focus of discussion.

7.5  Subtle racism

Drawing on the works of Balibar (1991), Bhabha (1984, 1994), Bonilla-Silva (2006), Maldonado Torres (2004, 2007), Jefferess (2008, 2011, 2012) and Goldberg (2009) subtle racism is understood within the context of this research as a subconscious attachment to and investment in a notion of cultural supremacy that requires ambivalent narratives of otherness and affirmative narratives of a benevolent self to be sustained. Unlike overt racism that seeks to explicitly demonize or denigrate the Other through overt claims about the Other’s biological or (more recently) cultural inferiority, subtle racism works differently as it is driven by the necessity to protect one’s self-image as benevolent and inclusive, mobilizing claims of equality and inclusion and sustaining the notion that everything is already

73 Researchers in the US have found that subtle racism (defined as non-manifest, non-verbalised racism) is strongly present in many US colleges and Universities (Biasco et al. 2001) and is likewise an important issue for black students in Canada (Codjoe 2001). Similarly, Stewart’s (2014) Visitor could be read as a personal account of ongoing experiences of subtle (and not-so-subtle) racism by a black university professor in Canada.
in place or being done to support the Other’s needs (the Other has nothing to complain about).

In this regard equality is understood predominantly as an *equality of opportunity* for the Other(s) to supplement/enrich the exalted subject/nation under circumscribed terms.\(^\text{74}\) As the Other’s potential claim for equality and equivocality threatens the superiority of the self (Bhabha 1994), the Other has to be constructed as necessarily insufficient and thus eligible for help, assistance and improvement. In this way the exalted subject can be constructed as *bestowing a status of equality* (- not to be conflated with more complex understandings of equality) upon the (un)grateful Other. The national subjects’ superior humanity and sense of personal achievement and benevolence are thus affirmed by their willingness to help and improve the insufficient Other and by his (self-proclaimed) openness and acceptance of the Other’s (exoticized) difference. Although only this subchapter explicitly mentions racism in its heading, many of the answers that are cited in other subchapters of this chapter could likewise be seen as belonging broadly to this category. For instance, the various examples of exaltedness, discussed in the previous subchapter could be seen as reflecting subtle racist tendencies – with the focus on the construction of positive narratives about Canadian national subjects and Canada (as superior to the rest of humanity), while examples used here primarily exhibit the perceptions about international students and people from different backgrounds. The examples listed below were chosen to represent a spectrum from what could be considered very subtle (and thus often overlooked) to not-so-subtle forms of racialized enunciations:

“Some have language barriers, others, cultural, socioeconomic. The university does its best to address these barriers and resolve any issues that stem from them.” (14SC036) F, B, NP

“Some of the students have a natural language barrier, but there are services at the university to help them.” (7ED030) M, B, BP

“I think international students still have various barriers to overcome. This can include social barriers.” (16ED090) F, B, N/A

“They face discrimination based on their cultural and language difficulties. They also have different experience and learning styles that may make it difficult to learn in an international context.” (19ED067) F, B, BP

\(^\text{74}\) This subject is also discussed in the next subchapter on opportunist inclusion.
“Since our culture is very different, international students may struggle fitting in, making new friends and finding things to do. Our food is also very different and they may not know how to eat properly.” (14SC006) F, B, BP

“This school is full of a broad spectrum of backgrounds and people so people understand.” (14SC012) F, B, BP

“They (global citizens) should think with open minds and act as though all man and women are equals.” (14SC058, emphasis added) M, PR, NP

“They keep to themselves & live an entirely different lifestyle. However, some are also completely integrated. People at both ends of the spectrum. Not many people in the middle.” (5SC022) M, B, BP

“Different cultural beliefs can be backwards/opposite from the majority and cause conflicts.” (7SE014) M, B, BP

“[on international students] Too much money, too little class.” (19SC006) M, PR, NP

“Canada is already civilised enough. Look at what is happening to England.” (5SS083) M, B, BP

“I live in Canada I don’t need it to be sullied by Eastern cultures.” (20SC041) O, B, NP

The Other’s insufficiency is visible in the students’ responses constructed in different ways, but it is very rarely directly (7SE014, 19SC006, 20SC041) referred to as such. Much more common is the employment of various euphemisms, such as ‘barriers’ or ‘challenges’ where these terms are not employed as referring to existing conditions within various social contexts, but as personal characteristics of international students or people from different backgrounds. In other words, international students for instance do not face challenges or barriers (in the society/institution/peer groups), they have them (14SC036, 7ED030, 16ED090), which could be interpreted that they are perceived as being in possession of various kind of insufficiencies that are established against normative perceptions of normality. Examples could include “a natural language barrier” (7ED036 they) “not know[ing] how to eat properly” (14SC006), lacking proper social etiquette (19SC006), or having “cultural difficulties” (19ED067). Subtle racism could also be seen in answers that explicitly recognize the existence of discrimination (such
as 19ED067), but where discrimination is seen as a kind of logical occurrence or logical response to the students “difficulties.”

Several answers in this subchapter (and across the survey) could be seen as articulating an assumption that if the Other is to be (conditionally) considered as equal, the Other needs to be understood (and integrated) first (in other words – the Other’s difference needs to be ‘domesticated’), before his/her Otherness becomes acceptable (14SC036, 14SC012, 5SC022, 14SC006). To paraphrase, the Other needs to learn to eat (14SC006), speak (14SC036, 7ED030, 19ED067) and behave (19SC006) ‘properly’ first, after which he/she could be seen as becoming eligible for bestowal of the status of (conditional/circumscribed) equality. The benevolent national subjects and institutions are in such articulations constructed as invariably helpful and understanding (14SC036, 7ED030, 14SC012), while the Other is constructed as in need of this help and assistance. Failure to comply with what is being expected from the Other, could result either in labelling the Other as “backwards” (7SE012) or in revocation of the privilege of being welcomed and accepted, as discussed in more detail in Subchapters 7.5 and 7.7.

Such constructions of the relationship between the self and the Other(s) seem to be very much in accordance with Balibar’s (1991: 24) discussion on “tolerance thresholds” where individuals and groups (within a certain national body) are classified according to their “greater or lesser aptitude for – or resistance to assimilation.” Balibar (1991: 19) has likewise identified “a will to know, a violent desire for immediate knowledge of social relations,” as a key driver behind what he calls “differential racism.”

If the previous subchapter on exaltedness identified logocentrism as one of the mechanisms by which (a positive) self-image is constructed, here we can observe how relations between the self and the Other are circumscribed by the subjects’ insistence on domestication through rationalization, where the Other has to be first known, before he/she can become relatable. Returning to the subject of ontological limits of Cartesian rationalities (mentioned in the previous subchapter), such an insistence on knowing first is likely to be considered as normal, even necessary, productive and above all reasonable (by the Cartesian subjects). While from the perspective of relational ontologies (McAllan 2014, see also Abram 1997, Viveiros de Castro 1998, 2004a, 2004b), the Cogito’s insistence on controlling and circumscribing the world through knowledge, forecloses opportunities for acknowledging relationality as already there. In other words, the presence or

---

75 See also examples in Subchapters 7.3 and 7.7.
primacy of relationality/entanglement is (from a relational ontologies’ perspective) seen as denied and rendered invisible precisely through the subjects’ insistence on its rationalization, understanding and subsequent ‘domestication’.\(^{76}\)

### 7.6 Opportunist inclusion

The students’ responses, gathered under the heading of ‘opportunist inclusion’, could be seen as constructing a relationship towards the Other that is based upon her/his (perceived) capacity to contribute to a growing national economy; according to her/his willingness to affirm and maintain the national subject’s exalted status (Thobani 2007, Stewart 2014); and according to her/his aptitude for assimilation (Balibar 1991). Inclusion in the national body is conditionally acceded to by the national subjects, depending on the level of complacency, assimilation and unproblematic, grateful behaviour from the Other. As the national subjects feel entitled to have the narrative of their and their nation’s exalted superiority affirmed by a complacent, unproblematic and grateful Other, any failure of the Other to comply with these existential and political orientations may result in a rejection/exclusion from the national body/community – anthropoemy (Bauman 1995).\(^{77}\)

The conflicting demands between the (economic/political) need for the Other’s contribution (in terms of labour, skill, commodification of the Other’s difference) and the threat of the Other’s potential equality (Bhabha 1994) to the exalted status of the national subjects, lead to a situation where a display of the Other’s competitive strength is viewed as a threat to the entitled privileges (of jobs, education) of (some) national subjects’, in spite of the potential benefit of their inclusion in the society and economy at large. This in turn constructs a relationship towards the Other, where the Other’s difference and contributions are circumscribed by the expectations of the national subjects’ of what kinds of social roles/positions in society the Other is supposed to assume. Depending on the current demands/needs of the society/economy, the Other is expected to closely ‘fit’ these prescribed images, lest her/his presence would be considered as either undeserving (not contributing enough and/or in the right ways) or threatening

---

\(^{76}\) Given the almost universal dominance of Cartesian forms of subjectivity today, this research does not assume that the subjects’ Other(s) should be seen as somehow inversely non-Cartesian. Rather it seems safe (and reasonable) to suggest that both the self and the Other should be considered as Cartesian (to varying extent).

\(^{77}\) Rejection is understood here predominantly in terms of social exclusion and not as a formal/legal expulsion, although that is possible as well.
(contributing too much in the wrong way). The inclusion of the Other could thus be referred to as opportunist, as the presence of the Other (depending on his/her competence, skill, capacity for assimilation and other traits) is seen as either restricting or expanding the opportunities of the national subjects to have the narratives of their exalted superiority affirmed and/or contested. Examples of articulations of such dispositions are listed below:

“They keep to themselves & live an entirely different lifestyle. However, some are also completely integrated. People at both ends of the spectrum. Not many people in the middle.” (5SC022) M, B, BP

“They do not affect my learning most of the time, except when I am expected to work with them and there is a language/learning barrier.” (7ED033) F, B, BP

“It is difficult having profs with accents so thick it hinders my ability to understand them and therefore understand the course.” (14SC021) F, B, BP

“Globalization and immigrants should be a separate issue. With such highly developed global network only a few representatives should be enough. Otherwise, immigrants cause friction; cultural/regional invasion and dominance, or discrimination from the locals.” (14SC029) F, NPR, NP

“Foreigners take up Canadian jobs and places in school but provide nice cultural diversity. Should jobs in Canada be given to Canadians first?” (5SC053) F, B, NP

“I believe it has a very positive effect on society in general because of the mixture it brings into society across all levels. However, sometime it can have a negative effect because the culture that is normal for a given area may have to change their ways to help others fit (and if roles were reversed the other culture wouldn't change for them).” (5SC090) M, B, BP

“Self-selected ethnic segregation can prevent effective teamwork. Course content could have ethnic bias.” (5SS043) M, B, BP

“Great to have diversity, however too many people come and try to change other values/beliefs of country/community.” (20ED030) F, B, BP

“Many international people can provide aid to Canada. However, there are many who don’t. It is difficult to incorporate all cultures and religions into the
community. Language barriers and difference in opinion is always a struggle.” (20ED036) F, B, BP

“Ideas from abroad bring advancements to technology and new ways to solve problems, but also cause social conflict from differing cultural views and beliefs.” (5SC080) M, B, NP

Several answers in this group address ambivalence towards the benefiting/threatening relationship directly (14SC029, 5SC053, 5SC090, 20ED030, 5SC080), usually in ways where the commodification of Other’s difference, knowledge and skills is considered beneficial, however these very same traits are also considered threatening to the national subjects’ jobs and education opportunities (5SC029), causing “friction; cultural/regional invasion and dominance” (14SC029) or various kinds of social/cultural conflict (5SC090, 20ED030, 5SC080).

The Other is referred to almost exclusively in relation to how his/her presence contributes positively and/or negatively to the benefit of the students – in terms of enriching or hampering their educational experience (7ED033, 14SC021, 5SS043) or the benefit of Canadian society at large (14SC029, 5SC053, 5SC090, 20ED036, 5SC080). As an example, it could be mentioned that several students complained that they find accents or English proficiency of visiting professors, international students and/or professors/instructors of non-Canadian origin as an obstacle to their learning and as impairing their education experience.

When the relationship between national subjects and the Other is not discussed in terms of direct benefits (or threats), the Other is referred to according to his/her capacity for integration/assimilation (5SC022, 20ED030). The categories in which the Other is described could be seen as mutually exclusive in the sense that the Other is either seen as fully integrated or as completely unassimilable (5SC022), but generally resisting integration in the national body and/or causing conflict (14SC029, 5SC090, 5SS043, 20ED030, 20ED036, 5SC080).

As the national subject is constructed as inherently benevolent, open and accepting, paradoxical or logically inconsistent claims, such as that “immigrants cause ... discrimination from locals” (14SC029), are necessary for the upkeep of such self-perceptions. Within an exceptionalist discursive framework, discrimination cannot be seen as resulting from inherent racism (that is already there), but is rather caused by the presence of immigrants. Immigrants are thus likely to be considered as somehow ‘provoking’ or ‘inciting’ discrimination of otherwise benevolent national subjects. Similarly, questionable concepts, such as self-segregation (5SS043, 5SC022), which is often referred to also in Subchapter
7.7, could likewise be considered indicative of discursive strategies where the Other is considered solely responsible for her/his lack of participation and contribution to society and thus consequently, unwelcome.

### 7.7 Minimization of issues

Minimization of issues in this cartography refers to various discursive strategies that seek to down-play, minimize or ‘normalize’ any challenges and/or issues that international students or people from different background may face in Canada. Examples of such strategies include, for instance, attributing reported examples of discrimination, racism and other forms of violence/injustice to the misbehaviour of certain ‘bad’ individuals, or normalization of issues related to difference/diversity as a natural occurrence when facing a new environment, culture or a new language (Bonilla-Silva 2006). For Balibar (1991) and Goldberg (2002), such explanations, rather than offering an objective description of the circumstances of the encounter between the national subject and the Other, explain away the racialized nature of the encounter, thus naturalizing racist conduct.

Other minimization strategies also include overstating the importance of language, weather, climate, differences in food and customs, infrastructural difference and other non-personal and non-systemic factors as the main or even the only possible challenge in the country/institution. Unlike answers that completely deny the very possibility of the existence of any issues (such as the ones discussed in Subchapters 7.2 and 7.3), answers in this group acknowledge their existence but seek to minimize their importance and/or direct attention to non-racialized issues. Examples are listed below:

“*The climate and norms are different (example) kissing on the cheek.*” (5SS084)  
M, B, BP

“*Speak a different language that courses aren't offered in, their culture may not be as widely celebrated.*” (16ED007) F, B, BP

“*Many times students get stuck in groups with people who understand them, which leads to a racial segregation unintentionally.*” (19ED018) F, B, BP

“*It's always hard for people to get used to an environment, because it is a fresh start and the person will be under pressure.*” (19ED070) M, PR, N/A
“Everyone is really open of accepting. When someone does step out of line they are quickly put in their place.” (7SE033) M, B, BP

“The only challenge would be leaving their families for a year.” (7ED020) F, B, BP

“Navigating though the city (e.g. learning bus routes).” (5SS030) F, B, NP

“Cultural - food, health/well-being, languages, accommodation, etc.” (16ED060) M, B, N/A

“Aside from language difficulties they face no other challenges. Their views are respected and they are given equal opportunities as any other student.” (16BO035) M, B, NP

“I would assume so. I think it would be hard coming to a new country to learn because it would be so different. They also may miss their home and family.” (7ED007) F, B, BP

“At the least, there is (usually) a culture shock, even with similar cultures. Different institutions can have confusing ways of doing things, even something like how to choose classes.” (14EA100) F, B, BP

“Not familiar with our rules/laws, currency differences.” (5SS003) M, B, BP

Similarly to answers in other subchapters of this cartography, the answers in this group in general do not express any kind of acknowledgement of discriminatory and/or racist behaviour that international students or students from diverse background may face. In rare examples where such practices are identified, they are either attributed to individuals that “are quickly put in their place” (7SE033) or to “unintentional racial segregation” (19ED018) that international students are themselves responsible for. In cases such as these, a recognition of racialized behaviour actually serves the purpose of affirming the exceptionalist self-perceptions of benevolence, tolerance and inclusion rather than questioning them, as this kind of behaviour is presented as a deviation from the norm that is quickly corrected, or as being beyond the capacity of benevolent national subjects to avert.

When examining answers in this (and other) subchapter(s) that are related directly to the experience of international students or students with diverse backgrounds (Question 3) it should be noted that the question inquired about the possibility of them facing any kinds challenges, rather than asking the students to merely report existing ones. In this sense the question inquired about students’
perceptions of what is or is not possible, which is a broader question than enquiring about what is happening or what the students were able to observe. As mentioned 26.1% of students responded that, in their opinion, there are no challenges whatsoever. The restriction of the imaginative capacity, circumscribed by exceptionalist discourse or exceptionalist dispositions, could be seen in the answers in this category. The kinds of challenges/issues that were imaginable, were mainly related to language (16ED007, 16ED060, 16BO035) – although the survey explicitly asked for identifying other issues “apart from language” (EIHE questionnaire). Other similar commonly identified challenges/issues included climate (5SS084), unfamiliarity with rules or social conventions (5SS003, 14EA100, 5SS084), unfamiliarity for with the educational system or institutional setting (14EA100), finding their way around the town (5SS030) or any other issues, related to familiarizing oneself with a new environment (14EA100, 7ED007, 19ED070), such as food (16ED060), currency (5SS003) or missing their family (7ED007).

In other words, the majority of the answers in this subchapter seem to be grounded in an assumption that once more knowledge is acquired (about language, cultural norms, institutional settings, the surroundings) any issues the students may initially face (apart from personal issues, such as missing friends and family or not enjoying the weather) will likely disappear. As such, these answers seem to be indicative of perceptions of Canadian society, institutions and people as again inherently benevolent and unproblematic. Any kind of systemic issues or structural existence of discrimination, prejudice and/or racism thus seems to be considered as not merely non-existent, but above all unimaginable. As one of the students said, the only identified problem (apart from language) that international students might face, is that “their culture may not be as widely celebrated” (16ED007). In such responses (of which the last case is perhaps the most extreme example) the conditionality of the welcome extended to students is never questioned and the possibility of the existence of any kind of deeper and/or systemic issues seems to be unimaginable, as the only issues that seem to be conceivable are of the kind that could perhaps best be described as ‘inconveniences’, such figuring out the bus network (5SS030), learning how to enrol in a class (14EA100), kissing on the cheek (5SS084) or not having one’s culture ‘celebrated’ enough (16ED007).
7.8 Extraction/consumption of otherness

This last subchapter of the AWESOME cartography is related to an exceptionalist stance, where the Other is constructed as unconditionally and unquestionably available for the exalted subject’s project of self-actualization and personal growth through extraction/consumption (anthropophagy) of the Other’s difference. The issue of consumption of Otherness or the Other’s exoticization for commodified purposes is a well-documented subject in anthropology, cultural theory and critical media studies (Comaroff & Comaroff 2009, Haldrup & Larsen 2009, Lalvani 1995, Loftsdóttir 2015, Paunksnis 2015). Borrowing the terminology of Levi-Strauss, Zygmunt Bauman (1995: 2) writes of the *anthropophagic* (devouring the Other) and *anthropoemic* (vomiting the Other) strategies in the “war of attrition waged against the strangers and the strange.” For Bauman (*ibid.*), these two strategies are seen as complementary for the functioning of the modern state, as they articulate “the clash between liberal and nationalist/racist version of the modern project.” The *anthropophagic* strategies seek to assimilate the Other by “smothering cultural and linguistic distinctions ... promoting and enforcing one and only measure of conformity” (Bauman 1995: 2), while *anthropoemic* strategies seek to either exclude or expel strangers from the community or territory – or, in case these strategies fail, to eliminate them physically.

For Bauman (1995: 12), although the omnipresence of strangers in post-modern societies makes such strategies (in their original form) no longer possible, rather than disappearing they find new forms of expression in what Balibar (1991) and Taguieff (2001) refer to as differentialist racism, where difference is perceived as good, but also as threatening the subjects’ (national) identity and position of superiority. The Other must thus be necessarily included, so that his/her difference can be extracted and consumed, but also set-apart (though not excluded), so that (s)he does not threaten the privileged position of the national subjects and that her/his difference can be maintained. Within this research it was possible to observe two different sets of responses, depending upon the success of the attempted extraction/consumption – as listed separately below. Examples of successful extraction/consumption:

“Diversity can enrich my university experience by helping me to learn about the troubles the students had back home so that one day I can help those countries.” (5SC089) M, B, BP
“Our world is a diverse and amazing place. Being able to experience the beauty of the world through the eyes of others is so enriching.” (14SC036) F, B, NP

“Learn about different people/cultures/things from students from different parts of the world. → Help to expand my knowledge and experience more. → Makes me more interesting.” (14SC103) M, B, BP

“Incorporating new cultures makes our lives rich with understanding for other cultures.” (14ED016) F, B, BP

“I take every encounter as an opportunity to grow and learn; this is especially possible when the people I interact with are different from myself in terms of ethnical background.” (14SC078) F, B, OP

“More than half the friends I made are international students. They are amazing people and will definitely change the world. Being with them helps you reach your potential and goals in life. An amazing experience :).” (15SS036) M, B, BP

“I think it’s important to learn from other countries and viewpoints in order to get a more well-rounded viewpoint on world issues. Life would be boring without input from other people living in other places, circumstances, and environment.” (14ED013) F, B, BP

“Obviously it is a good idea to get at least a little understanding about what life is like in other parts of the world. Like when you’re out with friends and meet a remarkable person and it makes you want to be remarkable as well.” (14SC068) M, B, OP

“New experiences are always good because they teach and develop you.” (14SC075) F, B, BP

“It will help me become a better global citizen and broaden my perspectives so that I don’t always view things with my inherent North American bias.” (5SC083) F, B, NP

“It must be difficult to find yourself in a completely different context among people who have probably been socialized in a different way. It is important for these international students to remember that their perspectives provide a refreshing change of scenery for other students.” (15ED094) F, B, BP
In the answers, listed above, interactions with students/people from other parts of the world are seen as inherently beneficial, because they can “make [one] more interesting” (14SC103), “make our lives rich with understanding for other cultures” (14ED016), are perceived as “an opportunity to grow and learn” (14SC078), “help you reach your potentials and goals in life” (15SS036), give one a “more well-rounded viewpoint” (14ED013), help one “become a better global citizen” (5SC083) or provide other forms of self-improvement and opportunities for personal growth, such as for instance overcoming ones’ cultural bias (5SC083) or simply being “a refreshing change of scenery” (15ED094). In none of these answers are the encounters seen as potentially problematic, disturbing or uncomfortable, rather they are seen as inherently beneficial to students, because they contribute to their project of self-actualization.

In this way the Other and his/her difference is seen as readily available to contribute positively to this project, without any observable consideration about how this consumption of the Other’s difference is seen by the Other. In such encounters the Other is constructed as seemingly unquestionably willing to concede to having his/her (circumscribed/commodified) difference consumed and remains as a passive subject that does not challenge the exalted subjects’ desire for consumption or their self-perceptions of superiority – understood in terms of their exceptional acceptance, benevolence and tolerance. As such, the Other is never described as potentially problematic, troublesome or conflictual (in fact it is hardly referred to at all), because (s)he acts, or is perceived as acting in accordance with expectations of his/her prescribed role. Examples listed below express very different sentiments and perceptions of the Other, resulting from the Other’s refusal to engage in the encounter. Examples of unsuccessful extraction/consumption:

“Some students are not willing to socialize and step out of their comfort level, leaving them to stick with only other international students.” (5SS075) F, B, OP

“Most of the international students that I have met do not attempt to make conversation despite the efforts of myself and my friends. We try to get to know them, but they don’t make the effort to know us.” (5SS054) F, B, BP

“[They] tend to isolate themselves even when we try to make an effort.” (14EA095) F, B, OP

“The Chinese kids in my dorm practically stay in their dorms 24/7 only leaving to pee and get water for their rice cookers. People like their homes, so
encouraging them to go overseas can only do so much. They remain apart from everyone else still.” (20SC110) F, B, BP

“Some may not be ready to have a positive world view and they won't change.” (16ED067) M, B, NP

“I live on residence and I feel like all the international students stick together and do not make an effort to find new friends.” (14SC007) M, B, NP

“Many tend to depend on each other and rarely mix outside their circle of friends; they miss out on diversity and multiculturalism.” (14EA009) F, PR, NP

“I find that our international students from China almost only mingle with other int. students from China. They make little effort to mingle.” (15ED023) F, B, BP

“They don’t socialize with locals very much. They mostly stay grouped together.” (15ED051) F, B, BP

“Some [face] many [challenges] because they don’t know how to communicate with people.” (14EA002) F, NPR, NP

“Some groups of international students that are larger will choose not to communicate with non-international students. This may sound strange but on multiple occasions in my residence I have been ignored by large groups of international (oriental) students. They will answer my questions with one word or not at all. They choose to speak in a different language to each other even when I’m around talking to them (they speak English fine). I just find this strange and not sure why they would [ignore] me other than the fact that I’m from a different race/culture.” (14SC013) F, B, BP

The common thread between the answers listed above seem to be a shared perception that the responsibility for unsuccessful establishment of relations between local students, who express their efforts at socializing (14SC013, 5SS054, 14EA095), and international students, who are constructed as generally asocial (5SS075, 20SC110, 15ED051); non-communicative (5SS054, 14EA002); unwilling to “step out of their comfort level” (5SS075); “not ready to have a positive world view” (16ED067); monocultural (15ED023, 20SC110, 14EA009, 14SC013); and potentially even racist (14SC013), lies exclusively with international students.
In terms of exceptionalist dispositions, it would be possible to argue that the refusal of the Other to engage in an encounter with the national subject is not perceived by the latter as a potential incitement for self-reflection or examination of one’s (underlying) interests, approaches and attitudes towards the encounter, but is rather automatically translated into a re-affirmation (or taken as a proof) of the general exceptionalist stance in which the national subject is constructed as open, multicultural and welcoming, while the Other is constructed as unchangeably monocultural, introverted and asocial.

Again, the purpose of the analysis here is not to ‘reveal’ what actually happened, or to find out who is ‘responsible’ for the failure of the encounter, but rather to explore what kind of narratives and perceptions are constructed in such events and how they either contribute to or challenge exceptionalist assumptions. In this regard, the examples listed above provide little or no evidence that these assumptions had been challenged (or even recognized), likely because challenging them lies beyond the horizon of imaginable possibilities. As one student (14SC013) remarked: “Why would they [ignore] me other than the fact that I’m from a different race/culture?” In such articulations it is difficult to interpret these stances as indicating any other option apart from constructing the Other as inherently racist, while the subject is perceived as benevolent, open and approaching. It seems that the exceptionalist disposition restricts the emergence of other, more complex interpretations.

To summarize, whatever the nature of the encounter may be, in terms of successful or unsuccessful consumption/commodification/circumscription of otherness, it seems that in both cases the encounter itself is interpreted in ways that reaffirm exceptionalist self-understandings and self-perceptions. When the encounters are unproblematic and unchallenging, they are interpreted as benefiting the subjects’ project of personal growth and self-actualization (without any concern for the Other), thus affirming his superiority as being personally enriched through multiple successful consummations of otherness/diversity.

In other words, the answers in this subchapter seem to articulate an exceptionalist stance towards the Other and/or difference, where the Other is understood merely as extension and/or projection of the subjects’ entitlement for self-actualization and personal growth through the consumption of the Other’s difference – “these international students to remember that their perspectives provide a refreshing change of scenery for other students” (15ED094). As such the Other is not seen as merely lacking or insufficient or otherwise inferior (as in other exceptionalist articulations), but is rather de-subjectivized, de-humanized, with having his humanity/subjectivity reduced to mere ‘colourful scenery’. 
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When the encounters (under the subject’s terms) are refused or made difficult, the exalted subject can instrumentalize the difficultness of the encounter as an opportunity to re-cast the Other as inherently ungrateful, undeserving, unadaptive and/or monocultural, while affirming his self-perception as inherently benevolent, accepting and embracing of difference. What remains unaddressed or unacknowledged in such difficult encounters is that an understanding of the Other as: (i) categorically different from the self and (ii) a de-subjectivized and/or dehumanized extension/projection of the self’s entitlement for self-actualization, invariably affirms exceptionalist, essentialized and hierarchical perceptions about both the self and the Other. Under the self’s insistence on the control over the terms of the encounter – so that they may positively contribute to his self-improvement and self-actualization – more genuine and more equivocal encounters are foreclosed due to the self’s insistence on seeing (or engaging with) the Other through a framework of difference, insufficiency and personal entitlement.

Further, the answers of the students in general (not just those analysed under this subchapter) seem to be permeated by a shared belief that the encounters between the self and the Other should be safe, unproblematic, self-affirming and personally enriching, so that they can contribute expanding and re-affirming the kinds of perceptions, attitudes and knowledge that the subject (and the Other) already possess. It was virtually impossible to observe any answers that would be indicative of an understanding, where encounters with Other(ness) would be seen as (also) necessarily disruptive, challenging and conflicting with the subjects’ knowledge and their (unconscious) self-perceptions, without these conflicts being described in exclusively negative terms and/or as something to be either avoided or eliminated.

To conclude, the general enthusiasm about diversity/otherness and its (potential/assumed) contribution to positive educational experiences, or projects of social and personal improvement that permeate the majority of available answers, should thus not be taken as automatically indicative of high levels of awareness of a need for (or existence of) equality, social justice and/or deconstruction of existing hierarchical/racialized power relations and structures, but more likely as reflecting a strong (personal) sense of entitlement to the consumption of de-subjectivized/de-humanized diversity/otherness for personal and national benefit.
8 Conclusion

This conclusion highlights some of the findings that I found the most relevant and could thus in certain ways be considered an extension of the discussion initiated in the previous chapter(s). It attempts to weave together the main observations from the analyses of the quantitative and qualitative data and to open-up some further challenges that would hopefully contribute to the ongoing debate on this subject. The conclusion begins by recalling the main research questions and methodological approaches, used to engage with them, and by summarizing the general findings of the analyses of the quantitative and qualitative data. It then proceeds to focus on the two (arguably) most significant findings that were observable in the analysis – the ambivalent relation of students towards critical thinking, and the fact that an exceptionalist discourse was adopted by all groups of students (in different ways), regardless of them coming from families of Canadian, non-Canadian, partially-Canadian or otherwise minoritised origins.

In relation to the subject of the omnipresence of an exceptionalist discourse, this conclusion also features a very brief presentation of the Discover Canada handbook (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012) that I believe holds significant potential to offer us some explanation for this phenomenon. Given the fact I came across this handbook only in the very days of writing the conclusion, I decided to include it in this part of the text, rather than trying to make its content fit into some of the other chapters. Although I would assume that in this regard some may find this conclusion to be somewhat unorthodox, I believe that its structure reflects the reality of the permanent unfinishedness of the processes of exploration, where ongoing encounters and conversations take us back, forward and (hopefully) deeper into our insights. In an attempt to honour the disruptions and interventions that have re-oriented the course of this research several times, often in ways I was not necessarily comfortable with, as they contradicted my desires for predictable and controllable outcomes, I decided to make one such intervention clearly visible in the text.

8.1 Main observations and findings of this research

This research sought to explore how different notions of Canadian exceptionalism were reproduced and/or contested in the responses to a survey on internationalization among the students of 7 universities in Canada. Further, it also explored how neoliberal, liberal and critical discursive orientations are articulated...
in students’ responses, which orientations (and interstices) dominate in the students’ responses, and how exceptionalist tendencies are articulated differently in these discursive orientations and their interstices.


Social cartography (Paulston 1999, 2010 Paulston & Liebman 1994) was used in the analysis of the qualitative data as an organizing tool that made possible a mapping and clustering of qualitative data into non-normative categories that enabled mutual comparison between different discursive orientations (main EIHE cartography) and articulations of exceptionalism (AWESOME cartography), without claiming normative ‘objectivity’. In both instances, but perhaps more visibly so in the case of the AWESOME cartography, social cartography was conceptualized in a post-representational sense (Crampton 2003, Kitchin et al. 2011) as a mirror that denaturalizes what is perceived as normal and desirable and amplifies unflattering traits in order to open possibilities for different conversations and to make visible otherwise hidden assumptions and interpretations.

The analysis of quantitative data, related to the students’ (family) origins, first languages and minority affiliations, suggests that that internationalization policies and processes, coupled to Canada’s history of centuries of strong and ongoing immigration, have resulted in a highly diverse higher education environment (among 7 participating institutions) – especially when compared to other countries/institutions that have participated in the EIHE project.78 However, the analysis of quantitative data, related to students’ perceptions/opinions on the social role of university, the impact of internationalization or the skills and content relevant to their studies, seems to suggest that the diversity of personal background does not necessarily translate itself into corresponding large-scale diversity in students’ opinions on these subjects. Quite inversely, a very high level of similarity of answers not just between institutions, but also within them (between various subgroups), is probably one of the most important and surprising observations.

78 ‘Diverse’ refers to observed diversity of students' background.
8.1.1 Ambivalence of critical thinking

Drawing on observations from both the quantitative and qualitative data, the highly complex and ambivalent disposition of the students towards critical thinking stands out as one of the key findings that merits further examination in these concluding pages. Students seemed to manifestly almost unanimously embrace critical thinking as the most important skill for their studies. However, they were much less inclined to favour other statements that could be considered indicators of critical thinking, such as ‘analysing power relations’, ‘questioning what they take for granted’ or considering as very relevant subjects such as ‘how rich countries influence poor countries’, ‘how social inequalities are created’ or ‘learning about the role my country played in global problems’.

The discrepancy between strong self-assertions of the importance of critical thinking and significantly lower levels of expressed interest in the subjects/issues that might be considered as indicative of critical thinking (understood broadly in terms of socially engaged critique), is seemingly affirmed also by the very low share of open-ended answers that could be classified as belonging to a critical discursive orientation (between 1.8 % to 5 %). This discrepancy could be interpreted in several possible and interconnected ways.

First it should be noted that there are significant differences between various interpretations of what critical thinking may refer to. Although critical thinking is, in this research, understood as an umbrella concept that includes (but is not limited to) systemic thinking, critical self-reflection, an analysis of power relations, structural hierarchies, injustice, violence and various types of hegemony, it could also be understood (and deployed) in other, quite divergent ways. For instance, critical thinking can also be understood as problem-solving, or as a process of uncovering objective, neutral truths, where the subject assumes that he/she is thinking and speaking from an unbiased, value-free position, or as an advocate of universal values and truths. The analysis of qualitative data seems to suggest that such understandings of critical thinking (rather than systemic critique) could be considered predominant among the students. Although such understandings of critical thinking have a certain merit of their own, they do not encourage the subject to self-reflexively examine his/her own situatedness, complicity or epistemic blind spots, because he/she perceives him/herself as speaking from a neutral, objective ground.

79 Only 5 students (0.3 %) out of 1,451 thought that critical thinking was not relevant to their field.
The understanding of critical thinking as an exercise to reach neutrality, and correspondingly – epistemic hegemony, brings us to the second possible interpretation, which is related to the modern subjects’ logocentric tendency to conflate a description of reality with reality itself, coupled with the desire for self-transparency and an assumption that self-transparency can be achieved. In other words, saying that critical thinking is important or declaring oneself as a critical thinker, creates an unexamined expectation and belief that critical reflection is already present or that the subject is already thinking critically, simply by saying that he or she is.

A third possible interpretation is related to the instrumentalization of critical thinking as a tool that should only be applied in certain situations or to certain processes, opinions and situations. In this regard critical thinking is understood as something that we employ only when we are invited to use it (in non-ordinary contexts) or when we assess that the situation calls for ‘critical’ as opposed to ‘regular’ thinking. The danger of this kind of understanding or using of critical reflection that does not need to be employed in the contexts that do not seem to require critical thinking at first sight, is that critical reflection only gets employed in situations and contexts that have already been identified as needing critical reflection beforehand.

This usually leads to critical thinking being used for topics that have been identified as being of general concern for mainstream society and in ways that are considered generally acceptable and un-problematic, but lead to positive resolutions of certain tensions and conflicts, or at least to resolutions that are again considered generally acceptable by the (privileged) majority. In this regard critical thinking is thus not meant to challenge or subvert existing relations of power and systemic violence, but rather to solve the problems generated by these power relations and hierarchical structures, while leaving these very structures intact and unexamined.

There are certain patterns in students’ responses that seem to suggest that critical thinking is predominantly used in this (circumscribed) way. For instance, the liberal-critical interstice – which is marked by the recognition of the existence of certain, mostly culture-related issues, and also by an absence of (visible) an analysis of power relations, systemic critique and/or recognition of complicity – was much more strongly represented in students’ responses (reaching up to 26.3 %) than answers that were classified as belonging to a critical orientation closer to social critique. These culture-related issues were presented as being transient, or were attributed to experiences or behaviour of certain individuals, and were
considered generally resolvable, provided more knowledge (about the Other) is obtained.

8.1.2 Consumption of cultural difference

A strong general focus on the subject of engagement with cultural difference and diversity seems to be observable in the majority of the students’ open-ended responses, where the subjects of internationalization, global citizenship, challenges facing international students, and the role of diversity in education, were discussed predominantly (and often exclusively) through the optic of inter-cultural encounters. Most of the answers thus emphasized the importance of culture over all other contextual dimensions of subjectivity, such as political, economic, social, historic and other related contexts.

This should not be considered surprising given Canada’s exalted status as one of the most multi-cultural societies in the world (Adams 2008, Berry & Kalin 1995, Bloemraad 2006, Kymlicka 1995, 1998). It is also generally consistent with Žižek’s (2008: 660) contention of the “culturalization of politics” in modern, liberal societies and of the subsequent cultural drowning-out (Žižek 1998: 1002) of other issues or understandings that could potentially be considered more (politically) disruptive. The emphasis on culture thus seems to have impacted negatively on the students’ general capacity to reflect more deeply on systemic and structural issues that extend beyond the horizon of inter-cultural encounters, especially since the latter were often understood as completely unproblematic, benevolent and (mutually) beneficial. Such responses represented a majority in all the participating institutions. When students did identify potential challenges brought about by internationalization they again focused on inter-cultural contacts, leaving other areas unexamined. For instance, when asked how global citizens should act/think/relate to the world most students emphasized the importance of acceptance, openness to diversity, tolerance, mutual learning, avoiding prejudice and non-discrimination.

Given the fact that only 9.4% of students did not consider themselves as global citizens, while others either saw themselves as such, or were unsure about their affinity, student responses to the question about global citizenship could be considered to some extent as self-descriptions or at the very least as descriptions of personal characteristics that students would like to have developed. What was markedly absent from virtually all the answers in the survey was any kind of problematization of one’s own position and role in the world, of embeddedness in
complex networks of hierarchical and exploitative relations, and of questioning the depth and veracity of one’s self-proclaimed openness and benevolence.

The content of these answers is consistent with predominant notions of Canadian exceptionalism, observable in the students’ responses, policy documents on internationalization (Department for Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development 2013, 2014, see also Pashby 2016), and various forms of critical and non-critical scholarship on Canada (e.g. Adams 2008, Bloemraad 2006, Howard-Hassmann 2003, Jefferess 2012, Kymlicka 1998, Thobani 2007). In all of these both the national subject and the state are constructed as inherently benevolent, compassionate, open and tolerant, or alternatively such constructions are critically examined. In contrast to the positive self-descriptions the Other is overwhelmingly constructed as permanently lacking, insufficient, inferior, occasionally even barbaric and/or uncivilized, but above all as unquestionably available for the exalted subjects’ projects of personal growth and self-actualization.

However, as suggested by the students’ responses (and other supporting narratives), this consumption of circumscribed otherness in general does not seem to be performed with (a conscious) attempt to subjugate, exploit, annihilate or humiliate the Other. Quite the opposite, the consumption and commodification of otherness seems to be grounded in the very widely shared (benevolent) ideals of inclusion, tolerance, acceptance, equality and human rights. It seems as if in this process the Other’s diversity and/or difference are being consumed precisely for the greater good of everyone (including the Other her/himself).

The general assumption seems to be that the extraction and consumption of difference contributes positively or ‘enriches’ the exalted subjects’ learning process, which would in turn enable him/her to develop even greater capacity for self-proclaimed and self-defined openness, understanding and inclusion, leading both to an increase in personal growth and self-affirmation and to a decrease in discrimination and prejudice in the society at large. In other words, the consumption of difference is understood as politically and ethically justifiable as it makes the national subjects (seem) more multi- and less mono-cultural. In a similar way as critical thinking was largely instrumentalized for suggesting (provisional) solutions to the problems generated by existing power relations and hierarchical structures without dismantling them, so the commodification of the Other’s difference was largely perceived in instrumentalized ways with the purpose of pacifying the disruptive potential of tensions generated in the inter-cultural (self/Other) encounters, rather than seeing these tensions as indicative of much
deeper and more problematic issues than a simple lack of knowledge about each other and/or of one’s cultural background.

Unfortunately though, rather than delivering on the (false) promises of multicultural harmony, equality of worth and cohesion, such processes only seem to increase the gap constructed between the permanently unworthy and insufficient Other and the ever improving, ever growing, ever developing exalted national subject, whose (benevolent) superiority is constantly affirmed and elevated through the processes of commodification, circumscription and consumption of the Other’s difference. These processes are dangerous not just for the Other, but also for the exalted subject himself, as he/she runs the risk of increased isolation and separation from his/her constitutive element (the Other), which results from having one’s humanity increasingly elevated over the Other’s objectified and de-humanized existence – thus increasing the gap between the self and the Other.

In this regard the exalted subject’s quest for goodness, openness, benevolence and innocence removes him/her further and further from the troubling, paradoxical, uncomfortable, dangerous, disruptive and violent, but on the other hand much more authentic and generative, encounters not just with the Other, but also with his/her own shadow, handily projected and externalized upon those, whose opportunist/conditional inclusion can always be revoked. The more the subject becomes affirmed in her/his unexamined positive self-constructions, self-perceptions and self-definitions that exalt his/her exceptional benevolence and superior humanity, either by the virtue of self-affirmation or by his/her subsumption in the general exceptionalist discourse, the more the Other remains as the only possible bearer of undesirable human traits.

Consequently, the Other is constructed not merely as potentially violent, underserving, ungrateful, impolite, conflictual, patriarchal and backward (as the data indicates), but above all as someone or something, whose worth can only be measured against the Other’s capacity for affirmation of the exalted subject’s projected self-image and the perceptions of him/herself and the world. In other words, an Other, whose competence(s) and claims for equality challenge the privileges, entitlements and epistemic hegemony of the exalted subjects, is likely to be perceived as threatening, unassimilable and consequentially “vigorously excluded” – to borrow J.S. Woodsworth’s (1909: 278) expression.

For the context of Higher Education the two main findings are that both critical thinking and diversity are instrumentalized for individual self-actualization. There are two key implications of this. The first is that critical thinking, which challenges the students’ ontological securities, including desires for (systemic) innocence,
affluence and self-affirmation is likely to be resisted. The second is that attempts of inclusion will domesticate difference into 'diversity'. In other words, such attempts at conditional inclusion also have the effect of silencing the Other. While this second implication has been explored by scholars, such as Sara Ahmed (2012) and Sunera Thobani (2007), other authors (Andreotti 2014, Pitt & Britzman 2003, Taylor 2013) suggest that the first implication and the connection between the two has received far less attention in the literature and should be explored much further.

In this discursive context visible minorities who challenge the terms of inclusion by exposing the silence that this inclusion engenders face enormous challenges, like Thobani herself did. Sara Ahmed (2012) also offers a useful articulation of the unwritten, but widely understood and enforced rules of these terms of inclusion in institutions specifically committed to diversity and multiculturalism. She conceptualizes these rules around the experience of being made a stranger (Ahmed 2000), of inhabiting a body that is visibly strange in the space where middle class whiteness is associated with normality. She (Ahmed 2000, 2012) argues that strange bodies included in the box of diversity are expected to be indebted to their 'includers'. Strange bodies should also populate the spaces of diversity specially created for them, so that the whiteness of the dominant space continues to be normal and benevolent. Strange bodies should be the voice of diversity affirming how well the institution is doing and agreeing not to rock the boat too much. If strange bodies start to voice problems with the framing of diversity, they should be considered themselves to be the problem. Incidentally, in the very days these words were written, Sara Ahmed resigned from her post in academia, due to institutional failure to address issues of sexual harassment at her university.

Returning to the analysis of quantitative data that clearly demonstrated the students’ diversity of origin (even if they were permanent residents of Canada), one is left with a certain sense of wonderment as to how the exceptionalist discourse on Canada and Canadians is shared (in different ways) also among those who either recently moved to Canada, or whose parents and grandparents are not of Canadian origin at all, in other words among those who would (especially as ‘visible’ minorities or ‘strangers’) likely be seen as qualified for the status of the Other. The study guide on Canada for immigrants, titled Discover Canada, and published by Citizenship and Immigration Canada (2012), can perhaps offer some insight into this subject. This guide, presented in the next subchapter, is considered as required reading for immigrants between ages 18 and 54, who wish to apply for citizenship and who have to pass a test on Canada, before being granted full citizenship.
8.2 Constructing Canada for non-Canadians

While it may seem unusual to conclude this research with a reference to a citizenship guidebook, and while (many) international students would likely not have read it, I believe that its content merits inclusion, as it showcases clearly, what kind of an image of Canada the immigrants/applicants for citizenship are required to subscribe to. In this sense it could be considered as indicative of the imagery that is constructed about Canada for non-Canadians. The guide begins by welcoming immigrants to their new country and explaining them that they “are becoming a part of a great tradition that was built by generations of pioneers before you” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 3). The guide emphasizes Canada’s openness to immigration and the long history of its democratic tradition:

Canada has welcomed generations of newcomers to our shores to help us build a free, law-abiding and prosperous society. For 400 years, settlers and immigrants have contributed to the diversity and richness of our country, which is built on a proud history and a strong identity. ... Canadians take pride in their identity and have made sacrifices to defend their way of life. By coming to Canada and taking this important step toward Canadian citizenship, you are helping to write the continuing story of Canada. (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 3).

By studying this document, the newcomers to Canada learn that “Canada is known around the world as a strong and free country” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 10), that has “inherited the oldest continuous constitutional tradition in the world” dating back 800 years “to the signing of Magna Carta in 1215 in England” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 8). Although aboriginal people are recognized as existing in Canada, the historical narrative about the country is constructed as “stem[ing] largely from the English-speaking and French-speaking Christian civilizations that were brought here from Europe by settlers” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 11). In general, the history of Canada is presented in ways that could be at the very least considered apocryphal, if not directly and deliberately misleading.

For instance, in the document we find no reference to the centuries of wars of attrition against indigenous people, rather they are described as having “died of European diseases to which they lacked immunity” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 14). Apart from this lack of immunity to diseases “Aboriginals and Europeans formed strong economic, religious and military bonds in the first 200
years of coexistence which laid the foundations of Canada” (*ibid.*). European settlers and colonists are presented as “outstanding leaders like Jean Talon, Bishop Laval, and Count Frontenac [that] built a French Empire” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 15) or as “skilled and courageous men who travelled by canoe ... and formed strong alliances with the First Nations” (*ibid.*). Under such conditions and outstanding leadership “democratic institutions developed gradually and peacefully” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 16), with Canada becoming a safe haven for “thousands of slaves [who] escaped from the United States, followed “the North Star” and settled in Canada.”

Presumably unlike other countries, Canada is portrayed as not merely having a government, but having a “responsible government” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 18) that was established through the work of many democratic reformists in the 19th century, such as “La Fontaine, a champion of democracy and French language rights [that] became the first leader of a responsible government in the Canadas.” Today, Canada is presented not merely as having a responsible government, rather this “powerful, united, wealthy and free country” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 19) that has in the post-war period “enjoyed record prosperity and success” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 24) is presented as a place where “today Canadians enjoy one of the world’s highest standards of living – maintained by the hard work of Canadians” and ultimately as a country in which “Canadians govern themselves” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 28), which seems to imply a self-perception of a highly refined level of democratic governance, likely considered unparalleled in other countries of the world.

Notions of self-governance are particularly interesting, since the official Sovereign of Canada is the Queen of United Kingdom to whom all new citizens must pledge an oath of allegiance, something not even the British people are required to do. The Oath of Citizenship (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 2) is reproduced below:

I swear (or affirm)
That I will be faithful
And bear true allegiance
To Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second
Queen of Canada
Her Heirs and Successors

And that I will faithfully observe

The laws of Canada

And fulfil my duties as a Canadian citizen.

Apart from pledging the Oath not just to the Queen, but also to her heirs and successors – in other words to known and unknown/unborn members of the Mountbatten-Windsor family, new citizens are required to demonstrate sufficient knowledge of Canadian history (as outlined in the guide), and to demonstrate sufficient understanding of the privileges and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship, such as “participation in the Canadian democratic process, ... volunteerism, respect for the environment and protection of Canada natural, cultural and architectural heritage” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 65). In the study guide, Canada is presented as a place where “millions of volunteers freely donate their time to help others without pay” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 9), where volunteers among other things “encourage newcomers to integrate” and where volunteering is seen as “an excellent way to gain useful skills and develop friends and contacts.”

Canada is further constructed as a diverse country that welcomes immigration, and where equality of men and women before law is assured, however “Canada’s openness and generosity do not extend to barbaric cultural practices that tolerate spousal abuse, “honour killings,” female genital mutilation, forced marriage or other gender-based violence” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 9). In opposition to such “barbaric cultural practices” (ibid.), Canada is constructed as:

the state [that] has traditionally partnered with faith communities to promote social welfare, harmony and mutual respect; to provide schools and health care; to resettle refugees; and to uphold religious freedom, religious expression and freedom of conscience. (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 13).

It seems difficult to imagine that newcomers to Canada would not wish to identify themselves as Canadians, especially since, according to the guide, Canadians have so many desirable talents. They are “artists [that] have achieved greatness both at home and abroad” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 25), sportsmen (and women) that have “invented basketball” (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 26) and have in various sports, but most notably in ice hockey “dominated the world”, and are also “world renown” scientists and researchers, that have –
among other things invented the telephone, the electric light bulb, the pacemaker, the snowmobile and contributed to the invention of the radio (Citizenship and Immigration Canada 2012: 27).

At the heart of the notion of imagined national community lies for Benedict the idea of the “nation [that] is regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship” (Benedict 1987: 7). These notions of imagined community and comradeship – imagined as inherent to any nation, bear significantly on the ways members of these imagined communities/nations perceive themselves in relation to members of other imagined communities. National comradeship, much like other forms of group affiliation, such as kinship, or religious affinity, *obliges* the members to defend (also physically, if necessary) these imagined communities against members of other imagined communities, or alternatively, against those who would be perceived as threatening to demystify the imagined nature of the national community.

### 8.3 Concluding thoughts and future research

Coming across this study guide at the end of my PhD, and considering Benedict’s insights, made me realize just how difficult it would be for a researcher in Canada to raise these issues, because of all the structures of affect that are tied to the exceptionalist discourse and that mobilize very real emotions in Canadian society. This attests to the fact that student responses and institutional policies cannot be considered individually. Rather they should be considered as symptomatic of wider social discursive processes that are naturalized and normalized and that mobilize a dynamic constellation of affective and relational responses and symbolic referents, whose evolving relationships are very difficult to identify and to interrupt.

---

80 While this is hardly the subject of this research, it should be noted that many of these ‘inventions’ attributed to Canadians are historically contestable. A sport, very similar to basketball had been played already by various peoples in Mesoamerica over 3,000 years ago (Blake *et al.* 1998), while the invention of the lightbulb would be more accurately attributed to Sir Humphry Davy in 1802, some 72 years before the patent filed by Woodward and Evans (Canadian scientists), or, in equal measure to anyone of the plethora of inventors that have contributed to its refinement until Edison's commercialization in late 19th century – many of whom have again preceded Woodward and Evans (Davis 2012). Similarly disputable is the claim of Fessenden’s contribution to the invention of the radio, since radio waves had been theorized, studied (and used for various purposes) by scientists, such as Maxwell, Hertz, Tesla, Marconi, Popov and others before Fessenden (Hong 2001) or Hopps’ invention of the pacemaker, since his pacemaker was neither the first such device, nor was it of the kind that is used today (Aquilina 2006).
That is also why it would be impossible to develop a heuristic that would represent discursive configurations in all their complexity and movement. On the other hand, representing them in a non-normative, pedagogical way could help (not just Canadians) to see our embeddedness in frames of referents imbued with history and social hierarchies that ground our modern identities, entitlements and securities. In other words, this research attempted to explore the depth to which our being in the world is conditioned and premised upon a constant re-affirmation and renewal of discursive master- or meta-narratives that frame our understandings, dispositions and relations.

In my future research I would like to explore this issue further in relation to both Canada and to other countries. I would like to dedicate part of my time to identifying how we establish collective and individual fences in relation to each other and into what kind of foreclosures and circumscriptions of our imaginaries emerge from this closing-off of our capacity for relationality. I would also like to dedicate part of my time to exploring pedagogical or educational processes that can take us to the edge of the ways of being that have harmed our relationships. For this I would wish to look into non-Western conceptualizations of the psyche and of the (entangled) self, to indigenous conceptualizations of well-being and to forms of psychoanalysis, that are not grounded in hegemonic or hegemony-seeking, Enlightenment-based ontologies, and that espouse non-anthropocentric forms of being. While I do not believe that any of these would hold a universal remedy for our current predicament, I do believe strongly that we need to expand our imaginative and relational capacities beyond what is considered accessible, understandable and desirable to individuated, modern/Cartesian forms of subjectivity.

Having had the opportunity to experience what it feels like to be part of a collective research project taught me to appreciate the value of not just professional or academic collegiality and support, but also of collaboration between people from very different, often irreconcilably divergent theoretical and personal backgrounds. Although being part of a research team in many ways contradicted the predominant understanding of the PhD as an individual, self-developing or self-interested project, it provided me with a rare and precious opportunity to participate in a group, whose inherent diversity would have under a different framework be likely considered as an obstacle to what is usually perceived as coherent, robust research.

Key to this, I believe, was the deployment of social cartography as a shared and general methodological framework which was able to contain and take account of the diverse theoretical orientations and backgrounds of the project partners.
Within the EIHE project social cartography was used as a tool that on one hand made possible both the mapping of multiple discourses in higher education, their absences, but also created openings for different readings of key concepts/signifiers. These different readings in turn enabled conversations that troubled, complexified and challenged the existing and/or more ‘mainstream’ understandings of the concepts/signifiers in question.

Hopefully some of this troubling, complexification and challenging of predominant understandings of ‘mainstream’ or normalized enunciations was reflected also in the ways social cartography was used in this research. The main challenge of this research lay precisely in its ambition not to portray exceptionalist discourse or exceptionalist tendencies as some kind of (exceptional) aberrations or deviations from ‘normality’ or ‘good’ behaviour, but rather as constitutive elements of the very notions of normality and normativity that ground our individual and collective identities. In the words of Tom Nairn (cited in Benedict 1987: 7):

“Nationalism” is the pathology of modern developmental history, as inescapable as “neurosis” in the individual, with much the same essential ambiguity attached to it, a similar built-in-capacity for descent into dementia, rooted in the dilemmas of helplessness thrust upon most of the world (the equivalent of infantilism for societies) and largely incurable.

Thus, if there was anything that was considered as deviant or pathological in this research, it was not the students or their answers, but rather the ways of (individual and collective) being in the world that have, through the course of history, come to be considered normal.
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Appendix: EIHE questionnaire
Dear Student,

We invite you to complete the Ethical Internationalism in Higher Education questionnaire. Your participation in this questionnaire will greatly contribute to our understanding of internationalization and the role of universities in wider society.

This questionnaire is part of an international collaborative research project which complies with the research ethics guidelines of the University of Oulu, Finland and of your university. The completion of this questionnaire is voluntary. We are very interested in your thoughts and opinions.

All of the information that you provide in this questionnaire is strictly anonymous. The data collected in different universities will be analyzed and compared, and reports of the project will be published in academic journals, presented in conferences, and made available in libraries and research databases.

You have the right to refuse to participate in this study. The completion of this questionnaire indicates that you have been informed about the aims of this research and that you consent to participate. We appreciate your time.

On behalf of the project team, I would like to thank you for your assistance in this international effort.

Professor Vanessa de Oliveira Andreotti, Principal Investigator
Faculty of Education, University of Oulu, vanessa.andreotti@oulu.fi

More information about this project can be found at: http://www.oulu.fi/edu/eihe. An executive summary of this research will also be made available when the analysis is complete.
Part A

We would like to invite you to offer your views on the social role of higher education and the internationalization of higher education.

Completely fill in the circle or square that best matches your response as indicated in this example:

1. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities are important to wider society because they</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>contribute to scientific knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribute to national culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribute to national economic growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promote critical awareness of social problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide effective solutions for social problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>create spaces to challenge injustices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contribute to democratic debate about the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enable the production of innovations for society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop rational thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enable the development of commercial products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>build understandings that contribute to social harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enable the discovery of facts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>train a highly skilled workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The internationalization of universities can offer students the opportunity to</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>become global leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop intercultural competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learn from other students from different countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate in study abroad programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>build international careers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volunteer abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compare universities through global rankings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engage with perspectives from multiple social groups in courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learn from instructors from different countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>become aware of global interdependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critically analyze global issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learn new languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understand global inequalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop skills to reduce global inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The internationalization of universities can pose the following challenges</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>foreign students experience discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local students are disadvantaged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>universities accept students with poor language skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>countries lose their strong students who move to other countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more content is added to an already crowded curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only skills related to the international economy are valued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other languages of instruction change to English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local and international students do not interact socially</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. To what extent do you consider the following items important to develop or to learn about in your field of study or academic discipline?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills and dispositions relevant to my field of study</th>
<th>not relevant</th>
<th>somewhat relevant</th>
<th>relevant</th>
<th>very relevant</th>
<th>not sure</th>
<th>no opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thinking critically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working well with people from different cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engaging with conflicting perspectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considering the impact of my actions on society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questioning what I have taken for granted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>becoming an entrepreneur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empathizing with those who are disadvantaged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analyzing power relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making ethical decisions that benefit society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promoting innovation in the marketplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global themes that are relevant to my field of study</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trade barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>global mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technological advancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international solidarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climate change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government overspending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loss of jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gap between rich and poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unequal relations of power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over-consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corporate greed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waste of resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terrorism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disease epidemics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over-surveillance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distribution of wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>racism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social and political issues relevant to my field of study</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how my field can generate profit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how my field affects society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how governments influence my field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how social inequalities are created</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how rich countries influence poor countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how academic knowledge can be biased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other, please specify:
3. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning from people from completely different contexts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning through the Arts (e.g., film, drama, music, poetry)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about how poorer countries can be helped to develop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having my views challenged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from successful young entrepreneurs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being given clear cut answers to problems in my courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning content that makes me competitive in the job market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having issues presented from different perspectives in my courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about how my lifestyle is related to global problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about other cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debating course ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from leaders of industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from people who think very differently from me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making up my own mind in courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from people who have experienced injustices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing what I learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about the role my country has played in global injustices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building consensus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part B We would like to know a few details about you

4. What is your current study programme?

- Area of study/academic major: 
- Current year of study: 
- Language of instruction: 
- Your first language: 

5. Do you identify as

- [ ] female
- [ ] male
- [ ] other

6. In what year were you born? 

7. Which statements reflect your family context in this country (mark all that apply)

- [ ] I am living in this country permanently
- [ ] I am living in this country temporarily
- [ ] I was born in this country
- [ ] Both of my parents were born in this country
- [ ] Only one of my parents was born in this country
- [ ] All my grandparents were born in this country
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8. Have you ever spent more than six months living or travelling outside of your home country?
   - no  - yes  

Have you ever chosen to travel to another country
   - no  - yes  
   □ for leisure/holiday/tourism
   □ to study
   □ to gain employment
   □ to learn about a different culture
   □ to learn another language
   □ to volunteer for charity work
   □ to visit family

9. In your university context, do you define yourself as
   - no  - yes  
   □ an ethnic minority
   □ a religious minority
   □ a language minority
   □ a minority in terms of social-economic status
   □ a minority in terms of sexual identity
   □ another minority

Optional comments: ____________________________________________________________________________

10. Who was your primary carer when you were growing up? (who looked after you the most)
    mother  □ father  □ other  □

   What is the closest description of the highest level of education and/or training of each of your
   parents or carer(s)? (if known)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>primary carer</th>
<th>other carer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left full-time education before 15 years of age</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left full-time education between 15-17 years of age</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained in full-time education to 18 years of age</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education lasting less than 3 years</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education degree or equivalent professional qualification (3 years or more)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What have been your interactions with people with different cultural, social or economic
    backgrounds, at different times in your life? Mark the closest match:

   5. All or nearly all people from a different background from mine
   4. Mostly people from a background different from mine
   3. About half and half
   2. Mostly people from my own background
   1. All or nearly all from my own background

How would you describe the composition of the following?

   Neighbourhood where I grew up  □  □  □  □
   My school experiences  □  □  □  □
   My friends growing up  □  □  □  □
   My friends at this university  □  □  □  □
   My online friends  □  □  □  □
   My romantic relationships  □  □  □  □
Part C

We would like to invite you to provide more details about your views (we are interested in your own thoughts and concepts - there are no right or wrong answers)

12. How does internationalization affect society in general?
   - positively
   - negatively
   - mixed
   - unsure
   - no opinion

12a. Please explain your answer to Question 12.

   

13. Do you see yourself as a global citizen?
   - Yes
   - Maybe
   - No
   - Unsure
   - No opinion

13a. How do you imagine global citizens should think, relate and/or act in the world?
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14. Apart from possible language difficulties, do international students or students with diverse backgrounds face challenges in your institution? □ no □ yes

Please explain your answer.

15. Can diversity enrich your university experience? (e.g., exposure to students, instructors, and course content from different countries and from less powerful groups) □ no □ yes

Please explain your answer.

16. To conclude, we welcome any final thoughts you have regarding your university experience, internationalisation, and this survey.

Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire!

All responses will be kept anonymous. Identification codes are used only for statistical purposes.

More information about this project can be found at: http://www.oulu.fi/edu/ithe.

An executive summary of this research will also be made available on this website when the analysis is complete.
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