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Abstract

This thesis moves beyond abstract approaches to cosmopolitanism by showing how young people’s relationships with mobility and the Other are enacted in emplaced material-discursive practices. Cosmopolitanism has emerged as a significant feature of contemporary education in addressing the ways global mobilities are transforming the social spaces in which youth learn and live. For example, the Australian government discusses the Australian education system in terms of meeting the needs of the country’s ‘global future’, aspirations commonly captured in policy documents under the banner of ‘global citizenry’ (Rizvi, 2006). This is also reaffirmed in educational policy that regularly believes that youth need to be educated to develop cosmopolitan skills and practices to engage with an abstract ‘global’ space through political and prescriptive frameworks that outline what it means to be a ‘moral’ and ‘good’ global citizen. This understanding of youth regularly silences alternative ways of being and of becoming cosmopolitan in favour of universalist conceptions of cosmopolitanism prescribed by hierarchical knowledge systems and forces. These competency-based frameworks also divide youth into social categories, such as those who are cosmopolitan and those who are not.

Extending in a new direction, my thesis proposes an emergent place-based approach that understands cosmopolitanism as a situated material-discursive practice. By employing non-representational and new materialist perspectives, or what has been referred to as a ‘more-than’ approach, I show how bodies and ‘everyday’ body-place relations are implicated in youth’s cosmopolitan ‘becomings’ (Barad, 2003; Harrison, 2000; Thrift, 1999). A major focus in my thesis is thus to render visible the ways youth form relations to globalised matter and the Other through their embodied or ‘lived’ place-making practices and the affective intensities produced through such body-place relations. Moreover, I address the ways such practices are entangled in broader material-discursive assemblages that constitute their social imaginaries of self, Other and world. Researching with 20 youth from a co-educational performing arts high school in a major city of New South Wales, Australia, my mobile ethnographic study employed an analysis inspired by the work of Karen Barad (2003) and her theory of a ‘performative metaphysics’. By attending to the material-discursive practices that constitute youth’s place-making projects, I
hope to interrupt normalised views in education about the ways youth’s cosmopolitan practices are produced and practised. Moreover, I wish to forward the utility of research based on the interrogation of matter (including bodily matter) in the analysis of youth’s cosmopolitan practices.
Chapter 1: Working against an abstract view of ‘global’ space in the analysis of youth’s cosmopolitan practices

There has been a renewed interest in cosmopolitanism as a central concept in understanding the ways flows of objects, ideas and people traversing the world transform people’s social lives (Beck, 2004; Delanty, 2006; Skrbis & Woodward, 2007). The concept of cosmopolitanism has also been used as a method to understand how global processes constitute and transform place and the ways individuals constitute place in society (Massey, 2005; Somerville, Power & de Carteret, 2009). An individual’s understanding of the Other and the world is always forged in relation to their subjective understanding of place and of the intersecting spaces that play a role in its making. Cosmopolitanism is therefore useful in demarcating the modes and practices of mediation, reflexivity and negotiation involved in the ways places are made and imagined (Appadurai, 1999; Delanty, 2006; Beck, 2002). Moreover, contemporary theories of cosmopolitanism have been used to draw attention to moments in which bodies form relations with global flows in ways that extend an individual’s moral responsibility and that constitute practices of solidarity and empathy beyond the real and imagined borders of the nation-state.

In this thesis, I adopt a ‘humble cosmopolitan ethos’ and examine youth’s everyday cosmopolitan practices in relation to the ways in which they ground globalised ideas, images, people and objects in the making of place (Rizvi & Beech, 2017, p. 127). I focus on the ‘materiality’ of their cosmopolitan practices by exploring how globalised matter and bodily matter are implicated in these practices. This includes how youth make place through their affective relations, the way the body feels, senses and moves in its relation to place and the spaces involved in its making.
I have written this thesis to address assumptions made in Australian educational policy about how youth understand their social lives in relation to global processes (Dolby & Rizvi, 2008). Blossfeld, Klijzing, Mills and Kurz (2005) have acknowledged that ‘global’ discourses in policy commonly refer to youth’s role in addressing ‘global and national problems’ through the adoption of a ‘global awareness’ or ‘global competencies’. For example, the preamble of the Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians (2008) has noted a great interest in preparing students for a ‘global’ world through the following rationales:

- The quality of young Australian lives depends on the ability to be competitive in the global economy, especially in the areas of knowledge generation and innovation.
- Rapid processes of globalisation and technological change demand us to develop education and skills that cater for the changing nature of jobs available to young Australians.
- Australia needs to ensure it develops a world-class schooling system that competes and performs strongly against other countries of the OECD.
- Asia’s influence on the world is increasing and young Australians need to become ‘Asia-literate’ and build relationships with Asia.

Above-mentioned policy initiatives such as the Melbourne Declaration assume and imply a social context of youth’s employability based on worldwide risk and the insecurity of the global market. This rationale also positions youth as ‘cultural brokers’ in relation to negotiating the Other. These normalised understandings of the ‘global’ are based on the practice of transcending local identifications and moving towards some abstract ‘global’ world, while ignoring the significance of place as a means by which young people are positioned in the world.

Cosmopolitanism has become a particularly important topic in education research due to its focus on building a global awareness and its emphasis on human rights and global social justice (Noble, 2009; Rizvi, 2009; Waldron, 1992; Weenick, 2008). With an increase worldwide in the number of national education policies outlining the need for students to develop a global awareness and to become global citizens, the Australian K–12 classroom is a space and place in which cosmopolitan practices are increasingly influenced, discussed and performed (Millei & Jones,
Given its surge in popularity, the ways in which cosmopolitanism has been theorised vary immensely. For example, it has been conceptualised as a moral framework, political theory, methodological framework, and critical social theory. Skey (2012, p. 473) asserts that given its theoretical ‘elasticity’, cosmopolitanism has become an overly abstract concept that has become difficult to ground in the everyday lives of individuals. For example, he has questioned the utility of ‘macro’ theories of cosmopolitanism that use the concept as a platform to move beyond the frame of the nation-state in the study of social and global phenomena. He notes that theories of cosmopolitanism that propose that a new ‘global’ era is shifting our ties, to places and people sitting outside the boundaries of the nation-state, presume and reify the nation-state as a solidified and stable social category. Drawing from Chernilo (2006, p. 15), Skey (2012, p. 473) argues that an understanding of the nation-state as a stable social category is under-theorised, and loses sight of the ways it has been ‘historically opaque, sociologically uncertain and normatively ambivalent’. He demonstrates the implications of relying on social categories as methods defined as ‘national’ or ‘global’ in theorising cosmopolitanism, as these categories have and will continually be contested as contingent phenomena. Moreover, Skey (2012) asserts that ‘methodological cosmopolitanism’ is not a way to move away from ‘methodological nationalism’ as such a theory always reifies a nationalist’s conception of the nation-state. Instead, he proposes that research should theorise
and study cosmopolitanism as contingent on the social contexts in which it emerges.

Cosmopolitanism research has also been critiqued for its tendency to normalise frameworks that distinguish how cosmopolitanism is and can be practised (Harvey, 2000; Skey, 2012). This has been especially prevalent in moral and political theories that propose the idea that an ethical obligation to humanity must override local and parochial interests (e.g. see Nussbaum’s 1996 theory on concentric circles). These theories argue for an allegiance and responsibility to all cultures and individuals through an outlined set of universal guidelines in which an ‘ethical’ and ‘moral’ subject has been constructed through a ‘Western’ vision of the world. These theories quite often take a normative stance on what it means to practise ‘openness’, ‘responsibility’ and ‘solidarity’ in such analyses (Skey, 2012). Rather than practising an openness to the Other, these normative theoretical frameworks are arguably governing practices. They close off and silence other modes of understanding our social worlds and the ways that practices of openness, responsibility and solidarity may emerge differently in particular social contexts. Moreover, these normative approaches fail to recognise that people’s engagement with globalised entities and the Other may produce practices that are counter to the cosmopolitan practices they advocate. As Rizvi and Beech (2017, p. 126) note, people’s relations to globalised entities have, in some cases, ‘given rise to high levels of anxiety, creating a space in which xenophobic and nativist politics potentially thrive’. These normative frameworks are continually contested in relation to their form and structure and have led to rhetoric about cosmopolitanism’s value in accommodating Others whose views are marginalised in political processes, such as the views and voices of youth.

A material and embodied social theory of cosmopolitanism

In the following, I address the problems associated with cosmopolitanism as outlined in the previous discussion by focusing on the materiality and embodied dimensions of youth’s place-making practices as key concerns for understanding their cosmopolitan subjectivities and practices. Youth’s cosmopolitan practices always take place in relation to somewhere. The ways youth understand and make place is therefore central in my understanding of the ways youth make connections
with and ground globalised entities in their everyday social lives. Place-making is 
conceptualised as the ways youth constitute their cosmopolitan practices through 
their relations to different places and their mobile practices that make such relations 
possible. Moving away from abstract notions of the ‘global’, I use Massey’s (2005) 
concept of a ‘global sense of place’ to argue that youth’s place-making practices are 
always contingent on their relations to other places beyond their imagined and 
geographical borders and the intersecting social spaces involved in their making.

Youth’s relations to globalised entities do not occur through the mediation of an 
abstract ‘global’ space that exists out there, but through their direct and embodied 
relations to material things, ideas and people that take place somewhere. How 
youth come to know the world and be cosmopolitan is therefore not only through 
their relations to representations and images of the world, but through their lived 
and embodied engagement with place (Germann Molz, 2006). For example, a 
discursive approach to understanding youth’s cosmopolitan practices would involve 
analysing how places are made and cosmopolitan subjectivities are shaped by 
drawing on discourses, or large bodies of knowledge that govern the ‘thinking’ body 
in terms of what is possible to say and represent about the Other and their world. 
Although making an extensive contribution to the field of cosmopolitanism, this 
approach only addresses the ways in which the ‘global’ is represented and limits the 
production of youth’s cosmopolitan practices to what can be thought. In reviewing 
the absence of the body and materiality in cosmopolitan research, McSorley (2013, 
pp. 207–208) asserts that:

any predominantly individualistic understanding of cosmopolitanism as a 
state of mind may undertheorise the crucial embodied, felt and unconscious 
intensities of belonging, and the social and processual dimensions to the 
emergence of such loyalties and dispositions. The model of subjectivity 
IMPLIED in such conceptions is overly static, Cartesian and self-aware.

This dearth in cosmopolitan research was a major factor in enlivening my search for 
new approaches to the study of cosmopolitanism that moved beyond discursive and 
abstract theoretical frameworks. It called for research based on addressing the 
neglect of the body and materialities driven by Cartesian-based frameworks that 
work within object/subject, culture/nature, body/mind binaries, such as those found 
in Kantian and moral formulations of cosmopolitanism, and those that are based on
abstract notions of the global. Support may be drawn from Harrison (2000, p. 507), who refers to the way such theorisations ‘tend towards either a search for objectivity in attempting to match up our mental representations with reality or accepting social constructivism’s idealisation of language’. Harrison highlights the fact that theories based on a purely discursive understanding of social life do not account for the way the ‘feeling’ body might also provide a space in which we come to know the Other and become cosmopolitan.

My emphasis on materiality and embodiment allows me to conceptualise young people’s cosmopolitan practices as contingent on the places and social contexts in which they emerge. My theorisation of cosmopolitanism takes its lead from Germann Molz’s (2006, p. 1) question: ‘How might we think of this world citizen, not just as a political or cultural figure of global allegiance, but also as an embodied subject with a corporeal disposition toward the world as a whole?’. To conceptualise the materiality and embodied dimensions of youth’s cosmopolitan practices, I engage with non-representational (Anderson, 2009; Harrison, 2000; Thrift, 1999) and new materialist theorising (Barad, 2003, 2007, 2008; Mazzei, 2011). I argue for an epistemological and ontological shift in understanding cosmopolitanism and propose that there is ‘more than’ the power of discourse or the ‘thinking’ body in the making of youth’s social worlds. I specifically draw from these paradigms as they re-centre the body, place, affect and matter as agentic in forging new ways of being and becoming cosmopolitan. In the context of this thesis, these are the potentials of what regularly ‘unseen’ bodily practices such as sensing, feeling, moving and dwelling in place ‘do’ in relation to shaping and constituting youth’s place-making practices. These ‘unseen’ bodily practices are commonly referred to as the ‘affective’ dimensions of social life, the ways bodies’ relations to entities are ‘lived’ through the sensate (Harrison, 2000).

Harrison (2000, p. 498) notes that ‘[c]onsidering the unseen in the everyday involves more than just epistemological consideration, but an awareness of the performed manners of everyday life as ontological’. In aligning with this ontological stance, I adopt a sensibility to the background ‘hum’ of the classroom: entanglements of bodies, globalised objects, learning activities and materials, and corporeal practices all have a role in youth’s emergent place-making. In examining the ‘unseen’ social practices of youth in my thesis, I argue that youth’s cosmopolitan
practices are also emergent from the body's relations and affect. As such, youth's possibilities to produce certain social imaginaries in relation to how they constitute cosmopolitan practices also manifest through the bodies' connections. This retheorisation also involves a scaling down of youth's relations to globalised entities in the everyday. It demands an ethological approach that maps and traces the bodies' connections to globalised entities within assemblages of time, space and matter in which youth's 'cosmopolitan' practices in the everyday emerge.

I also show the ways globalised entities are performative in their materiality in constituting youth’s place-making and cosmopolitan practices. Barad’s (2003) theory of a ‘performative metaphysics’ is pertinent in addressing this aim as it gives equal weighting to the material aspects of youth’s cosmopolitan practices. By drawing from Barad’s theory, I argue that globalised matter doesn’t exist in place as a static entity, but rather it is reconfigured as agentic and takes place in youth’s social worlds. I therefore argue that matter (including bodily matter) ‘does’ things in youth’s place-making practices.

By adopting Barad’s (2003) theory of a performative metaphysics, I have also addressed issues related to the separation of the thinking and material body in my analysis of youth’s cosmopolitan practices. Barad (2007) argues, for example, that material and discursive practices fold in on each other or ‘iteratively intra-act’ to produce our subjective understanding. This is established through the argument that discourses are not understood as replicated or taken up, but are material as they produce affects and ‘do’ things. As such, social practices cannot be separated as either discursive or material, but are rather understood as ‘material-discursive’. Thus, the unit of analysis in my thesis is not matter or discourse as isolated points of production, but the multiplicity of intra-actions of material-discursive practices in phenomena that constitute youth’s place-making and cosmopolitan practices.

In arguing that my theorisation of cosmopolitanism is not based on a reified view of space and place, but is contingent on entanglements of material-discursive practices, conceptualising the way time is implicated in youth’s cosmopolitan practices is also relevant to my study. The temporal is used in my study to theorise the material-discursive practices in specific social contexts that forge youth’s
cosmopolitan practices. Skey (2012, p. 475) argues that it is important ‘to ask at
which moment(s) do people exhibit a more open attitude towards others and/or
participate in activities that involve different cultural groups or forms’. By addressing
the temporal (the when) in my analysis of youth’s cosmopolitan practices, I identify
and map how certain practices and relations come to matter in very specific social
contexts and places.

From these above theoretical standpoints and arguments, the project has two
overarching aims:

1) To show how youth’s and globalised entities intra-actions constitute their
place-making practices.
2) To show how youth’s cosmopolitan practices are entangled in and
emergent from these practices.

These aims are formulated from the onto-epistemological framework of performative
metaphysics of Barad (2003) and the ontological and epistemological foundations
put forward on body–place relations by non-representational theorists, such as

In my study I engaged in research with 20 youth participants between the ages of
16 and 17 from a co-educational performing arts high school in a major city in New
South Wales, Australia. The interview questions derived from the above-mentioned
principal aims were explored using in-situ interviews, group discussions,
observations, visual representations/process diaries and video essays. In
formulating these methods and questions, I created a space in which youth’s
dissenting and alternative voices could be heard regarding how globalised entities
are entangled in their everyday place-making and cosmopolitan practices.

Overall structure of the thesis

There is an overarching theme of youth’s past, present and future place-making
practices in the way I structure my thesis. This is by no means leading to or
representing a linear structure to youth’s social worlds, but highlights the
intersections of times, spaces and matter that are entangled in the ways youth understand themselves, Others and the world.

I begin Chapter 2 by conceptualising the global processes that are increasingly shaping the lives of youth and youth education in a global era. I delineate past theorisations of cosmopolitanism and global social theories, highlighting my shift from a normative understanding of cosmopolitanism and the global processes related to its constitution, towards a research paradigm based on a pluralist, practice-based understanding of cosmopolitanism and place-making. I also conceptualise the social and global imaginary as both discursive and embodied. My position on space and place is also elaborated on in this chapter by drawing from the work of Lefebvre (1991) and his 'spatial trialectic' and the work of Doreen Massey (2005) and her theory of a 'global sense of place'. I then outline the way I conceptualise the cosmopolitan practices of youth as a ‘becoming’ by drawing on Deleuze and Guattari’s (2002) concepts of the ‘Body without Organs’ and the ‘assemblage’. I also conceptualise cosmopolitan practices as embodied and constituted through the affects produced by body–place relations. To do this, I draw upon major contributors in literature based on the concept of affect, such as Massumi (2002), and on work in ‘non-representational theory’ by Thrift (1999), Harrison (2000) and Anderson (2009). I then elaborate on how I address problems associated with the dualism between ‘matter’ and ‘discourse’ in my theorisation of the body by adopting the materialist approach of Karen Barad (2003, 2007). I also outline how the way youth constitute their understanding of self, Other and world is through their situated material and embodied practices. The chapter concludes with an overall summary of the theory to understand globalisation, cosmopolitanism and place-making as the foundational ideas of the thesis.

In Chapter 3 I outline the methodological considerations of the thesis, emphasising a focus on non-representational methods based on the production of data through the participants’ and the researcher’s place-making and bodily practices. I argue that, in conjunction with observational and discussion-based methods, visual-based methods are useful in producing a space and place in which youth engage in practices of place-making. I also outline a ‘flattened’ onto-epistemological approach to knowledge production that centres the body and provides equal weighting to the agency of the materialities in youth’s social lives. This ‘flattened’ approach is
influenced by the work of Barad (2003, 2007). I elaborate on how each individual empirical chapter of the thesis has been produced and read through multiple ‘apparatuses’ (e.g. place-making, the body, affect) to highlight the contingent nature of my analysis and the ‘reading’ of youth’s cosmopolitan practices. I finish the chapter by outlining my analytical strategies and the ways in which they are influenced by the work of Skey (2012), Thrift (1999) and Barad (2007).

As the first of four empirical chapters, Chapter 4 examines the ways youth constitute their understandings of a shared humanity and a ‘global’ space through their relations to globalised entities. I ground youth’s production of a shared humanity and ‘global’ space in the ‘everyday’ material-discursive practices that take place in their classroom, homes and hometowns. This grounding also includes the ways youth’s embodied relations to these globalities and places forge a sense and understanding of the world as a whole and the practices they share with the Other. I argue that youth’s ideas about a shared humanity and forging of a ‘global’ space are produced through their grounded and embodied intra-actions with globalised things, ideas, and bodies that take place in the ‘everyday’. I also argue that there is the interplay of spatial imaginaries such as the local, national and global imaginary in the co-constitutive material-discursive practices that forge youth’s understandings about their own and the Other’s position in the world and the ways these shape youth’s cosmopolitan practices.

In Chapter 5 I am primarily concerned with the lived dimensions of youth’s body–place relations and what affects ‘do’ in youth’s subjective understanding of themselves, Others and the world. I address how youth’s analysis of the affective intensities emergent from their relations to the Other and place, or what Dawney (2013) would refer to as the ‘oscillation’ between the pre-subjective and subjective, fold in on their cosmopolitan ‘moments’. The driving argument in this chapter is that we need to pay more attention to the ways youth analyse and articulate how their bodies affect and are affected through their relations with globalised Others and places. I argue that in some cases there is a tension or ‘gap’ between what youth feel or how they forge a ‘sense’ of place and the ways they read and mediate such intensities through liberal cosmopolitan practices (Germann Molz, 2017). I show that the ways youth analyse these affects might be in relation to their inadequate analytical vocabularies and liberal cosmopolitan practices that limit youth’s
understandings of what it means to be a ‘good’ and ‘responsible’ global citizen. I argue that in some cases the emergent affects from youth’s discussions about their experience with difference can provide a space to critically engage with the political and historical spaces in which such social inequalities are produced.

In Chapter 6 I adopt a ‘flattened’ logic to analyse the material and sensual dimensions of youth’s cosmopolitan practices (MacLure, 2013). I do this by drawing from Manning’s (2013) concept of the ‘objectile’ to direct attention towards the agency and ‘thing-power’ of globalised objects in youth’s body–place relations. I show how body–object intra-actions and their emergent affects provide a space for the production of more ethical and open cosmopolitan practices. Furthermore, I show how these objects produce affects in their relation to the body and how these affects get folded in on their cosmopolitan practices by changing what bodies can ‘do’ and become in relation to being ‘cosmopolitan’. Making a theoretical contribution, I argue that youth’s cosmopolitan practices aren’t necessarily purely discursive and humanist phenomena that are thought into existence, but that matter makes itself intelligible to us by the way it becomes entangled and intra-acts with different spaces and time in youth’s place-making and therefore has agency and power in the making of youth’s cosmopolitan practices.

In the last empirical chapter, Chapter 7, I examine youth’s future cosmopolitan practices in relation to the ways they make place. These cosmopolitan practices are those emergent from the ways the youth in my study discussed and (re)presented in their interviews, video essays and process diaries the places they wish to travel to, work, and live in their future. I analyse how their place-making practices provide a space in which certain mobile and cosmopolitan practices are made possible (or in some cases not possible). I argue that the youth’s place-making and cosmopolitan practices in these (re)presentations are related to their subjective understandings of ‘progress’ and ‘happiness’. I posit that their subjective understandings of ‘progress’ and ‘happiness’ are also based on constituting practices of self-management of their futures and careers in relation to the global knowledge economy. In this chapter, I also (re)present the ways youth are constituting cosmopolitan or preparatory practices of ‘fitting-in’ based on their grounded understandings of the destinations and places they wish to travel to (Germann Molz, 2006). I argue that youth’s cosmopolitan practices of ‘fitting-in’ are not only being constructed as a means of
demonstrating their flexibility, adaptability, and a sensitivity towards the Other, but to maintain a sense of security in their experiences with difference. I also problematise the ways positive connotations of cosmopolitanism and mobility normalised in the classroom and my study may be implicated in silencing youth that have alternative imaginaries of their future. I conclude the chapter by arguing that youth’s future cosmopolitan practices resemble and align with the ways they have been positioned in Australian educational policy and neoliberal ideals commonly advocated by education institutions and a globalised workforce.

In the last chapter of the thesis, Chapter 8, I discuss the implications of the thesis. To do this, I discuss the utility of non-representational and new materialist theories for addressing the core philosophical and sociological problems associated with studying cosmopolitanism empirically. I also discuss the undoing of my own subjectivity in this research project. Drawing from Somerville’s (2007 p. 323) concept of ‘post-modern emergence’, I engage with the way my own subjectivity has shifted through my research project and how this has re-shaped my engagements with the research landscape and youth’s cosmopolitan practices. I conclude this chapter by discussing the broader utility of an emergent place-based approach to cosmopolitanism for investigating cosmopolitan spaces and places in the classroom. This also includes addressing how such an approach to the study of cosmopolitanism and youth’s context-dependent cosmopolitan and place-making practices could be drawn upon in educational policy.

The overall aim of this thesis is to adopt non-representational and new materialist approaches to study intra-actions between youth and globalised entities and the ways such intra-actions constitute their everyday cosmopolitan practices. In these chapters, I address how data production is a lived experience of youth’s making of place and constitutive of the ways youth’s cosmopolitan practices emerge and get remade in the research. These lived experiences of data production are not understood as purely discursive practices, but also include the materiality and affects emergent from youth’s relation to place. In (re)presenting these affects and materialities as entangled in youth’s emplaced material-discursive practices, I draw attention to the possibilities of what the body can ‘do’ and become in terms of being cosmopolitan and distance myself from the universalising and abstract frameworks associated with normative forms of cosmopolitanism.
Chapter 2: Cosmopolitanism and the constitution of space and place in a ‘global’ era

Introduction

This chapter provides the theoretical framework for the thesis. As one of its broader aims, this research project strives to illuminate the ways in which youth’s social practices are co-constituted by their everyday relations to globalised entities that traverse the world. It discusses questions based on the way youth forge their understandings of I (we), the Other (otherness) and the world in relation to such globalised entities. More specifically, it addresses how their cosmopolitan practices shape the way individuals, and groups of individuals, view and experience the world (Appadurai, 1996; Delanty, 2006, p. 42). It therefore aims to illuminate the relation between the constitution of youth’s social imaginaries and the ways youth constitute and deploy their cosmopolitan practices.

This theoretical chapter is organised into six main sections. First, I situate my research within a particular understanding of globalisation that emphasises the banality and everyday nature of youth’s relations to globalised entities. Second, I briefly explicate and critique notions of cosmopolitanism to identify variations and contestations of its conceptions. Third, I draw primarily from the work of Delanty (2006, 2014), Beck (2006), Eisenstadt (2003) and Appadurai (1996) on multiple and alternative modernities to demonstrate how my thesis extends itself in a different direction from universalistic understandings of modernisation and cosmopolitanism. I relate these alternative notions of modernity to the development of an emergent place-based theory of cosmopolitanism whereby the constitution of cosmopolitan practices is understood as taking place through youth’s relations to assemblages of knowledge, symbols, material objects and the different appropriations of modernity brought forward by processes of globalisation and other defined mobilities (Delanty, 2006). Fourth, the chapter discusses theories of space and place from the work of Lefebvre (1991), Massey (2005) and Casey (2001) and relates the production of
space and place to the ‘discursivities, socialities and materialities’ (Pugalis, 2009, p. 81) evident in these assemblages of mobilities and banal forms of globalism and the ways in which these assemblages constitute new spaces that enact youth’s cosmopolitan practices. Fifth, I draw from the work of Deleuze and Guattari (2002) and non-representational theory to conceptualise the body and the affective dimensions of youth’s social lives as a part of the assemblage that constitutes their cosmopolitan practices. Sixth, I draw from Barad’s (2003) theory of performative metaphysics to theorise a flattened approach in relation to an evenly distributed agency between discursive and material (including bodily matter) practices in youth’s cosmopolitan becomings. The chapter concludes with an overall summary of the theoretical foundations of the thesis.

‘Globalisation’: ‘Banal’ globalised entities in the co-construction of youth’s social and global imaginaries

The first characteristic of research on the conception of cosmopolitanism is that it is a contested term and is highly multidimensional. In addition, although ‘modern’ reconceptualisations of cosmopolitanism are somewhat related and a reaction to theories of globalisation, they are by no means the same in terms of conceptual and theoretical origins. Globalisation’s role in the re-emergence of cosmopolitanism is based on the fact that it forms, as Held (1991, p. 145) states, a ‘chronic intensification of patterns of interconnectedness mediated by such phenomena as the modern communications industry and new information technology’. Or, from the more critical functionalist perspective of Wallerstein (1974 cited in Olssen, 2002 p.4), globalisation is understood differently to cosmopolitanism ‘as patterns of interaction and communication typically cross-cut national boundaries, so the cultural identities traditionally defined within these boundaries are increasingly undercut’.

The ‘globalisation paradigm’ that I adopt in this work is grounded in Urry’s (2000) definition; it can be taken for granted ‘that the media (and other) industries increasingly involve globally interlocking patterns [assemblages] of ownership and control, that there are multiple new forms of “global governance”, that there is the proliferation of “global” images and brands circulating across much of the world (from Coca-Cola to Greenpeace) and that the global level is partially self-organising’.
(cited in Szerszynski & Urry, 2002, pp. 463–464). The ‘global’ does not denote one whole entire space, but a fluidity and plurality in its ‘different spatial principles of connectedness’ (Blok, 2010). Globalisation has provided – through assemblages of practices/mobilities in the form of, for example, the internet, transport, travel and popular media – spaces in which relations to the Other and other cultural models are intensified. This intensification of such mobilities necessitates cosmopolitanism in the form of acknowledgement, negotiation, mediation and reflexivity of the individual or group that is encompassed in these relations (Delanty, 2006; Elliott & Urry, 2010).

One particular difference between cosmopolitanism and globalisation, noted in the work of Beck and Sznaider (2006, p. 9), for example, is that ‘globalisation is something taking place “out there” and cosmopolitanization happens “from within”’. What is meant by this statement is that the individual, whether from Australia, Japan or Canada, is responsible for living an interrelated and interconnected life as well as regulating the intensification of such relations. The role of globalisation in such processes is primarily based on its function in providing resources of mobility through such things as the media and other telecommunication networks. Beck and Sznaider (2006) further argue that the boundaries so commonly addressed in the expansion of globalisation have little relevance to cosmopolitanism. Globalisation, if understood in this way, proposes that space and time compression has emphasised the relationship between the local and global and the mediation of the contrasting conceptions of cosmopolitanism within a particular locality, rather than a universal understanding of its function. These mediations have been discussed in terms of the emergent particularities of cosmopolitanism within what has been described in some research as a ‘global public’ (e.g. see Appadurai, 1996 and Appiah, 2010).

These global shifts are referred to in this thesis as both mobilities and banal globalism. Stemming from Billig’s (1995) work on banal nationalism, these forms of globalisation refer to those symbols/objects/discourses in the global context that become so platitudinous they become commonplace in our understandings of reality. These forms of globalisation belong to the mediums that have the ability to shape what Sobe and Fischer (2009, p. 6), by building on Appadurai’s work, would refer to as ‘world generating optics’. Giddens (1994, p. 84 cited in Sobe & Fischer, 2009) has explained that these global forms have the capacity for both decontextualisation and recontextualisation at the local level and are valorised by
‘impersonal principles, which can be set out and developed without regard to context’. These symbols/objects do not just exist ‘out there’, but are given sense through their relationship with and their ‘groundedness’ in the local (Massey, 2005), or as Thurlow-Jarkowski (2011, p. 4) states, ‘each and every communicative act, whether verbal or nonverbal, is bounded and reflexively configured or mediated by other semiotic structures of the environment’. Therefore, I am not just interested in their movement from one destination to another, but in the ways in which individual and formal institutions in specific settings enact and appropriate ideas of the global.

Szerszynski and Urry (2006) discuss the idea of ‘banal globalism’ in terms of the way it is produced through the numerous symbols and narratives that are evident in the media and popular culture, as well as its role in expanding people’s awareness about the world and how they compare locales. Specifically, they refer to visuality and mobility in the transformative process of becoming a cosmopolitan citizen. They propose that a culture of cosmopolitanism results from a transformation of vision conditioned through the multiple forms of mobility individuals encounter. Szerszynski and Urry (2006) identify three forms of mobility as important in this transformation process. First, physical travel: travelling has become both cheaper and easier due to its popularity, the reduction of time in travel and increased levels of immigration. Second, imaginative travel: we are seduced by images of faraway destinations and cultures on television and other media networks. Third, virtual travel: this is made possible through communication technologies that connect people across the world. Banal globalisms are examples of mediations between real and imagined spaces. In other words, banal globalism reorganises relations between people, time and space, constitutes intensities and decontextualises or recontextualises events. Therefore, banal globalisms play a part in constituting global imaginaries that shape the cosmopolitan subjectivities that individuals practise. What is most emphasised in using the word ‘banal’ is that these subjectivities are present and taken up in the everyday practices of youth.

For example, banal global images of faraway places can be experienced and mediated on a drive home via work on billboards and at bus stops, or images of a child looking down at a globe placed in their hands, on flyers that are conjuring up support for international charity appeals. It is through these everyday practices that the global imaginaries become materialised and it is the ‘reading’ of cosmopolitan
subjectivities through these ‘banal’ practices that shape the cosmopolitan gaze. Banal globalism is an example of how mobilities, whether physical, virtual, imaginative or communicative, enter into the constitution of self (Elliot & Urry, 2010). As Elliott and Urry (2010, p. 13) note, ‘the social structure of human agency [care of self] and individual life is substantially and increasingly constituted through systems of movement’. These mobilities affect relations between home, family life and social life and have the ability to construct assemblages in processes of self-constitution and of youth developing relations to entities that traverse the world.

**Theorising cosmopolitanism: Addressing empirical problems associated with theories based on universals and binaries**

Several new and contrasting conceptions of cosmopolitanism and global citizenry emerged in the social sciences at the beginning of the 21st century. For example, cosmopolitanism has been theorised as a moral outlook, political/legal framework, critical theory and methodological framework. Historically based and conceived through Ancient Greek philosophical thought and then appropriated and politicised during the Enlightenment in the work of Immanuel Kant, earlier conceptions of cosmopolitanism emphasised the role and development of the autonomous actor in maintaining and ensuring a universal moral order. In some cases, these ideas have been appropriated in the works of contemporary theorists, especially in the theorisation of political and legal forms of cosmopolitanism. Other contemporary theorists, such as Delanty (2006), Appiah (2010) and Appadurai (1996), argue that rather than understanding cosmopolitanism under Western universalistic idioms of the concept, we must see it as a process/practice of mediation in which humans reflect on the vast array of cultural models that make up this world. It is this approach that this thesis primarily engages with and is influenced by.

Recent theorists of cosmopolitanism such as Bromley (2009), Delanty (2006), Falk (1994) and Parekh (2003) urge researchers to take the concept of cosmopolitanism seriously. They argue that cosmopolitanism has the utility to transform our thinking in terms of the broader implications of universalistic conceptions prevalent in the concept’s political and moral forms; cosmopolitanism’s possible application as a methodology; and the importance of developing a spatial analytic in the construction of such conceptions. I begin by introducing cosmopolitanism as a concept and outlining some of the debates over its theorisation. I primarily draw from and problematise theories of cosmopolitanism.
based on political and legal frameworks that are grounded in earlier classical liberal thought. These theorisations emphasise in their modern incarnations that the nation-state is limited in governing acts outside a nation’s political arena. I then introduce theories based on moral and cultural understandings of cosmopolitanism that demonstrate the problems that arise from the universalistic and depoliticised nature of their theorisations. My discussion concludes by outlining how this thesis wishes to extend in a different direction, from universalistic understandings of modernisation and cosmopolitanism evident in political and moral forms of cosmopolitanism to an emergent place-based understanding of cosmopolitan practices.

Political/legal cosmopolitanism(s)

Political and legal theories of cosmopolitanism support the notion of universal principles of justice, human rights and the development of a global democratic society. They justify this notion by arguing that the nation-state has a limited capacity to govern processes brought about by globalisation, including political communication and processes that reflect a cosmopolitan outlook. Legal cosmopolitanism stems from earlier conceptions of liberal forms of cosmopolitanism, such as that of the early work of Immanuel Kant (1991) and his development of a cosmopolitanism based on the world order of republic states and ideas of a universal form of hospitality (Delanty, 2006). Liberal cosmopolitanism is therefore understood in this thesis as an ontology where equality is understood and operationalized as the given freedom and autonomous rights of the individual as the foundation of a global democratic order (Chandler, 2009).

The idea of ‘universal hospitality’ stemming from Kant’s work in *Perpetual Peace* (1991) is based on the idea that the Other must not be subjected to hostility on their arrival to another territory, but also that the Other on arrival must not expect conditions resembling that of a guest of the territory, but rather a reserved form of hospitality. Kant proposes a form of cosmopolitanism built on normative positivist principles of both rights and justice, a promise of freedom to the individual upheld through the replacement of power with the development of a cosmopolitan constitution and possibilities of an international civil society. Laws under the development of such a cosmopolitan constitution were suggested to come into fruition through the will of the individual and the free republican states would form
social contracts at an international level. This is reflected in Kant’s (1991, p. 30) statement that ‘[f]reedom (independence from being constrained by another’s choice), insofar as it coexists with the freedom of every other in accordance with a universal law, is the only original belonging to every man by virtue of his humanity’.

Two scholars who draw from aspects of this notion, Held (2004) and Falk (1994), have argued that the national boundaries that determined what was politically relevant or irrelevant previously have been eroding. They argue that what is emerging from this erosion is a moral and political disposition that is based on a liberal order and a number of universal global principles in relation to human rights and democratic values that in turn act as a moral and ethical guide for a global democratic society. Many theorists, including Held (1995), deem the capacity of the state no longer sufficient to govern global acts and processes brought forward by globalisation and propose that political capacity has to be established on a much larger global level. Also referred to by Grande (2006, p. 94) as a form of ‘cosmopolitics’, much literature has set about establishing normative cosmopolitan principles to separate their definitions from that of internationalism. For example, Held (2003, p. 473) states that cosmopolitanism implies ‘an ethical and political space which sets out the terms of reference for the recognition of people’s equal moral worth, their active agency and what is essential for their autonomy and development; it seeks to recognize, affirm and nurture human agency, and to build on principles that all could assent to’. Held (2003, p. 473) proposes, however, that these principles are enacted through individual agency rather than cultural models, establishing them through an individual’s capacity ‘to reason self-consciously, to be reflective and to be self-determining’. These resonate with the liberal sentiments of Kant’s justification for a cosmopolitan constitution, a principle and a promise of autonomy for the individual.

Habermas (1998) acknowledges cosmopolitanism’s role in the development of a binding international law based on worldwide political communication and argues for the expansion of a world public sphere. Grounded in a liberal ontology and leading on from Kant (1991) and his idea of cosmopolitanism acting as a form of ‘universal hospitality’, Habermas proposes the establishment of a supranational institution with the power to legislate and enforce at a global level. He supports the possible transformation of preexisting transnational organisations, such as the United
Nations, through the development of legislation that seeks to formally guarantee cosmopolitanism (Delanty, 2006). However, Habermas (1998) grants that such moves may present difficulties within these institutions due to the pre-existent power struggles at a world-order level.

Fine (2007, p. 2) expands on this idea by stating that cosmopolitanism as both a concept and methodological lens has the potential to extend ‘the reach’ of pre-existent international law over issues concerning state sovereignty. Fine argues that we reevaluate the normative value of a national lens and methodology when addressing issues of social justice and other social phenomena beyond the scope of the nation. Fine’s argument encompasses three streams of thought that echo the work of Anderson and his work titled *Imagined Communities* (1991). First, that the sovereign state is a product of historical forces. Second, a national consciousness is not a permanent feature of the human condition and is, in fact, constructed. Third, with this being the case, the national consciousness can be surpassed when it is no longer relevant for the individual and social group and, as a result, the unit of analysis of such global social phenomena should move as well. As Fine (2007, p. 454) states: ‘We must free ourselves from a conceptual world that no longer exists by overcoming categories of understanding and standards of judgment that depend on a national framework.’ This idea, however, assumes a bounded and fixed understanding of the national and does not figure in how global processes and economic cosmopolitanism play a role in producing such national constructions and vice versa.

Parekh (2003) rejects the concept of global citizenry and the associated strength that members of a ‘global public’ have in enacting principles of social justice and human rights. He proposes that a globally oriented national citizenship could be further developed and adopted to resolve conflict caused by opposing obligations – those of our fellow nationals on the one hand and those of individuals within the global sphere. Parekh (2003, p. 7) states:

> We then have both general and special duties, the former owed to all human beings, the latter to some of them. The two sets of duties have different sources, common humanity or equal worth of all humans in one case and special ties in the other. Although these two sources are related, they are
Parekh notes how our perspectives in terms of what it means to be a dutiful citizen within a local and immediate context is very different to our general and less pertinent idea of equality for citizens elsewhere. He discusses our duties to global citizens as a form of awareness rather than an idea of belonging to a community on a global level. Brownlie (2001, p. 2) similarly puts forward this idea by stating:

Global citizenship is more than learning about seemingly complex 'global issues' such as sustainable development, conflict and international trade – important as these are. It is also about the global dimension to local issues, which are present in all our lives, localities and communities.

This notion highlights the role of global citizenship in mediating global events and their effects on spatial imaginaries of nation, community and individual. The problems that arise in political and legal forms of cosmopolitanism are therefore based on the distribution of power and agency in the formation of governing practices. For example, Mignolo (2000) questions the virtue of a cosmopolitanism based on universal rights that operate in a top–down governance model as they undermine cosmopolitanism’s claim of being open to other cultures and do not account for the uneven power geometries of neoliberal globalisation. He forwards a critical approach to cosmopolitanism that engages with the political dimensions of universal claims and frameworks.

The above theorisations of cosmopolitanism are based on the idea and possibility of legal-based cosmopolitan citizenship and an overarching global constitution in the governance of global affairs. The problems associated with liberal legal and political forms of cosmopolitanism derive from the recognition of uneven power geometries that guide such forms of cosmopolitan governance. For example, problems arise when trying to construct and legitimise global governance structures beyond the nation-state. Decisions made about how and by whom these changes are made and implemented therefore undermine the openness to alternative ways of viewing the world and thus the ideals of cosmopolitanism that such governing bodies are trying to advocate in the first place. This is because this cosmopolitanism involves the formation of 'global' political institutions that govern and impose change. As
Chandler (2009 p. 62) has argued, liberal cosmopolitanism is based on the workings of power:

For liberal cosmopolitans, the existence of rights (law) prior to and independently of political subjects is held to legitimize regimes of international intervention and regulation, while for poststructuralists the autonomy of law is read as the autonomy of power to interpolate and create the ruled subject. In both frameworks, by theoretical construction, there is no longer a distinction between the citizen and the non-citizen as rights claims are merely a reflection of the claims of rule made by (benign or oppressive) power.

Therefore, as Chandler has noted, the liberty (in most cases) of the nation-state and the groups and individuals that are subject to global governance will be limited rather than extended. Such governance would result in some voices being heard and alternative understandings of the world silenced. Moving on from the role of a cosmopolitan constitution in the governance of global matters, I will now explicate theories that propose that cosmopolitanism should be based on the idea that an individual’s moral responsibility for humanity exceeds their local responsibilities – what has been referred to as moral cosmopolitanism.

Moral cosmopolitanism(s)

In this section, I address the problems associated with moral forms of cosmopolitanism. Moral theorisations of cosmopolitanism emphasise the role of reflexivity and the socio-cultural context in the shaping of the moral contours of an individual in terms of their obligations to the Other and humanity. I will discuss two advocates of moral cosmopolitanism, Nussbaum (1996) and Pogge (2002). I will then briefly engage with Hannerz (1990) and Sanahuja and Ghia’s (2015) critique of moral cosmopolitanism to identify its limitations.

One of the representatives of this stream of cosmopolitanism and who has argued for what has been termed a ‘strong’ (Miller, 2002) form of moral cosmopolitanism is Nussbaum (1996). Nussbaum draws heavily from stoic notions of cosmopolitanism, based on the premise of liberal humanism. Nussbaum (1996) has described cosmopolitanism in terms of concentric circles that begin at the individual and then
extend to family, community, nation and finally the global Other. By developing these concentric circles Nussbaum emphasises the need to prioritise the outer global circle as she deems it as most important due to its recognition of universal principles of justice and human rights and presupposes an individual’s overall obligation to humanity. She argues that the global circle is at the point at which humanity reaches a universal ‘we’ and therefore a universal ‘us’. Nussbaum (1996, p. 8) continues: ‘the point is more radical still: that we should give our first moral allegiance to no mere form of government, no temporal power. We should give it instead to moral community made up by the humanity of all beings.’ She goes on (1996, p. 15) by noting that such an allegiance to humanity is a ‘lonely business’, explaining it as ‘a kind of exile – from the comfort of local truths, from the warm, nestling feeling of patriotism, from the absorbing drama of pride in oneself and one’s own’. Movement between these concentric circles is believed to be something worked towards; therefore, as Fischer (2007) explains, Nussbaum sees cosmopolitanism as entailing isolation and abstraction, ‘a habit of mind’ of the individual.

In contrast to the normative frameworks in political forms of cosmopolitanism, this ‘imagined community’, according to Nussbaum (1996), extends everywhere and membership is based on one’s human state rather than based on the formation of a global political or legal framework in which membership can be gauged, controlled and conformed to within constructed territories. She also understands difference in terms of something to be accommodated and thus suggests a movement towards cultural pluralism.

Advocating what has been termed a ‘moderate’ form of moral cosmopolitanism, Pogge (1992) proposes three characteristics that define liberal and moral forms of cosmopolitanism (Miller, 2002). Pogge argues first, that our ‘special’ relationships, such as those with our local community and personal friends, may increase our moral obligations to them, but will or should not decrease what we owe to all humans. Unlike Nussbaum, he posits that although we do owe all humans recognition and have a moral obligation to them, the nature and distribution of this obligation may be very different or less to what we owe the people geographically closest to us. Second and similar to Nussbaum, he supports the notion that cosmopolitanism comes from within and is concerned with the individual and not
larger groups or separated communities. Third, cosmopolitanism in general can be applied and taken up by all. Although Pogge’s framework sets normative boundaries, its focus is on emphasising the moral dimensions of cosmopolitanism in relation to the ways such obligations are based on the dealings and the forms of relationships that develop between individuals.

In critiquing moral theorisations of cosmopolitanism, Hannerz (1990, p. 240) has described the latter as having ‘a narcissistic streak; the self is constructed in the space where cultures mirror one another’. He argues that reflexivity only occurs through the engagement of the Other and in relation to one’s socio-cultural context. Others, such as Sanahuja and Ghia (2015, p. 11) have similarly noted that ‘sometimes it seems that in order to become part of the cosmopolis it seems that every form of particularity or identity must be eliminated’. This point of view highlights the idea that a universal framework based on the equal treatment of all humans can’t account for all differences and cultural identities that make up this world. Sanahuja and Ghia (2015, p. 12) go on to point out, however, that ‘cosmopolitanism can point to the universal aim of equality and at the same time demand its realization locally’. They forward the idea that cosmopolitanism is possible if it understood and emergent from the location in which it is practised.

Moral cosmopolitanism is theorised in the above discourses as a conditioned habit of humanness and is viewed as necessary due to intensified global interconnectivities that highlight the point of the global in which all of humanity is viewed as a universal ‘we’. Drawing from liberal universal understandings of cosmopolitanism, the moral perspective also emphasises an individual’s obligation to maintaining a socially just humanity. The abstract understanding of the global in these theorisations does not consider the situated and contingent nature of cosmopolitanism and presumes that such intensified global interconnectivities are evenly accessed and lead to a natural obligation to a global Other. These theorisations also don’t account for the uneven power relations emergent from neoliberal globalisation, nor their function in constituting counter-practices in which xenophobic and racial divides might arise.
Unlike moral cosmopolitanism, cultural cosmopolitanism isn't necessarily concerned with our moral obligation to the Other. It is rather based on the cultural identity of the ‘self’ and cultural groups and its/their possibility of transformation. That is, cultural cosmopolitanism is based on the idea that the cosmopolitan person is open to their identity being fluid or hybridised through their relations to numerous cultural models and encounters with difference. For example, Nava (2007, p. 40) describes cultural cosmopolitanism as being about ‘the desire for merger with the other, about the desire to become different’. Below I discuss the work of both Scheffler (1999) and Waldron (2002) who put forward two particular forms of a universal and fluid cultural cosmopolitanism, and then the work of Appiah who advocates a ‘rooted’ form of cultural cosmopolitanism.

Supporting a cultural cosmopolitanism, Scheffler (1999, p. 256) is ‘opposed to any suggestion that individuals’ well-being or their identity or their capacity for effective human agency normally depends on their membership in a determinate cultural group whose boundaries are reasonably clear and whose stability and cohesion are reasonably secure’. Scheffler’s cultural cosmopolitanism emphasises an understanding of cultural identity that is fluid and ever-changing. Accordingly he argues that cosmopolitanism should be based on the transformation of identity through our relation to different cultural models. Scheffler (1999, p. 257) describes this as humans’ ‘remarkable capacity to forge new identities using materials from diverse cultural sources, and to flourish while so doing’. Scheffler argues that this fluidity is possible as it is demonstrated in the fact that humans can create culture in the first place. He also argues that between cultures (or in terms of representations of cultural groups) there are always shared practices and similarities between different cultures that are present because they became relevant to that culture over time. Scheffler’s theory of cultural cosmopolitanism therefore highlights the positive aspects of encountering difference, in that our cultural identities may be transformed; according to this view the protectionism of cultural identities should be discouraged.

Like Scheffler, Waldron (2000, p. 232) believes that most of the world’s population already live a cosmopolitan life, claiming that ‘cultural purity’ would have only been
possible through ‘historical contingency and extraordinary geographical isolation’. His understanding of cultural cosmopolitanism is therefore based on the nature and theorisation of culture itself. In his theorisation of culture, Waldron argues that the idea of an existent ‘pure’ culture is redundant because any attempt of an individual to immerse themselves in such a culture is a practice that would involve displacement from other cultural models and the world. It would therefore be deemed as a misleading practice that assumes ‘one’s surroundings epitomize what it is for a culture to really exist’. There are many arguments that deny this claim in terms of the possibility of an individual’s agency in countering such cosmopolitan practices and working against transformation and hybridisation.

Waldron (2000) also supports his position by addressing the question of what it means to be cosmopolitan. For Waldron, cosmopolitanism refers to the ways our cultural identities are transformed by the numerous cultural sources that make up our social contexts. As the below quote shows, Waldron (2000, p. 231) sees this transformation of identities in terms of our relations to major cosmopolitan cities, specifically drawing from the example of Manhattan.

A person who grows up in Manhattan, for example, cannot but be aware of a diversity of cultures, a diversity of human practices and experiences, indeed a diversity of languages clamouring for his attention. They are there on the streets, in Greenwich Village or on the Upper West Side. It is another matter whether we call this a single culture – ‘New York culture’ – a culture of diversity, or whether we say (as I think) that it is just many fragments that happen to be available at a given place and time and that that does not amount to the existence of a single culture in any socially or philosophically interesting sense of ‘singularity’.

While I disagree with Waldron’s thesis on the inevitability of cultural transformation, Waldron does draw attention to the increased possibility for such transformations to exist in relation to the nature in which places are produced and lived. Whether an individual’s access to cultural sources and mobility directly leads to the constitution of cosmopolitanism practices is debatable, especially if understood in the liberal sense of being open to the Other. For example, Skrbis, Kendall and Woodward (2004) argue that there is little evidence to suggest that an individual’s increased mobility necessarily leads to people enacting cosmopolitan practices. Accordingly, Waldron’s cultural cosmopolitanism is unlikely to account for nationalistic practices.
increasing in particular areas of the world (e.g. the United States of America and Australia) as a reaction to the increased flows and migration of people between countries.

A focus on the particularities of cultures rather than universal similarities between cultures are also emphasised in Waldron’s theorisation of cultural cosmopolitanism. Waldron (2000, pp. 231-232) notes:

When children in the United States have Guatemala Day at school, we do not want them all to make a special ceremony of wearing Levi jeans and drinking Coca-Cola, even if that is what Guatemalans in fact like to wear and drink. In that context, we have reason to highlight the differences between culture in Guatemala and Norteamericano culture. But the general view that it is distinctiveness that counts may be seriously mistaken if it is intended as a description of the consciousness of those who live in the communities in question or as a prescription about what respect for another culture ought essentially to involve.

By drawing from this very specific example, Waldron identifies that our moral obligation to the Other may in some contexts involve articulating the particularities of some cultures, but this also means evaluating the universalising effects of such a practice and the possibility of wrongly identifying or assigning such particularities to an individual’s cultural identity. Waldron identifies that the way we form our understandings of the Other should be contingent on the experiences we have with them and that the purpose of such articulations should not necessarily be the basis for the respect that the Other requires in such social contexts. He identifies the ways culture is difficult to define in certain contexts and the way that the voice of the Other is evidently needed to form our moral obligation and recognition of them.

Appiah (2010) extends this idea through the notion of ‘rooted cosmopolitanism’. Rooted cosmopolitanism is a cultural cosmopolitan approach and refers to how an individual’s memberships in family, local community and their nation-state are inextricably tied to the person’s roles and obligations within the global arena. Appiah refers to a person’s ability to pledge an allegiance to their own country and still understand their role in terms of global identities or universal values (he uses his own multiple global affiliations to demonstrate this). He also addresses the idea that without this sense of ethical duty or obligation to the local, a genuine sense of
ethical duty and belonging to the global public is highly improbable. What Appiah also demonstrates is that cultural models are mediated, appropriated and engaged with in a variety of ways. Some individual’s mediations are quite hegemonic in nature and move toward appropriation of the universal and others are conflicted and destabilise constructed hegemonies.

Cultural cosmopolitanism is based on the recognition of the fluid nature of cultural identities. The problems associated with cultural cosmopolitanism are its limited engagement with the political and moral dimensions of these transformations. Such dimensions are not thoroughly addressed in either Scheffler’s or Waldron’s cultural theories of cosmopolitanism. Such theorisations don’t, for example, account for the social inequality facilitated by the forced transformation of a culture or for the forfeiting of rights of those who do wish to maintain rather transform their cultural identities. Rather, they are based purely on supporting a notion of the naturally ‘fluid’ and thus cosmopolitan ‘self’, given its increased relations to different cultural models and sources. The agency of the individual is thus not sufficiently problematised in terms of its capacity to counter or work against such cultural models and sources to maintain their cultural identities. Moreover, an assumption that the majority world is already cosmopolitan, as developed in Waldron’s theorisation does little to secure the equal ‘worth’ or just recognition of the Other that moral and political theories emphasise. Nor does it address counter-transformations in which people enact practices that close themselves off and intentionally maintain rather than transform their cultural identity. Appiah’s ideas, based on a ‘rooted’ cultural cosmopolitanism, address this problem; rather than viewing such cultural transformation as inevitably leading to a more cosmopolitan life, he takes into account the different ways cultural models are mediated and understood within a local context. He also accounts for the possibility of such cultural models deconstructing universalising hegemonic practices.

Now that I have identified the limitations and problems associated with political, moral and cultural theorisations of cosmopolitanism, I will discuss how I have adopted and developed an emergent place-based approach to cosmopolitanism. I will also explain how I address the limitations of the above-mentioned theorisations of cosmopolitanism and account for the different types of cosmopolitan practices that have emerged from my research project.
An emergent place-based approach to cosmopolitanism

As shown in the three previous sections, conceptualisations of cosmopolitanism, similar to other Western notions of progress, such as development and intervention, have been understood as a governance project constructed under Western notions and rationales of equality, justice and belonging (Popkewitz, 2002). Cosmopolitanism under Western modernity is understood to function in one static way despite the different and quite contrasting cultural and social contexts that exist globally. As a means of addressing the problems associated with the empirical analysis of such universalist and normative theorisations of cosmopolitan, I adopt an emergent place-based approach to analyse youth’s cosmopolitan practices. In this section of the chapter, I elaborate on the theorisations of cosmopolitanism that influence my analytical approach, namely the work of Delanty (2006), Beck (2002), Pollock, Bhabha, Breckenridge and Chakrabarty (2000) and Skey (2012).

By drawing from the work of Delanty (2006), I adopt an alternative understanding of both cosmopolitanism and modernity. I do not view cosmopolitanism as being based on normative universal claims but rather as a practice emergent from the ways the youth in my study make place and the intersecting spaces involved in such place-making. This stance is influenced by Delanty’s (2006, p. 41) critical cosmopolitan social theory whereby ‘cosmopolitanism refers to the multiplicity of ways in which the social world is constructed in different modernities’. By drawing from elements of this theoretical framework, I aim to destabilise the universalistic idioms of both ‘cosmopolitanism’ and ‘modernity’ and propose cosmopolitanism as a practice that is emergent from the places and socio-spatial contexts in which it is entangled.

My emergent place-based approach to cosmopolitanism is also influenced by ideas developed in theories of multiple and alternative modernities (Eisenstadt, 2003). The thesis extends itself in a different direction from universalistic understandings of modernisation and cosmopolitanism and the cultural globalisation paradigm that assumes that globalisation works to produce one universal understanding of the world. The theory of multiple modernities suggests, for the most part, that the contemporary world is better understood through the continuous constitution and reconstitution of numerous cultural programs (Eisenstadt, 2003). Eisenstadt (2003),
for example, proposes that although modernity in its original form derived from the West and its early appropriations were quite hegemonic in nature, contrasting cultural histories around the world have in fact shaped several diverse understandings of modernity and thus cosmopolitanism. He describes modernity as a dialogue between Western understandings and the imaginaries constituted because of different cultural pasts.

Like Eisenstadt (2003), Appadurai (1996) describes modernity as being non-monolithic in nature and goes further to demonstrate how the phenomenon of globalisation has attributed to reflexive forms of modernity and increased the rate of reflexivity that is occurring. Appadurai (1996, p. 33) establishes that the diasporic global flows and ‘virtual neighborhoods’ evident in the multiple forms of globalisation are contributing to the formation of a number of diverse understandings of modernity and, moreover, are shaping and constituting new global imaginaries. Modernity is not viewed as moving from the West and taken up by individual nation-states one by one. It is being constituted and reconstituted in a world where processes of reflexivity are transforming identities and previously constructed imaginaries, such as that of the nation-state, are being remade by new relations between individuals and other global imaginaries.

Following Pollock et al. (2000), I also understand cosmopolitanism as practised rather than a concrete pronouncement derived from Western thought. Cosmopolitanism for Pollock does not exist in such binaries as the universal and the particular or the vernacular and cosmopolitan, which emphasise an ‘Either’/ ‘Or’ understanding of cosmopolitanism. Rather, Pollock proposes an ‘as well as’ or, as he states, an ‘And’ understanding of its existence. What is meant by Pollock is that a number of cosmopolitan actions took place, first, prior to the Western conception of cosmopolitanism and, second, in non-Western places. Therefore, its relationship to dominant Western understanding becomes irrelevant. Pollock’s critical historical analysis of cosmopolitanism and vernacularisation proposes that alternative understandings of cosmopolitanism must be given greater emphasis and thinking must depart from finite conceptions of cosmopolitanism of a coercive nature so we can gain a better understanding and more accurate representation of our social world and have a more open understanding of cosmopolitan practices.
Others, such as Beck (2002), refer to cosmopolitanism as a ‘dialogic imagination’ with the world. Beck (2002, p. 18) frames this as occurring only when the “internalized other” becomes problematized and does not align with other cultures, understandings and ways of life, and as a result forcibly enacts processes of comparison, reflection and multiple combinations of the uncertain’. Beck (2002, p. 20) views cosmopolitanism as an alternative imagination to that of the ‘monolithic national imagination’. Beck (2002, p. 20) asserts that the cosmopolitan perspective is:

an imagination of alternative ways of life and rationalities, which include the otherness of the other. It puts the negotiation of contradictory cultural experiences into the centre of activities: in the political, the economic, the scientific and the social.

Beck’s (2000) key term, ‘cosmopolitanization’, is based on his previous work; it encapsulates the idea of a ‘world risk society’ and conflict-based interaction whereby relations between individuals in global space are induced through difference, indifference and the multiple ‘moral life-worlds’ that exist in the global public. Beck’s understanding also differs to Delanty’s in terms of expressing and explaining the internalisation process when ‘becoming’ cosmopolitan. The ‘moment’ (as I will call it) of interaction and transformation is inextricably linked to globalisation and is referred to by Beck (2002, p. 28) as ‘internal globalization’. Delanty (2006) would understand this ‘internal globalization’ as the ‘differing cultural modes’ of mediation individuals practice to understand the Other and the world. Although this mediation is intensified by globalisation, the cosmopolitan practices of the individual are dependent and shaped by their own social and cultural context, and not necessarily directly linked or reduced to processes of globalisation.

Delanty (2014 p.386) also notes that cosmopolitanism ‘is a critique both of a vision of the world based on self-enclosed nations, and a vision of the world homogenized by globalization’. For Delanty (2014) cosmopolitanism exists in the enactment of critical practices that question a limited view of the world and the Other within a particular cultural context. Moving away from a Eurocentric understanding of cosmopolitanism, Delanty (2014) also asserts that such a critical practice would involve the recognition of different ‘world varieties’ of cosmopolitanism. This would not be in the sense of categorising particular cosmopolitan practices within
particular cultural classifications (e.g. Chinese, Japanese, South American) but to analyse the alternative cosmopolitan practices enacted in such cultural contexts. The main aim of analysing such world views for Delanty (2014 p.377) is to ‘understand the process by which cosmopolitanism emerges’ and is sustained. By conceptualising cosmopolitanism as a process and activity of critical analysis, reflexivity and comparison, Beck (2002) and Delanty (2014) provide a useful way to think about how cosmopolitan practices are fluid and evolving processes, rather than based on universal social categories.

Summarising cosmopolitanism

The theories discussed in this section and their identified problems have contributed to the development of a non-universalistic understanding of cosmopolitanism in my thesis in several ways. First, these theories support the notion that cosmopolitanism – similar to modernity – is constituted and reconstituted through material and discursive practices shaped and brought forward by both formal and banal forms of globalisation. Second, they assert that new global imaginaries are emerging through mobile practices whereby ‘virtual neighborhoods’ have opportunities to interact (Appadurai, 1996). Third, they assert a plurality of cosmopolitanism resultant of different cultures mirroring each other and in turn initiating a reflexivity concerning the Other and themselves in comparison to the Other. Fourth, they posit that cosmopolitanism should be viewed as a practice based on the equal treatment of the Other, but in relation to the structural inequalities in which it emerges. Lastly, the theories hold that cosmopolitanism and ‘cosmopolitanization’ occur locally and that these global imaginaries emerge because ‘locality is always emergent from the practices of local subjects in specific neighbourhoods’ (Appadurai, 1996, p. 198). Moreover, the theories posit that these new emerging social imaginaries are never complete because it is the relations among the different understandings of the world that constitute the ways in which modern identities deploy and engage in cosmopolitan practices (Appadurai, 1996).

My conceptualisation of cosmopolitanism takes in all the aspects and competing understandings of cosmopolitanism as it more broadly identifies how cosmopolitan practices/subjectivities/understandings are emergent and dependent on the socio-spatial and place contexts in which youth are situated (Delanty, 2006). Influenced by
this theorisation, I will destabilise the universalistic idioms present in legal and moral frameworks by adopting a situated and contingent place-based understanding of youth’s cosmopolitan practices (Skey, 2012). By concentrating on the banal social practices of youth I have shifted the onto-epistemological focus; I posit that youth’s emergent realities and cosmopolitan practices are not just reliant on adopting a cosmopolitan ‘lifestyle’ based on increased mobility, but they are also shaped by globalised entities that fold in on youth’s everyday and situated lives (Beck, 2004; Noble, 2009). These realities and practices have been conceptualised as social and global imaginaries in my thesis and will be theorised in the following section of this chapter.

Social and global Imaginaries as performed and practised

To understand and explain the role imaginaries play in the co-construction of youth’s subjectivities of ‘I’, ‘Other’ and world, my research project draws from the work of Dawney (2013), Steger (2009) and Spinoza (1996) on both social and global imaginaries. Because of cultural and economic globalisation, the references and practices people draw upon in understanding of social life, including people’s relations to the Other and the world, are continuously being re-evaluated (Beck, 1994). Global processes and increased social interconnectedness produce new ‘social imaginaries’ that individuals draw from to understand the everyday running of their lives, how they form a sense of belonging to a community, and the basis on which relations plays out in such communities.

‘Social imaginaries’, as defined by Steger (2009, p. 6) for example, ‘are deep-seated modes of common understandings within which people imagine their communal existence’. As such, ‘social imaginaries’ contain normative understandings of self, Other and world. They can shape particular understandings of concepts, such as forms of belonging, citizenship and democracy (Millei & Jones, 2014). Therefore, social imaginaries are understood in my research project as a new frame of reference to analyse how cosmopolitan practices are deployed as well as the social practices through which global images and imaginaries are both understood and put into play in the educational context.
Castoriadis (1997, p. 331) asserts that ‘we should consider the idea of a sensory, and more generally bodily imaginary’. Aligning with Castoriadis’s assertions, the social imaginary is not only understood as discursive in my thesis, but as also material and embodied. In drawing from Spinoza (1996), Dawney (2011, p. 539) has expressed that the imagination is central to experiencing the world and understands the social imaginary as ‘entities in process, existing in the circulation of ideas and imaginings through affective engagements between bodies and worlds’. Therefore, social imaginaries are embodied in the sense that ‘perceiving, entertaining images, feeling an emotion or having a sensation, are all cases of having an idea which is an idea of some bodily modification’ (Hampshire, 1951, p. 94 cited in Dawney, 2011). Social imaginaries are therefore also affective in nature and produce sensual and corporeal experiences. For example, the ways images of places and people in travel brochures affectively produce relaxing sensations in the body or conjure up memories of family holidays. Thus, a Spinozist theory of the imagination as both embodied and material is useful as it conceptualises the body as central in the production of an individual’s subjectivity in relation to their affective experiences. As Dawney (2013, p. 632) argues, a Spinozist understanding of the social imaginary assists in interrogating the ‘oscillation’ of the affective and subjective.

Dawney (2011) also draws from the work of Gatens and Lloyd (1999, p. 123) to acknowledge and emphasise the material nature of the social imaginary. Gatens and Lloyd (1999, p. 123) note how the imaginary is material in the sense that:

[i]imaginative constructions of who and what we are, are ‘materialised’ through the forms of embodiment to which those constructions give rise. The imagination may create fables, fictions or ‘collective illusions’, which have ‘real' effects, that is, which serve to structure forms of identity, social meaning and value, but when considered in themselves, are neither true nor false.

Thus, what becomes enacted are material-discursive practices that construct imaginaries, and what the imaginaries themselves materialise and enact cannot be separated from discourse and vice versa. Rather than approaching the imagination as a representation of an individual’s world, it is retheorised as material, embodied and affective.
In addition to the concept of the ‘social imaginary’, ‘global imaginaries’ are also drawn upon as a central concept in this thesis. Global imaginaries are particular types of social imaginaries that are based on the constitution of imagined global wholes, global societies and their problems, and the global processes related to their construction. Their conceptualisation is highly pertinent in the study of cosmopolitanism as they shape the way individuals position themselves and Others within a global society and youth’s perceptions about the way ‘global’ events are produced and can be negotiated. For example, Steger (2009, p. 11) asserts that ‘[a]s the global imaginary erupts with increasing frequency within and onto the national and local, it destabilizes and unsettles the conventional parameters of understanding within which people imagine their communal existence’. Steger (2008, p. 6) therefore argues for an approach to the analysis of global imaginaries that is based on cultural and ideological dimensions of global processes.

Thus, social and global imaginaries are understood in this thesis as particular social spaces that shape both understandings and the embodied experiences of individuals. They constitute an individual’s perception, conception and embodied understanding of the world and the Other. It is the theorisation of the Other and practices of Othering that I turn to next in my theoretical discussion.

Conceptualising the Other, Othering and Otherness

Like Onyx, Ho, Edwards, Burridge and Yerbury (2011, p. 50), my conceptualisation of cosmopolitanism posits an emergent and ‘lived cosmopolitanism, which sees individuals of different cultures routinely negotiating across difference in order to coexist within a shared social space’. Related to the ways youth understand their coexistence is the constitution of the Other. Understandings of the Other are understood as the boundary work in which youth territorialise and constitute difference through social categories of ‘self’ (collectivist ‘we’) and Other (collectivist ‘them’). This boundary work is understood as the way people forge a sense of belonging in relation to groups, communities, nations and the world and the social spaces in which these imaginaries are forged. These social and spatial imaginaries of belonging are also entangled with youth’s practices of Othering. For example, Anderson (1983) has discussed the way certain social spaces constitute an individual’s imagined sense of belonging to the nation and the way that individuals
construct the Other in relation to and against the ways they define themselves as belonging to a national ‘we’. Therefore, for my purposes, the Other is understood in the first place as the way it is constructed by the social spaces that constitute youth’s places of belonging.

Aligning with an emergent and situated understanding of cosmopolitanism, I also draw from Ahmed’s (2000, p. 144) conceptualisation of the Other. This is relevant to my understanding of cosmopolitanism as it provides an account of Otherness that works against it being universalised. Instead of Others, the Other and the possibility of an other Other is understood as produced within contingent and bodily relations. This is a valuable way of understanding Otherness as it addresses the specific ways in which we experience or encounter the Other that constitute difference. Ahmed (2000) further notes that it is within the particularities of Otherness that our moral and ethical practices for the Other are constructed. This understanding of Otherness is particularly pertinent in problematising liberal cosmopolitan practices in which the particularities of Otherness are made redundant. This is because liberal forms of cosmopolitanism can sometimes manifest in understandings of the Other that are formed outside the particularities of their cultural histories and practices by adopting an individualised morality towards Otherness that makes us all Others and ignores the uneven power geometries in which the Other is constituted.

I also draw from Ahmed (2004) to conceptualise the ways youth constitute the Other as an embodied and lived practice. Her concept of the Other is useful in understanding the way Otherness operates in relation to the body and affect. For example, Ahmed (2004, p. 39) asserts that ‘[t]he strange encounter is played out on the body and is played out with emotions’. She draws attention to the ways affects have the potential to demarcate a division between ‘self/us’ and ‘Other/them’. This is indicative of the ways emotions and intensities can be connected to a sense of national ‘pride’, a feeling of ‘comfort’ in the home, or the ways bodies at the level of the skin have the capacity to ‘mark’ and affect an individual in terms feeling ‘out-of-place’. Ahmed (2004) outlines the ways our body–place relations play a co-constitutive role in the ways we territorialise difference, which includes the visceral experiences and intensities emergent from our relations to individuals that we categorise as Other.
Popkewitz (2008, p. 126, italics in original) has also drawn attention to Othering practices that constitute the ‘Other as abject’. He discusses this in relation to educational policy and the abjection of youth within a constructed national space, noting:

The hope that ‘the national dream is not denied’ and that there is no child left behind embodies processes of abjections – fears of not fulfilling the dream of including the excluded and fears of populations jeopardizing that future who are rendered abject by their modes of living.

What Popkewitz outlines here is the ‘double gesture’ of the Other. To place this in the context of cosmopolitanism it is a practice that positions the Other as an individual whose fate and qualities project the hope for an inclusive and harmonious humanity, and at the same time whose qualities such as being ‘poor’, ‘uneducated’ and ‘diseased’ are seen as a threat to such a future. The Other therefore sits outside the normative modes of living set by power knowledge systems that forge what is a liveable condition for being human. It is also the way cosmopolitan practices and the ‘self’ rely on relations with an abject Other for them to come into being. In Nyer’s (2003, p. 1073) explanation of abject cosmopolitanism, he notes that:

All too often it is an ‘us’ – Westerners, Europeans, humanitarians, etc. – who are the cosmopolitans, the champions of justice, human rights, and world order; leaving ‘them’ – the Third Worlders, the global poor, the ‘wretched of the earth’ – as the abject, the societies and subjects in crisis, the failed states in need of intervention. Consequently, answering the questions about alternative meanings for abject cosmopolitanism requires some critical self-reflection on what Linda McDowell calls the ‘categorization of the classifiers’.

This form of Othering forces the Other to be voiceless, invisible, and apolitical. Or to draw from Nyers again (2003, p. 1074), ‘the impurity of abjection becomes the purity of the abject’. This form of Othering is also based on uneven power relations in which the Other is constituted through an ‘act of force’ (Rose, 1999, p. 253). It is related to the governing practices that outline the boundary practices in which someone is ‘human’, the ‘limits of the liveable’ (Rose, 1999, p. 253). In
problematising the Othering practices that are entangled in youth’s cosmopolitan practices, it is therefore pertinent to address the ways the abject Other is both produced and functions as a constitutive force in youth’s cosmopolitan practices and the possibilities in which the abject Other could be thought otherwise.

My theorisation of the Other is based on understanding the particularities of otherness that are used to distinguish and territorialise youth’s sense of belonging and difference in their cosmopolitan practices. It must be noted that I have paid particular attention in my empirical chapters in terms of how this relates to the youth’s ideas about their moral and ethical obligation to the Other. In drawing from Ahmed (2002, 2004), my understanding of the Other is not universalised and there is always the possibility of being an other Other in the multiple and contingent spaces and places in which youth come to understand difference and construct boundaries of belonging. I also understand youth’s Othering practices as including the affective intensities emergent from their encounters with difference and the discourses that are linked to analysing such sensual experiences. To end, my conceptualisation of the Other includes the construction of the abject Other in youth’s cosmopolitan practices and looks to address the double gesture of the Other in my analysis. Such practices, as Popkewitz (2013, p. 450) notes, highlight the ‘rules and standards that are historically inscribed as principles to articulate commitments to difference’ on which youth’s cosmopolitan practices might be relationally reliant. Such ‘rules and standards’ are a part of the constitutive spaces that make up youth’s ‘global’ imaginaries. It is therefore necessary for the researcher to engage with spatial discourse to understand and theorise how such spaces work and fold in on the making of our social reality.

Spatialising the social and global imaginary: Drawing from the work of Lefebvre (1991) and Soja (1989, 1996)

The ways that youth constitute their cosmopolitan practices is theorised in my thesis as co-constituted by the ways they imagine and construct particular understandings of self, Other and world in relation to globalised entities. These social and global imaginaries are understood in this thesis as produced in relation to particular social spaces produced through the mobility of materialities and discursivities that intersect and are emplaced through such relations. I support the notion that youth’s social
imaginaries and subjectivities are continually being made and re-made through the intersection of relations to globalised matter that traverse the world and is made intelligible in relation to other spaces (e.g. national, political, economic, school, personal). It is therefore important that I introduce spatial discourse into the theoretical framework and outline how I understand the constitutive nature of space and its role in shaping the ways cosmopolitanism can be understood and practised by youth.

Leading on from our discussion of the social imaginary, Anderson (1983, p. 6) states, when outlining understandings of nationalism and belonging in his text *Imagined Communities*, that the nation is ‘imagined’ because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion’. Here he speaks of the ways in which a space of ‘nation-ness’ and the formation of a national imaginary have been constructed through cultural processes and practices, unique to a nation’s particular historical context. That is, he attempts to explain how ‘identity production is related to state production’ (Kearney, 1995; Allen, 1999, p. 251). Although this framework is based on the nation-state, Anderson draws our attention to the role that both time and space play in the construction of our understanding or our world, the frame of reference drawn from when constructing our reality. Given the changing nature of our relations to the national and in fact the world through processes of globalisation and assemblages of particular global knowledge, symbols and images, new spaces are constituted in which new understandings of self, Other and world are made possible. As Harvey (2006, p. 244) explains:

> Speed-up of turnover time and reductions in the friction of distance have meant that spatio-temporality must now be understood in a radically different way from what was operative in, say, Classical Greece, Ming Dynasty China or Medieval Europe. Any search for an alternative to neo-liberal globalization must search for a different kind of spatio-temporality.

Harvey (2006, p. 244) has recognised the delimiting effects of discourse associated with this traditional modern historical frame and proposes that it has been outmoded by understandings of space and time that exist as ‘an active moment (rather than a
passive frame) in the constitution of physical, ecological, social and political–
economic life’. This shift in analytical thinking is also evident in the work of Lefebvre
(1991) who explains this outmoding as the ‘historical space’ being replaced by a
macro ‘abstract space’ brought forward by processes of industrialisation and
capitalism. Delueze (1987) would acknowledge this transformation of understanding
as the ‘molar lines’ that normalise particular knowledge and ways of understanding,
including the spatial. It is this shift in thinking about the ‘spatial’ that guides the
theoretical underpinnings of this thesis where an individual’s practices of time,
space and themselves are perpetually constituted and reconstituted by material-
discursive practices. First, however, I must outline how and why I have selected a
spatial framework that moves in a different direction from modernist thought.

The ‘spatial’ under modernist frameworks is limited to a ‘contextual’ understanding
of the role of space whereby it encases human life. Modernist frameworks of space
work between a binary construction of space that fetishises either the ‘real’ (first space)
or ‘imagined’ (second space) and thus marginalises an Other’s alternative
understandings of space (Soja, 1996). Soja (1989) notes that this perspective has
saturated the ways in which we come to analyse and understand social life/human
geographies and as a result it has become difficult to think of ‘space’ in any other
way but in its materialist/physicalist sense. What has been overlooked in modernist
conceptualisations of space are the socialities of space, such as those evident in
the mediation of relations between material and mental spaces that have a large
role in shaping our understanding of reality (Soja, 1989, p. 80). This is why Soja
(1989, p. 80) uses the term ‘spatiality’ in an attempt to specify a socially produced
space and evade thinking/discourse generated by physicalist/materialist frameworks
of space; at the same time Soja sheds light on the ways in which modernist
frameworks of space mask the existence of socialities and marginalise alternative
spatial knowledge.

Soja (1989), by building on the work of Lefebvre (1991), has termed the masking of
other spatial modes in modernist spatial knowledge as the ‘illusion of opaqueness’
(that fetishises the space of the real) and the ‘illusion’ of transparency’ (that
fetishises the space of the imagination) (cited in Allen, 1999, p. 254). This spatial
binary has been termed by Lefebvre (1991) and referred to later in the work of Soja
(1989) as the ‘double illusion’. In the ‘illusion of opaqueness’, objects ‘speak for
themselves’; that is, they are read from an objectivist and materialist viewpoint. Objects are deemed real through ‘common sense’ and a constructed normative framework, whereby they exist primarily due to the fact that they can be sensed and measured. Cogitating the construction of these normative principles is viewed to only complicate and obscure the constructed ‘truths’ of modernist spatial knowledge (Soja, 1989).

The ‘illusion of transparency’, however, involves the imagined spaces that guide our understandings of spatialities. Spatial metaphors are represented as a ‘design waiting to be discovered and then deployed into a space of pure utopian agency’, rather than as something constructed through socialities, mediations and relations of and between both real and imagined spatial modes (Allen, 1999, p. 256). Imagined spaces construct and shape dominant spatial subjectivities that govern our understanding of the way in which we come to understand reality and that become ‘crystallized’ in institutions through disciplinary technologies (Allen, 1999, p. 257). They universalise these spatial subjectivities through metaphors and social abstractions that make only certain ways of understanding reality possible and thus marginalise alternative spatial knowledge (Allen, 1999; Lefebvre, 1991).

Aligning with a new spatial consciousness in the social sciences and in an attempt to move toward a different conceptualisation of space overstepping this spatial binary, I am influenced by elements of Lefebvre’s (1991) theory of spatial production. Spatiality, and the ways in which global imaginaries are experienced, can be understood most generally as the manner in which ‘social relations [are] taking up particular geographical forms’ (Skordoulis & Arvanitis, 2008, p. 107). I find Lefebvre’s (1991) spatial trialectic useful because it provides a theory of space that encompasses the multiple modalities of space that are produced in geographical spatial expressions of ‘material engagement, scientific conception and cultural expression’ and the associated relations between these spatial modes (Pugalis, 2009, p. 79).

It should also be noted that these spatial analytical frameworks have been specifically appropriated to complement each other in an attempt to overcome the dualism of both material space and mental space found in many of the
aforementioned conceptualisations of space, as well as to account for the new geographies developing through the ‘new space-time configurations that are determining our world’ (Schmid, 2008, p. 27). Similarly to Schmid (2008), my theorisation of the production of space not only acknowledges spatiality in terms of the way it establishes itself in, for example, ‘discursivities, materialities and socialities’. It delves further into the specific processes/practices in which spatial meaning is constructed. I also elucidate the dialectical nature of the relationship between the mental and material construction of such spaces; in the work of Lefebvre (1991) this is argued as being trialectic in nature. Lefebvre in his trialectic includes social processes involved in mediations between mental and material modes (Allen, 1999; Pugalis, 2009, p. 81). Allen (1999) relates this social space to the ways in which it becomes possible to constitute and reconstitute particular ways of understanding of our world through movement between the real and imagined (material and mental).

Therefore, by acknowledging this new spatial consciousness, the first and most obvious characteristic of my analytical framework is that space is inherent and a necessary quality of social existence (Allen, 1999; Foucault, 1986b; Lefebvre, 1991; Soja, 1989). This is based on the premise that no event can take place outside of space, even the understanding of space itself. As Allen (1999, pp. 250–251) describes, ‘more than just a given, natural context in which culture and history occurs, space is in part a socially-constructed view of the world that both “reads” and is “read through” cultural and historical knowledge, amongst other things’.

This understanding of space is reflected in the trialectical spatial theory of Lefebvre (1991) (Figure 2.1). Lefebvre proposes that space is produced through three modes: the perceived space (spatial practices), the conceived space (representations of space) and the lived space (spaces of representation). Lefebvre approaches the trialectic of the production of space from the idea that space is produced through processes or acts (phenomenology) and through language and knowledge (semiotics/linguistics) (Schmid, 2008).

The ‘lived space’ (spaces of representation) is used as a philosophical term and refers to the way individuals enact symbolic use of an object in relation to the body. It could be the front row at a cinema, the shopping centre car park or even the
bedroom. It is what exists and what we experience in our everyday lives. It is the type of space that people feel the need to control and master. It is space that has been articulated as felt, sensed and embodied by the body (Deleuze, 1992).

‘Conceived space’ (representation of space) describes the constitution of space by, for example, academics, policy makers, architects or an institution. This construction of space imposes order through discursive practices and is related quite closely to relations of power and dominant knowledge systems, or what Deleuze would refer to ‘molar lines’. In Lefebvre’s trialectic, conceived space is the most dominant mode of space. It is represented in this spatial mode as an imagined space that organises and subjugates by linking what is produced/constructed to the way in which it ‘governs’ the individual/subject in terms of particular understandings of themselves and their world.
Discursivities: Specific mental concepts and knowledge of space constructed as ‘truth’. (Resources for identity: subjectivities)

Perceived: Moment of spatial practice (e.g. connections made between images in the media and reality)

Materialities: Production of physical and real space

Conceived: Moment whereby representations of space are constructed (e.g. global imaginaries)

Lived: Moment whereby spaces of representation occur in everyday practices and are embodied

Socialities: Agents’ experiences and relations within/with the space

Figure 2.1 Lefebvre's (1991) unified theory of spatial production (spatial trialectic)

‘Perceived space’ for example, exists in those spatial practices that produce the imaginary and structure of what is lived. It is the ‘spatial competence’ or process that individuals use to mediate between the lived and conceived spatial forms (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 33). For the purposes of this thesis and in terms of the re-emergence of a cosmopolitan space, the social practices that structure this space could be, for example, the space and pace of growing up created by developmental theorists; inside and outside practices in early childhood; public and private spaces
in public institutions etc.; the mobilities that connect people to places such as practices of travel; and images in the media that symbolise particular realities, such as that of a league table in education, highlighting the international, competitive and comparative nature of education on a global scale.

The production of space is therefore dependent on the relations between modes of production within particular social fields and geohistorical contexts (e.g. relational assemblages of space, time and matter). Therefore, given that the ways in which these spaces assemble, disassemble and reassemble, space is differential and thus also constitutes fluid, shifting, plural and, contradictory subjectivities. Lefebvre’s framework of social space has provided a theoretical framework that outlines the production of space, but has provided little advice in terms of assessing and describing the relational nature of these modes of space: what takes place between the ‘imagined’ and the ‘real’ as they are mediated and produce particular social practices in an individual’s becoming. Pugalis (2009, p. 82), through the problematisation of Lefebvre’s framework, describes it as a dialectical process:

The materialisation of discourse demonstrates the power to transmit idealised spatial imaginaries of present and future needs and desires, whereas discourse materialised demonstrates the power of urban reality to shape future needs and desires as reflected in discourse. In this way, insights into social structures of the material world are mediated through discourse.

In other words, on one side, particular ways of knowing and understanding the world are constructed through discursive practices deployed in the ‘materialisations of discourse’ (actual physical spatial features and physical states). The way the discourses become materialised is also understood as how the materialised reality and present context are understood through discourses that produce particular desires. The conceived space is therefore understood by Lefebvre as the dominant space that governs subjectivity, through discursive practices that constitute and normalise particular ways of understanding concepts and subjectivities. What comes with the conceived space is a form of power that enacts hegemony and manages the subject through disciplining knowledge and ‘regimes of truth’ in terms of possibilities of ‘seeing’ in this world. In terms of cosmopolitanism, this understanding of space is utilised to define the emplaced material-discursive
practices that constitute space and thus the subject and to theorise particular understandings of self, Other and world that are constituted through such socio-spatial practices. These social spaces intersect and always take place somewhere. It is therefore important to flesh out my understandings of place and how youth make place and I do so in the next section of this chapter.

**Place-making as an intersection of social ‘spaces’ and practices**

I theorise youth’s cosmopolitan practices as emergent from their emplaced material-discursive practices. That is, their cosmopolitan practices always take place somewhere. ‘Somewhere’ refers to the intersections of social spaces that materialise through the ways youth’s relations are based on entanglements of discourses, matter and time. Youth’s cosmopolitan practices therefore come into being through the materialities, discursivities and socialities with which their place-making practices are entangled. This includes the ways globalised entities both make up and intersect with such spaces and thus constitute youth’s cosmopolitan practices.

As with existential understandings of space, place is commonly studied and conceived within a modernist frame where a quite materialistic understanding of place is used in the analysis of place-making (Casey, 2001). Moving away from these modern conceptualisations of place, I understand the constitution of place as existing in youth’s body–place relations as conceptualised in the work of Massey (2005), Casey (2001), Thrift (2008) and Somerville et al. (2009). These frameworks emphasise and account for the contingent, procedural and ambivalent nature of youth’s place-making. They also account for the embodied and sensual practices involved in the production of place, positioning the relations between body, matter and discourse front and centre in youth’s place-making practices. Theories of place and place-making are thus central to understanding how globalised entities shape youth’s subjective understanding of the Other and how they position themselves within the ‘world’, and how youth’s relations to different places change the way space, time and matter are co-constituted in relation to their bodies.

Our mobile practices (both virtual and lived) transform the relations we have with emplaced entanglements of people, objects and events, but simultaneously bring us
and connect us with ‘new and different ecologies of place’ (Conradson, 2005). For example, Massey (2005, pp. 140–141) describes the ‘thrown togetherness’ of place in terms of the coming together of different entanglements of ‘history and geography, humans, and non-humans, including changing landscapes and climates’. As such, Massey (2005) views place as a moment in the mediation and intersection of social relations. These social relations can extend across space and time and give rise to differing spatial scales, as Massey (1994, pp. 120–121) describes:

One way of thinking about place is as particular moments in such intersecting social relations, nets of which have over time been constructed, laid down, interacted with one another, decayed and renewed. Some of these relations will be, as it were, contained within the place; others will stretch beyond it, tying any particular locality into wider relations and processes in which other places are implicated too.

These intersecting social relations in places are also constitutive of youth’s social understanding. Casey (2001, p. 684) has noted that ‘the relationship between self and place is not just one of reciprocal influence … but also, more radically, of constitutive co-ingredience: each is essential to the being of the other. In effect, there is no place without self and no self without place.’ The place-making projects of youth are thus the ways their understandings of places and their positions within them are constituted by relations to human and non-human entities in both their immediate social context and beyond. Or, as Thrift (1999, p. 312) explains, the ‘innumerable interactions between things and bodies which are placed at particular locations’. Therefore, ‘places are politicised and cultured; they are humanised versions of space’ (Anderson & Jones, 2009, p. 293). This understanding of place also draws attention to the fact that ‘places and institutions carry meaning and ways of being that may give rise to specific “communities of interpretation”’ (Kehily & Nayak, 2008, p. 326). For example, the ways youth explain and construct a sense of belonging to a place, or understand themselves, Others and the world in relation to the places they inhabit. Or others, such as Gille and O’Riain (2002, p. 271), believe that ethnographers, by positioning themselves in spaces of the ‘global’, can illuminate the ‘socioscapes’ that are constructed through the global processes and relations that individuals are engaged with in a locality/place (Appadurai, 1998).
Moreover, Casey (2009, p. 329) notes that '[a] place is more an event than a thing to be assimilated to known categories'. To understand such events this thesis adopts the term 'place-making projects' as used by Massey (1999), Tsing (2000) and Appadurai (1995). Place-making describes the process in which 'place' is constructed and reconstructed in a relational manner. It describes relations that exist within a pre-existent place (the intersection of numerous spaces, taken up, conflicted and contested) and new relations beyond the constructed place of the extended network. Massey (1991) views place as a mediation of the social. As well as being constituted by the social, a place’s relation to the social in turn shapes and reconstitutes the social, as what is trialectically demonstrated in Lefebvre’s (1991) spatial theory. Places are thus moments and events of social, material and discursive construction or, as Casey (1996, p. 33) states, ‘a given place takes on the qualities of its occupants, reflecting these qualities in its own constitution and description and expressing them in its occurrence as an event: places not only are, they happen’. This can be related to the way Gruenwald (2003, p. 621) has noted how ‘places are profoundly pedagogical … [and] places teach us about how the world works and how our lives fit into the spaces we occupy. Further places make us: as occupants of particular places with particular attributes, our identity and our possibilities are shaped.’ Places are a part of the spatial assemblage whereby particular spaces are constituted and shifts in spatial relations reconfigure places and vice versa (Pacelli & Marchelti, 2007; Burawoy, Blum, George, Gille & Thayer, 2000). Massey (2005) similarly argues that the intersection and contestation of relational spaces in which places are made possible are in fact constructed from ‘somewhere’ and in most cases in relation to other places. Both youth’s construction of their social lives and place-making are therefore viewed as constituted through relational assemblages of place as well as mobility made possible by global processes.

Defining and conceptualising locality/place as a site for inquiry, however, has been a major tension in the social sciences. This tension has arisen predominantly in conceptualising and mediating differences between the concepts of ‘place’ and ‘space’ in the selection of appropriate sites for inquiries into global processes/phenomena. As aforementioned, I have adopted the spatial trialectic of Lefebvre (1991) where space is dependent on the relations between the three spatial modes of production, discursivities, materialities and socialities, within particular social fields and geohistorical (time) contexts. Although Lefebvre does not
directly use the concept ‘place’ in his spatial theory, place is captured under the notion of ‘concrete space’ or ‘material space’ that is shaped relationally with both conceived and social spaces. The spatial theory does not dismiss ‘place’ in its conceptualisation of space, but supports the idea that place, as Agnew (2003, p. 3) has described, ‘is constituted by the impact that being somewhere has on the constitution of the processes in question’.

Places like spaces are also understood in this thesis as embodied. Casey (1993, p. 337) asserts that ‘[f]ar from being dumb or diffuse, the lived body is as intelligent about the cultural specificities of a place as it is aesthesiologically sensitive to the perceptual particularities of that same place. Such a body is at once enculturated and implaced and enculturating and implacing – while being massively sentient all the while.’ An example of what Casey describes here could be the material-discursive practices of Othering that are regularly constituted through national and place imaginaries. This example draws attention to the way affective intensities emergent from body–place relations are implicated and understood as both transformative, providing a space in which to understand ourselves, Other and place differently. Casey also highlights the fact that body–place relations may also have the productive capacity to co-constitute youth’s cosmopolitan becomings by enacting practices of negotiation, empathy and understanding.

Non-representational theory, affect and a new materialist paradigm for theorising youth’s ‘cosmopolitan’ practices.

Cosmopolitan practices have been primarily understood and explored through theoretical frameworks based on the constitutive power of discourse (e.g. Millie & Jones, 2014; Rizvi, 2006, 2009; Calcutt, Skrbis & Woodward, 2009). These explorations are concerned with how places are made and subjectivity is shaped by drawing on bodies of knowledge that dictate what is possible to say and represent about self, Other and world. This would include an individual’s understanding and practices of what is or whom they are, the ‘constitution of the subject’s modes of being’ (Foucault, 1982, p. 41) and a ‘mode of managing meaning’ about who they are in terms of the other (Hannerz, 1990, p. 238). For example, the construction of the national citizen has fabricated a self-defining Other (Flint, 2003). Discursive approaches are based on researching the dominant knowledge systems that
position individuals in society and the world.

Frameworks based purely on representation and discourse, however, are limited in their utility to address other dimensions of our social worlds that also have a role in the production of an individual’s reality. For example, affective and material registers of subjectivity have been historically scarce in the study of subjectification and cosmopolitanism, but are now re-emerging through new vital materialist (e.g. Barad, 2007; Coleman, 2010; Ingold, 2005, 2012) and non-representational (e.g. Anderson, 2009; Thrift, 2008) frameworks. Non-representational and vital materialist approaches have therefore also been adopted in this thesis as they break away from the primacy of the discursive subject and assert that frameworks based purely on representation and discourse do not account for other bodily experiences, matter, and affects that play a role in the constitution of an individual’s cosmopolitan becoming. The driving ontological and epistemological claim in both non-representational theory and vital materialist approaches is an understanding of both space and place as being co-constituted by its relations with the body and matter. These positions don’t refute the power of discourse in our becoming, but argue for a more-than-discursive approach in the exploration of subjectivity.

Cosmopolitanism as a ‘becoming’: The body as an assemblage

To conceptualise the way the body is implicated in youth’s place-making and cosmopolitan practices, I draw from Deleuze and Guattari’s (2002) concepts of the ‘assemblage’ and ‘Body without Organs’ (BwO). These concepts refer to the way the body is understood not just in its physical presence, but as a moment of assemblage. Deleuze (1990) argues that there is ‘more than’ the discursively constructed body in such assemblages, and that bodies are also made up of presubjective connections to affects, intensities and flows. Fox (2015, p. 305) drawing from Deleuze (1990, p. 218), notes that this moves our attention and emphasis ‘from what a body or a thing is, to its capacities for action and desire, what it can do’. It also emphasises the openness, fluidity and unfinished nature of these assemblages and the potential of always ‘becoming’.
Fox (2002, p. 352) describes the BwO as a ‘dynamic model for understanding the relations between the body and self’, and the body and the world. Deleuze and Guattari’s (2002, 2004) notion of the BwO includes both the anatomical body (individual body) and all social formations (assemblages) where an individual is relationally dependent on another body (the institutional body). The BwO thus theorises and includes both ‘the physicality of embodied subjectivity’ and the discursive structures (plane of immanence) – the values, norms and becoming in which the body becomes meaningful (Fox, 2002, p. 351). Accordingly, the embodied cosmopolitan practices of youth are not understood outside the connections they make with other bodies. The agency of the body is brought into being by these connections.

Aligning with a non-linear understanding of the way time, space and matter are entangled and with Deleuze and Guattari’s conceptualisation of the body as an assemblage, I adopt an understanding of youth’s cosmopolitan and place-making practices as entailing a ‘becoming’, a ‘cosmopolitan-in-the-making’. I draw from Deleuze and Guattari’s (2004) work on becoming and Barad’s (2003) metaphor of ‘entanglement’ and ‘intra-activity’ to conceptualise the body as a relational assemblage of both matter and discourse that is both constitutive and constituted through the apparatus of youth’s place-making practices.

Deleuze and Guattari’s (2004) understanding of ‘becoming’ highlights the partiality and the intermittent and processual nature of youth’s embodied cosmopolitan practices. Their concept of ‘becoming’ is based on the idea that the ‘social’ is not produced from one isolated causational point, but is entangled and exists within a broader relational assemblage. Therefore, in this thesis a cosmopolitan ‘becoming’ refers to the social imaginaries and subjectivity produced as an outcome of the relations between the body, discourse and matter (including bodily matter), as well as the affective relations that are emergent and formed through relational assemblages. This relational assemblage is what Deleuze and Guattari (2004) would refer to as a ‘rhizome’ of bodies, affect and forces of discourse and matter.

Deleuze and Guattari (2004, p. 262) explain ‘becoming’ in terms of the potential of subjectivity and bodily practice coming into being. For example, they state: ‘What is
this “becoming-animal”? The point is not to be an animal or to imitate it but to guarantee desire the possibility of its production. Becoming produces nothing other than itself.’ Therefore, the ‘subject’ is understood as nothing other than the temporary intersection of multiple becomings considered, produced, sustained and imagined by a conscious body and the relational assemblages that are sustaining and are a part of that potentiality. Or, to link this to Massey’s (2005, p. 95) theorisation of social space, ‘if space is the sphere of multiplicity, the product of social relations, and those relations are real material practices, and always ongoing, then space can never be closed, there will always be loose ends, always relations with the beyond, always potential elements of chance’. In addressing the body in this research project, I am engaging with the way globalised entities are entangled in youth’s practices of place-making and the ways the body’s connections to such entities provide potentials for what the body can do and become.

Place and mobility are also dominant metaphors in Deleuze and Guattari’s work on becoming. As such, there is a geographical rather than an historical approach to understanding the ways social spaces are entangled in individuals’ social lives. For example, in extending his metaphor of mobility he refers to an individual as a ‘nomad’. For Deleuze, ‘[n]omads are always in the middle … Nomads have no history, they only have geography’ (Deleuze & Parnet, 2002, p. 31). The temporal aspects of youth’s cosmopolitan becomings are therefore not understood in my project to intersect in a linear manner but assemble (territorialise) and reassemble (reterritorialise) to constitute a multiplicity of becomings that occur and exist in the ‘middle’ of an entanglement of material-discursive practices. Given the temporality and geographical nature of such assemblages, we cannot pre-emptively assume the constitutive capacity and potential of such relational assemblages until the body acts.

Deleuze and Guattari’s conceptualisation of ‘becoming’ is pertinent to my thesis as it aligns with my aim of demarcating the affective intensities emergent from youth’s body–place relations and how they come to matter in their cosmopolitan practices. It assists in investigating the affective intensities emergent from the pre-subjective relations between bodies and matter that are central to understanding how youth’s ‘cosmopolitan’ practices come into being. I will now expand on the ways I draw from
concepts derived from non-representational theory to understand and conceptualise
the affective dimensions of youth’s cosmopolitan becomings.

Non-representational theory: Theorising the affective dimensions of youth’s
place-making practices

I adopt the work of Harrison (2000), Thrift (1999) and Anderson (2009) and other
scholars who have adopted theories on the affective dimensions of body–place
relations. Such theories assist me in outlining the ways globalised entities are
grounded and the body is implicated in youth’s cosmopolitan practices. Aligning with
an understanding of our social world as a process of becoming, non-
representational theory views the co-constitution of place and subjectivity as an
‘event’, produced through enactments of lived and bodily experiences (Thrift, 1999).
Moving away from an emphasis on the textual entirely, for example, Thrift’s (1999)
theory of the ‘more-than textual’ accounts for emerging new forms of empirical
material that may not be linguistically evident. These are the forms of empirical
material that have been ‘folded into the research process all along under several
other signifiers’, such as senses, feelings and movement of the body – empirical
material that is usually discarded or ignored when constructing such representations
(St. Pierre, 1997, p. 177). As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the body’s practices
and movement are highly emphasised in this non-representational research
paradigm and its utility lies in its ability to challenge the contingent nature of the
‘textual’ in social research and to engage in new research practices that transform
our research imaginary, such as the creative and emergent art-based and mobile
methods adopted in this research project.

Anderson and Harrison (2010, p. 7) have noted that the affective capacity of ‘things-
in-place’ is included in the ‘hum’ of on-going activity’ that shapes our intentions,
produces experiential shifts in our body and constructs subjectivities. Non-
representational theory’s utility lies in its capacity to attend to the corporeal and
sensual experiences that shape how we understand self, Other and world. For
example, how our emotions enter into subject positions of the Other or our sense of
being home is also constructed through the bodily experience of smell and feelings.
Affect is thus an intensity that enacts sensations, feelings and movement in body–
object entanglements. Such phenomena are not expressed discursively in the everyday, but play a large role in shaping our experience of social reality.

Affect has been conceptualised and applied in myriad ways and contexts in the social sciences. Taking the lead from the work of Thrift (1999), the interpretations and translations by Massumi (2002) of the work of both Spinoza and Deleuze and Guattari influence my work. Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 25), for example, assert that affects are ‘becomings’. Deleuze and Guattari understand affects as having the capacity to augment the capacity or potentialities of a body’s relations to entities. These changes may include spatialising the body in terms of physical, emotional, social, psychological or economic affects. Deleuze and Guattari (1987 p. 400) describe affects as being ‘projectiles’ that have the capacity to constitute further affects within relational assemblages. For example, as affective flows spatialise particular relational assemblages to act and ‘do’ something, these actions in turn create further affects and affective flows.

Massumi (2002, p. 128) in his reading of Spinoza notes that affect is:

> an ability to affect and be affected. It is a prepersonal intensity corresponding to the passage from one experiential state of the body to another and implying an augmentation or diminution of that body’s capacity to act.

The affective ‘intensities’ that Massumi (2002, p. 128, italics in original) describes here provide a metaphor for conceptualising the forces or ‘limit expression of what the human shares with everything it is not: a bringing out of its inclusion in matter’. These ‘limit-expressions’ are regularly invisible to us and have the capacity to change the body’s actions, materiality and emotional state. They are productive of and enact, for example, events that have been qualified as embodied sensations, feelings and movements in the body that are prelinguistic in nature. These pre-personal intensities do not exist as feelings and emotions but may be territorialised and qualified as such (MacLure, 2013). Thus, they are not owned by the body, but exist through it. Affect is thus another way the body, space and place are connected and the way in which this connection spatialises the body (Farrugia, Smyth & Harrison, 2015).
The ‘affective turn’ has also affirmed the importance of sensual experiences in body–place relations that play a role in constructing individuals’ cosmopolitan practices. This thesis borrows from the work of Nava (2002) on ‘affective cosmopolitanism’, a term that conceptualises cosmopolitan subjectivity as drawing from pre-discursive and material dimensions. Nava (2002) documents how affective dimensions of cosmopolitanism can be understood as being enacted increasingly through our relations to everyday material objects. In her study of the shopping practices of women in the United Kingdom during the early 1900s, Nava (2002) explored the constitution of what she noted was a cosmopolitan imagination through the women’s embodied practices. In particular, Nava explored the subjective felt dimensions of being cosmopolitan, or what she termed ‘structures of cosmopolitan feelings’. These cosmopolitan practices were defined by Nava (2002, p. 82) as ‘the fluidity and excitement of modern urban life, physical mobility and encounters with strangers … and, above all, the advent of a new modern consciousness: a psychic, social and visceral readiness to engage with the new, with difference’. For my purposes, Nava’s (2002) work draws attention to the importance of emerging affectivities in body–matter relations that play a role in co-constituting the ‘cosmopolitan’ becomings of youth, the way that ‘cosmopolitan’ bodies are spatialised in specific ways by globalised objects and body–place relations.

Affect also intersects with an individual’s situated knowledge of Otherness and difference. Hickey-Moody and Malins (2007) note that affect has the capacity to interrupt how we see the world, including our pre-conceived notions of the Other and further entrenched and universalist ways of knowing and being (Dawney, 2013; Hickey-Moody & Malins, 2007). This is also echoed in the work of Tolia-Kelly (2006, p. 215) who asserts that:

By acknowledging power geometries of our present as linked to our pasts, we can make complex and assert the differentiating forces that effect the parameters and flows of affectual capacities and sensitivities which course and shape the rhythms of everyday living.

Tolia-Kelly (2006) has described how a political understanding of affect acknowledges how power geometries, as specific entanglements of histories,
knowledge and power, effect the constitution of place and thus change the way places form connections with the body. Along these lines, Massey (2005, pp. 140–141) describes the ‘thrown togetherness’ of place in terms of the coming together of different entanglements of ‘history and geography, humans and non-humans, including changing landscapes and climates’. Our relations to such places thus change the way space, time and matter are co-constituted in relation to the body. For a more grounded example, how we imagine our security in a world of global processes is constituted through our relation to place, which then enters into our capacity to be affected and affect. It also signals how we understand and enact particular understandings of the Other in relation to place. As Tolia-Kelly (2006, p. 215) notes, ‘a body that is signified as a source of fear through its markedness cannot be free to affect and be affected similarly to one that is not’. A grounded example of this could be the material-discursive practices of Othering that are regularly co-constituted through particular national imaginaries and material-discursive practices of individuals and government that frame the Other in relation to levels of risk. Affective intensities are therefore understood as transformative and provide a space in which to understand ourselves, Other and place differently. Thus, they may also have the productive capacity to co-constitute youth’s cosmopolitan becomings by enacting practices of negotiation, empathy and understanding.

A non-representational approach has been adopted in this thesis to understand the pre-subjective dimensions of youth’s cosmopolitan practices because it breaks away from the primacy of the discursive subject and asserts that frameworks based purely on representation and discourse do not account for other bodily experiences and practices that also play a role in the constitution of an individual’s cosmopolitan becoming. The driving ontological claim in non-representational theory is an understanding of both space and place as being co-constituted by its relations with the body. This position doesn’t refute the power of discourse in our becoming, but argues for a more-than-discursive approach in the exploration of subjectivity, including the recognition of the agency of (bodily) matter. Accordingly, the agency of both matter and discourse is distributed evenly in my understanding of youth’s cosmopolitan becomings. This flattened rather than hierarchical approach to discourse is elaborated on in the following section.
Vital materialism: Eliminating the dualism of ‘words and things’ through the work of Karen Barad

As stated earlier in this chapter, the cosmopolitan becoming has been conceptualised in my research project to emerge through the way both discourses and materialities (bodily matter) fold in on youth’s cosmopolitan practices. Aligning with this ontoepistemology, I was faced with the task of developing a theoretical framework that could produce knowledge about how globalised entities and the embodied practices of individuals co-constitutively shape the research participant’s practices of subjectivity and place-making. The question that drove this process was, how can I approach and develop a theoretical framework that encapsulates the dialectic relation of discursive and material or what Barad (2003) would describe as the ontological divide between words and things to gain a better understanding of practices of subjectivication and the lived experiences of the participants’ place-making?

This question is not new by any means and has been at the forefront of social-constructivist research for many years. For example, Foucault in his History of Sexuality (1986b) traced the material participants that mediate assemblages to produce particular understandings of ‘sexuality’. These non-human entities were understood as belonging to ‘a network of pleasures and powers linked together at multiple points and according to transformable relationships’ that, in addition to human actors, also shape understandings of reality and make understandings of particular concepts possible (Foucault, 1986b, p. 46). Foucault, however, never clearly provided a framework about how these material entities are linked to such understandings; as Barad (2003, p. 809) asserts, he fails to bring together how ‘materiality plays an active role in the workings of power’. More recently, by building on the work of Foucault, Butler (1990) has theorised the embodiment of subjectivity as a form of performativity. For example, Butler has engaged in research concerning performances of gender, where the repetition of specific acts of gender are constructed through the normative technologies of dominant discourse. This performativity is discussed in relation to the body acting primarily as a citation of discourse, where discourse is drawn upon to shape performances of the body. Barad (2003, p. 811) refers to this understanding of performativity as a form of ‘iterative citationality’, as it cites the body as the central hub of knowing and reality.
Thus, understandings of ourselves, such as conceived discourses, are external and addressed as predefined ways of being taken up by the subject.

In my theorisation of the cosmopolitan becoming I draw from the work of Barad (2003) that conceptualises the role of the more-than human's capacity to affect and be affected in processes of subjectification. For example, by building on the work of both Foucault (1986), Butler (1999) and the work of theoretical physicist Neils Bohr, Barad (2003) proposes a theoretical framework based on a performative metaphysics. For Barad (2003), reality exists as reconfigurations of ‘things-in-phenomena’, also understood as ‘iterative intra-activity’. Barad (2003, p. 811) claims that ‘representationalism separates the world into the ontologically disjoint domains of words and things, leaving itself with the dilemma of their linkage such that knowledge is possible’. Furthermore, she posits that representations and their emphasis in research is a contingent part of history; they exist and are important but are not necessarily more accessible than non-textual modes of empirical material. Similarly to Massey (2005), Barad (2003) notes that bodies do not just ‘simply take their place in the world. They are not simply situated in, or located in, particular environments. Rather “environments” and “bodies” are intra-actively co-constituted.’ That is, iterative intra-activity is the reconfiguration of material-discursive practices where discourse is understood as a form of matter in phenomena rather than external and causal unit of such phenomena.

The term ‘iterative intra-activity’ stems from Barad’s (2007) concept of ‘agential realism’. Agential realism understands that ‘bodies (“human,” “environmental,” or otherwise) are integral “parts” of, or dynamic reconfigurations of, what is” (Barad, 2007, p. 170). Therefore, entities that were in the past understood as being banal and basic, and the immediate source of the phenomenon being researched, become themselves produced by more basic material-discursive practices. Put simply, our situated reality is produced by the intra-activity of things and words that are created by further intra-activity. As such, an individual’s choices, intentions and agency that were originally thought of as a unit of cause of phenomena are not the property of bodies, but come after and are a product of the intra-activity of open-ended material-discursive practices. It is through reconfigurations of intra-activity that ‘a differential sense of being is enacted in the ongoing ebb and flow of agency’.
The reconfiguration of material-discursive entities in phenomena thus form reality (Barad, 2007, p. 140).

There is therefore a change evident in thinking in materialist frameworks in terms of how matter shapes an individual’s social world. Intention and agency are distributed within an assemblage of relation, not among the individual material and discursive entities themselves. A dualist understanding between subject and object no longer exists when understanding phenomena. Rather, the constitution of knowledge, as understood in this thesis, takes place in a dialectic or, as Dolphin and van der Tuin (2012, p. 110) state, a ‘two way track’ between globalised material and discursive entities. The distribution of agency is thus understood as existing in the formation of historically contingent material conditions that are produced through further relational assemblages of intra-actions (Barad, 2007).

Barad (2007) adopts the terms ‘apparatus’ and ‘agential cut’ as practices of boundary- and meaning-making. Unlike the Cartesian cut that understands the divide between ‘subject’ and ‘object’ as taken for granted and pre-existent of phenomena, the agential cut is the emergence of ‘relata’, such as ‘subject’ and ‘object’ enacted through forms of further intra-activity. These cuts can be enacted in different ways to focus our attention on particular elements of phenomena. As mentioned previously, however, the individual does not own agency; agency is produced through ‘the enactment of iterative changes to particular practices through the dynamics of intra-activity’ (Barad, 2007, p. 827). The conceptual shift that Barad (2007) outlines through such agential cuts is in terms of changes in subjectivity being enacted through practice produced by other practices. Vital to such an understanding is positioning the individual as ‘spontaneously responsive, embodied beings, immersed within a somewhat “fluid” reality’ (Shotter, 2014, p. 308) and a return to a focus on bodily experience and practice. This positioning is also inclusive of the researcher as a part of the relational dynamics of such phenomena.

Like the ‘agential cut’, the ‘apparatus’ is used in this thesis as a form of boundary-making in the production of knowledge about youth’s cosmopolitan practices. Barad (2007, p. 816) notes that ‘apparatuses are dynamic (re)configurings of the world, specific agential practices/intra-actions/performances through which specific
exclusionary boundaries are enacted’. Specifically, I use and enact the apparatus of youth’s place-making projects as a way of thinking about the historical, cultural and social relational context in which particular globalised matter are understood and produced. Place-making is drawn upon as a specific relational assemblage in which we can come to understand the contextual specific meanings and agency of globalised matter, generating what I have called cosmopolitan moments in which particular understandings of self, Other and world are produced.

For Barad, both time and space are understood as produced through iterative intra-actions that materialise the phenomena being addressed by the researcher. In addition, phenomena are not ‘things’ as such, but exist as relations or ‘relata’ as defined by Barad. Mattering and materialising are dynamic processes through which temporality and spatiality are produced as something specific. This is addressed in the last concept of Barad’s adopted in this thesis known as ‘spacetimemattering’ (Barad, 2007). ‘Spacetimemattering’ highlights the way entities (human and non-human) are produced together in one processual movement. Barad (2012) theoretically reworks ‘natural’ constructions of time and space, by throwing into question what we presume to know about time and space through the endurance of specific historical material-discursive practices in our research practices. Barad (cited in interview in Juelskjær & Schwennesen, 2012, p. 18) notes:

Why should we find the metaphysical individualism of classical physics so ‘natural’ in its obvious applicability to human phenomena, while refusing to consider the possibility that the relational ontology of quantum physics might yield a different set of insights worth considering about human and nonhuman worlds, and the ways that boundary gets made and enforced? Notice that what I’m suggesting here is a shift in the ontological and epistemological underpinnings of our theories, not an insistence that quantum physics can provide an explanation for everything under the sun.

Key questions shaping my research are: How might these new concepts of ‘spacetimemattering’ make us think otherwise about subjectivities, particularly the agency of bodily matter in the enactment cosmopolitan subjectivities? How does the troubling of pre-fixed spatial scales and conceptions of past/present change the analytical practice and what we might be able to ‘see’ analytically? This theoretical
questioning guides this thesis’s analytical and methodological apparatus as outlined in the next chapter.

Concluding remarks

This chapter began by arguing that youth are situated and engage in everyday global processes because of banal forms of globalisation that are entangled in their everyday social practices at home and school (Szerszynski & Urry, 2002). It has also defined its shift from a normative and universalistic understanding of cosmopolitanism towards an understanding of cosmopolitanism based on social practices and embodiment, highlighting the contingent and messy assemblages of material-discursive practices that shape youth's social and global imaginaries and place-making practices.

By drawing predominantly from the work of Thrift (1999), Massey (2005) and Casey (1993) I have also put forward an understanding of place as the intersection of different social spaces and other places. I also understand youth’s place-making as constructed in relation to the body and the affective intensities produced and emergent from body-place relations. Furthermore, I have adopted an understanding of youth's place-making based on a ‘global sense of place’ where place is constituted through bodily practices that engage with globalised entities throughout the world. I assert that places are pedagogical and, as such, the analysis of the place-making practices of youth has the capacity to produce fruitful knowledge about their cosmopolitan practices and the ways they relate to globalised entities in such moments.

I have also retheorised the co-constitution of youth’s cosmopolitan becomings as produced through spaces that are embodied and material in nature. Affect is understood as both a pre-personal and pre-discursive intensity that has the capacity to change experiential states of body and the ability to interrupt an individual’s subjective understandings of themselves, Others and the world. Vital materialist understandings of subjectivity are interlaced with theories of affect and a discernment toward object–body entanglements is also emphasised in the analysis to highlight the intra-actions between globalised objects and bodies in the co-
constitution of youth’s cosmopolitan subjectivity. Furthermore, Barad’s concept of ‘spacetime mattering’ is used in my project to understand how youth locate what matters, such as the continuity and discontinuity of practices of place-making that bring into being youth’s subjective understanding of the Other and space in which further material-discursive practices of negotiation and openness can emerge.

Drawing from elements of the above conceptual frameworks to theorise youth’s cosmopolitan becomings leads to an emphasis on the agency of assemblages of practice, affect and matter in the analysis of empirical material. Discourse is understood therefore primarily as an activity or practice and embodied as a form of intra-activity not in the sense that discourses are primarily iterative citations by the body and on the body, but that such practices are entangled in the becoming of the individual. ‘Knowing’ and becoming cosmopolitan within Barad’s materialist paradigm is thus co-composed through the intra-action between discourse and matter.

The separation of the textual and more-than textual empirical material remains in my analysis (which is evident in the following chapter), but as a re-inscription of social-constructivist concepts to act as what Barad (2003) describes as an ‘agential cut’, a practice of boundary- and meaning-making through phenomenon involving practices/activities of place-making construction. Central to this understanding of becoming and subjectivity is an understanding of discourse as a form of situated practice and ‘doing’ and the body as both affective and affected by such ‘doing’ of discourse. As such, key questions for the research project include: what do globalised entities do and how do discourses and bodies enact and practise affect and the sensual in the emergent activities of youth’s situated place-making and subjectification? This theoretical framework provides an understanding of the co-constitutive nature of the intra-activity of words and things in the place-making of youth without prioritising one ontological frame over the other. Thus, youth’s cosmopolitan becomings do not precede performances of material-discursive practices – they are made through them (Mulcahy, 2012).

In the following chapter, I outline how I operationalise these ontological and epistemological perspectives to produce knowledge about youth’s place-making and cosmopolitan practices. Drawing from the work of Barad (2003), I discuss the operationalisation of these previously discussed concepts in terms of my ‘apparatus
of knowing’, an emergent, non-representational and materialist methodology for understanding youth’s cosmopolitan practices.
Chapter 3: Place-making with youth – methodological considerations

Research questions

The overall aim of my research project is to understand youth’s cosmopolitan practices within a frame that accounts for individuals’ relations to places, people, ideas and other non-human entities that traverse the world. More particularly, it hopes to gain insight into how youth understand their social lives by intra-acting with ‘globalised’ entities through the apparatus of their place-making projects. From these aims, the following research questions were developed.

Main research questions:

How do youth’s and globalised entities’ intra-actions constitute practices of place-making in the everyday running of the youth’s lives?

How do ‘cosmopolitan practices’ emerge from the material-discursive practices evident in youth’s place-making?

Sub-questions:

What are youth’s perspectives in terms of how they are positioned in a broader ‘global’ society? (perceived space)

How do certain social/spatial/material practices in the school setting shape youth’s understanding of place?

How is the materiality (including bodily matter) of youth’s social lives entangled in their cosmopolitan practices?

Methodological considerations: Operationalising a situated and non-representational approach to cosmopolitanism

Qualitative research is based on the idea that social life is inherently ‘messy’, with social phenomena entangled within a diverse range of social relations and practices of humans and non-human actors in particular contexts. A qualitative approach resonates with my theoretical framework as it attends to the fluid, partial and
multiple entanglements of material-discursive practices in which youth’s cosmopolitan practices come into being. Individuals are continuously making sense of the places they inhabit and of their social lives through taken-for-granted understandings of the world and social practices enacted with other humans and non-human objects (Dougherty, 2002). One of the main purposes of qualitative research is to demarcate, and systematically explain, the qualities of such complex phenomena.

Social life is increasingly disembedded and its messiness is exacerbated through global processes that ‘reorder the classical relationship between self and the other, society and knowledge’ (Gille & O’Riain, 2002, p. 273). For example, individuals no longer need to venture out of their home to shop for food and may know more about the daily activity of an individual or incident half way across the world than what is happening in their own neighbourhood. Moreover, individuals readily have increased access to a plethora of information that they continually comprehend, assess and ignore, information that shapes their social practices on a daily basis.

My main methodological considerations are accordingly around the selection of methods of inquiry that account for the multiple social processes involved in present global relations, as well as those that are suitable for exploring the many types of global entities that the globally oriented ethnographic inquiry encounters.

My research is influenced by literature based on a relational logic that extends the parameters of ethnography across space, place and time (Massey, 2005; Thrift, 2008). It is formulated to account for youth’s intra-actions with globalities that are both de-territorial and material in nature. From this ontological standpoint and while working within and between a constructivist and vital materialist paradigm, the research project’s methodological considerations are based on the argument that ‘I’ as the researcher in the school setting is viewed as just as involved in the place-making projects of youth as the youth themselves. I have therefore developed methods in which the youth and I can make place together. The making of place emerges from material-discursive practices entangled in in-situ-interviews, group discussions, the production of process diaries and video essays. By creating a space for the youth to practise place-making, I analyse the material-discursive practices that forge both their understandings and sense of place and the ways that these place-making projects are entangled in their cosmopolitan practices (Thrift, 2008).
I begin this chapter by expanding on how my methodology is guided by the ontological and epistemological claims of both a constructivist and vital materialist paradigm; what I have termed ‘emergent thinking’. I also delineate this methodology’s critique and reconceptualisation of the concept of reflexivity by introducing Somerville’s (2007) concept of ‘postmodern emergence’. Following this, I extend on how a mobile ethnographic approach of situated globalities (Blok, 2010) is an appropriate method of inquiry for addressing both my research questions and ontological position. I will then specifically outline my research methods, such as observations, in-situ interviews, visual ethnographic methods, and group discussions, and their relevance in generating a space for youth’s emergent place-making. In addition, I discuss how I work between both spaces of representation and non-representation in the production, organisation and analysis of empirical material through Barad’s (2007) concept of agential realism. The chapter concludes with an explanation of the actual research process.

The researcher and knowledge production

Following the onto-epistemological perspectives of Barad (2007, p. 88), I am always ‘understanding the world from within and as part of it’. Knowledge about youth’s subjective understanding of the world is accordingly formed in my project through the intra-actions between myself as researcher, the student participants, and discourse, matter and affect. I am not socially dis-embedded as a researcher from the production of knowledge, but instead relationally entangled in its generation. I also understand knowledge and a ‘truth’ as always relative to an individual’s perspectives (Baxter & Jack, 2008, p. 545), a perspective that ‘comes from somewhere’ (Haraway, 1988). My role in the production of knowledge cannot escape the histories, affects and materialities that are entangled in my own becoming (Somerville, 2007).

A vital materialist epistemology also acknowledges the agentic forces of matter and its capacity to move us, affect us and shape the way we act. Lorimer (2012) for example, has asserted that new materialist research is concerned with the important biopolitical role of materialities governing one’s everyday life. Given that there are
myriad forces in our social research fields, a vital materialist perspective argues that ‘the analysis of the constitution of subjectivities calls for a co-thinking of social, subjective, technological, and other material as well as discursive forces’ (Højgaard & Søndergaard, 2011, p. 339). This means I am also ‘obliged to acknowledge that data have their ways of making themselves intelligible to us’ (MacLure, 2013, p. 660). My methodology is formulated around the idea that I am embodied in the research project and research is an experience that has material effects and affects me, which in turn shapes the ways I produce my situated understanding of youth’s cosmopolitan practices. As Barad (2007, p. 49) asserts, ‘[k]nowing does not come from standing at a distance and representing something, but rather from a direct material engagement with the world’. It emphasises the agency of our material and embodied research practices in which knowledge of our social worlds is produced and becomes remade.

MacLure (2013, p. 659) refers to a materialist onto-epistemology as a ‘flattened’ logic where representation and ‘[l]anguage is deposed from its god-like centrality in the construction and regulation of worldly affairs, to become one element in a manifold of forces and intensities that are moving, connecting and diverging’. I must emphasise that I do not set aside the power of discourse in the production of knowledge about youth’s cosmopolitan practices, but also address discourse in its materiality. I address discourse in terms of its material affects or what it ‘does’, what it limits and makes possible in youth’s cosmopolitan becomings.

In sum, rather than focusing primarily on significations and discourse in the production of knowledge about youth’s place-making and cosmopolitan practices, I also attend to the material and affective dimensions of youth’s cosmopolitan practices that are interwoven in the ways we understand and come to know the world. I therefore de-centre (but not exclude) the agency of the human in my analysis and focus on how matter, including bodily matter, is entangled in youth’s cosmopolitan practices. Methods relevant to such registers thus account for experiences that are not expressed linguistically (e.g. corporeal and sensual experiences) and work as agentic force in the cosmopolitan becomings of the youth in my study.
Emergent thinking: Intra-acting with, rather than mirroring, an ‘outside’

I start my discussion of emergent thinking by engaging with feminist critiques of reflexivity within post-humanist and new materialist paradigms (e.g. Haraway, 1999; Barad, 2007; Mazzei, 2013). These critiques suggest that many ethnographic researchers have given in to a ‘modernist seduction’ of reflexivity, where transparency in terms of the (re)presentation of knowledge is thought to equate to a more valid approach to addressing unequal power relations and a level of transcendence that removes the researcher from dealing with such political problems (hooks, 1990; Varadharajan, 1995 cited in Pillow, 2003). They also raise problems in relation to decisions about what to include in terms of researcher’s own subjectivity and what is irrelevant. Trihn (1989, p. 28), for example, questions this self-focused understanding of reflexivity in terms of how it is possible for a researcher to ‘inscribe difference without bursting into a series of euphoric narcissistic accounts of yourself and your kind?’ One way that this has been accounted for by ethnographic researchers is to work ‘within and against’ our own continuously shifting subjectivity and ‘politics of our gaze’ (Pillow, 2003, p. 187). At the forefront of this understanding is the idea that our reflexivity does not center on expressions or descriptions of the discovery of our own subjectivity, but is driven by ‘writing through’ the ‘impossibilities’ broached in our ethnographic research (Chaudhry, 2000; Pillow, 2003). Haraway (1997) contends that such practices are still limited in accounting for the researcher’s role in the production of knowledge.

Building on Haraway’s claims (1997), Barad (2003, 2007, 2008) and Mazzei (2013) note that reflexivity is based on the adoption of a practice of mirroring in qualitative research where the researcher is still positioned to some extent as external to the phenomena they are ‘seeing’ and the knowledge they are producing. As Mazzei (2013, p. 777) states: ‘I become something else in the process. I constitute and am being constituted in the process of a more materially engaged research practice. I am constituted by and constituting data, my selves, my participants, and my misunderstandings. I am both made and unmade in such a process.’ As such, my analysis also involves examining the research process in terms of what power practices are at play when knowledge is based on particular ontological and epistemological perspectives/claims (Aguinaldo, 2004). In other words, I have attempted to consider and write about how my ‘apparatus of knowing’ intra-acts and
coproduces the phenomena and matter I am in fact exploring and how my thinking about the ways youth constitute their cosmopolitan practices gets unmade.

Interwoven into my empirical chapters is emergent thinking that addresses the ways I am both positioned and embodied in the production of youth’s cosmopolitan and place-making practices and the ways in which knowledge is formed about them. For example, I have addressed how my body was affected by material objects in the classroom and how these affective intensities directed and were implicated in how I questioned the youth and my own thinking about their cosmopolitan practices. I have highlighted the way the research data and matter redirected me to think otherwise and shaped my research process. In the words of St. Pierre (2002, p. 60), I have analysed data in terms of the way I ‘travel in the thinking [and affects] that writing produces’. This type of emergent thinking also includes the ways data unmade me in terms of the ways I ‘respond differently to the landscapes of the research’ (Somerville, 2007, p. 231).

My research ‘apparatus’

A mobile ethnography of situated globalities

Urry (2000) proposes that a ‘sociology beyond societies’ is needed to fully encompass the ‘messiness’ and far-reaching network of social relations intensified by interconnectedness and mobilities. Closely affiliated with Actor Network Theory (ANT), ethnographic inquiries of global connections focus on this very idea. By drawing on Latour’s work (2005), global ethnography describes “the social” by tracing the constant movements (or translations) in the connections of heterogeneous elements’ and the ways in which these translations are constitutive of the relational assemblages that construct both our social and global imaginaries (Blok, 2010, p. 113). Ethnography thus is focused on mapping how actors (human and non-human) form relational assemblages across different contexts and how these global networks strategically and freely globalise and construct new social spaces and places in which concepts, institutional models and understandings come into being. For example, Saito (2010) examined the educational practices that shaped Japanese students’ understandings of networks of transnational connections in which their daily lives are embedded. Saito was primarily concerned
with exploring the ways that educators and educational programs assist students in recognising the global networks they were entwined with in their local environment and how they facilitated and shaped cosmopolitan practices within this network.

This approach leads to questioning whether our sense of place and belonging and our associated place-making projects are still based on traditional understandings of community and whether levels of geographical scales are constructive in this imagination about the global (Amin, 2004). As Amin (2004, p. 33) states, senses of place ‘are no longer necessarily or purposively … scalar, since the social, economic, political and cultural inside and outside are constituted through the topologies of actor networks which are becoming increasingly dynamic and varied in spatial constitution’. Understandings of ourselves and Others are no longer understood as confined to social relations within the nation-state, the suburb or the neighbourhood, but are shaped by individual’s relations to things, ideas and discourses that cut across space and time via, for example, the media, online social networks, or travel. Global ethnography applied this way removes the global and the local as points of reference and instead understands relations as neither global nor local, but based on relations that extend across space, place and time, relations to globalities that are de-territorial in nature. These methodological dilemmas have been most recently addressed in the methodological considerations of Blok (2010).

This methodology based on relational assemblages that highlight the hybridity of social relations in the unfolding of phenomena has a close affinity with my understanding of relational space. The ‘messiness’ of the spatial assemblages that make certain phenomena possible can be demonstrated and more accurately translated through the study of situated globalities (Blok, 2010; Law, 2004). This methodology counterbalances the overemphasis on the circulation of the ‘globalisation’ jargon through specific material examples. It provides a metaphor to bring to the fore how global entities are embedded in the heterogeneous relations grounded in particular places and social contexts of youth and how these embedded globalised entities enter and reconfigure social, material and discursive relations to give rise to new forms of social order and understanding. Blok (2010), by drawing on Latour (2005), refers to these particular globalities as (im)mutable mobiles and panoramas. Panoramas are constructed global collectives that have a particular way of capturing global wholes and societies. For example, when someone refers to
a risk society, global warming or global village, they form particular subjectivities in terms of how they understand themselves given the social context imagined that way.

The concept of ‘(im)mutable’ mobiles is used to explain the co-constitutive processes of the global. An (im)mutable object, as adapted by Blok (2010), is an entity sustained in a network that when travelling from one point to another does not change its form or appearance (Latour, 2005). This could be, for example, data from a research project, an image of the world or statistical information about the environment. These objects enact material-discursive practices when intra-acting with other objects and discourses and are a part of the relational entanglement in which youth’s social and global imaginaries get made and re-made.

In conclusion, I have adopted a mobile ethnography of situated globalities as a way to elucidate youth’s social relations to globalities referred to by Blok (2010) as (im)mutable mobiles and panoramas outside the traditional ethnographic field. The extension of a relational logic in this mobile ethnography allows the participants and researcher to produce space and place that account for relations that I have explored here as the parameters of the global.

Phases in the production of empirical material

I engaged in place-making with the youth in my study by combining ethnographic observations, visual and audio-visual methods, and discussions, in two main phases.

In the first phase of knowledge production I observed the youth in the school, including in the Society and Culture classroom, and produced a thick description of their social lives and interests. I recorded my observations using field notes and all field notes were recorded in workbooks and stored in a secure place at the university during analytical phases. I illuminated social imaginaries and place through observations of students’ engagement in social and spatial practices in their everyday lives. I conducted interviews-in-situ as students changed settings or if observed phenomena needed clarification and elaboration. In addition to the
observations and interviews-in-situ, I photographed and video-recorded the youth's spatial practices, for example, when a student isolated oneself to answer a text or converse with an individual via social media, as well as those practices that involved music and other visual mediums that required more than linguistic description. Aligning with a unit of work that the youth were already working on, I also asked the youth to contribute their ideas about their past, present and future place-making through a (re)presentation activity, such as paintings, short essays, stories, collages, their own music and lyrics; such activities provided a space for the youth to constitute subject constructions of ‘I’, ‘we’ and ‘Other’ and place. Further details are provided in the following section.

In the second phase I asked the youth to participate in the production of a video essay as a new ‘reading’ of their place-making practices as evidenced in the first stage of the research project. They produced these video essays both in small groups and individually. There were four video essays in total for the class, each approximately three minutes in length. The video essays included images collected from the internet, photographs taken from around the city they lived, holiday snaps, sound and music recordings, and snippets of interview and discussion data. I also used group discussions to produce data about youth’s place-making in this second stage. The youth participated in three small informal group discussions (including five individuals in each discussion) that were conducted to highlight youth’s understanding of social ordering in action, the ways they initiated discussions and reflected on their own and each other’s understandings of issues and themes relevant to the group. I used visual data (photos and video recordings) produced by me in the first phase of data collection in the second phase to elicit discussion and to clarify events as understood by the participants. I used this second phase of research to explore how particular concepts and understanding of youth’s social world are evident in the ways they imagine the Other and what the other might think of them, their own position in the world and their moral obligations towards the Other, and the ways such understandings and imaginaries were negotiated across space and time (Silverstone, 2007).

Recruitment, participants and sites
The recruitment of participants in this research project was a difficult and uncomfortable task. I recruited the youth participants based on what classes and teachers from the schools I approached were both willing and had the time to participate in the project. I emailed several principals from numerous independent and public high schools in New South Wales, Australia. Among those principals who replied, one public high school principal was willing to provide the necessary time it would take to complete the research project. He agreed to ask his staff if they would be willing to participate and, from this consultation, one Society and Culture teacher (known as Ms Johnston in the project) communicated her interest in participating. She provided me with class time to present and provide information to the youth about the details of my research and what they would be required to do if they chose to participate. Although it would have been nice to have approached the youth independently from the teacher and the principal, it was not possible given the way youth are positioned in the education system. In a way, I felt that the research project was imposed on them or expected of them given the teacher’s and the principal’s enthusiasm for the project. I became painfully aware of the uneven power relations between myself and the participants that were already shaping my research in the education context and the ways in which these power relations were normalised by the ‘gatekeepers’ before the project essentially started. To address these uneven power relations, I repeatedly emphasised that participation in this project was voluntary and that the participants could pull out at any time. Moreover, I emphasised that whether they chose to participate or not in the project, it would not reflect on the participants academically or affect how they were viewed by myself, their teacher and principal.

After the recruitment stage, 20 youth aged 16–17 who were enrolled in the Society and Culture class consented to participating in my research project. Anderson and Jones (2009, p. 132) state that ‘[y]outh are no longer children, but they are not yet adult. This “liminal” positioning has consequences for the places that they can take and make with the cultural and social] world.’ Youth is also a period in one’s life when individuals are encouraged to make decisions about their future in terms of employment, education and relationships. This ‘liminal’ positioning of youth, as noted by Bhabha (1990, p. 211 cited in Anderson & Jones, 2009, p. 134), may ‘give rise to something different, something new and unrecognisable, a new era of meaning and representation [and practice]’. Youth are a focus in my research.
because their social positioning and context may provide insight into possible alternative ways of being and becoming cosmopolitan.

Like Skrbis and Woodward (2007, p. 734), I argue that despite there being both an ethical and political value in society for having a global imaginary, ‘one does not need to be a member of the global elite to potentially hold cosmopolitan views’. Other than the participants being youth, my selection criteria for participation in my research project was quite broad. This is because participants were not understood as existing or sedimentary cosmopolitans being ‘found’ due to their social positioning, but as individuals whose subjective construction of self, Other and world could potentially be forged through contingent cosmopolitan practices (Skey, 2012). In other words, I was not in the search for or select participants based on whether I viewed them as cosmopolitans, but because I considered their everyday practices might provide the space for the constitution of cosmopolitan practices.

Australian youth’s intensified relations to globalised entities are also another justification for the selection of this group of individuals in my study (Anderson & Jones, 2009). Kenway and Bullen (2008) have noted that uneven forms of interconnectedness have implications for youth and their education. They believe that the ‘global corporate curriculum’ of the young is not conducive to developing a ‘sense of critical agency in the young’ outside of what is provided by the media culture (Kenway & Bullen, 2008, p. 22). This generation of youth have been born into a world where increased global processes of communication and mobility, and their resulting reconfiguration of social relations, have already begun to be intensified and normalised in their everyday practices and schooling.

The number of participants in the research project was limited to 20 as I focused on exploring the lives of the participants in the school setting in a nuanced fashion. The research site was a selective performing arts school in a relatively large city in New South Wales, Australia. The school’s socio-educational advantage rating as outlined on the NSW MySchools website demonstrated that a large majority of the student population at the school (over 40%) were socio-economically advantaged and had access to external resources for their educational and living needs (Australian
Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2010). This also included the students’ access to economic resources for national and international travel.

At the time of the research, the youth were engaged in a unit of work entitled ‘Intercultural Communication’ that encouraged them to discuss communicative practices of different cultures, problems that arise in moments of intercultural communication and how individuals may overcome such barriers in an ethical manner. This unit of work provided an excellent space for research in terms of generating class discussions about engagements with Others and the globalised entities that youth would draw from when discussing issues related to global events and their imaginaries of other places in the world. The unit of work was based around the following educational outcomes:

1. Describes the interaction between persons, societies, cultures and environments across time.
2. Identifies and describes relationships within and between social and cultural groups.
3. Describes cultural diversity and commonality within societies and cultures.
4. Explains continuity and change, and their implications for societies and cultures.
5. Investigates power, authority, gender and technology, and describes their influence on decision-making and participation in society.

This unit of work provided a valuable space to discuss how participants understand their own subjectivities and positions in relation to specific global processes and built-upon experiences and everyday activities in the classroom. It also provided a space in which youth discussed their lived experiences of travel, online communication practices and the globalised entities encountered in teaching materials. I was in the school for Society and Culture lessons a week for a total of 10 weeks (June to October 2015).

The city in which the school was located is relatively large and on the coast of New South Wales, Australia. The city is currently undergoing a revitalisation process.
initiated by local and state politicians to improve the negative image it gained as a heavily industrialised area. Such changes have included the redevelopment of the waterfront and city retail areas as a material practice of attracting tourism and generating revenue for local businesses. This initiative was also based on shifting the place identity of the city from one based on industry to a cultural hub focused on local arts and shared community spaces to produce social cohesiveness, increase employment and create affordable living opportunities in the area. It was also aimed at presenting and marketing the city as one of the finest revitalised ports on the ‘global’ stage.

Ethnographic observations combined with interviews-in-situ

I combined observations with interviews-in-situ. These interviews were included to help document youth’s encounters with place and mobile practices that may have a role in shaping youth’s place-making projects and social imaginaries as social phenomena unfold (Anderson & Jones, 2009). Their inclusion acknowledged questions raised by McGuinness, Fincham and Murray (2010, p. 2) who ask: ‘Can existing social scientific research methods that slow down and freeze experiences (the observation, the focus group, the survey) adequately capture mobile experiences, practices where the context of movement itself may be crucial to understanding the significance of the event to the participant, rather than being simply “read off” from the destination points and origins?’ Anderson and Jones (2009, p. 299) argue that interviews-in-situ account for this by stating: ‘Interviews-in-situ allow the researcher, in the ethnographic tradition, to witness an array of social practices as they are experienced and performed by those involved’. As such, the interview-in-situ method together with participant observations allowed my own experience of the social practices to be acknowledged alongside the experience of the participants. For example, I asked students during interviews-in-situ to elaborate on their virtual mobile practices on the internet as they navigated online places for school work, the ways in which they felt different in different spaces and places in the school.

There were other obvious strengths to the interview-in-situ method. Porter et al. (2010, p. 102) has noted, for example, that ‘walking conversation, whether as part of a purposive journey along a defined route, or even merely a perambulation, has
much to offer in many research contexts, but perhaps especially where establishing rapport with interviewees is complicated by strongly skewed power relations. For example, I found that interviews, when performed this way, created a more casual and comfortable environment for the student to be interviewed in. All interviews-in-situ were recorded on a digital recording device and transcriptions of the interview-in-situ data were made selectively.

**Visual ethnography: Visual representation, audio-visual recordings and video essay**

Visual images and material objects play a large role in deploying particular understandings of the world and meaning (Urry & Szerszynski, 2006). Vital visual ethnographic methods are well suited to engage with much of what is globalised, since banal forms of globalism appear as the mobility of visual forms and objects. These methods also address what a large body of literature in the mobilities paradigm has noted as a ‘neglectfulness’ to explore the spatial and material practices of the body in sociological fields of research (Merriman, 2009). A vital methodology is concerned with the affective nature of ethnographic methods and focuses our attention on what Vannini (2015, p. 322) describes as ‘body-centered activities that require the performance of skill’, also referred in this research project as practice. When research participants are interconnected and mobile subjects, new techniques of research need to be developed to account for these practices (Spinney, 2009). In drawing from Spinney (2009, p. 827), Merriman (2014, p. 175) explains further that:

> [i]n situations where the research subjects are moving, and their spatial, social and material contexts and relations are ever-changing, it would seem that new techniques and technologies must be adopted in order to ‘keep as much of the context of practice as possible’.

I used art-based methodologies to ‘encompass the multiple forms in which alternative representations of place are expressed; the embodiment of experiences in place; and the multiple alternative voices and stories about any particular place’ (Somerville et al., 2009, p. 10). For example, ‘by focusing on how movement [and our bodies’ relation to material objects] participates in how place is made through performance, text and the ethnographers’ own participation, we are invited to attend
to the textual, embodied and phenomenological aspects of place-making’ (Pink, 2008b, para. 5). I engaged art-based methodologies to ‘encompass the multiple forms in which alternative representations of place are expressed; the embodiment of experiences in place; and the multiple alternative voices and stories about any particular place’, similar to the work of Somerville, Power and de Carteret (2009, p. 10). Drawing from the work of Pink (2001, 2008b), my visual ethnographic methods were not used or understood in terms of presenting events and knowledge as purely captured by the filming process, but were addressed in terms of their partiality, ongoing constitution and the way they facilitate our understanding of particular subject positions and place. Similarly Crang (2009, p. 9) has drawn from Trinh (1991) to advocate a level of interference in the visual ethnographic process that ‘use[s] visual documents to throw into focus contradictions and tensions, so that rather than representing a seamless whole or way of life they offer a “trangressive validity” by confronting the limits of representations’.

The (re)presentation activity

Following the onto-epistemological framework of Barad (2008), symbols and representations are not understood as mirroring knowledge, but rather ‘[l]anguage, already collective, social and impersonal, pre-exists “us”, and my voice comes from elsewhere’ (MacLure, 2013, p. 660). In other words, (re)presentations are not understood as mirroring an image of thought or experience, but are part of entanglements that remake experiences and understanding. The (re)presentation activity asked the project participants to create a (re)presentation of places of their past, present and future that were important to them. They were able to use a material/textual mode of their choosing, for example, paintings, short essays, stories, collages, their own music and lyrics. This activity was used so that the youth could illustrate their social imaginaries (subject constructions of ‘I’, ‘we’ and ‘Other’) and understandings of place. Adopting the elements of the mapping methods of Vincent (2014), the task asked students to not only create a (re)presentation, but to provide an activity as a lived experience of place-making and the embodiment of knowledge. The task was stated to them as follows:

*Given what you have learnt about your own social lives as Year 11 Society and Culture students living in NSW, Australia so far this year and from further personal*
reflection and social research, create a (re)presentation of places in your past, present and future through a medium of your choice.

I asked students to document their process in the form of a process diary, providing information about their selection of images, text, why certain places were important to them and where they found information about the places they imagined in their future. The youth approached the (re)presentations of place activity in numerous ways: some produced collages of images that included images and text from local and global mediums, while others drew mind-maps, made detailed drawings or used photographs of travel and their local engagements with the Other.

The video essay

I used the video activity as a way of returning to the empirical material the youth and I produced in the first phase of the research project. Rather than mirroring events in the ethnographic field, the video essay activity was structured to 'coproduce, construct and distort memories, places, memories of places in ongoing flows of performativity and materiality' (Stevenson, 2014, p. 340). The video essay activity asked the youth to listen to and view the empirical material produced by them and the researcher during the first phase of the ethnography. The youth were asked to interpret their own place-making practices, while simultaneously co-composing places both material and imaginary in nature. There were four video essays in total for the class, composed of a selection of video recordings, photographs, sound recordings and text deemed as significant to the place-making practices of the participants. The written text in the video essay also included field notes of the researcher, and snippets of transcribed interviews and written contributions about the participant’s research and creative process. Supporting these images was a music track that the participants either had produced or selected from a public domain site of free downloadable music.

I also used these visual methods to elicit discussion among participants. Visual representations assisted me in terms of exploring how subjectivities and social/spatial practices are continuously changing and unstable (Schell, Ferguson, Hamoline, Shea & Thomas-Maclean, 2009). The visual representations and the creative process generally were used as an elicitation device for discussions and produced a new way for me to explore data with participants. This practice also
produced a new space in which new knowledge about the youth’s understandings of place could be discussed and remade. For example, the youth were asked to mind map and discuss their ideas to find commonalities among themes in the data and formed their groups in relation to these commonalities and shared place-making practices.

Discussing empirical materials (photos, video recordings and video essay) with participants

I use discussions to account for response and sensual forms of empirical material that reshape/reconstruct both the researcher’s and participants’ understandings of social phenomena as the research projects proceeds. The (re)presentation activity and video essay, developed through a collage of visual and audio empirical material, therefore has a dual role, acting as an elicitation device for discussion to explore how the researcher ‘makes place with research participants through research practice’ and reconstituting place at the same time (Pink, 2008b, para. 5). The discussions in the research project are therefore viewed as events that enact worlds. Rather than being focused on how place and subjectivities of ‘I’, ‘we’ and ‘Other’ were represented by the participants in my study, discussions were selected to see how place and such subjectivities come into being through the participant’s material and social practices. This method of data collection draws attention to not only what was said, but also how shared meaning is constructed. Drawing from Pierre (2010, p. 185), this method ‘move[s] me out of the self-evidence of my work and into its absences and give[s] me the gift of different language and practice with which to trouble my common-sense understanding of the world’. Nyiri (2002, p. 123) has noted that discussions have ‘a vital import lacking in the fixed and frozen words of written speech … Vision is a spectator; hearing is a participator.’ Discussion in my project therefore also provided a space to highlight youth’s social imaginaries in action, the way they shape judgements and perspectives about issues relevant to them, including the way they interact with, position themselves and respond to empirical material presented in the video essays that they made. For example, what the participants have chosen to elaborate on, identify and speak to in relation to the questions is a part of how they understand and create place and space.
Groups of five participants were selected for the discussions, based on whether participants felt comfortable working with each other. This provided two discussion groups in total. Decisions about the number of participants included in the discussion were based on what I viewed as maintainable as a researcher, but that would still sustain discussion and an adequate amount of interaction within the group. Discussion topics were also based on issues relevant to the participants that were identified in the observation phase of data and the visual forms of data produced by the researcher to elicit discussion. For example, I had noticed a few of the youth were discussing with their teacher how they were planning trips overseas and decided to ask on the different avenues they were using to plan and learn about the places they were about to visit. All group discussions were audio-recorded. I did my best to note the ways the youth were organised in the discussion group and to provide context to their discussion in relation to tone and gesture. Transcription of the response data was conducted selectively, with only dialogue that the researcher viewed as relevant to the research project transcribed.

Analysing empirical material as events of subjectivity and place-making

My approach to analysing youth’s cosmopolitan practices is influenced by Skey’s (2012) idea of ‘dilemmatic thinking’. Skey argues that cosmopolitanism should be analysed in relation to the social positioning of the individuals involved, the context in which they emerge, the form they take (e.g. embodied, discursive, material practices in which the youth’s belonging to the ‘world’ gets made) and the way they are understood by the participants and researcher. Skey’s approach also aligns with Haraway’s (1988) concept of ‘situated knowledges’. As both an epistemological perspective and methodology, such a practice draws attention to the ‘specificity of the speaking subject in order to foreground her capacity to speak, and also to account for the way that all knowledge claims remain situated and contingent’ (Hinton, 2014, p. 100). So as part of my analysis, I showed the way time or the ‘when’ youth’s cosmopolitan practices emerged as a practice of territorialising the moment and social context in which such practices could be understood. I analysed each cosmopolitan practice as a moment that was emergent from a very specific open entanglement of bodies, matter, affects and space. The social forces and power relations forged through such entanglements were understood as implicated in what the body could do in terms of becoming and being cosmopolitan.
I understand youth’s cosmopolitan practices as produced through the entanglement of material-discursive practices generated by the methods of data production in the research project. In other words, I analyse data not as representations of youth’s cosmopolitan practices, but as indicating the ways in which these practices and experiences are continually made, remade and (re)presented through the research methods. I treat the empirical material (e.g. the production of text, images, photographs, creative products) as ‘events’ of lived experience and not only as textual (re)presentations. Accordingly I explored how the students, through specific events of making place as well as through the process of mapping their relations to global ideas, people and objects, change, stabilise and shift through such methods of producing knowledge (Vannini, 2015).

The first part of my analysis involved partially mapping the interweaving relations between self, Other and place to delineate the entanglement of material-discursive practices in which the youth were affected or affect. Affect was understood and identified as any point in the data when the youth discussed how they felt, sensed, and moved during their data generation. I also made notes in discussions and interviews about the youth’s body language and tone to identify such affects. In mapping these relations, I could show the ways youth discussed their relations with globalities to remake and continually constitute ‘global’ space and place and their intra-actions with the Other and the world. In other words, I took notes in terms of what intra-actions with globalised entities and bodies were evident when the youth noted they were affected and how these intra-actions were entangled with and connected to particular cosmopolitan ‘discourses’.

I also examined the data in terms of how such affects mobilised (provided a space for) and shaped youth’s cosmopolitan practices, or what the body could ‘do’ in terms of being cosmopolitan. An example of this in my data is in Chapter 6, where I showed how feeling at ‘home’ with the Other and youth’s comfort in difference shaped what they could ‘do’ in terms of forming an ethical and moral sense of responsibility for the Other. I (re)presented the ways affective intensities, when linked to certain cosmopolitan discourses, closed off and limited their practices in terms of engaging with inequality and positions of privilege. This form of analysis meant not only addressing the affects discussed in terms of youth’s experiences
with difference, but the ways in which the affects emergent from the entanglement of bodies in interviews and group discussions shaped their cosmopolitan practices. For example, this included analysing the emergent feelings of fear and anxiety from the idea that they might sound ‘wrong’ and ‘prejudice’ in such situations (Skey, 2012). Analysing the affective dimensions of youth’s cosmopolitan practices was therefore also linked to the ways in which the youth engaged with discourses to (re)present and remake their cosmopolitan practices and experiences, rather than assuming an objective account of the experience itself.

Materialist understandings of social life also draw attention to the fact that ‘constructions and interactions then are not just about bodies, nor just about words, but about the mutual production of both subjectivities and performative enactments’ (Mazzei, 2014, p. 745). Discourse from a vital materialist lens expands on the ‘how’ in constructivist/poststructural paradigms of research by attending to the performative aspects of discourse or, put simply, what discourses ‘do’ in our becoming. Such an understanding of discourse highlights the fact that discourses bring into being what they describe and symbolise. As Barad (2003, p. 802) notes:

A crucial part of the performative account that I have proposed is a rethinking of the notions of discursive practices and material phenomena and the relationship between them. On an agential realist account, discursive practices are not human-based activities but rather specific material (re)configurings of the world through which local determinations of boundaries, properties, and meanings are differentially enacted.

I understand discourse as performed and practised and not a representation or a mirroring of an individual’s reality. As Grosz (1994, p. 199) asserts, ‘it is no longer appropriate to ask what a text means, what it says, what is the structure of its interiority, how to interpret or decipher it. Instead, one must ask what it does’. Discourse is a material expression of knowing in being, shaped by both time and space. That is, discourses are not owned by the individual, but practised in turn producing material affects.

In the second part of my analysis I mapped the way the youth constructed socio-spatial divides or territorialised understandings of themselves (‘I’, ‘we’), Others and the world through particular material-discursive practices. For example, I paid
attention to what globalised spaces and matter were entangled in their constructions of ‘we’, ‘home’, ‘Australia’, ‘Europe’ or ‘Americans’, and what kinds of differences they drew from when constituting boundaries and territorialising such entities and understandings of the Other. This mapping strategy was especially pertinent in addressing youth’s sense of belonging and the ways in which they position themselves in relation to the Other and the world. I am referring, for example, to the ways they performed spatial imaginaries through certain entanglements of material-discursive practices (knowledges) and the ways such entanglements forged at times their sense of belonging to the nation and at others, the world. In other words, I concentrated on the way these territorialised spaces sometimes overlapped, were reorganised, and shifted in relation to the particular spaces and places the youth’s bodies were intra-acting with and in turn remaking.

Lastly, my analysis focused on the multiple ways these material-discursive entanglements produced and limited the ways youth could practise cosmopolitanism. This included the ways youth’s affective relations to the Other and difference intra-acted with liberal cosmopolitan discourses that precluded the youth from practising an ethical responsibility to the Other. I analysed the ways certain discourses associated with cosmopolitanism, such as empathy, openness and acceptance, were possible or closed off in relation to the entanglement of material-discursive practices that constituted the ways the youth made place. Moreover, I documented how these cosmopolitan practices constituted what the body can do and become in relation to how the youth imagine and make their worlds.

**Ethics and unequal power relations**

I was granted ethics approval in March 2014 by the Human Ethics Committee at the University of Newcastle (Approval no. H-2013-0297). The youth (including their guardians), their teacher and the school principal who all participated in the research project provided consent by reading a Participant Information Statement (PIS) and signing a formal recognition of consent. This process was followed with the approval of the New South Wales Department of Education. All names used in the research project are pseudonyms that the youth selected prior to the commencement of the research. They selected their own pseudonyms so that they could be reminded of and read their interviews in my finished and published thesis.
The Australian government notes that social research should be based on a ‘respect for human beings, research merit and integrity, justice, and beneficence to help shape that relationship as one of trust, mutual responsibility and ethical equality’ (NHMRC, 2007, p. 6). My approach to ethics is therefore based on the recognition of unequal power relations between myself and the youth as well as the ways in which the youth are understood and positioned within the educational context as ‘learners’. This recognition of uneven power relations also extends itself to an attentiveness to ‘the power of epistemology (including the ways in which exercises of power can conceal themselves). It expects on-going concern about boundaries, silencing, absences, marginalisation and attentiveness to the relational context in which we/I research’ (Ackerly & True, 2008, p. 704).

Being ‘cosmopolitan’ was understood as a desirable and admirable quality of youth at my participating school. At times I felt that my position as an older ex-teacher, and my enthusiasm in the way I presented my research process to the participants, may have played a role in what Hollway and Jefferson (2000, p. 6) refer to as the ‘defended subject’. This is where the youth were ‘invested in particular positions in discourses to protect vulnerable aspects of self … and are motivated, largely unconsciously, to disguise the meaning of at least some of their feelings and actions’ (Hollway & Jefferson, 2000, p. 6). This was especially prevalent when they were discussing their perceptions of Others in group discussions with myself and their peers. For example, I had noticed that a lot of the participants in discussion groups and interviews were more hesitant or anxious about the ways they discussed their experiences with inequality overseas and the possibility of ‘sounding wrong’. In these situations, I did my best to remind the youth that they could say what they wanted in the discussions if they respected the other group members. I also theorised these power relations evident in discussions and interviews-in-situ in my empirical chapters, noting the ways these social forces played an inescapable role in shaping the youth’s cosmopolitan practices.

The need for the youth to seek approval and ‘please’ me during the production of their visual (re)presentation activity and video essay was another point at which my position as a researcher was made evident and shaped the research process. I tried to emphasise to the youth that I was not their educator by dressing more casually,
reminding them to call me by my first name and by communicating in a less formal manner. I also outlined that although their contribution to the research was invaluable, it should not be produced to please me, but offered as a way of contributing to a body of knowledge about their own lives as youth and their place-making practices. This was a difficult task in the school, given the formal constraints of wearing a bright yellow visitor badge and the awkward position the teacher was placed in as an authoritarian. For example, at times she was forced to remind the youth not to swear or be rude in my presence during the research activities that took place during class time, which positioned me as ‘special’, an ‘outsider’, and someone needing to be impressed and pleased.

Validity

My position on validity rejects the ‘positivist’ practice of presenting an ‘authentic’ and ‘objective’ representation of reality or the idea that a reality can be ‘found’. These sorts of practices are understood in my research as policing and limiting what research can ‘do’ or become. My understanding of validity is based on the idea that ‘science is a performance’ and that validity is ‘transgressive’ rather than based on correspondence (Lather, 2007). What I mean by this is that I understand validity like Lather (2007, p. 120): ‘as a space of constructed visibility of the practices of methodology and “a space of the incitement to see” (Rajchman, 1991, p. 85), an apparatus for observing the staging of the poses of methodology, a site that “gives to be seen” the unthought in our thought.’ The ‘unthought’ here refers to how new ways of thinking about researching with youth are emergent from my thinking about the ethical dimensions of being a co-constitutive force in their world-making.

My understanding of validity is reliant on a high level of ‘emergent’ thinking. This involved me questioning and ‘wondering’ about my own position as a researcher and the ways in which my research questions, data, methods and theory are agentic and transform the ways in which I ‘do’ research or ‘become-Other’ (Somerville, 2007). Or, to draw from Deleuze (1992, pp. 163–164), this understanding of validity is rhizomatic because it works ‘against the constraints of authority, regularity, and commonsense and open[s] thought up to the creative constructions that arise out of social practices, creativity which marks the ability to transform, to break down present practices in favor of future ones’. In other words, I align myself with the idea
that in thinking about the research process with youth differently we are not limiting ourselves as researchers, but providing a space in which alternative ways of knowing and being might be produced (Barad, 2007).

**Concluding remarks**

To summarise, I have adopted an emergent, rather than a reflective, approach in the analysis of data (Somerville, 2007). My methods provide a space for the youth to make place as a way to produce knowledge about the material-discursive practices involved in their subjective understandings of self, Other and world. Such an approach draws attention to not only the capacity of the participants to produce empirical material, but the intra-action between researcher, subject, data, method, affect and agency in the emergence of ‘new’ knowledge in this research project. The analytical practices I employed are thus also a part of the relational entanglements within the ethnographical context. My analytical writing should not be understood as the mirroring of youth’s reality, but viewed as a co-constitutive material-discursive practice that is entangled in the production of youth’s cosmopolitan practices. ‘Knowing’ and ‘being’ are thus inseparable in my approach to understanding the social and my methods of data generation are based on this onto-epistemology.

In the empirical chapters that follow, I draw from insights from literature based on the agency of place, discourse, materiality (including bodily matter) and affect in youth’s social life to examine the ways youth forge their everyday cosmopolitan practices. I do so to enact world-making, ripples that create something new in the form of knowledge (partial and incomplete) about the ways these concepts come to matter and emerge in the cosmopolitan practices of youth.
Chapter 4: Spatial imaginaries entangled in youth’s forging of a shared humanity and belonging to a/the ‘world’

Introduction

This chapter takes as a backdrop the role of youth’s place-making practices in generating their global imaginaries and subjective understandings of a shared humanity. The recognition of a shared humanity is based on a liberal cosmopolitan ideal in which a universal ‘we’ is constituted and our moral obligations and responsibilities to the Other are extended to all humans beyond the geographical and imagined boundaries of the nation state. Despite being based on a universal obligation to all human beings in the world, many cosmopolitan theorists have noted the plurality of perspectives in relation to the ways individuals imagine a shared humanity. These theorists highlight that this plurality is a product of individuals’ contingent and differentiated practices of interconnectedness and mobility (Ahmed, 2004; Calhoun, 2003; Rizvi & Beech, 2017; Skey, 2012). As a way of contributing to this area of inquiry, in this chapter I examine the ways youth constitute their understandings of belonging to the world and a shared humanity through their contingent relations to globalised entities and the Other. I theorise youth’s subjective understandings of a shared humanity and world as the material-discursive practices that make up the ‘globally defined fields of possibility’ entangled in the ways they construct subjectivities of self, Other and world (Appadurai, 1996, p. 31). I ground youth’s ideas about how they belong to a shared humanity and world in the ‘everyday’ material-discursive practices that occur in their classroom, homes and hometowns. This grounding includes the ways youth’s embodied relations to these globalised entities and places forge their sense and understanding of the world as a whole and the practices they share with the Other. Moreover, I demonstrate how youth’s ideas about a shared humanity and the associated forging of a ‘global’ space shape the possible cosmopolitan practices they can perform in terms of their moral obligations and responsibility to the Other.
I link the ways youth forge a ‘global’ space to the ways they constitute a ‘global’ imaginary. The ‘global’ imaginary refers to the ways in which the ‘global’ gets made or is practised by youth. The ‘global’ imaginary has been undertheorised in cosmopolitanism research, commonly addressed and analysed through an abstract global/national or global/local spatial binary (Skey, 2012). I contribute to discussions about the utility of the ‘global’ imaginary by positioning it within my theorisation of a practised and place-based understanding of cosmopolitanism. In so doing, my analysis draws on Massey's (2005, p. 131) idea of ‘a global sense of place’, as ‘woven together out of ongoing stories, as a moment within power-geometries, as a particular constellation within the wider topographies of space and as in process, as unfinished business’. I also examine the interplay of youth’s spatial imaginaries, such as their performances of the personal, local, national and global spatial imaginary, in the material-discursive practices that constitute youth’s understandings about their own and the Other’s position in the world. This work demonstrates the ways these spatial imaginaries are performative and implicated in the production of their cosmopolitan practices.

In the first section of this chapter I consider the ways particular objects, signs and symbols recur in the classroom, the ways that they shape youth’s practices of ‘seeing’ the Other and the ways these practices are entangled in how they produce particular spatial binaries and imagined boundaries in relation to their world-making. I pay particular attention to the ways the spatial imaginaries constitute their ideas of Otherness as existing outside their local contexts. In the second section, I analyse youth’s ideas about a shared humanity that emerge from their everyday intra-actions with globalised entities accessed through online and television media. I show how the body is implicated in the ways youth forge a sense of belonging to the world when geographical space and time are reconfigured. I also address the role of the immobile body in how youth imagine what is possible in terms of being interconnected globally. In the last section, I analyse how the youth construct ideas about their hometown in terms of what it offers in a ‘global’ context. I show the ways a collective and global ‘we’ is forged through the youth’s practices of reappraisal of their hometowns and nation in relation to globalised entities and other places. It must be noted that I do not interpret the youth’s accounts of ‘global’ space as
representations of them or something that pre-exists them, but as an entanglement of material-discursive practices in which the ‘global’ gets made.

Classroom as a ‘third’ space: Performed spatial imaginaries of an ‘inside’ and ‘outside’

When working with a relational understanding of place and space, Holloway and Valentine (2000, p. 779) assert that ‘schools and homes need to be thought of not as bounded spaces, but as porous ones produced through their webs of connections with wider societies which inform socio-spatial practices within those spaces’. Drawing from Delanty (2011), I see the classroom as resembling a ‘third party’, a space and place enacting encounters with other people and places through cultural displays, learning material, classroom objects, the internet, histories and bodies.

On my first visit to the Society and Culture classroom, I was drawn to the images and flags that covered the walls of the classroom. In the words of MacLure (2013), these objects as data ‘glowed’ and drew me in. They also ‘glowed’ for the students, who were aware of their presence and noticed when new objects were added to the classroom. The objects included pictures of the world, images of Others from the third-world, national flags, and a world newsfeed that was always displayed on the smartboard. In my group discussions with the youth, I asked them why they thought these objects were there and what they told them about the Other and the world. From this questioning, the youth discussed the ways the objects transformed and interrupted ways of situating themselves in the world and were agentic in broadening their moral canvas and responsibility to the Other.

The imaginary of the classroom as ‘global’ was articulated by the youth as the ways space and place were forged and reconfigured by the objects. For example, Hope drew my attention to the material-discursive practices of flags in the classroom in our discussion together.
Hope: Just flags everywhere and it’s just so open to all these nationalities and cultures. There’s a map on the wall just there, like … This room is just open to everything.

Figure 4.1 Maps, prayer flags and national flags in the classroom

A concept of ‘openness’ in the classroom emerges from my discussion with Hope. Hope doesn’t mention which flags and maps she is referring to, but both religious and national flags as well as several world maps are displayed in the classroom (Figure 4.1). Hope notes how these objects play a role or are symbolic of the idea and practice of being open to other nationalities and cultures. The room itself is understood as a place ‘open to everything’, a cosmopolitan space where difference is present.

Jane discusses the classroom in terms of it shaping her practices of looking at things from overseas and how this has broadened the focus and drawn her attention to the ‘global’.

Jane: I think a lot of HSIE [Human Society and Its Environment; similar to Society and Culture] classes, so geography, history all those types of things, there’s a lot of looking at the world rather than just our classroom or Australia. We’re looking at, like we’re looking overseas cause if you go into an English classroom you have books and kinds of things and other things from overseas, but that’s not the focus. It’s more the classroom and what we’re doing and these kinds of classes you’re looking more broadly at things.
Jane discusses how in the HSIE classroom there is a lot of ‘looking at the world’. This practice of ‘looking more broadly’ is understood as looking beyond the local and the national imaginaries. Jane discusses how this gaze is generated in very specific places and spaces within the school and the way her and her friends’ gazes shift as the students move through the school. For example, she notes that there are objects in the English classroom from other places in the world (Figure 4.2), but points out that she does not engage with ideas of the ‘global’ in the English classroom as this is not what is expected of her. In this way, Jane highlights what can be seen as a contingent entanglement in which, ‘looking more broadly’ at the world and the way in which she produces knowledge about the world and the Other are dependent on the places (different classrooms) in which she is situated in the school.

James also addresses the positive nature of these objects and their role in the students’ formation of a particular way of viewing the world. However, for him, the globalised objects in the classroom constitute not only his ‘global’ imaginary, but are also co-constitutive of and reifying his national imaginary.

James: It reminds you of how great you have it here [Australia], and how grateful we should be. And how it’s always important to remember that Australia is not the ‘world’ [laughter]. There’s much more out there. Jane: And which we often forget. James: That there’s so much more out there, that’s happening both good and bad and it’s not good to forget that. And then after that to encourage you
to make a difference. Maybe not now, but in the future. Kind of like how you view the world, view everything that happens in it.

James here demonstrates how the classroom’s objects have been agentic in situating himself in relation to the rest of the world. He discusses how the objects in the classroom contribute to his understanding of his own privileged positioning and constitute a national imaginary that is constructed around ‘how great Australia is’ compared to the places and lives of Others. James also addresses the way in which these objects extend his moral canvas and responsibility to the Other. He notes that ‘there’s so much more out there’ and it is ‘not good to forget that’. The global exists outside the national, or ‘out there’, in James’ spatial imaginary. This spatial imaginary of the global existing ‘out there’ aligns itself with common regulatory practices of education institutions responding to the problems of economic globalisation. For example, James notes that these objects ‘encourage you to make a difference’. The practice of making a difference is left, however, to the future for James, demonstrating that this moral responsibility to the Other and world might be something he views as having to work towards. His ethical obligation to the Other is restricted to a certain temporality in his life; perhaps he is referring to a lack of capacity as an individual to make a difference yet or that there is an ‘aged process’ of ‘cosmopolitanization’ (Beck & Sznaider, 2006) in which his cosmopolitan identity is incomplete until it is mature enough to participate in making a difference (Cheng, 2016). He also acknowledges that these objects shape how he or others view the
world in the classroom in terms of what they are shown as happening in it or what is available to them (Figure 4.3).

Like James, Jane discusses how objects in the classroom bring attention to the multiple ‘worlds’ that she constructs in her everyday life and the ways these ‘worlds’ are territorialised in her spatial imaginary.

Jane: We even get lost into our closer, like micro worlds, where in the Indigenous and Ab Studies classroom there’s a lot of, you know, artworks and that kind of thing. We get to see another side of our culture that we may not see if we’re not part of that culture.

Jane notes the ways these objects stop her and other youth getting lost in their own ‘micro worlds’ and how the artwork in the classroom is agentic in enacting material-practices of looking beyond these. Her inattention to the Other is understood as a process of the self being ‘lost’ in what is closest to her. Jane here constructs the idea of a bounded and rational self commonly associated with Western thought and quite an individualised notion of how she comes to know the world (McDowell, 1999). She speaks about the ways the artwork in the Aboriginal Studies class has transformed her practice of ‘seeing’ and connecting to another side of her own culture and ‘self’ as well as the Other that she may not be familiar with or not have been able to ‘see’ before.

What emerged from my discussions with the youth about these globalised objects in the classroom was an understanding of the ways they cultivated and performed particular spatial imaginaries in their forging of a ‘global’ space and positioned themselves in the world. These spatial imaginaries generated a form of global optics or way of ‘seeing’ and drew imagined boundaries between an inside and bounded ‘self’, and a global outside. Matus and Talbort (2009, p. 522) note that ‘actors frequently imagine places as having identities that pre-exist their contact with the global’. The ‘fluidity’ of places and spaces in the youth’s everyday ideas about how they are positioned in ‘global’ space is not evident or articulated in the above data. This is exemplified in Jane’s practice of ‘looking at the world’ as only occurring in certain classrooms in the school, or in James’s idea about the national positioned as outside global processes and the ‘good and bad out there’. The spatial imaginaries
of the local, national and global are constituted through imagined contact zones, or in the words of Jane, the multiple imagined ‘worlds’ that their responsibility to the Other or recognition of difference are entangled with and become constituted by.

What is also interesting is that when I asked the youth about the objects they never discussed specific objects but spoke in general terms of the overall purpose and agency of a body of objects/images. For example, the Society and Culture classroom was understood by the youth as a producer of ‘globality’ in so far as the classroom was constructed through these objects as a place ‘open to everything’ and one that displayed images of places of the world and the Other. At the same time, however, through the practice of imagining the ‘global’ and the Other as ‘out there’, the youth practised a neutral or apolitical understanding of their localised places. By positioning the global as ‘outside’ their local and ‘micro’ worlds, their capacity to practise an ethical responsibility to the Other was something that would happen in the future and something that needed to be worked towards or achieved (as represented in my discussions with James and Jane). In the next section I show some of the ways these spatial imaginaries are performed in youth’s discussions about their material-discursive practices with online and television media and how their embodied practices are also implicated in the constitution of their understandings of a shared humanity and ‘global’ imaginary.

Relating to the Other through media and television

To open my group discussions with the youth participants, I asked them what they had watched on television or online from other places in the world and what these practices told them about these places and the people living in them. Most participants were eager to discuss their favourite television shows or the popular news channels they would watch daily. For example, the youth elaborated on the ways footage of other places in the world in their favourite television shows and news media constituted social imaginaries about their own global interconnectedness and the material-discursive practices they share with Others. Furthermore, the youth articulated how affective intensities emergent from watching these television shows were entangled in the production of an imaginary of the cultural and geographical landscape of these places and the world.
Mike, for example, discusses the way he constructs a 'feel' and 'snapshot' of places in the world from a television show called *Sensei*.

Mike: I feel like television shows, especially from other countries, they’re kind of the easy way of travelling to that country.
Researcher: What do you mean by that?
Mike: They like kind of give a snapshot of different scenarios and different areas, and different kind of feels of that country. You kind of, without travelling there, you kind of get a feel for that country.
Researcher: Can you give me an example?
Mike: Um … there’s a show and it is called *Sensei* and there’s eight different people from all over the world and like … there’s one in Korea and one in Mexico and America and England and all these other places. Gives you a new feel, every time you change to one of them you get the feel of that country, you get the atmosphere.
Laura: Yeah, I watch that.
Mike: Cooking shows are like that.
Researcher: So, how does one country feel to you? Can you give me an example?
Mike: Well, Korea in Seoul it kind of feels like a cleaner more efficient version of Sydney, it’s kind of futuristic, kind of … a place that is kind of utopian, a place that you see and is just nice. England …
Laura: So, what we get out of that is that it is nice [laughter].
Mike: England, you feel cold watching it and Russia …
Laura: Russia and vodka!
Mike: And all these European countries you feel cold and wet.
Laura: I feel a lot of these European countries would be interconnected because they’re all so close.
May: You’d have to be.
Laura: And so many and when I talk to friends online from Germany or whatever. They’re like ‘Oh yeah, I just went to friggin France [laughter]. It’s like oh my god it is a two-hour train ride.
Mike: It’s ridiculous, it’s like let’s just go to another country.
Laura: You just feel so isolated in Australia.

Mike describes a panoptic gaze and a practice of imaginative mobility when watching *Sensei*. He refers to how each episode gives him a ‘a different feel’ and ‘atmosphere’ of the country that it is set in. Responses to my questioning about how places ‘feel’ show that even though Mike hasn’t travelled or lived in some of these places, his imaginary is forged through the television show’s relation to his bodily matter. The world landscape in this instance is not enacted as an isolated visual phenomenon, but one that is forged and mapped through a physical and sensory practice in relation to the body (Rose, 2006). For example, Mike states: ‘England,
you feel cold watching it and Russia’ and ‘And all these European countries you feel cold and wet’. Responses like these demonstrate how globalised visual images have material affects articulated in what Mike feels and senses in his body. Moreover, they show that these affects are emergent from these relations and then mapped onto particular areas in the world.

Mike also draws on his local imaginary and his lived experiences in Sydney when constituting his imaginary of South Korea. He notes that ‘[in] Seoul in Korea it kind of feels like a cleaner more efficient version of Sydney, it’s kind of futuristic … a place that is kind of utopian, a place that is you see and is just nice’. In building his imaginary of South Korea Mike modifies his imaginary of Sydney through the addition of a feeling of cleanliness and efficiency as a way of forging a utopian sense of place. Temporality also emerges as a relevant feature of this utopian imaginary. Mike refers to South Korea as ‘futuristic’ and describes this aesthetic as nice and something that is desirable.

There were cultural stereotypes that emerged from my discussion with the youth, such as the association made between vodka and Russia. But what also emerged alongside such cultural stereotypes of the Other was an imaginary of Europe as being a close network of socially interconnected and mobile individuals; this was evident in Laura’s shared practice with her friends online. May also agrees with this imaginary, noting that people living in Europe would ‘have to be’ connected due to their proximity. A feeling of what Laura refers to as ‘isolation’ is a product of this conversation with the Other. The limits of connecting with the Other and other places is discussed in terms of what the body can experience and become through physical travel in Laura’s imaginary. The limitations of her geographical positioning are understood and mapped in relation to how far she would get or the geographical distance that a two-hour train ride would transport her in Australia.

When discussing the different places that he has travelled to with his family, Mike describes how his understandings of Paris and Japan and Others living in these two places have been impacted by what was represented on television and books and his lived and embodied experience of being-in-place. Mike, for example notes:
Mike: I meant, like, when we see things on TV or in books or in movies that represent place they're kind of compacted and like kind of summarised versions of places to try and get everything in there. And sometimes they don't really get that right. So, when you're actually go to these places it doesn't feel at all like what you've seen on television.

Mike here is elaborating on the ways globalised entities enact ‘certain [and limited] ways of relating to people and places are organized, normalized and performed’ (Germann Molz, 2012, p. 62) through the practice of the tourist gaze. His relation to globalised media in its numerous forms (e.g. TV, books, movies) is interwoven with his lived and embodied place-making practices and he now enacts a critical practice in terms of the way he relates to such representations and imaginaries of place. He explicitly acknowledges that what is sensed and felt in these places is sometimes contradictory or incorrect in terms of what has been represented. For example, Mike continues:

Researcher: Can you give me an example of a place you've been when you've gone ‘oh’?
Mike: Um, Paris felt a lot different to how it should be.
Researcher: So, what did you see in the images of Paris?
Mike: Like, just the proximity to things. Like, you think the Eiffel Tower is near the Arc de Triomphe, but it's not. And the Champs Elysees is not as it looks, but it's so long, but um yeah, the Mona Lisa … tiny. Um, just a lot of misleading stuff that we've kind of got in our head.

The spatial and geographical differences that Mike felt were in relation to his physical proximity to architecture and objects in Paris. He notes how his lived experience of the actual size and position of these objects produced a feeling of alterity. The relation between perceived, imagined and material spaces here have produced a shift in the way Paris is constructed and understood by Mike. His lived experience in Paris, and his awareness of the ways these initially imagined globalised entities (e.g. the Eiffel Tower and Arc de Triomphe) were displaced in place, have made him conscious of the fact that he needs to engage more deeply with the representations of places and Others in these types of media. Mike’s embodied and sensed alterity is then further communicated in the way he feels in relation to becoming Other in these places. For example, he explains:
Researcher: So, what about the feel of places?
Mike: Yeah, so when I was in Paris I didn’t like it because um, they assumed because I spoke English that I was actually like British, like English and they really don’t like English people, so you had to keep telling them that you weren’t British and you were Australian and they’d be really lovely and nice. But it just kind, the fact that they’d already judge you straight away from just ‘cause you’re English. Yeah, it just made me feel a bit uncomfortable and unwelcome.

Positioning himself through the discursive and embodied practices of Other bodies produces affective intensities, articulated by Mike in his discussion about feeling uncomfortable during his time in Paris. His ‘lived’ experience of Japan, however, has shaped Mike’s understanding of Japan and the Other quite differently.

Researcher: Was there a place where the representation was close to what you saw?
Mike: Um, Japan. Japan was pretty spot on. I think because a lot of photos of places kind of, um, tend to edit all the bad, like telephone wires and whatever. But in Japan, it’s part of the aesthetic and stuff.

The alignment of the lived experience with the constructed imaginary of what was presented in the media provided a space in which comfort with the Other and other places was produced. The practice of editing ‘all the bad’ here is understood as not aesthetically pleasing or aligning with a romantic view of place. Mike, for example, enacts ‘telephone wires’ in his constitution of ‘Japan’ as being as imperfect or ‘bad’ objects, but that produce a more accurate depiction of what is lived and as objects that align with his own pre-existing idea of what Japan is like.

Clement moves beyond forging a global landscape and discusses how he constitutes ideas of a shared humanity through his regular practice of watching one of his favourite shows, Outnumbered. This is a contemporary television comedy about the everyday trials and tribulations of a young English family that is both set and made in England.

Clement: There’s this little fave show of mine and it’s called Outnumbered and it’s about these kids and this really crazy family in England and it just kind of shows that although we’re so far away, families are so similar.
Although trivial and quite humorous, shared practices of families feature in constructing a global ‘we’ and shared humanity for Clement. Clement notes that ‘we deal with this everyday stuff no matter where we are’. This statement demonstrates ‘a consciousness of the world as a single place’ (Robertson, 1992, p. 132). Clement also comments that banal and quite distasteful practices such as searching for nits in hair is ‘just so like relatable’. This is recognition by Clement that all individuals share to some extent practices related to the banality of ‘everyday’ life, banal practices that everyone participates in worldwide.

What also emerges in this discussion is what Ibrahim (2015, p. 51) refers to as ‘an abject fascination with other people’s lives and practices performed through the act of gazing into others’ everyday objects’. Through Clement’s interest in the show and the family’s regular social practices represented through this medium, the youth could ‘locate themselves and their everyday worlds in relation to those of distant others’ (Hull, 2014, p. 39). This also relates to a concept of aesthetic cosmopolitanism where ‘[t]he omnipresence of the products of globalised cultural industries – that is to say of standardized products juxtaposed with local productions – produces, maintains and recreates a sentiment of familiarity with images from elsewhere’ (Cicchelli, Octobre & Riegel, 2016, p. 56). The television show here is culturally different but at the same time, through the continued practice of watching it, Clement has become familiar with the Other and their everyday social practices. Clement’s relation to this television show and its humorous take on ‘everyday’ life provides a space to work across difference. Ideas of a shared humanity are therefore not mapped in relation to an abstract global space, but through the mundane practices that we share with the Other.

The porousness of the classroom space and mobilities such as the internet also played a role in constituting the youth’s shared cosmopolitan practices with individuals in other countries. When constructing his video essay on place, for
example, Clement asked me whether it would be appropriate to ask some musical artists he was friends with online if they would contribute some of their music for him to use. When I said yes and that it would be a great idea, Clement spoke about a friend in the United Kingdom that he knew from an online collective of artists he was friends with on Facebook.

As I was standing there, Clement signed into Facebook and wrote a personal message to his friend in the United Kingdom who he had been sharing music with on and off with over last couple of months. He had written to him for permission to use his original music in his video essay. Within 2 minutes he had received a reply from his friend and yelled out to me ‘He’s cool with it Miss!’ and signalled to me to come over and listen to it. I commented to Clement that I thought that was fast and walked over to listen to the music. Clement had explained to me that he picked the music as ‘it sounded scientific’ and ‘transitioned into a different style half-way through the recording’. (Observation notes, 22/7/2015)

In his reflections on his video-essay-making process he included the following correspondence:

Hey Clement!

Yes, it’s fine that you use my music! It’s a pleasure that you would want to use my song. Thanks for asking for permission to use my song, Means a lot! Hope it all goes well! Burt Cope

The apparatus of the video essay is performative here. In conjunction with mobilities in the classroom such as the internet, the video essay provided the space for Clement to interconnect with a geographically distant Other elsewhere and contributed to forging a ‘global sense of place’ in the classroom. Although he has never met his friend in person, Clement engages in his conversation with ease and confidence, at his desk in the middle of other activities taking place around him in the classroom.

What is also evident here is Clement’s practice of moving ‘between recognition as (I am this, you are other), and recognition with, the mutual, collective fashioning which comes out of shared practice’ (Noble, 2009, p. 46; emphasis in original). This recognition is enacted through the practice and production of different forms of art.
and music that are shared in this global art collective and virtual place. Through his membership and belonging to this global community of artists, a global ‘we’ becomes constituted. Gaining permission from the Other was something that Clement felt was also necessary, an ethical and legal practice or obligation to the community that the community had established.

Other shared practices with people from other parts of the world also featured in youth’s everyday activities online. The youth, for example, described the ways they must navigate information about Others and the world through different social media and news media sources that they are bombarded with daily. Jane, for example, opens up a discussion on the positives of being connected to different media online and social media’s ability to create a space in which to discuss world issues, work across cultural difference and form knowledge about Others.

Jane: I guess it’s good that we get to hear about, we get to hear about these things.
Amelia: Form our own opinion on things as well.
Jasmine: Yeah!
Mike: I guess the fact that we get thousands of sources rather than maybe one or three and get thousands of sources with different opinions, it’s great to kind of, find some sort of, yeah.
Laura: And there are different kinds of news that like tell you about advancements in medicine and um.
Amelia: Social media just opens everything up, like information and you know like learning different things. It just connects people to stuff, connects you to news and things from different places.
May: I think because social media has such a quick turnaround, people can look at something really quickly and they don’t necessarily need to read the whole article on it. That they can read a headline and know, okay that’s something that’s happened in the world today. It’s not an in-depth understanding but it’s a knowledge about things that otherwise they wouldn’t have known.
Laura: And that generates, that sparks conversation.
Group: [yeah]
May: You can go, have you heard about this, and the other person might know more and you learn more about it that way.

In this discussion Amelia notes that social media ‘opens everything up’ in terms of providing spaces of learning about different things and places in the world. The youth also discuss how their imaginaries of the world are forged through
pedagogical material-discursive practices of learning from an Other based on the possibility of individuals having different world views or perspectives on such events. For example, learning about world events by engaging with them at the simplest of levels, or what May refers to as ‘not an in-depth understanding’, is understood to constitute a practice of ‘conversation’ and produce a cosmopolitan space in which to learn from Others. May also acknowledges how this online space provides an opportunity to learn from other people from the world, noting ‘[y]ou can go, have you heard about this, and the other person might know more and you learn more about it that way’. It demonstrates how the globality, in this case ‘news’, is agentic in forming and sustaining new relations and global networks/communities that forge their global imaginaries. Moreover, seeking out and forming your own opinions by navigating and ‘connecting’ to Others in the world is understood as produced through having to mediate extensively more rather than less globalised news sources.

Laura also mentioned the reporting of world events in news media when discussing how she engaged with other places and the Other online and through watching the television. For example, Laura was very enthusiastic about discussing what she had heard about the war between Israel and Palestine by watching the news.

Laura: The war in Palestine!
Researcher: Okay, and how did you find out about the war in Palestine?
How do you know about it?
Group: [Laughter.]
Laura: No, I heard about the war in Palestine, um, through the news really that’s how. But it was only like, kind of ... recently, like within the last few months that I heard about it, which is really odd because like we’re learning about it in Modern [History] and it’s happened, it’s been happening for like a while now.
Researcher: So, you weren’t aware of it until you learned about it in Modern [History]?
Laura: Yeah, until I heard about it in the news, and then I wasn’t properly informed about it until we learned about it in Modern [History].
Researcher: Okay so what do you know about people in Palestine?
Laura: I know that there is a war going on between Palestine and ... Olivia: Israel! Bit rusty aren’t we.
Group: [Laughter.]
Laura: Israel, thank you … over homeland. And that’s what they’re all fighting about.
Researcher: And is this as far your understanding goes?
Laura: No, I know that the Jewish people were kicked out … no …
Mike: Not kicked out, but driven out a long time ago.
Laura: And they tried to come back and claim Palestine as their homeland.

The conflict in the Gaza Strip is understood through a variety of apparatuses in this example. Laura’s basic knowledge of this world event was initially through her relation to news media. Being ‘properly informed’ about this issue, however, was based on the local place-making practice of her learning about it in Modern History at school. The classroom is essentially seen as a space and place in which a formalised practice of learning forms a superior and more detailed understanding of the conflict in the Gaza Strip. Laura also notes that she found it ‘odd’ that the conflict had been going on for so long, but she hadn’t heard about it. During this discussion, another participant, Mike, elaborated on his understanding of this crisis and the silencing of this world event in the media.

Mike: Um, well, um. In America, they, they … you hear that it’s the Arabs’ fault. Like it’s through Islamophobia, like they … it’s perpetuated that it’s the, the um, the Arabs’ fault. As well as you know … ‘cos America supplies Israel with a large amount of money for their military for government spending and all this stuff. So, they have a democratic kind of launch pad for all their operations in the Middle East. But, um, yeah.
Researcher: Where did you learn about that?
Mike: Through various YouTube videos and sort of independent resources.
Researcher: Yeah. Did you find them on your own or were they provided?
Mike: Well I heard about, like last year when Israel carried out the airstrikes on the Gaza Strip and killed millions of people.
Laura: Yeah, I definitely remember that.
Researcher: Did you all get on YouTube?
Laura: I didn't have a look, but I remember the … hearing about it.
May: I think we talked about it in Geography.
Amy: I think Johnston [their Geography and Society and Culture teacher] did a bit about it in Geography.
Mike: And the reason it can’t be … because Israel has obviously violated human rights laws, but the reason it doesn’t get passed in the U.N. is because the United States vetoes it, you know, from being heard, so you know.
Laura: It's all on the down-low. It’s a bit …
Researcher: What do you mean it's all on the down-low?
Laura: Well I don’t know, it’s just. I don’t know much about it.
Jasmine: We just don’t know very much about it.
Laura: I think most people don’t know much about it. It’s only media stuff coming out kind of now and it’s been going on for a long time.
Mike discusses how he has become informed about the conflict between Palestine and Israel through his relation to YouTube videos and ‘independent’ sources. His understanding of the global event and these countries were constituted through his understanding of the uneven power geometries associated with systems of global governance. It is understood within the precarious frame of ‘human rights’, demonstrating Mike’s consciousness of a world polity and global whole. He also engages in a critical cosmopolitan practice, and enacts his knowledge of the histories of global political and economic relations between America and Israel to constitute his imaginary of this global event. Mike here demonstrates a cosmopolitan practice in which he ‘confront[s] the possibility that cultural diversity involves necessary and deep differences in understandings of the good, or human rights, which make the imposition of one vision of the good problematic’ (Calhoun, 2003, p. 540). For example, he problematises and engages with America’s membership in the United Nations and its relationship with Israel, forging an understanding of this partnership as working against and constituting a ‘democratic launch pad’ that silences the voices of Palestinians.

Researcher: Why do you think the media … it’s only just coming out in the media?
Jane: Because it’s owned by big companies and corporate …
Mike: Well, actually … No … I think the main, main reason we don’t hear about it as Western people is because as a country there’s about 10 countries that don’t acknowledge Palestine as an actual country and acknowledge it as part of Israel and those countries are heavily allied with America. Who, again as I said supplies a lot to Israel. So, we through government, um, censorship …
Laura: Is it the British as well?
Mike: Um, the British don’t have anything to do with it anymore. After the British mandate, they left and America took over.
Laura: So, they would want it to kind of end …
Mike: So yeah, through government censorship we’ve kind of been told that it’s the Arabs’ fault.
Researcher: Okay.
Laura: I think people and they all believe, like the government and everything believe it’s not … like we don’t have anything to do with them so why should we bother. Which is, I don’t think that is good value to have.
Researcher: Do you feel like that?
Laura: No, I want to know about it, like I want to understand, understand why it’s happening, yeah.
In this discussion, Laura also notes how the practice of censorship by governments and big companies positions herself and the other youth as irrelevant and incapable of forming their own opinions on the unravelling of this conflict. In reflecting on these practices by news media outlets, Laura conveys that the idea of youth being irrelevant in global society as not a ‘good value’. In this discussion, Laura disagrees with this positioning and demonstrates a desire to ‘understand’ and ‘know’ about why the conflict is happening. A shared ‘responsibility’ to learn and care for the Other is therefore produced and a practice of resistance manifests through Laura’s reflective practices and knowledge of ‘values’.

Massey (2005, p. 91) notes that ‘the question which is raised by speed-up, by ‘the communications revolution’ and by cyberspace, is not whether space will be annihilated but what kinds of multiplicities (patternings of uniqueness) and relations will be co-constructed with these new kinds of spatial configurations’. In the above discussions, observations and interviews, the youth’s ideas about a shared humanity and the practices involved in the constitution of a shared humanity vary immensely. In most cases, their global imaginaries are not forged from practices commensurate with liberal cosmopolitan practices based on a global polity or regulatory practices of globalised institutions where an abstract ‘global outside’ exists in their localised place-making practices. There was no simple distinction between the youth’s local and global imaginary. Instead, the youth’s global imaginaries were entangled with the particularities of the Other and places (re)presented in these globalised entities. Moreover, the youth engaged with the ways such globalised entities and the political, national and cultural spaces they were entangled with constituted and normalised particular ideas about the ways they should practise their moral obligation to the Other and imagine a shared humanity.

What is also distinctive here is the ways in which the youth produced understandings of place and the world as a whole through their embodied material-discursive practices. The observations show the ways in which affective intensities were interwoven in the constitutive material-discursive practices of the youth’s world-making and spatial imaginaries. Take, for example, the ways images of places produced affects for Mark and enabled him to produce imaginaries of places around the world with a certain ‘feel’. Or the felt dimensions of Mike’s experiences in
Paris and Japan and the ways his place-making, produced through his relations to
globalised entities, did not align with and were sometimes disconnected from his
lived experiences of place. This is especially emergent in the comments made by
him about the ways a place “doesn’t feel at all like what you’ve seen on television.”
Cosmopolitan practices and relations to the Other and place were therefore
emergent from our discussions based on the ways the youth interpret the nature of
globalised entities mediated through online media and television. Moreover, these
discussions and interviews highlighted the ways these relations forged their
understanding of the complex politics of mobilities and the global imaginaries they
have given rise to (Rizvi & Beech, 2017).

Aligning with Appadurai (1996), it was also evident through the ways the youth
discussed their practices with online and television media that they were disjunctive
in terms of constructing a relational and interconnected spatial and geographical
imaginary and interrupted a striated understanding of ‘global’ space. The youth’s
spatial imaginaries were incongruous with the rigid boundaries and territories that
were raised in my discussions with them about the objects in the classroom (see the
first section of this chapter). For example, the youth’s understanding of their
belonging to this world was forged outside their cultural identities and was instead
based on their shared practices in the everyday that the global ‘we’ engage in, such
as the humorous practice of a family dealing with head lice.

The youth’s cosmopolitan practices were also based on shared banal practices and
forms of sociability that are experienced by Others no matter where ‘we’ are. For
example, these subjectivities emerged from the ways the youth discussed how their
everyday relations to social media provided a space to connect with the Other to
forge more ‘accurate’ and alternative understandings of global events and
imaginaries of place. Their cosmopolitan practices were based on their knowledge
about the ways ideas about the Other and place are both (re)produced and
circulated by the media or by corporations with vested interests in increasing
audience receptiveness, the consumption of places, and other national economic
interests. In several instances, the youth’s interest in practices combatting truth
regimes and the uneven power geometries of ‘global’ space were constitutive of
their sustained interconnectedness with Others. Much of what emerged from my
discussions with the youth was around the ways in which they forge their practices
of belonging to the world by engaging with the political space related to (re)presentations of place and the Other. These practices are relationally dependent on the ways youth believe to be positioned by neoliberal globalisation as uninformed ‘consumers’ of globalised news and the ways they reworked these power relations by connecting and forming new networks with Others online.

Spatial imaginaries of belonging entangled in youth’s global sense of ‘home’

It was evident in their discussions about themselves and their hometowns that the youth’s understandings of self and collectivist understandings of ‘we’ were also co-constituted in relation to their lived experiences in and imaginary of other places. This especially emerged in the youth’s subjective understanding of ‘home’ and in their ideas of what ‘home’ offers when situated and understood within a relational understanding of global ‘space’.

Adam in the following discussion commented on how he found Australia was quite ‘dull’ after his return from India.

Adam: I think it is quite dull. I got back and the road was smooth, there were no cars about and no people, not like India. Even driving through Sydney to get out of Sydney I didn’t see many people about.

Although a very mundane practice, what has constituted this understanding of Australia is, interestingly, what Adam’s body sees and feels on his trip home from the airport. He has articulated the way his body could not register movement and how the absence and distant proximity of people and cars around him constituted a sense of Sydney and his home as being dull.

Among the objects that Adam returned with from India was a newspaper article from one of the English-language country’s periodicals (Figure 4.4). The article discussed problems related to the Westernisation of the Indian education system and students being taught in English. It outlined the ways immobile and isolated Indian students were marginalised through English instruction and findings that identified that they
performed better when using their ‘mother tongue’. In the following Adam discusses how this article has made him think differently about how Indigenous students are educated in Australia.

Researcher: And what about this one?
Adam: Ah, I found this interesting, ‘If you think kids fare better when taught in mother tongue’. Ah, I was thinking about how Australian Aboriginal people are taught in English, wondering if they would achieve better in school if like in the outback and remote areas if they were taught in their own language … would their education levels be higher? Would they be able to learn more, would they be more engaged? Because, for some, English is their second language.
Researcher: Yep, okay. That article is English, isn’t it?
Adam: The article is in English, it talks about um … Hindi and English being the official languages of India and in the schools in the South where Hindi is not spoken, English is taught in schools. If you can’t speak English, you won’t understand what the teachers are saying.
Researcher: Oh, okay.
Adam: But there is a certain level of English that you need to be able to speak at graduate school.
Here Adam makes visible the ways ‘more-than’ local politics fold in on his national imaginary and the ‘local’. His reappraisal of Australia’s education system is what Delanty (2009) would recognise as the way the ‘self’ adopts and critically engages with ideas of the Other in order to refashion the self and social imaginary. In the above example, the globalised entity is understood and being enacted in Adam’s locally situated imaginary of Australia and the education of Aboriginal people. The newspaper article is a catalyst for and agentic in Adam seeing national educational issues differently. In particular, the global entity was drawn upon to construct his understanding of issues pertaining to the treatment of people of cultural minorities in Australia. It opens a space for reflecting or in this case ‘wondering’ about the education of Aboriginal students in rural classrooms, in particular the challenges they face when having to learn in a language that may not be their preferred or spoken language. The article has reworked Adam’s imaginary of national education problems in Australia and he notes the need of student-centred learning approaches for marginalised groups in his own society. A new space had been produced through Adam’s entanglement with this object, one where he can critically engage with social problems in the local and sympathise with the treatment of the Other in his local context.

The multicultural space of the nation also lends itself to the way youth forge their ethical and moral obligations to the Other. In the following discussion, May addresses the limits of the Australian government’s ideological stance and the imaginary of Australian multiculturalism.

Researcher: What has this told you about Australia?
May: As I’ve grown up, I mean I know we’re [Australians] are promoters of multiculturalism, but all throughout our history we’ve done everything in our power not to let people in. We’ve [Australian society and government] had the ‘White Australia’ policy, we’ve had ‘turning back the boats’. Like it’s just incomprehensible to me. Like they [the Australian government] say multicultural, but what they really mean is people coming from England or New Zealand. It’s very very limited. It’s like let’s call it ‘multicultural’ because they come from somewhere else and it’s really upsetting to me.

May expresses how she views the Australian government’s position on multiculturalism in terms of it valuing a particular Other. She criticises the way the Australian government’s understanding of Otherness is limited to a white and colonial form of Otherness. May is very selective in the ways she positions herself in
this discussion. For example, at times she aligns herself with the national imaginary and at other times she moves outside and positions her alliance to a global and marginalised Other. For example, a collective national imaginary begins with a discussion based on a ‘we’ and ‘we have’, demonstrating how May forges a sense of belonging to Australia and its history related to injustices based on its immigration and treatment of asylum seekers. May then refers to a ‘they’ when discussing government policy to distance herself from these policies. Her imaginary of Otherness is based on the increased diversity of the mosaic. She connects to the ideas of Ahmed (2004) relating to the plurality of the Other, by communicating that there is always the possibility of an other Other that we should be open to and include in this mosaic.

A similar national imaginary is evident in my discussions with James. In his discourse on multiculturalism, he notes that living with diversity should mean more than accepting the mosaic of Otherness in Australia.

James: It’s really sad what the government think about multiculturalism. Because what they believe is if you get a whole bunch of people from different countries that makes Australia a multicultural country. And it doesn’t. It’s about communication, like the interaction between these cultures.
Researcher: What kind of communication are you referring to?
James: Like putting people together in groups. It shouldn’t be like that. It should be about people coming together, all these experiences of different cultures, that’s what makes a multicultural country.

James’ national imaginary is forged by the actions of a government that has a particular way of understanding multiculturalism and the Other. James proposes a cosmopolitan approach to multiculturalism when discussing what our nation needs in terms of an openness to the Other. His understanding of Australia’s stance on multiculturalism is based on practices of different cultural groups living in the same place, but with limited interaction. He proposes a practice of ‘togetherness-in-difference’ through not just acceptance of a culturally different Other, but by embracing and engaging in the lived experiences of the particularities of other cultures.
The city in which the youth lived was referred to them as a ‘bubble’ during class and formal discussions. The youth’s emergent imaginary of their hometown of Stanton was frequently referred to as a place that is culturally empty and separated from the rest of the world.

Researcher: Okay, so you’ve told me how you’ve learned things about other places in the world and Others through forms of media and at school. What can you tell me about the way this knowledge of other places tells you about Neville?
Group: [Laughter, whispering in each other’s ear.]
May: My Mum’s a Ward 1 Councillor, so as part of her Ward, it covers like Mayson, Stanton, like the inner-city, Capers Hill and it’s really interesting going with her to all the different places. Because if you go to Stanton, Stanton’s like its own little community [laughter]. Everybody knows everybody. It’s great [sarcastic tone]. ‘Cause I met like, I was doing a street stall there, um, I met this guy and he was like, ‘Oh, yeah I met my wife here 45 years ago, we married 40 years ago, and I moved here then and they still don’t consider me as someone who comes from Stanton [laughter]. Unless you were born in Stockton, you are not from Stockton [laughter].
Jane: It’s just a bubble in general, Neville is just so close and everyone … Mike: Anything further than two suburbs is too far for some people.

This understanding of the youth’s hometown and the people living there was discussed in relation to the way the youth noted how fellow community members in their city were not inclined to engage with Others and other places in the world. May positions herself outside this imagined community in Stanton and their inability to escape, move and think beyond the geographical boundaries of their hometown. Knowing everyone in your community is deemed as indicative of the closed-off nature of Stanton and of the community’s inclination to be interested in what is closest to them. Jane uses the metaphor of the bubble to describe her imaginary of these localised practices and specifically her hometown. The immobility of some of those living in Stanton is mapped onto their understanding of their local city. Massey (2005) sees the plurality of meanings in the production of space and place as constitutive of the way in which material spaces are imagined, embodied and discursively constructed by different social groups in place. The distinctiveness of the group of people in Stanton discussed by May is constitutive of the way she produces an imagined boundary and thus a dichotomy between the deindustrialised city in which she lives and an imagined ‘global’ outside.
Interestingly, a practice of judgement is also emergent from the youth’s construction of ‘locals’. The ‘bubble’ is used as a metaphor for those who stay put and are characterised as backwards. In this discussion, the youth imply a judgement of members of their community as being less good, less open and less flexible in terms of their inability to be mobile. The youth aren't afraid to make fun of the immobility of locals and do little to engage with the reasons why they are immobile in the first place, such as inequalities that prevent them from experiencing other places. Mobility and openness are thus constructed as ‘elite’ cosmopolitan practices in this moment, emerging as contradictory to how the youth view members of the community in Stockton to live. It’s okay for them to judge locals whose inequalities and insecurities prevent them from experiencing other places, but not okay to judge the geographically distant Other for the inequalities they experience. The youth here thus enact neoliberal material-discursive practices that idealise the mobile and flexible individual and construct locals and local spaces as inflexible and stuck (Corbett, 2007; Popkewitz, 1998). Their engagement with difference is thus understood differently in relation to their construction of a local space, compared to their understanding of difference in the production of their cosmopolitan practices constituted through their making of a ‘global’ space.

Despite May’s quite dystopian and negative imaginary of Australia in our earlier conversation, she discusses how the ‘cosmopolitan canopy’ of Melbourne and San Francisco have the same feel (Anderson, 2004). In describing her flaneur-like practice in both these places she notes:

May: I always use the comparison that it [San Francisco] is America’s answer to Melbourne. Um, it’s so much more laid back.
Researcher: What’s Melbourne like?
May: It’s sort of funky, a bit carefree, and there’s lots of sort of multiculturalism and, um, you know it feels of almost like equality I think because you sort of have a lot of people that are different go to centres and areas and they sort of all hang out. It’s a lot more, I wouldn’t say ‘fun’, more relaxed I think. And when I went there I really got that. Because when I was in Vegas it was like eww.

For May, San Francisco is a metaphorical ‘answer’ to Melbourne that ‘feels of almost like equality’. The cosmopolitan canopies of both Melbourne and San
Francisco are desired places for May (Anderson, 2004). A ‘feel’ of equality emerges through her discussion of the practice of ‘different’ individuals congregating in city centres. A feeling of relaxation is articulated as an affective intensity emergent from her body’s practice of hanging out in these places; these dimensions of being in Melbourne were like those she had experienced in San Francisco. May maps similarities between places not based on the individual cultural traits of individuals, but on the diverse mosaic of difference in both these cities and the fun and relaxing sensation dwelling in this mosaic of difference produces.

May also discusses the way Neville has changed in relation to the cultural experiences that one can have in her hometown in terms of her consumption of eating food from around the world. Her global sense of home is mapped in terms of the cultural experiences she can consume.

May: King Street, there’s an Ethiopian restaurant next to a Japanese restaurant. Fifteen years ago, you probably wouldn’t’ve had that. Dolby Street, you’ve got an India restaurant, a Korean place, you know, two maybe three Vietnamese places, you know. There used to be one Chinese shop and it used to be Australian-Chinese with what is it? It’s changed so much in the last couple of years, there is still a lot more we need to do, yeah there’s an Ethiopian restaurant, um.

For May the transformation of ‘home’ is evidenced by an increase in the diversity of food from other places in the world available in her hometown: ‘Fifteen years ago, you probably wouldn’t’ve of had that.’ She also notes that ‘there is still a lot more we need to do’. Here May is discussing a collectivist view of the hometown’s need to become more ‘global’. In this context she is an agent of cosmopolitanism, encouraging an increase in the diversity food and cultural systems available to the community.

In this section I have shown the ways the youth constructed a global sense of their home and hometowns and how these constructions were based on localised place-making practices that coalesced and worked between different spatial imaginaries that constituted their sense of belonging. Much of the youth’s discussions about their hometowns were based on what Conradson and Latham (2007, p. 252) would describe as ideas about ‘what the “home setting” and “hometown” entailed and
offered in a global context’. Moreover, we saw how their understanding of home
shaped the ways they engaged with the Other and other places and how, at the
same time, these cosmopolitan practices co-constituted their understandings of
‘home’, ‘we’ and ‘self’ and the nation’s limited understanding or commitment to the
Other. In analysing the youth’s global sense of home, I have shown how
unpredictable affects and the territorialising practices emergent from their relations
to globalised entities demonstrate the ways the youth’s localised sense of belonging
to the world ‘challenges, because it mostly ignores, exceeds, surrounds and
interpenetrates, the striated space of the nation-state … it is the medium of the
glocal’ (Ashcroft, 2010, p. 80). This is not a case of simply identifying the ways the
youth transcend a sense of national belonging in their subjective understanding of
belonging to the world, but also of highlighting the way localised political, social and
embodied practices are co-constituted by a striated understanding of the national.

Chen (2015, p. 541) has noted that ‘cosmopolitanism cannot be divorced from
nationalism and the associated cultures in “national spaces” (Harvey, 2000; Cheah
& Robbins, 1998), especially when nation-states try to influence it as part of the
imaginations of their citizenry (Anderson, 1983)’. In my analysis, I expanded on this
idea by seeking a relational rather than static understanding of local/national/global
imaginaries, addressing the way in which global relations fold in on the youth’s
understanding of home and a collective understanding of ‘we’. When asking the
youth about how their mobile practices and relations to globalities shaped their
understandings about the places in which they live, they noted that these practices
made visible the isolated and ‘bubble’-like nature of suburbs in their hometowns and
the ways in which their understandings of the Other were governed by national
actors and policy. Their mobile practices also produced subjectivities of home based
on the exclusive and marginalising practices that people from their hometowns and,
in some cases, they themselves engage in through their everyday practices. In
discussing these marginalising practices, the youth drew from the imagined
boundaries and ideologies (re)presenting their subjective understanding of the
nation to constitute their cosmopolitan practices. For example, in May’s discussion
about Australia’s views on multiculturalism she articulates a sense of belonging to
both the nation and the world. Her obligation to the Other is performed in relation to
her efforts of questioning and working against national immigration policy and the
idea that Otherness is understood in relation to an ideal and a particular mosaic of
Otherness in which white, English-speaking, middle-class Others are favoured. Or
Adam, noting that ideas about the treatment of Others elsewhere contribute to his understanding of the marginalising and inequitable practices of localised Othering and the ramifications that this has for Indigenous Australian citizens in general. The youth’s Othering practices that emerged from these interviews and discussions were based on an understanding of the Other and the particularities of Otherness that was grounded in an understanding of a shared and just humanity.

Concluding comments

In the above analysis I have shown how youth’s cosmopolitan practices emerge from their relations to different times, spaces and places in which their spatial imaginaries are performed. For example, I examined how youth’s intra-actions with globalised entities have shaped the ways they enact and map social practices onto particular imagined geographies and spaces such as the personal, local, national, and global.

This analysis of how youth’s spatial imaginaries are interwoven and constitutive of their sense of belonging to the world aligns with Massey (2005, p. 84) who notes that a ‘vision of global space, then, is not so much a description of how the world is, as an image in which the world is being made’. I have shown how globalities come to matter in the constitution of youth’s subjective understandings of a shared humanity and ‘global’ imaginary through the ways in which they make place. My ontological interpretation here, in terms of youth’s place-making, is that the ‘local’ is already ‘global’. This was evident in the first section of this chapter where I posited that the youth’s intra-actions with classroom objects and matter constituted the way they practised and territorialised not only their national and global spatial imaginaries, but their ideas about the ways places and classrooms in the school were more ‘global’ than others. I discussed the ways these objects were agentic and a ‘conscious attempt to [make them] be familiar with people, objects, and places that all sit outside one’s local or national settings’ (Skrbis & Woodward, 2007, p. 732). In my discussions with the youth, an abstract ‘global’ emerged as positioned ‘outside’ their local understanding of place, or in the words of James and Jane, the ‘global’ sat outside their ‘micro’ and ‘national’ worlds. This in turn shaped what was possible in terms of their cosmopolitan becomings. For example, their intra-actions with these globalities reified an idea of the Other as someone needing ‘help’ and
‘out there’, and their ideas about their ethical obligation to the Other was that it was something that had to be achieved rather than something that already existed.

When discussing agency in relation to ethical responsibility with the youth, however, I found that they did not address ethics specifically by drawing on particular objects, but by relying on a body of objects in their entirety. For example, the youth didn’t refer to individual entities in their discussions e.g. newspaper articles about global events, but more generally about the kinds of things that were displayed in their Society and Culture classroom. This made me question how the youth’s depoliticised engagement with these objects and how this overly abstract non-specific view of Otherness might shape their moral and ethical responsibility to the Other. In many of these discussions, ‘Other’ referred to any possible Other not as fortunate, reifying a privileged self and nation. I was now more aware of the power of matter and the image in the classroom and the way the global or cosmopolitan curriculum was imposed and governed particular ways of forging a ‘global’ space for the youth. What I felt at first were tokenistic and passive practices within the classroom I now viewed as problematic in the ways they shaped and limited youth’s practices of a moral and ethical responsibility to the Other.

The spatial imaginaries that were emergent and practised in the youth’s discussions about their mobile practices online and watching television, as outlined in the second section of this chapter, showed the ways that their ideas of belonging to the world were also embodied. Youth’s sense of the ‘global’ had a ‘feel’ or was performed through the body’s sense of difference in the context of body–place relations online. Belonging to the world or a global ‘we’ was also based on a joint practice with global Others for the purposes of combatting neoliberal globalisation and also of forming a more ‘accurate’ global imaginary and understanding of the Other. Spatial and geographical imaginaries were also practised in the youth’s ideas about other places in the world and were entangled in their ideas about the extent to which they could belong to a global community. For example, the challenges of their geographical positioning became problematised in terms of how they could access and be interconnected with the Other through online networks. In a way, these networked practices dis-embedded them from the local conditions in which the (re)presentation of the Other and place are governed.
When I asked the youth to discuss globalities in which they intra-acted with at home or online, what emerged from these discussions was the ways in which they were engaged with how the globalities were produced, or by whom, and the ways in which these representations were both partial and based on particular perceptions of the Other. The youth were more engaged with the political nature of mobilities in these online spaces, more than I probably would be myself. Prior to my discussions, I had assumed that these practices would have had to be learned in the classroom, but I have now reconsidered the pedagogical nature of embodied experiences.

Affective intensities emergent from the youth’s lived experiences with place and with neoliberal practices of globalisation were obviously productive in terms of providing a space for the youth to engage in informal material-discursive practices with the Other and rework their imaginary of the world. These affects provided a space to circumvent liberal cosmopolitan practices and generated alternative ways to engage with the Other and ideas of Otherness beyond the youth’s cultural identities.

In the third section of this chapter it was evident that the youth produced a global sense of the local. Moreover, the youth illuminated the ways in which their local, national and global spatial imaginaries are interwoven and co-constitutive of the ways they understand their own position globally. Nowicka (2012, p.14) asserts that ‘cosmopolitanism is thus more than simply transcending the local scales to embrace the world but a matter of contesting the dominant spatial imaginary and of proliferation of alternative geographies of difference’. For example, the youth’s knowledge of the Other and other places in the world were agentic in shaping their local and national imaginaries and constituted a perceptiveness of the effects of immobility. This was commonly constituted through material-discursive practices that forged their ideas of belonging to ‘home’ and ‘nation’ and the boundary and bubble-like practices that the youth mapped onto these spatial imaginaries. Their spatial imaginary of the ‘nation’ was also predominantly performed and understood in relation to ethical practices based on the national political space and its citizens’ and governments’ treatment and recognition of the Other.

By addressing youth’s spatial imaginaries I have been able to show the ways ‘place and space affects the beginnings/being/becomings of local/cosmopolitan identities and also emotional aspects of citizenship’ (Chen, 2015, p. 542). What links the
above three sections of analysis is the way the youth didn’t just transcend a national space, but worked and positioned themselves as existing ‘in-between’ their different spatial imaginaries of belonging. Take, for instance, how James’ obligation to the Other is forged through his duties as an Australian citizen to question and change national policy that outlines particular ways in which Australian citizens should come to know and live with the other in Australia. The ambiguous nature of the youth’s cosmopolitan practices was emergent from the ways their spatial imaginaries at times ‘reinforce each other, or how they can combine, fragment, disintegrate […] or how agonistic sociospatial imaginaries are implicated in politically organised world-making projects’ (Delaney, 2010, p. 16). For example, the spatial imaginaries emergent from the discussions about the youth’s relations to globalised entities have produced an understanding of belonging to the world where ‘discourses that celebrate and promote fluidity of movement sit uncomfortably alongside discourses of political fixity and closure’ (Rizvi & Beech, 2017, p. 126). This can be seen in the youth’s hypocritical judgement of locals’ immobility and ways of life, while ironically promoting an idea of being open to all, or the cultural stereotype of Russians and their association with vodka that emerges from their discussion of the way places feel. In some cases, their relations to globalised entities reified a fixed local/global binary, where their moral and ethical obligations to the Other are limited and in some cases not yet achievable, such as those performed by James and Jane in the first section of the chapter. In other instances they constituted a global sense of home and belonging to the world in which Otherness is mapped in relation to the ways the youth form a global sense of community in their hometowns and question the moral practices of government and their national policies in terms of the way they treat local Others. My work has highlighted how youth don’t necessarily transcend their national imaginary in their cosmopolitan practices; rather they explore and question how the national and local do not align with universalistic ideals of cosmopolitanism or are transformed through neoliberal practices of globalisation and vice versa. The youth’s questioning in terms of their obligation to the Other isn’t just mapped onto or in relation to their spatial imaginary of Australia, but is a part of a practice of questioning the uneven power geometries of a networked global space. Moreover, the youth question and problematise the networked global space’s power in mobilizing and normalizing particular ways of understanding and imagining the ‘Other’ and world.
In the following chapter I address the affective dimensions of youth’s encounters with the Other and difference. I analyse the ways these pre-subjective experiences become meaningful through cosmopolitan practices and societal forces on which youth’s understandings of values, expectations and norms are relationally dependent.
Chapter 5: Affective geographies of difference (im)mobilising youth’s cosmopolitan practices

Introduction

This chapter foregrounds the ways youth’s moral obligations to the Other and their understandings of difference are constituted by affects emergent from their embodied practices in place. I address the lived dimensions of youth’s body–place relations and what affects ‘do’ in their subjective understanding of themselves, Others and the world. I am also concerned with how youth’s analysis of the affective intensities emergent from their relations to the Other and place, or what Dawney (2012) would refer to as the ‘oscillation’ between the pre-subjective and subjective, fold in on their cosmopolitan ‘moments’.

The driving argument in this chapter is that we need to pay more attention to the ways youth analyse and articulate how their bodies affect and are affected by their relations with globalised Others and places. I argue that in some cases there is a tension or ‘gap’ between what youth feel or how they forge a ‘sense’ of place, and the ways they read and mediate such intensities through liberal cosmopolitan practices (Germann Molz, 2017). I show that the way youth analyse these affects is, at times, limited by inadequate analytical vocabularies and liberal cosmopolitan practices that restrict youth’s understandings of what it means to be a ‘good’ and ‘responsible’ global citizen. I argue that liberal cosmopolitan practices of the youth in my study could be understood in some cases as sanitising their perceptions of the Other. That is, the youth aren’t provided the space to discuss the particularities of the Other through liberal cosmopolitan understandings of Otherness that are relevant and necessary in meeting our moral obligation to the Other. This was especially evident in the ways they articulated their experiences with structural inequality that emerged from their discussions about their overseas travels.
I also show how youth’s body–place relations constitute a space for ‘alternative’ cosmopolitan practices where they engage with their own privileged positioning in relation to the Other in the context of structural inequalities perpetuated and ignored through the representation of place by the tourism industry, governments, news media and other ‘global’ corporations. These alternative practices of cosmopolitanism often take place through a practice of dissidence where youth question ‘global’ actors and the neoliberal regimes of ‘truth’ they generate. This work draws attention to the emotional geographies of youth’s ‘alternative’ forms of cosmopolitanism by addressing affects emergent from their relations to globalities and Others. It highlights that in these cases their cosmopolitan practices are emergent from feelings of anxiety, anger and shock that do not neatly align with the ‘emotional skillset’ commonly associated with normative practices of cosmopolitanism such as a sense of appreciation of and comfort in difference. I show that although existing outside the emotional parameters associated with liberal forms of cosmopolitanism, these affects are still generative of youth’s cosmopolitan practices in which they form an ethical and moral obligation to the Other (Germann Molz, 2017).

Interwoven in this analysis is a question of how the research process and research setting shape the discourses made available to students to articulate their ethical cosmopolitan subjectivities. An example is the way that expectations forged through the youth’s relations to peers, the teacher and me as the researcher may shape their practices in terms of ‘appearing’ or ‘sounding’ more ethical in their perceptions of the Other. Moreover, I discuss how these social pressures might be seen as both productive and counterproductive in terms of constituting a space for youth to work on the ‘self’ and to understand the ways they discuss difference and forge their responsibility to the Other.

Based on these arguments, the youth’s cosmopolitan ‘moments’ have been organised in relation to two different cosmopolitan practices. The first is the ways in which the youth draw from liberal practices of cosmopolitanism to understand difference, especially in relation to racialised inequality. The second is an analysis of what I have referred to as youth’s ‘alternative’ cosmopolitan practices. These practices are the ways youth’s feelings of being ‘out of place’ are agentic in constituting their engagement with the workings of power and inequality in their
understanding of difference. I end the chapter with some emergent thinking around how the power relations between myself and the youth may have been entangled together and played a part in constituting their cosmopolitan practices.

**Sanitising difference through liberal notions of cosmopolitanism or a limited analytical vocabulary?**

When discussing their experiences in places overseas, some of the youth had difficulty grappling with feelings of discomfort emergent from their lived experiences with difference and racialised inequality. To analyse and navigate these affects many of the youth drew from liberal practices of cosmopolitanism that allowed them to rework their particular positioning in relation to their understanding of the Other. During one of the youth’s group discussions, for example, Katie noted how her imaginariness of America, and specifically her imaginaries of New York and Atlanta, were transformed through her experience with the African American population who lived in these places.

Researcher: How did you feel in those places? So, you said you were in New York and then you went to …?
Katie: And then we went to Atlanta.
Researcher: So how did you feel as a person walking in the streets of these places?
Katie: Ah, in New York it was really overwhelming, like there were just points, because it was during winter, um, so it wasn’t super busy, but like it was still busy, um … because you were so cold you were so alert, like just stepping out of the hotel, just made you just feel so like alive. Um, and there were points where it would just be so busy and like you like just feel so far away from home and it’s just a whole new place and it’s just so big and there were people everywhere and different. And then going to Atlanta was really different because it was … they’ve got the main part because the Olympics was there, so that’s really pretty and then there’s a bit of poverty, not poverty poverty, but the lower economic part within America and that was really different and interesting. It was sort of bit like we didn’t expect it. So you come from this New York which was all lights and like pretty. And you sort of step back and see the sort of different socio-economic areas and just how vast it can get. Which is different from here.
Researcher: What do you mean by ‘different from here’?
Katie: Like I guess, I don’t want to sound wrong, but the people there and the things there …
Researcher: You can’t say anything wrong here, it’s all open, you can’t say anything wrong. As long as you’re respectful to the other group members …
Katie: It was just, ah, there was a very big African American, um, population there [Atlanta], which was funny, not funny but like [awkward laughter] you had all of this as well in New York, which was heavy and interesting. It’s sort of hard to explain. I think being away from home and then … It was sort of as if it [Atlanta] was behind and like in the past just a couple of years.

Researcher: Oh, that’s interesting …

Katie: Like, the shops and things, yeah it was really funny, it’s not bad, it was just different. Like it was.

Researcher: That’s interesting that you refer to it as in the past …

Katie: Yeah, it was sort of like the Hopper Street Mall before it got like the whole refurbishment. You know …

Clement: Like, you kind of feel a bit warped.

Katie: Yeah! Worn down. Yeah it was like that.

Researcher: Warped, in what way what do you mean by that?

Clement: As in time hasn’t really affected this place, it is like still stuck. Like …

Jane: Living in the past.

Clement: Yeah.

Jane: It was kind of new once, but now it’s kind of the exact same as it was. It is a bit withered.

This understanding of America could be understood as being constituted by Katie’s feelings of being overwhelmed in New York and Atlanta. For example, she describes how she embodied a sense of feeling ‘so far away’ through her body’s relation to the geographical spaces of the city and it being ‘big’ and populated. She also notes how she felt overwhelmed in New York by the way the weather and tempo of the city made her feel ‘so alive’ and that it was ‘sort of hard to explain’ what she sensed and felt.

Katie also discussed her sense of difference in relation to her encounter with the African American population in Atlanta. Katie struggles to find the right language when discussing this experience, using the words ‘funny’, ‘not funny’, ‘heavy’ and ‘interesting’ as descriptors of how she felt in relation to the Other. Katie’s perception of racialised poverty in Atlanta was also entangled with the temporality of place. She notes that Atlanta was ‘sort of as if it was behind and like in the past just a couple of years’. She draws from her lived experience and everyday practices in the local to understand and articulate this temporality. She communicates how Atlanta ‘was like the Hunter Street Mall before it got its refurbishment’ (Hunter Street Mall being a frequented area by youths in her hometown that has recently gone through a period of gentrification). Clement contributes his insights into this felt dimensions of place,
explaining it in relation to feeling ‘a bit warped’ and the way in which time builds our understanding of place.

Katie’s awkward explanation of her sensed difference in Atlanta could also be understood as a performance of a liberal cosmopolitan practice. For example, Katie repeats ‘[i]t’s not bad, but different’ several times during her discussion about the African American population living in Atlanta. Through this repetition, she demonstrates the morality of her comments about her sensed and lived experiences of difference with the Other. This comment is repeated several times as a practice of asserting and acknowledging the need to identify the distinction between judgement and the recognition of difference. Katie also notes: ‘Like I guess, I don’t want to sound wrong, but the people there and the things there …’.

This, for example, could be evidence that she is aware that it is not socially acceptable to demonstrate an interest in the African American population and racialised poverty and is hesitant to acknowledge her feelings of discomfort in relation to what she witnessed and experienced. Her uneasiness in terms of discussing difference could be understood as reflective of a liberal understanding of difference. For example, she is hesitant to acknowledge that these people were both African American and poor as this is not a permissible material-discursive practice under liberal forms of cosmopolitanism. The particularities of Otherness were overridden by the practice of universalising the felt dimensions of tolerance and acceptance of the Other and shared humanity. In other words, Katie cannot relate what she has experienced or articulate these felt dimensions within the limited terms of liberal cosmopolitanism that are available to her.

In this case, Katie could also be understood as sanitising difference to counteract her perceptions of marginalised Others rather than critically engaging with the presence of inequality (Calhoun, 2003). Her gaze has returned on her own experience with the Other and sense of difference, but in a way to excuse herself from critically engaging with why she was uncomfortable in the first place. Her performance here may be based on her concern with how she looks among her peers rather than analysing this felt dimension and using it to rework her interest in marginalised Others.
Like Katie, May also emphasises the need to distinguish between judgement and the recognition of cultural difference. She discusses this idea in relation to how one should treat the hypothetical abject Other who is living in poverty.

May: I guess it’s about being accepting, but also a sensitivity to the culture of that particular country. Like, because they don’t have a fridge, they’ve had to adopt a way to prepare their food and if you go up to someone and they hand you some food and you go ‘Oh gross’, it’s totally insensitive and you’ve got to be willing to … just be accepting. You may not like the way they live but … and the term ‘they’ is horrible. It is non-specific and you’ve got to specify a particular culture, you can’t just generalise it. But, you know in general, you’ve got to understand that it’s relevant to them, but it may not be relevant to you.

May discusses this separation through the practice of being sensitive to the feelings of those Others who may live differently and accepting their ways of living. She notes that one should not exhibit how they might feel ‘gross’ when accepting a kind gesture of food from someone experiencing inequality. The reasons for the Other living differently, or the uneasy feelings in this experience, especially around inequalities based on the Others’ living and health standards, are not addressed by May. She instead discusses these differences and inequalities in terms of cultural ‘relevancy’. She emphasises that ‘[y]ou may not like the way they live but …’. May presumes the Other has a choice and agency in the way they live with such inequalities, and acknowledges that one should be accepting of such inequalities. In other words, May is engaging in the same universal liberal cosmopolitan practices as Katie, accepting the way in which the other lives should be understood as different rather than wrong. In adopting this universal liberal cosmopolitan practice, May does little to challenge how she comes to know the Other through a depoliticised understanding of inequality.

This universal understanding and acceptance of difference is also evident in Katie’s discussion of the poor living conditions of local Fijians who she visited when on holidays in Fiji.

Katie: I think with places you’ve been overseas … Like, I was thinking about it last night. Like in … when I went to Fiji where the tourist area is it’s so beautiful and then they live in poor conditions, but these places are these people’s homes and you’ve got realise how important they are to them and
even though for us it’s so bad. You know, it looks so shit, but it’s important to them.
Ms Johnston: You mean like the pride they take in looking after their house?
Katie: Yeah, and we have a lot of friends in Fiji and you know we go to their homes and you know you see the pride they take in their homes. I think it’s good to remember that even though these houses look bad to us, it’s important to them.
Researcher: Who’s us?
Katie: Like tourists going to these places and going, Oh? It’s so shit. [Inaudible conversation.] It’s just different, they take so much pride, even though we feel it’s bad.

Like May, Katie refers to a similar idea of relevancy in terms of the way Fijians homes are important to them, but viewed by her as ‘bad’ living conditions. Speaking from a privileged position, Katie notes that it is important to remember ‘that even though these houses look bad to us’ or ‘we feel it’s bad’, it’s not wrong, just different and important to them. The structural inequalities evident in her experiences with Fijians are circumvented by linking her comfort in difference to the privatised emotional attachment of Others to their homes. In this conversation, she has come to know the Other in relation to the affects emergent from her experience with the poor living conditions, but has discussed this in relation to her individual morality and her obligation to the Other to sanitise these differences rather than engaging with the political, economic and historical spaces productive of such inequality.

It was evident in my first discussion with Katie that she was overwhelmed by her experience with difference and I have argued that her liberal cosmopolitan practices could be understood as being used to work against her perception of the Other. A similar liberal cosmopolitan practice is also evident in Adam’s discussions concerning his experiences in India. Unlike Katie, Adam’s liberal cosmopolitan practice is constituted in relation to his feelings of comfort and safety. Adam would come close to what Germann Molz (2017) would refer to as a ‘world-schooler’. He has travelled somewhere overseas every year of his life and has frequently visited Europe and Scandinavia. In my discussions with him, he articulated how affectivities described as comfort and safety are produced through his flaneur-like practices of walking around with Others in the streets of India.

Adam: It was crazy. Like, I expected that there would be so many people that you couldn’t walk around …
Researcher: What was it like walking around?
Adam: If I compare it to other places I’ve been, like Italy … Like in some parts of Europe I’ve felt threatened by walking around. But in India I didn’t. I didn’t feel threatened. It was very different.
Researcher: What do you mean by threatened? In what way?
Adam: Um, I remember being in a bad part of Prague and, um … a whole lot of people in one street and, um, I remember some guys coming up to us and harassing me. But in India they’ll leave you alone unless it’s a beggar or something. Ah … even walking around at night … people aren’t out to get you. I didn’t feel that anyway. My parents made the comment that when they were in the Middle East they felt threatened on the streets. But, they didn’t feel that in India.
Researcher: Why do you think that is?
Adam: Um … I think because there is such a diversity of people in India. Diversity of religion, diversity of caste and where they come from in India. Um, everyone just has to get along, um … and get on with their lives. It’s not … they’re not out to have a go at you if you’re different or whatever.

Plage, Willing, Woodward and Skrbis (2017, p. 16) note that individuals generally have a greater propensity for openness to the Other ‘when they were open to acknowledge and understand cultural differences, even though, often this process was accompanied by growing anxiety about their own positionality’. Adam drew from his imaginaries of Others and other places when discussing and analysing his experience in India. For example, he refers to his experiences in Italy and Prague where individuals harassed him on the streets. His imaginary of India prior to leaving was thus forged by feelings of apprehension in relation to how the populated streets would make him feel and affect what his body could do in India. Despite this imaginary, Adam notes how his lived experience on the streets of India made him feel comfortable and a place where ‘no one was out to get him’. He communicates how his feeling of comfort was produced through coexisting with difference and the acceptance of difference among the Other where ‘everyone just has to get along’. This comfort is therefore constituted through the performance of belonging and enacting a shared cosmopolitan space and place; as Harris (2016, p. 365) puts it, it is the ‘ability to be comfortable in a community to the extent of its diversity and mix’.

It can also be explained by drawing from Anderson (2004, p. 28) who notes that ‘the existence of the canopy allows such people, whose reference point often remains their own social class or ethnic group, a chance to encounter others and so work toward a more cosmopolitan appreciation of difference’. In this cosmopolitan performance, Adam’s imaginary of India and the Other emerges in relation to the way spaces such as the cosmopolitan canopy of the street is made up of a ‘diversity
of religion, diversity of caste and where they come from in India’ and what Adam understands as the ability of people to ‘get on with their lives’ despite this difference.

The inequalities rampant in India and associated problems related to poverty and social divide are, however, overlooked and quite different to what Adam describes in his own imaginary of the country. Adam’s comfort in difference doesn’t account for Others who do not experience this place through a sense of comfort; nor does he critically engage with the role that inequality and his privileged positioning plays in his own practices of solidarity and experienced comfort with Others in India. In a way, his own comfort in the streets and universal liberal practices of cosmopolitanism (as in his own comfort in and with the Other and difference) have arguably inhibited his awareness of problems related to these differences. Adam returns the gaze on himself, but purely on the ways in which his body is affected by his relation to the Other. His own comfort in difference positions him outside these inequalities and limits his perceptions of the Other. He feels comfortable, the people living in India are nice and not ‘out to get him’, and therefore his subjective understanding of India is quite a utopian one.

Wetherell and Potter (1992) argue that when individuals focus on themselves as the source of either tolerance or prejudice it forwards the idea that ‘racial harmony comes from the considerate and unbiased treatment of all fellow human beings’ (p. 209) and is based on a practice of ‘changing people’s attitudes rather than modes of social organisation’ (p. 210). In the above examples, the youth have similarly drawn from a ‘generic’ and ‘even’ understanding of globalisation, where their cosmopolitan practices are constituted through the erosion of geographical space and read outside their own privileged positioning. The youth were aware that it was socially unacceptable in their group discussions to discuss their perceptions of the Other in terms of racial stereotypes and racialised poverty and struggled to find the analytical vocabulary to discuss these differences without sounding or feeling ‘wrong’. Skey (2012, p. 484) has noted that ‘because research subjects often look to manage their (self) presentation, it may be necessary to focus on the dilemmatic aspects of their explanations for what they do and believe’. By addressing this complexity in our discussions, it could be argued that the youth’s liberal cosmopolitan practices returned the gaze on the ‘self’, but in terms of how they were perceived as intolerant and judgmental by their peers and myself.
Like Germann Molz (2017), I could also argue that the youth’s cosmopolitan practices could be understood as part of a broader individualisation project. What I mean by this is that in some cases the youth could be understood as attempting to justify their social positioning to me in these discussions as privileged white, middle-class youth. Germann Molz (2017, p. 24) notes that ‘[w]hen this happens, people resort to personal solutions – for example, working on one’s own emotional skillset or escaping from an emotionally exhausting lifestyle – to the collective problems of living with neoliberalism’. Through these justification practices the possibility of the youth practising ‘alternative’ forms of cosmopolitanism are/were quashed.

Cosmopolitan practices that address the particularities of difference that are needed to define our practices of responsibility and recognition of the Other (e.g. the critique of unequal power relations) were not evident or possible due to the youth’s liberal cosmopolitan practices. The particularities of difference in these experiences were glossed over as means to practise a form of harmonious diversity and social cohesiveness. When the youth did refer to particularities, such as racialised poverty and other structural inequalities, that they could not attribute or place under the guise of harmonious diversity, they struggled to find the vocabulary to discuss what they experienced without sounding ‘wrong’. The affective dimensions associated with their sense of difference were read in relation to constructions of Otherness that were based on them ‘appearing’ cosmopolitan or comfortable in difference, but did little to shape their moral and ethical obligation to the Other or acknowledge their feelings or voices.

Pedwell (2013, p. 19) notes that a ‘liberal framing of empathy as universal rarely takes into account the historical circumstances and power structures that make empathy more possible or beneficial for some than others’. These liberal and universal understandings of empathy in difference that were entangled in the youth’s cosmopolitan practices worked against them ‘doing’ cosmopolitanism in a way that acknowledged how they became or were positioned as privileged in these experiences with difference. When structural inequalities were linked to the universal liberal cosmopolitan practices, the youth sanitised them as just different, limiting their moral obligation to question or shift the inequalities that contributed to their sense of uneasiness/comfort in their relation to the Other.
This was not the case for all the youth in my study, however, as demonstrated in the following empirical examples that show the political and pedagogical dimensions of affect in youth’s embodied sense of difference. The following section illustrates the ways some of the youths engaged with their own positioning in relation to the Other and the distribution and redistribution of power in their imaginaries of the ‘global’. It deals with the way affective dimensions of encounter provide a space in which the youth’s political capacity is extended through alternative ‘global’ imaginaries and cosmopolitan practices of dissidence.

Engaging with power relations and inequality as a cosmopolitan practice

Many of the youth were highly aware of how their understandings of the Other and place were entangled with and governed by actors that worked towards constituting social imaginaries that would serve the actor’s own economic and national interests. The following examples show how the youth moved beyond liberal forms of cosmopolitanism and forged alternative cosmopolitan practices through their body–place relations. For example, some of the youth constituted a practice of cosmopolitan dissidence in relation to the ways neoliberalism and national regimes of power play a role in how they understand the Other and world events.

When discussing how certain world events in the media make them feel in a group discussion, Mike articulated an affective intensity emergent from his relation to news entities in the media. He noted how his relation to globalised news media produced a feeling of powerlessness and hopelessness. He and other participants, such as Jasmine, discussed how news media positioned themselves and young individuals as external and incapable of engaging in world events, despite their efforts and desire to do so.

Mike: You just feel powerless.
Researcher: Powerless? What do you mean by powerless?
Mike: It feels like, like there are big kinds of things in the world that you just can’t stop, and they’re inevitable. There is someone, like a class above you, that’s just controlling this sort of thing.
Researcher: What class above you? What do you mean by that?
Mike: Oh, I don’t know … it feels like …
Group: A higher power!
Mike: Oh, just, some sort of higher power. It's kind of, not religious, but …
Jane: It’s like someone making all these decisions for us.
Mike: But in a corporate kind of way.
Researcher: Oh, a corporate way. What do you mean?
May: Money, controlling for their own interests.
Mike: You’ve got Rupert Murdoch who is …
Jasmine: That’s exactly it.
Mike: He’s, uh, to sell his papers to make his news more … he manipulates his, um, people into creating fear; you just have to look at, um, is it Bill O’Reilly? Oh, there was a news article on a news thing on quality of life crimes, which are crimes like graffiti, loitering in a place, which means if you’re a homeless person staying outside, you can’t sleep, sleep anywhere ‘cause you’ll be taken to jail or moved along. So yeah, you have these massive companies kind of perpetuating this cycle of poverty.
May: They’re making it scary.

Mike has communicated a quite dystopian imaginary of the world and he has positioned himself in the world as lacking both agency and power. He communicates this by describing a feeling of being ‘powerless’ in relation to ‘big things’ that occur and are out of our/his control. He positions himself and fellow youth as having a ‘class above’ them that is produced by ‘big kinds of things’. These are identified by Mike as existing in the media’s and other global corporations’ potential to control the way global events are reported and to ‘manipulate’ the truth and how we come to understand the Other and what is happening in the world. Material-discursive practices of producing ‘fear’ are also drawn upon in Mike’s understanding of the ways in which subjectivities of the Other are forged by globalised media. He discusses how the affective potentials produced through a person’s relations to ‘big’ media and corporations are done so to perpetuate what he describes as a fear of the Other, in this case homeless minorities and the propensity for them to remain in a deprived position.

This feeling of powerlessness also underpins Jane’s understanding of actors such as news media forging particular truth claims and normalising particular knowledge systems for their own economic gains. Jane draws attention to the ways these globalised practices silence other ways of seeing and understanding world events. She notes that ‘[i]t’s like someone making all these decisions for us’. Mike then defines these decision makers as corporations, specifically identifying media owner/baron Rupert Murdoch as a significant actor in this process.
The group then continued to discuss how their feelings of powerlessness produced a space and practice of searching for a ‘truth’. This practice was discussed in terms of the youth working outside the power regimes inherent in news media that shape their understanding of the world as a place.

Mike: There is obviously like evidence out there that these things happen and these things happen a certain way. But you see on things like Fox News, it is perpetuated, um, through alternative versions of history. This different … like …
May: Retelling of events …
Mike: Yeah!
May: And it’s not even a retelling of events that happened a long time ago, it’s like oh it happened yesterday, oh but we’re going to tell you this way and you’re all going to believe it!
Jane: Or even just not hearing about, you just don’t hear about some things.
Katie: I think it has brought to my attention, it’s through school, like I think my friends and like people like Miss Johnston are really informed. Probably two years ago, I wouldn’t have had a good understanding of things like that. My family doesn’t talk about these issues and things. I think it’s through, like people that are here, that are interested in like, you know, looking at things and saying well, that’s, well not wrong, but like bringing to attention what is happening behind the scenes.
May: Yeah, there’s always got be some element of questioning even if you think it is right or wrong, always look at it from the point of well, is it? Like …
Laura: The open mind.
May: Yeah, you’ve got to question it.

Mike refers to the practice of news media telling ‘alternative versions of history’, constituted through relational networks that construct and sustain truth claims (that include imaginaries) about particular issues that then become globalised through such entities as news channels and ‘big’ business. For example, two practices of ‘Fox News’ are reflected on by the youth: the reporting of alternative understandings of world events and the silencing of them.

In reflecting on the actions of news media, for example, people such as Katie’s teacher and other students are positioned as informed global citizens by Katie. Their practices of researching or being aware of what is ‘happening behind the scenes’ construct this understanding of them. It is also constructed through their demonstrated awareness and Katie’s practice of reflection on the partiality and
political leanings entangled in the practices of media. This includes the ways in which events emerge through situated knowledges based on the news corporations’ financial interests. Katie notes that these practices of being ‘aware of what’s going on behind the scenes’ should not include asking or concluding that something is ‘wrong’ but requires further attention or research. May, however, asserts that this shouldn’t be the case and that it is necessary to question the legitimacy of globalised news and media whether you support their claims politically or not. This practice of questioning is then acknowledged as a key practice of ‘openness’ or an ‘open mind’ by Laura.

Silencing of the ‘truth’ about the world and world events is also understood as controlled through the regimes of government and media channels. Jane notes that ‘you just don’t hear about some things’. Butler (2009, p. 31) has noted that ‘liberal norms presupposing an ontology of discrete identity cannot yield the kinds of analytic vocabularies we need for thinking about global interdependency and the interlocking networks of power and position in contemporary life … [where] part of the very problem … is that not everyone counts as a subject’. Here, Jane notes the agency of media in enacting what and who counts as being ‘global’ and reported on as ‘news’ and how the media produce, or in this case don’t produce, our imaginings of marginalised Others. Unlike the discussions in the previous section, the youth here were able to engage and move beyond the universalising practices of liberal forms of cosmopolitanism by attending to the political spaces (e.g. the uneven geometries of economic globalisation) in which particular understandings of the Other and place were governed and perpetuated.

Germann Molz (2017) has commented that feelings of angst and fear might be a ‘conduit’ for producing a pedagogical space in which our position in relation to the world and the Other may be analysed and transformed. Body–place relations and the emergent affects from such relations are heavily featured in both Laura’s process diary (Figures 5.1 and 5.2) and video essay (Figures 5.3 to 5.6). In her video essay Laura conveys the need to rework the affective intensities emergent from a dystopian global imaginary forged through her relations to and understanding of global conflicts. Laura notes in her process diary (Figure 5.2) that she was representing a place of mind, a place of ‘anxiety’ and that this anxiety was based on her precarious position in the world. Like Molz, Butler (2009, p. 33) has noted that
‘the ontology of the body … is a point of departure for a rethinking of responsibility … precisely because, in its surface and its depth, the body is a social phenomenon: it is exposed to others, vulnerable by definition’. Laura has produced in her video essay the juxtaposition between what she feels in relation to the rest of the world and its events, and the desire to become otherwise and open to Others. She has conveyed how our responsibility to the Other is constituted through our ability to work between the ‘feeling’ and ‘thinking’ body.

The picture Laura placed in her process diary (Figure 5.1) is of a body folded over multiple times with a head trying to escape from this folding. To accompany this image, she includes snippets of a poem by Rainer Maria Rilke that she states is about the ambivalence of our position in the world ‘between feeling alone in this world and not feeling alone enough’ (see Figure 5.7).
Figure 5.2 Laura’s planning notes for her video essay on representation of a ‘place of mind’

The making of Laura’s global imaginary is then remade through the production of her video essay. This ‘place of mind’ has become remade/unmade through her creative place-making practices by Laura engaging with the histories and bodies of Others in her video essay. Berberich, Campbell and Hudson (2013, p. 320), citing Butler (2006), note that ‘[i]f the fate of the body is tied to others and to the world, then it is “traversed by a relationality” that encourages “fundamental dependency’.
and ethical responsibility” one to the other’. For example, Laura has enacted footage from a world event she obtained from the internet. She has used footage from World War II of civilians in the brace position protecting themselves from being bombed in her video essay (Figures 5.3 and 5.4). Feelings of ‘fear’ and ‘anxiety’ as a ‘place’ are thus made manifest through the historical contingencies of this position of the body in times of war.

Figure 5.3 ‘I want to unfold’, image from Laura’s video essay

Figure 5.4 ‘Body in brace position’, image from Laura’s video essay
I am much too alone in this world, yet not alone enough
to truly consecrate the hour.
I am much too small in this world, yet not small enough
to be to you just object and thing,
dark and smart.
I want my free will and want it accompanying the path which leads to action;
and want during times that beg questions, where something is up,
to be among those in the know,
or else be alone.

I want to mirror your image to its fullest perfection,
never be blind or too old
to uphold your weighty wavering reflection.
I want to unfold.
Nowhere I wish to stay crooked, bent;
for there I would be dishonest, untrue.
I want my conscience to be
True before you;
Want to describe myself like a picture I observed
for a long time, one close up,
like a new world I learned and embraced,
like the everyday jug,
like my mother’s face,
like a ship that carried me along
through the deadliest storm.

Figure 5.7 Poem that Laura draws from in her video essay

Feelings of difference and isolation are drawn from to communicate this idea of not being able to ‘unfold’. This is also enacted metaphorically through the image of the boy camouflaged in green body paint in the middle of the forest (Figure 5.5). Laura’s own positionality and global imaginary are therefore enacted through world events in which the Other has experienced fear and vulnerability. In the making of her video essay, the possibilities of Laura empathising with the Other are facilitated through an imagined shared understanding of this feeling of anxiety.

The desire to unfold is also communicated in Laura’s video essay. Wanting to connect with Others and the world shows a transformative practice and a possibility of working through the anxiety and fear produced through such relations. The line of ‘Nowhere I wish to stay crooked, bent; for there I am a lie’ is drawn upon to illustrate a propensity to work on one’s self in order feel ‘at home’ and not alone in the world (see Figures 5.6 and 5.7). Laura’s analysis of these felt dimensions produces a space to rework her feelings of anxiety and discomfort. Laura has thus highlighted the way the feeling body is pedagogical, providing a space to be open to the ‘world’ and the Other. Moreover, her story shows that this space is produced and interwoven with emotional geographies alternative to those associated with liberal cosmopolitanism. The making of her ‘place of anxiety’ has provided Laura with the space to engage with the world and the Other differently. She articulates the ways in which her lived experience in place – in other words, her ‘anxiety’ – is inextricably tied to the state of the world. But she also communicates that this way of ‘feeling’ and ‘thinking’ about the world is lonely. The last line of text in her video essay
articulates that to overcome this loneliness it is therefore necessary to ‘unfold’ and connect with Others and other places in the world as a means of transforming the felt dimensions shaping her global imaginary. Laura examines how these felt dimensions have provided a space for her to understand her role in the world differently, one that has given her agency and a willingness to face the world’s problems with rather than for Others.

In the following example, May critically engages with the moral and ethical dimensions of our eagerness to ‘help’ the Other and draws attention to the tension between aligning herself with the universal tenets of cosmopolitanism and what might come of her moral obligation to the Other in terms of her lived experience with difference.

May: It’s that privilege of living in a first-world country and going you know ‘I want to help’ [sarcastic tone].
Researcher: You don’t think you do?
May: No, I don’t. Like it’s definitely the intention of me and that’s what I want to do, but at this point in time I don’t know nearly enough to make judgement or … um. I want to be open-minded and be able to accept people, but if I was confronted with something I don’t know how I would feel or act. I’d hope I’d be very accepting to it, but yeah.
Researcher: Do you think there is more knowledge about third-world countries on TV and things?
May: I wouldn’t call that knowledge.
Researcher: What would you class it as?
May: It depends on the context, propaganda.
Researcher: What do you mean by propaganda?
May: Well it’s based on the fact, on promoting that there are third-world countries so people will help, but it’s not like really helping if there’s like corporate … or in the end it’s going to benefit somebody in a first-world country. And that’s not really helping [using fingers to symbolise inverted commas] in the true form of the definition.

May acknowledges that she doesn’t know enough to make an informed decision about what ‘helping’ or what practices of acceptance might emerge from her experiences with difference. Instead of insisting on automatic comfort in difference or inequality, May discusses the idea that this ideal of acceptance and comfort of the Other might not be possible or is dependent on her experience. She notes that she is working towards or intends to be open-minded and accepting, but that this
practice is dependent on the context and understanding of the Other in which it emerges. Feeling and acting cosmopolitan therefore don’t pre-exist her experiences with the Other, but are produced through these relations.

May also questions and problematises the practice of ‘helping’ the Other in relation to hierarchical systems and structures of inequality and oppression, such that ‘helping’ can be a systemic part of the problem. She notes that ‘helping’ doesn’t necessarily equate to economic stimulation if the ways in which the global economy is structured equate to marginalisation and profiteering by those from a privileged position. It could also be argued that May is linking and problematising the practice of ‘helping’ to the ways the Other is made abject through such cosmopolitan practices (Nyers, 2003). Nyers (2003) notes that one’s recognition of an individual’s need for help and inclusion does not negate the ways the ‘Other’ is excluded or provided agency in these situations. May’s comment of ‘that’s not really helping [using fingers to symbolise inverted commas] in the true form of the definition’ demonstrates an understanding of the historical and political spaces in which subjectivities of ‘helping’ are constructed to legitimise privileged actors’ abject cosmopolitan practices.

In further discussions with May, I asked her about why she decided to present a video essay about the misrepresentation of place. May discussed how her imaginary of Los Angeles and particular social practices of the Other in Los Angeles didn’t align with her lived experience there on holidays and the affects that emerged from her lived experience there.

May: Um, I think certain areas or like locations can be sensationalised. Normally it’s for the benefit for somebody else or I guess to bring in more money. Um, I feel like a good example is like LA. When I went there in 2012 it was really like not how we expected it to be at all.
Researcher: What did you expect and why did you expect it in this way?
May: Um, I think because we’d seen it all on the TV and my mum kept using the example of, um, Rodeo Drive. Like when you see it on TV you sort of expect it to be really wide and really long and lots of shopfronts and it’s all sort of big and sparkly and shiny and it’s really not that at all. Like it looks like Newcastle West, like it’s really narrow and dirty. Like, I was just so surprised by how dirty it was. You get that feeling, um, yes it may have been grand at one time, but it’s just sort of lost its shine. Yeah, it’s just become somewhere that’s … yeah they’re using I think that sort of 50s
representation of it. Everything is all shiny and new and grand, but now it’s sort of just run down.

Researcher: How did you feel when you were there?
May: Um, it was odd and in a way, almost confronting because you’ve got such high expectations of something and then you’re sort of brought back down to reality and you think, oh well, you know, that was something that was supposed to be fantastic and huge and then it’s ... it’s not. And you feel like something has been taken away from you. You know you had this feeling and you were so excited and then you get there and it was like, oh. Well, we can get this back at home. I think the whole of America can be like that because they have portrayed themselves as this big massive power globally and when you get there, there’s people who literally cannot pay, you know to live, it’s so many homeless people. Um, you know, people can’t pay medical bills, they can’t pay university bills, like people are in debt until after they’re dead. And you sort of see this as, oh, they’re this huge global power, but they can’t even take care of things, their own people. It’s like, yes! Go America! [sarcasm], but then it’s like there are Americans that are starving and dying and can’t pay for their own education, can’t get an education. It’s like are you really such a great massive power?

According to Urry (2002, p. 11), tourists engage in a practice of analysing elements of other places to look for visual symbols, globalised through travel discourses and representations of places as a way to find differences and similarities with their everyday practices and the affective potentials of such difference. Although originally enacting a quite imperialist tourist gaze in the constitution of her imaginary of America, May’s imaginary is dramatically transformed through her lived experience in Los Angeles. She states ‘we can get this back at home’, noting a disappointment in the way Los Angeles aligns with her imaginary of home.

As May discusses this disappointment and shock further, however, she begins to engage with the social and political landscape of Los Angeles and consequently America, and the globalised imaginary of the country being a ‘global power’. She draws from this historical and political knowledge as a way of critically engaging with the social problems, such as high levels of poverty, homelessness and unemployment she experienced and witnessed during her time in Los Angeles. The temporality of place is also emergent from her conversations with me about engaging more critically with representations of place. May notes that she felt that the representations and globalised images of Los Angeles were a ‘sort of 50s representation of it’ prior to everything being ‘run down’. This shock and what would
be deemed a quite imperialist view of America emergent from our discussions together then becomes remade in May’s group video essay.

The idea of the misrepresentation of place as a global process is further explored and remade in May, James and Claudia’s video essay (Figures 5.8 to 5.10). In their video essay, the students discuss how they wanted to portray experiences they had in places that transformed their understanding of the way places and the Other are constructed and portrayed through a ‘tourist gaze’ in social and tourist media. They are referring to what Salazar (2014, pp. 864–865) would call ‘unspoken schemas of interpretation’ of these places and Others living in them. He outlines the link between tourism practices and imagination, as the production of ‘socially transmitted representational assemblages’ that are ‘meaning-making and world-shaping devices’. May, Claudia, and James’s video essay was titled ‘Misrepresentation of Place’. As part of their video essay they included the following excerpts that were produced during interviews between themselves and the researcher and then laid over images that were taken by them on their travels to America.

"...we saw all these things on TV, for example rodeo drive, and like when you see it on TV you expect it to be really wide and really long and big and sparkly and shiny and it's really not that at all..."

Figure 5.8 ‘Not shiny’, image from May, James and Claudia’s video essay
In the above screenshots, the youth drew from examples that highlighted how their lived experiences in America did not align with the imaginary forged through their relations to television and online media and the ways this made them feel ‘out of place’. In searching for images taken during their lived experiences overseas, May, Claudia and James were enacting moments in their travels where place wasn’t what they had expected or moments in which they felt ‘out of place’. There is dissonance here with Urry’s (2002) theory of the ‘hermeneutic circle’, the practice of
cosmopolitan tourists providing proof of their travels by photographing iconic images they have witnessed. The affects produced from their lived experiences in place have instead interrupted this understanding of the tourist gaze and provided a space for a re-reading of ‘difference’. Affective intensities articulated as disappointment and shock (although produced as a result of their privileged positioning and tourist gaze) are now a part of the relational entanglement that constructs their understanding of America. In these moments of lived experience and through the event of making the video essay, a shift from a romanticised and tourist practice was shaped into a more political engagement with place and the Other. How the youth remade place was now reliant on political and economic spaces, such as the social and economic issues America had in relation to poverty and homelessness and the way in which these work against America’s representation as a ‘global’ power. The students became more critically engaged with these places and the Other in-between their relations to both imagined and lived spaces.

Summing up

Reay et al. (2007, p.1055 cited in Germann Molz 2017, p. 24) insist that we must ‘develop critiques which, while recognizing how people negotiate inequitable situations, also constantly keep in play the structural injustices within which they are situated’. After reflecting on the felt dimensions of their experiences with difference, the youth in my study highlighted the forms of globalised entities that governed their practices in relation to their ethical and moral obligations to the Other. They engaged with the ways globalities and their relations with power and truth regimes in globalised media position the Other in particular ways. For instance, they engaged with the material-discursive practices of ‘global’ actors such as the United Nations and globalised news media in generating particular understandings of world conflicts. They also engaged with the limitations of cosmopolitanism and the idea that a global polity could exist ‘so long as this is defined as a harmonious arrangement in which all cultures are seen as attractive parts of a mosaic, but not when members of one cultural group organise to demand that the mosaic be altered’ (Calhoun, 2003, p. 545). These material-discursive practices especially emerged in Mike’s discussions of the war between Palestine and Israel and May’s critique of America being a ‘superpower’.
Interestingly, in these empirical examples the youth’s ‘alternative’ cosmopolitan 
practices were constituted outside the organising realm of normative forms of 
cosmopolitanism due to their relation to globalities and Others that were not 
generated by the elite or through knowledge systems governed by the corporate 
curriculum. For example, these alternative imaginations were constituted by truth 
claims presented by Others on YouTube, their own mobility and embodied sense of 
difference and emplacement (e.g. feelings of outrage, powerlessness and anger). 
By questioning the youth about how they formulate their own ideas about difference 
and the ways global events unfold and are mobilised through particular global 
processes, I provided them with a space to think about not only the ways in which 
they forge their responsibilities to the Other, but how the Other is constituted by 
globalities in the first place.

This section also highlights how the emotional geographies in these moments are 
extended beyond those normatively associated with cosmopolitanism. Emotions 
associated with normative forms of cosmopolitanism, such as feeling at home with 
the Other and the world, are not necessarily the emotions entangled in the 
production of youth’s sense of responsibility to the Other. Instead, feelings of shock, 
disappointment and anger are productive of youth’s political reading and 
engagement with/of Otherness. These feelings were not only associated with their 
perceptions of the Other, but the ways in which their previous mobile practices and neoliberal practices of globalisation (re)presented ideas about the Other and place 
that were incongruous with their lived experiences with difference. Their solidarity 
and empathy for the Other were generated in these cosmopolitan moments through 
a critique of how their own privileged positioning and consumption of the Other and 
place perpetuates these romanticised constructions of place.

Concluding comments

In this chapter, I showed how there was a disjuncture between youth’s affective 
relations to place and the Other and the ways they understood difference through 
their liberal cosmopolitan practices. In order to engage with the injustices of 
structural inequality, Ahmed (2004) notes that the particularities of the Other need to 
be understood beyond an understanding of difference that is related to an 
individualised morality. As such, in trying to articulate how they felt in their
encounters with the Other the youth were limited in relation to the ways they could engage with such inequality (Dawney, 2012). For example, it was apparent that in some circumstances the youth’s discomfort with difference and racialised inequalities of the Other could not be clearly understood in relation to liberal cosmopolitan practices. When drawing from such liberal cosmopolitan practices their perceptions and constitution of the Other could only be understood as being ‘not wrong, but different’. Such discussions became a ‘dilemma’ in terms of the youth trying to practise abstract ideals in their perceptions of the Other and when articulating their experiences with difference (Skey, 2012). Some of the youth also felt comfortable in difference and interpreted this comfort as the resultant practice of all of us managing ‘to just get along’. The ability to critically engage with the reasons for such inequalities was quashed by a very utopian and abstract notion of living with difference. This aligns with Germann Molz’s (2017, p. 23) claim that ‘[p]ositive emotions toward others may appear to be evidence of democratic communities, but in fact hold little capacity for undoing structural inequalities’. The gaze was returned on the self, but in relation to what was normatively expected of the youth by others and the educational institution, that of being able to feel ‘good’ and ‘comfortable’ in difference.

It must be also acknowledged and could in fact be argued that the youth’s inability to interpret and analyse these affects outside these universal liberal cosmopolitan practices may have also been due to their limited analytical vocabularies. For example, the youth may have had difficulty articulating their understandings of these differences and their possible role in perpetuating such inequality. Language thus seemed to be an obstacle for some of the youth in expressing and analysing these felt dimensions. Or, to put it another way, a voice from ‘elsewhere’ was not possible given the limited discourses available to them.

In the second section of the chapter, the youth’s cosmopolitan practices or the ways in which they come to know the Other were produced differently. They were instead understood in relation to the uneven and unequal circumstances of increased mobility and the differences that could mark these circumstances in certain social contexts (Rizvi & Beech, 2017). Harrison (2000, p. 205 cited in Farrugia et al., 2013, p. 13) has noted that “feeling and sensibility are the rendering of the emergent surface, the sense we have of a “good” ordering, or the disturbance we feel when
something is “out of place” … Sensibility and feeling are in touch with an outside because they are constantly attaching, weaving, and disconnecting.’ The youth in these discussions brought attention to how their body–place relations, when interwoven with their imagined social worlds, were productive of this sense of being ‘out of place’. For example, the affective intensities produced by the youth’s body–place relations mobilised their ethical and moral obligations to the Other in relation to the structural inequalities in which they were experiencing. This commonly occurred in terms of challenging the uneven power geometries of neoliberal globalisation and issues related to the (re)presentation of place mediated through their mobile practices.

What is inescapable about the affective geographies of cosmopolitanism and the ways in which individuals articulate and analyse the felt dimensions of social life is that they are based on the gaze of the ‘self’ and an individualised morality. Berlant (2008, p. xii) argues, for example, that political dimensions of feeling bring to the fore ‘the obstacles to social change that emerge when politics becomes privatized’ (see also Pedwell & Whitehead, 2012). As evidenced in my analysis, similar obstacles arose when youth analysed their own affective relations with the Other and their experiences with racialised inequality. It showed that in some circumstances these felt dimensions of uneasiness, comfort, joy and excitement have provided a space for the youth to depoliticise their cosmopolitan practices. Conran (2011, p. 1455 cited in Germann Molz, 2017, p. 24) argues that ‘the focus on intimacy overshadows the structural inequality on which the encounter is based and reframes the question of structural inequality as a question of individual morality’. Or to draw from Papastephanou (2011), the problem arising from this focus on our sense of respect for the Other is that it overlooks material inequalities of the Other and related problems that arise due to this inequality. Moreover, it does not include the ways in which our practices or positioning are entangled in the lives of the Other, limiting the way we engage with Otherness to the extent to which their voices can be heard.

I also think that my questioning of the youth in terms of how they feel in these places has been pedagogical. I have been able to show how liberal notions of cosmopolitanism and ‘generic’ understandings of globalisation may have been drawn upon by students as a way of not dealing with ‘uneasy’ feelings emergent
from their relations to racialised inequalities and differences and because of their own positioning as privileged cosmopolitans. What started off as appearing as a practice of openness to the Other on closer analysis turned out to be what is arguably a concerted effort by the youth to not look or sound ‘wrong’ in front of their peers and the researcher. These moments could be used to rework the material-discursive practices in which we come to know the Other. This kind of work would be based on questions such as: how might our attention to the affects emergent from our relations to the Other and place lead to more critical engagements with globalised entities and difference if we undo the normative emotional parameters associated with universal and liberal cosmopolitan practices? How might we approach the ways in which we come to know the Other differently? What might a situational and emergent approach look like in the classroom? These types of questions might open a space to overcome the problems students faced in the first section of the chapter in terms of the ways they were limited in both expressing and understanding their lived experiences with difference.

To finish, I have shown how the affective dimensions commonly associated with liberal cosmopolitan practices aren’t those that necessarily produce a space in which youth’s ethical and moral responsibility to the Other are possible. In rethinking the affective ‘skillset’ or emotional parameters of cosmopolitanism, I have shown that in some cases the youth’s feelings of anxiety, discomfort and anger produced through their body–place relations have provided a space to engage with the histories and politics in which their understandings of place and the Other are entangled.

In the next chapter, I continue with analysing the affective dimensions of youth’s cosmopolitan practices, but in relation to a flattened logic, a material approach that decentres the agency of the human and positions matter front and centre as a co-constitutive force in the making of youth’s cosmopolitan practices (MacLure, 2013).
Chapter 6: The performativity of the body and globalised ‘objectiles’ in the constitution of youth’s cosmopolitan practices

Introduction

Non-representational and vital materialist theories of affect are directly drawn upon in this chapter to demarcate what youth’s relations with globalised objects ‘do’ in the constitution of their cosmopolitan subjectivity. Specific reference is made to the emergent affectivities produced through youth’s body–object relations and how such affective intensities produce a space in which the reflexive practices of the participants are enacted. The chapter explores how subjectivities of ‘I’, ‘we’ and ‘Other’ materialise from body–object[ile]/place entanglements where globalised objects and past material experiences of the body and place extend into the relational entanglements of the classroom (Barad, 2007). The guiding questions for this chapter are twofold. First, how does globalised matter come to matter in youth’s cosmopolitan and place-making practices? Second, how do the affectivities emergent from body–object/place relations shape youth’s understanding of themselves, Others and the world?

A major concern in cosmopolitan research is the exploration of how globalised entities ‘bring people into contact with thoughts, ideas and transformative experiences through their connective and performative capacities’ (Skrbis & Woodward, 2013, p. 76). I argue that in drawing from vitalist materialist theories of affect and embodiment we can interrogate the different ways our bodies affect and are affected by globalised entities. Moreover, we can explore the ways affective intensities, emergent from youth’s relations to globalised matter, have the capacity to enact practices of negotiation and mediation that lead to more ethical and open understandings of the world and the Other. In focusing on the affectivities emergent from body–place relations we are thus able to interrogate the ‘political materialities that resonate from and that are formed through emotions’ (Tolia-Kelly, 2006, p. 76).
213). For example, many of the youth in my research project recognised that the way they constitute different places they both live in and imagine is influenced by the way their bodies are spatialised and affected by objects and matter around them. They highlighted how their sensual, emotional and embodied experiences are both transformative and provide a space in which to understand themselves, Others and place differently. Moreover, they recognised that such experiences have the productive capacity to co-constitute their cosmopolitan becomings by enacting practices of negotiation, empathy and understanding.

Aligning with a new materialist paradigm, Manning’s (2013) concept of the ‘objectile’ rather than object and Barad’s (2007) concept of ‘intra-activity’ are drawn upon in this chapter as useful tools to think about the performative aspects of globalised objects in the cosmopolitan becomings of youth. Manning (2013, p. 110) has noted that an object ‘functions not as a thing-in-itself but as a force of form that generates complex patterns in an ecology that touches on the everyday while moving beyond it into the time of the event’. Manning uses the example of how place-making practices in the home, such as the organisation and selection of furniture in particular spaces, has the choreographic capacity to produce habitual and subconscious movements in the body, noting that ‘how the space moves you is synonymous with the eventness of its objects’. The concept of the ‘objectile’ therefore directs our attention to the agency and ‘thing-power’ of globalised material objects in body–place relations (Bennett, 2010). An ‘ontological imaginary of things and their powers’ (Bennett, 2010, p. 349) focuses on the intra-activity of the human and more-than human through the redistribution of an object’s agency across discursive-material practices.

It must be noted, however, that this type of power is not referring to power through which the object acts upon the individual; it is the power through which the material objects and the body intra-actively produce material-discursive practices that shape how they can become cosmopolitan (Barad, 2007). Barad (2007, p. 152), for example, asserts that ‘discursive practices and material phenomenon do not stand in a relationship of externality to each other; rather the material and the discursive are mutually implicated in the dynamics of intra-activity’. Intra-activity in this context therefore refers to performative and productive forces of ‘entanglements of discourses, places, materialities and embodied practices in or connected to the
school environment’ (Lenz Taguchi & Palmer, 2013, p. 672). For example, in the context of this research study, the empirical material includes entanglements of different languages, affectivities, objects and past experiences of place that materialise in the classroom setting. The way these spaces, time and matter assemble is what Barad (2007) would call ‘spacetimemattering’, which draws attention to how both the youth’s past and future (as the continuity and discontinuity of particular material-discursive practices) come to matter and are implicated in the relational assemblage that produces and sustains the youth’s cosmopolitan becomings.

I have organised the chapter into four sections. The first section is based on the power of cultural objects in the youth’s homes and school and their capacity to enact particular material-discursive practices in the youth that mark them as ‘cosmopolitan’. The section focuses on the affectivities emergent from such relations and the way these are involved in the critique of the youth’s own racialised practices. It also shows how these cultural objects are read and understood within their own national imaginaries and place-making practices. The second section examines how affectivities emergent from particular body–place relations, qualified by the participants as comfort and discomfort, influence how the youth form practices of empathy and a continued eagerness to return to the Other and their related cultural models and practices. The third section of the chapter draws attention to the affective dimensions emergent from a participant’s relation to the Other through literature, online communication practices and dance practice. It addresses how such a relation produces a cosmopolitan space in which cultural barriers are overcome and entangled in the material-discursive practices of two participants’ own imaginaries, of Germany and India respectively. The last section analyses youth’s relation to globalised food and how the affective intensities emergent from such relation produce particular understandings of the Other and particular places in the world and create an openness to try new cultural experiences through the potential of displacing youth’s bodies.
Affectivities emergent from body–object relations and the related material-discursive practices marking the ‘cosmopolitan’ subject

During discussions with the youth about their relations to globalised objects, I asked them if they had items in their school, homes and bedrooms that had come from other places in the world or that they had brought back with them from overseas holidays. Two objects were mentioned: the youth’s relation to the Buddha statue and symbol, and a Coexist flag hanging in the classroom (as well as a similar sign used by one of the youth at specific political events in her city).

The following empirical material comes from a discussion group interview that took place in a Society and Culture classroom between five participants. Discussing their experiences with the Other and globalised objects in their geographical space, the students drew from objects such as the souvenirs they had brought back from holidays or acquired during experiences with the Other in other countries. These included culturally symbolic objects, such as the Buddha and prayer flags, collected by their family on holidays or put on display by their teacher in the classroom. The discussion often referred to the cultural and religious origins of the objects (e.g. Vietnam, Buddhism).

James: The stereotypes I learnt in Vietnam was that it’s a two-way street. Like, even though Western society has lots of stereotypes, Eastern society has stereotypes about Western society.
Jill: Oh yeah! [loudly]
Will: And the big stereotype in Vietnam is that if you’re white you’re rich, if you’re white you don’t work. And it’s, that was a really big stereotype. And, like it was just really great just kind of interacting with everyone and kind of breaking down those stereotypes ‘cause while I’d be breaking down mine, they’d be breaking down theirs. It’s funny to think about it. How did these even start? How did these stereotypes even start?
Group: Yeah [loudly].
Jane: From misinformation and misinterpretation on one side.
Will: Yeah, and it’s like on to what you said about how our upbringing and stuff, trying to make everything look pretty. Like that was a really big shock to me in Vietnam. Like everything they used wasn’t to look pretty. Everything they used, like a shrine [pointing to the Buddha on the prayer flags], they would go there every day. It wasn’t just there to look pretty. Like in Australia, you might buy a Buddha and go ‘Oh that looks nice, I might put that in my room’ [points to the Buddha on the prayer flags in the classroom again].
Researcher: Hmm, hmm.
Will: It has like, they use it, it has all these kind of symbols to them and meaning to them, so it's kind of about trying to use it too, but being a bit respectful, kind of down to you.

Jane: It’s understanding.

Steph: Yeah, like, understanding exactly, like just ...

Jane: My Mum has 27 Buddhas [laughter from the entire group].

Jill: I’m sure we all have a Buddha [laughter from the entire group].

Researcher: Hang on, keep going, keep going.

Jane: She’s not Buddhist, she doesn’t know anything about Buddhism, she just thinks they’re cute [laughter from the entire group].

Steph: My Mum likes Buddhas

Jill: Surely we all have a Buddha in our house.

Jane: I have prayer flags [laughter].

Jill: It’s not just like other people, we all do it [frowning].

We can describe the Buddha in this case in Bennett’s (2010, p. 3) terms: ‘Refusing to fall back into itself or play into the art-as-object scenario, the thing produces a new event – an ecology – that will rise up to meet us.’ Here the body–place–Buddha entanglement has produced a space that enacts, through an entanglement of material-discursive practices, individual and collectivist becomings of ‘self’, ‘we’ and ‘Other’. The Buddha has formed connections (intra-acted) with youth’s other material-discursive practices and place, as made manifest through their wider ‘apparatus[es] of knowing’, as illustrated below.

The ‘power’ of the Buddha was first understood by the youth within the apparatus of ‘past experiences of place’. For example, Will’s short narrative about his experience with the Other in Vietnam has surfaced in this entanglement, drawing attention to the temporal aspects of place-making and its co-making with human and non-human entities. Will communicates to the other participants how his own experience with the Other (i.e. Vietnamese people) and individuals’ social practices in Vietnam of purposefully using things was productive of an affective intensity, qualified by Will as that of ‘shock’. This feeling of ‘shock’ emerged as being important as both a moment of transformation and productive of further reflexivity in relation to Will’s and the other participants’ understanding of the Other. As has been noted, ‘time is needed for subjects to reflect on the shock of affect and reinsert it into the semiotic and narrative chains that render it partially “analyzable”’ (Massumi 2002, p. 36 cited in Maclure, 2013, p. 553). For example, this qualification of ‘shock’ was also read in relation to Will’s national imaginary, where in Australia ‘everything is used to look pretty’; this binary is then erased by comments from Jane who announced this
practice as being a form of ‘misinterpretation’. The Buddha–classroom–body entanglement triggered an affective event, an entanglement of individual subjectivity (e.g. shame, laughter, shock, guilt and empathy) in relation to non-human entities (e.g. Buddha, classroom, homes). According to Massey (2005, p. 139), ‘[h]ere is an intertwining of histories in which the spatiality of these histories (their then as their here) is inescapably entangled. The interconnections themselves are a part of the construction of identity.’ Will’s understanding of the Other had therefore ‘not emanated from a singular subject’ (Mazzei, 2013, p. 733), but an entanglement of material-discursive practices: material-discursive practices of bodies, objects, the Buddha on the prayer flag, affectivity, and Will’s own narrative of being ‘there’. Drawing from Hickey-Moody (2007), affect in this discussion between the students was pedagogical; it opened the door for an examination of this feeling of shock. It produced the possibility of co-constituting the Other as well as Will’s and the participants’ relation to the Other through more open, ethical and respectful material-discursive practices.

The embodied practice of laughing and smiling also emerged in the participants’ relations to each other and in the comments made about the Buddha being in their homes and classroom as a form of ‘misinterpretation’ of the object. For example, the interruption of laughing as a bodily affective response enacted a practice of critique and a feeling of shame in one of the participants in relation to their own bodily and political practices. Jill notes, for example, ‘[i]t’s not just like other people, we [Australians] all do it’ while exhibiting a frown. In this event, shame as an ‘emotional response becomes part of what shapes how a child [Jill] comes to understand the potential of their own belonging in the world and ways of living in a world with others’ (Rooney, 2015, p. 23). Here the bodies of the participants don’t just respond, but are co-composed by these responses. The bodily practice of laughing together is co-constitutive of a ‘we’ in the participants, or what Anderson (2005, p. 653) calls an ‘ethics of affection based on how bodies compose with other bodies’. Ahmed (2004, p.106) notes that through feelings of shame ‘I expose to myself that I am a failure through the gaze of an ideal other’ (Ahmed, 2004, p. 106). In this case, Jill has become transformed by this feeling of shame in relation to what she thinks she should or shouldn’t do in relation to the ‘Other’.

Jill is also aware that the acculturalisation of the Buddha is wrong and acknowledges that the normalisation of such a practice is unethical and works
against the idea of 'understanding' that she emphasised earlier in the discussion. She notes how her mother’s inclusion of this object in the home does not reflect a knowledge of the culture and that the object is purely ornamental. While Will is talking about how he broke down stereotypes and barriers, Jill is raising the fact that the Buddha is an object that is consumed and used as an ornament in Australia. She has acknowledged the way that orientalised notions of the ‘Other’ have become banal through the repetition of the Buddha’s use in Australia. She also acknowledges that this practice is common among the other youth in the group discussion and that they all use objects from other cultures to an extent in this ornamental manner.

The Coexist flag was present in the classroom and was an object used by one of the students, May, as way of demonstrating solidarity with the ‘Other’ (the welcoming of refugees to the area) in opposition to a Reclaim Australia rally held in her hometown (see Figures 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3). Reclaim Australia rallies are held in Australia by far-right movements protesting against Islam. The flag in its physical relation to May, through her body’s practice of holding and waving the banner and flag, marked her as a politically engaged ‘cosmopolitan’ subject. May elaborates on this in the following discussion.

May: We were using it at a protest rally, um, it was in protest of a Reclaim Australia rally held in [insert city name].
Researcher: Do you know what these symbols on the sign represent?
May: It says ‘coexist’, and uses different religious symbols from … these are the three Abrahamic religions, so …
Researcher: So what are they?
May: Islam, Judaism, and Christianity.
Researcher: Yep, okay.
May: And I believe I’m using it to say that we can coexist. It's not very difficult, ah, so we can reach a common understanding, that kind of thing.

It is evident that May has built extensive knowledge of the Coexist flag and what it represents. She has done so in relation to a broader apparatus of the history and knowledge systems evident in society about ‘Other’ religions represented by the symbols on the sign and flag. May has drawn from this cultural knowledge in order to establish herself as a person who is open to the Other and encourage diversity in her hometown.
Figure 6.1 The Coexist flag hanging in the classroom
May also conveyed that through the shared bodily practice of holding and waving the Coexist sign an affective intensity was emergent. This was articulated as a feeling of pride, but at the same time frustration and anger.

Researcher: Why were you using the sign?
May: We wanted to not only encourage diversity in [insert city’s name], that’s something I really strongly believe in, but there were people who weren’t
being accepting and I think we wanted to show them that that that … won’t be tolerated, it’s not nice, let alone, you know, it’s just nastiness not needed [frustrated tone to her voice].

Feelings of disapproval, anger and shame, are a part of the entanglement in which the sign becomes intelligible to May in this discussion. These contradictory affects are dependent on and materialise through the different spaces in which the flag intra-acts with May’s body. For example, feelings of anger emerge from May’s material-discursive practice of conveying to other community members that their intolerance of the Other will not be tolerated. May’s cosmopolitan practice of encouraging diversity and openness to the Other is related through the embodied practice of holding the sign. A ‘we’ here is also constructed through the connection of bodies to the sign in the shared practice of protesting against the discrimination and racist ideologies of the Reclaim Australia members.

By analysing this empirical material from a materialist perspective, I wanted to draw attention to the ‘thing’ power (drawing from Bennett, 2010) of the Buddha and Coexist flag in the body–place entanglements. Here, the Buddha and Coexist flag are not just static and inanimate objects that existed in the participants’ homes and the classroom, but objects with material-discursive agency. This discussion, illuminates what the Buddha does by intra-acting with bodies in the classroom to produce their possible cosmopolitan becomings. The Buddha has made itself intelligible to the youth as a practice of orientalism, a practice of faith, and a practice of openness to the Other. Emergent from this discussion was the way the Buddha attached itself to different times and spaces to produce a multiplicity of understandings about the youth’s own practices in relation to their understandings and moral obligations to the Other. The Buddha has become more than a static and aesthetic object in the classroom. It has generated an event that challenges our everyday practices and relationships with globalised objects and the ways that humans and the Buddha co-compose and enact place and subjectivity.

This ‘eventness’ was also evident in relation to the agency of the Coexist flag in the production of May’s cosmopolitan subjectivity. When the flag connected to different spaces and time it produced a continuity of difference in which different practices and contextual understandings of the object were made possible (Grosz, 2005). In
the classroom, it emerged in its intra-action with May as a product of religion. That is, an object that had a history and embedded meaning in terms of the ways in which we should come to know and accept the religious Other. In May’s discussion about the use of the flag outside and her active participation in a protest against xenophobic behaviour, the flag became a part of the assemblage and force that was used to govern appropriate behaviour toward the Other, an agent in the acceptance of diversity. It was also an agent that challenged those who think otherwise when it became intertwined and connected to other bodies, producing a collective cosmopolitan ‘we’ in this political space and interview.

The ‘eventness’ of objects also emerged in my discussions with the youth about their sustained interest in other places and people in the world and the ways the youth historicised affects produced through their intra-actions with objects in different times and spaces. In the next section, I draw from Barad’s (2007) concept of ‘spacetimemattering’ to demonstrate a geographical approach that helps us understand the ways space, time and matter intra-act and are entangled in youth’s cosmopolitan becomings.

**Bringing globalised objectiles and past experiences of place into the classroom: Historicising affectivity and our relations to matter**

While observing classroom activities and the production of the youth’s video essays, I discussed with the youth the ways their ‘closeness’ or proximity to objects from their past enacted particular affects that were sensed and felt in their bodies and the ways that these bodily experiences shaped their understanding of places and Others. Among other things, it was evident that the experience of sensing comfort and discomfort in the body’s relation to particular objects and places surfaced in the co-constitution of the youth’s cosmopolitan practices.

The following ‘event’ was produced during an interview with Will that occurred during a classroom discussion on experiences communicating with the Other. In this interview, Will shared his experience of purchasing a hat, pillow and bed cover with his parents in Vietnam and his everyday relation to such items in Australia (see Figure 6.4).
Will: They take me back to actually being in Vietnam, they remind me of my experiences in Vietnam, and everything is a happy feeling and it gives me a sense of comfort.

Researcher: Oh okay, so it's a sense of comfort. Um, what about this one? You were talking about stuff you did in this and why. The hat we're referring to, the hat here.

Will: Yes, the hat. I wear the hat when I mow the lawn and clean the pool.

Researcher: Why?

Will: Because it reminds me of seeing others in Vietnam, working their day-to-day lives, especially when I went to my father's work site and saw everyone, so it's a nice feeling. It's very 'out of place' in Australia. But I get a very happy feeling from wearing it. It just transports me back to being in Vietnam.

Researcher: Why out of place?

Will: So, it's just not normal, it's not a custom in Australia to wear these hats, it's very, all Australians would find it very, not normal, kind of an unusual fashion choice.

Researcher: Have you ever seen anyone wear a hat like this in Australia? Will: No, I haven't to be honest, I probably have, but can't remember it.
Will has narrated that emergent from his embodied practice of wearing the hat from Vietnam and his proximity to things of his past life in Vietnam, such as the blanket and pillow, were feelings of comfort and relaxation. He has communicated that his continued engagement with the Other and globalised objects is a result of the affective potentials of such a relation, what Simonsen (2010) would refer to as a form of ‘affective cosmopolitanism’. At the same time and in the ‘event’ of the interview, Will has critiqued such material-discursive practices as being ‘out of place’ in relation to the national imaginaries and belonging to nation of Others. The interviewer’s question of ‘Have you seen people wearing these hats in Australia?’ produces a space in which ‘contradictory subjectivities of different spatio-temporalities are enacted’ (Juelskjaer, 2013, p. 761). The ethnic-racialised material-discursive practices of wearing the Vietnamese hat, when entangled with other material-discursive practices of Will’s national imaginary, enacts a sense of being out of place in Will. Will notes that ‘all Australians would find it not normal’. Feelings of ‘comfort’ are thus juxtaposed against feeling ‘out of place’ as time, space and matter intra-act differently with different spaces and places. The event demonstrates how different spacetimematterings have been enacted in particular places (e.g. the home, the nation, Vietnam) in order to find a way of practising a form of openness to the Vietnamese culture, despite this practice being ‘out of place’ in relation to the national imaginary of others. The event also shows how particular entanglements that co-constitute cosmopolitan practices are sometimes fleeting, with a becoming-cosmopolitan Will enacting material-discursive practices to both discard and work within his own and others’ national imaginary.

Lennon (2004, p.111) notes that the imaginary is ‘constitutive of our experience of the world, bearers of affective significance, the means by which we not only think but feel our way around the world’. In the following event, Laura was analysing her own interview data to produce her video essay and communicated that her imaginary of ‘Germany’ and her desire to visit there was formed by her embodied response to a particular poem she had read in a fiction novel. This was a poem by the German author Rainer Maria Rilke. In focusing on the following empirical material, I would like to draw attention to how the act of Laura listening to her own interview data in the production of her video essay enacted something ‘new’ in Laura’s place-making practices. Rather than focus on Laura as creator, I am exploring the creative process (the entanglement of discursive-material practices) in which the imaginary of Germany materialises or gets made.
During the making of her video essay, Laura and I discussed why she had chosen to focus on Germany and on ‘feelings in place’ for her creative video essay (this was not the primary interview of her project).

Researcher: Do you feel different in other places?
Laura: I think anywhere outside of Australia would make you feel … because it’s a completely new world. Because it’s a different culture, it’s a different idea of things, so that would just be, it would be learning things for yourself and then getting the knowledge you have and trying to make a character out of yourself and putting that into a new situation and then kind of interpreting and learning from yourself how to adapt.

Laura has never travelled outside of Australia, but notes that she imagines ‘Other’ places outside of Australia as ‘a completely new world’ and as being felt in the body. Laura also notes how becoming cosmopolitan in these places would be based on a form of ‘work on self’, ‘trying to make a character out of yourself’, demonstrating that she expects to be transformed by the new place she may visit. This flexibility is also based on the practice of interpretation of the knowledge one already has from being in this ‘new world’ and resituating it as an interpretive practice on how one might go about adapting. If we now go to the original interview that Laura was listening to, we can understand how such a practice of reflecting on her interview has shaped and surfaced in her video essay/place-making.

Researcher: Is there a place outside Australia you would like to visit?
Laura: Germany.
Researcher: Why Germany?
Laura: Because I love, I'm a bit obsessed with Germany at the moment. I learn the language at the moment and I'm in love with the language because it's so, so like straight forward. Like, they just say what they mean and they mean what they say and there is no hidden meaning or anything and that's what it is. And it's got such a rich history. They have had ups and downs and they've just been everywhere with the history. So I think that is really interesting. They have a really rich culture, so it would be amazing to go and see and experience that.
Researcher: How have you learned about Germany?
Laura: Fiction novels [laughs].
Researcher: Fiction novels, now this is interesting.
Laura: That’s how I came to love the language. I was reading a book one day and it had lots of lovely poetry from a poet, the poet Rainer Maria Rilke. Researcher: What did the poem say? Laura: I am much too alone in this world, but never alone enough. Researcher: What do you think he means by that? Laura: I think he means like, I interpret it as … he feels so lonely in the world, even though he’s surrounded by people, but the same time he doesn’t feel quite alone enough. He doesn’t have that same, like he feels lonely and he feels like he needs someone, but at the same time he doesn’t have enough independence and I don’t have enough freedom … and it’s just Researcher: And that … Laura: That just resonated so much with me. Researcher: So that’s your attachment … Have you learnt about Germany anywhere else? Laura: Only talking to German friends online.

Her openness towards Germany was constituted through feelings of pleasure and love emergent from the force of the poem that ‘resonates’ with Laura. A romantic imaginary of Germany has thus been produced through affective intensities emergent from the material-discursive practice of reading fiction novels and poetry. Laura narrates how her love and openness for learning about the German culture was also enacted through the practice of speaking the German language at school and with her German friends on Facebook. Learning a new language is a new cosmopolitan becoming as it has changed what Laura’s body can do in relation to communicating with the Other. It has made communication with the Other more accessible and a part of her everyday routine online communicating with her friends. As Ros i Solé (2013, p. 332) notes:

The language learner inhabits and performs social and even personal acts within the target culture. She does not see a barrier between herself and what is possible in the other culture.

Learning a new language has also provided a new virtual space (e.g. Facebook) in which Laura can intra-act and feel comfortable with the Other. Thus, what surfaces in Laura’s place-making and cosmopolitan becoming are entangled material-discursive practices that ‘immerse [her] in new exciting cultural worlds through aesthetic, intellectual and moral experiences’ (Ros i Solé, 2013, p. 332). The outcome of being able to communicate with German friends in the German language is an embodied closeness and love of Germany through a language
practice that produces an appreciation of Otherness. Othering based on an individual’s mother tongue has been eliminated through this practice.

If we also understand Laura’s video essay as a material articulation of her imaginary of Germany and her place-making, we are able to map how Germany is both embodied and imagined through her intra-actions with German text, spoken language, images, music and her relation to its history.

Figure 6.5 Laura’s planning notes for the video essay
From Figure 6.5 we see that Laura wanted a ‘time lapse’ of the city, with text highlighted from the poem that would be included in her video essay to represent ‘feelings in a place’. In Figure 6.6 we see that an assemblage of juxtaposed images and film, sourced from the internet for Laura’s video essay, has enacted a particular temporal and visual construction of Germany. In the video essay Germany also materialised through a continued movement between images of geographical spaces, footage of the country during World War 2, rural Germany, forests and images of the cityscape in its modern form. Through her creative place-making Laura has demonstrated how her intra-actions with the histories and memories of the Other co-constitute her imaginary of Germany; these images have enacted what Germany is and could be for Laura.

The embodied practices of the Other have also surfaced in Laura’s video essay/place-making. The footage of the hunched-over girl hiding and protecting herself and the lone young boy roaming the forest are drawn upon to represent, as Laura states, ‘how I feel at ease in some places and anxious in others’ (Field notes,
24/9/2015). Germany is thus also enacted by the different affective dimensions of particular spaces and places present in the visual images. These affects also include how place is both understood and produced through the body’s perceptiveness to sound. Laura included a work of Beethoven in the video essay as it ‘totally sounds German’ (Field notes, 24/9/2015). As a creative practice of place-making, Laura’s video essay and imaginary of Germany is enacted through both real and imagined spaces, illuminating how Germany is co-constituted through its relation to Laura’s body. As such, Laura’s imaginary of Germany is co-constituted not only through discursive matter, but also her bodily matter – through the sensual, visual, auditory and corporeal dimensions of Laura’s body–object relations.

Hickey-Moody and Page (2015, p. 10) have described dance and performance as an ‘embodied cultural space’. As such, dance as an art practice is viewed to have:

a politically effective capacity, the capability to rework a body’s limits, to reconfigure individual arrangements of structure/agency, augment that which a body is or is not able to understand, produce, and to which it might connect. (Hickey-Moody & Page, 2015, p. 11)

Hickey-Moody and Page are explaining here the way dance provides a space in which individuals' bodies are agentic in the way cultural ideas and objects are experienced. They also highlight the ways such globalised entities intra-actively spatialise the body and produce affects that shape an individual's understanding of the Other. For example, Adam in the following discussion elaborates on the way he sustains a creative cosmopolitan body through the practice of Indian dance. In his discussion about how he had come to form a love of India, Adam describes how Indian dance has opened up a new way of imagining the Other and India as a place. In his Indian dance practice, he notes how globalised objectiles such as costumes, bodies and instruments are a part of the relational assemblages that form Adam’s knowledge about Indian culture. These objects don’t just mark him as a cosmopolitan, but work in sustaining the desire to be so through the affective potentials brought about by their relation to his body. In the following screen shots (Figures 6.7 and 6.8) the relation of Adam’s body to such globalised objects is evident.
In discussing these images Adam demonstrated his knowledge about Indian dance practices.

Adam: Well, um, I actually do Kathakali, which is a type of South Indian classical dancing, I also do folk Indian, which is a mixture of dance from all over India, and I also do Bollywood dancing ... It's been evolved from other earlier dance styles in India and it's, ah, when it first came about it was just people sitting down on the floor in a temple telling stories with their hands because of the illiteracy rates in India, but it's now evolved into, dance ... like whole dances with portions of a dance being spoken through our hand
symbols, while a small group of instruments, usually a singer, a drummer and maybe a Zinah player, which is like a sitar, but from Southern India and they’ll have someone keeping the time with a block of wood or stick …

Researcher: What has this type of dance told you about the Indian culture?
Adam: It’s told me a lot about south Indian culture and the importance of mythology in Hinduism.

Adam’s dance practice involves the telling of Indian mythology through the corporeality and modification of his body. Through this practice Adam’s body has produced a space in which knowledge about the Indian culture and the Other is both embodied and discursive in nature. Hickey-Moody (2013, p. 91) asserts that youths’ ‘voices’, when produced through performance and situated in relation to globalised entities, may ‘become intelligible as a form of global citizenship’. This is evident in the way Adam describes the different and multiple cultural spaces in which he is entangled in through his dance practice. For example:

Adam: It’s not self-expression like in contemporary dance, you’ve got to fit into the character.

Adam has recognised the differences in which his body becomes spatialised within the two distinctly different cultural dance spaces. His body is part of the relational assemblage that produces and constitutes this cultural difference, but at the same time is open to it and moves between them. These visceral differences are also encapsulated in relation to the way dance has displaced Adam’s body.

Researcher: How does doing this type of dance make you feel?
Adam: I can go to [Indian] dance and disconnect from my own life, not bring any outside emotions in and just know that I have to be the people in the stories.

Adam has expressed how his body has become displaced from his ‘own life’ through the practice of Indian dance and that this disconnection is a desired and positive practice. His experience draws attention to ‘not only the ways the body becomes (actually and physically) marked by its cultural practices, but the ways in which the cultural practices (and therefore subjectivities) are produced in and of the materiality of bodies’ (Stanger, 2015, p. 123). Adam’s body thus feels ‘elsewhere’ through the narrative of the Other, which then produces and enacts affective flows.
that produce a positive and open relation with the Indian culture. Coole and Frost (2010, p. 19) note that there is ‘increasing acknowledgement within theories of politics – and especially in theories of democracy and citizenship – of the role played by the body as a visceral protagonist within political (and I would also include, cultural) encounters’. Adam has noted how during performing Indian dance his body essentially becomes something else. He is transformed as a more open and engaged cosmopolitan, an experience enacted by the way different cultural spaces positively affect his body.

In the above three moments, Will, Laura and Adam have discussed how they have historicised the ways in which affect was emergent from their body–place relations in ‘Other’ places and how they have ‘plugged into’ these experiences when expressing their openness to and understanding of other cultures (Mazzei, 2013). Dawney (2011, p. 636) has highlighted that ‘[t]he body, in its affective relations, responds with reference to its own past, and the pasts of other bodies’. Dawney is describing here the way space, time (continuity/discontinuity) and matter become entangled to constitute possibilities of becoming. Or, to draw from Barad, the ways affective intensities within a participant’s engagements with place and objects in place are ‘iteratively reconfigured and enfolded through the world’s ongoing intra-activity’ (Barad 2012, p. 44). Barad’s concept of ‘spacetimematteriing’ highlighted in these cosmopolitan moments how the continuity of the participant’s experiences in place are co-constitutive of their cosmopolitan becomings. It draws attention to the ways space and time become entangled and remade in their intra-activity with other spaces and matter such as the classroom, school, and national space in which they are intra-actively entangled. For example, the ways Indian instruments and costumes when connecting to bodily matter in particular spaces in Adam’s dance practice became intelligible as affects and as an openness to the Indian culture. Or the ways Will’s Vietnamese hat became intelligible in different ways as it connected to different spaces and places, such as his home, Vietnam, and the spaces that constituted his imaginary of Australia and Australians. The discussed objects ‘shape-shifted’ and produced new becomings in the youth’s world-making in these moments (Sauzet, 2015).

These emergent affects and multiplicities were not only demonstrated through youth’s intra-actions with globalised objectiles that they could, see, hold and wear,
but also matter that could be made, smelled, tasted and consumed. It is in the next section that I turn my focus to the agency of food objectiles and how they come to matter in youth’s cosmopolitan becomings. I address the ways such edible matter connects with bodies (not just the youth’s, however) to shape what the body can do and become in the youth’s world-making and the ways in which they constitute the Other.

**Globalised food objectiles and affective intensities emergent from culinary–body relations**

Everyday cosmopolitan practices are evident in youth’s culinary habits and food consumption. In my study, body–food relations were constitutive of affective intensities that were commonly reflected on by the youth as producing positive feelings in places and particular understandings of their personal identities. This included how the youth’s tastes and habits are productive of an inquisitiveness to try more foods and a desire to learn about different cultures. Hayes-Conroy and Hayes-Conroy (2010) note that in addressing body–food relations we attend to the different ‘visceral geographies’ that constitute youth’s banal cosmopolitan practices. For example, the interest of the youth in my study in globalised food objectiles demonstrates how cultural knowledge is related to bodily experience and practice. The practice of enjoying a meal from another culture, having cultural knowledge of the food objectile’s origins and the process in which it was made, is co-constituted by the way in which youth’s bodies have been spatialised by food objectiles; these intra-actions are those that enact particular feelings and senses. Furthermore, such practices draw attention to how affectivities and matter are connected to and construct subjectivities of ‘self’ and shape the way youth imagine the Other and particular places in the world.

In the following interview Jane presents a particular imaginary of South America constituted through her body’s relation to ‘fresh and wholesome’ food objects. She demonstrates how such a relation has enacted an embodied sensation of excitement and eagerness in respect of travel to the continent.
Jane: For the food, and the culture, but the food. I really want to go to South America because my parents went there and it’s just everything I like in a country like … Like fresh limes, avocado, not all of it, but most of it is like wholesome and fresh rather than … but they do do a lot of deep fried things. I dunno, just like all the bright colours and stuff. It makes me very excited, I really want to go. It’s very my personality, and I’d just love it there.

Ahmed (2000 p.117) notes that ‘[i]t is the tourist who is mobilized experientially through the taste of the Other, but who is also moved in a relationship of desire toward the foods on the plate; it is the eater who “moves between (eating) places”’. In this discussion South America is purely understood and constituted through Jane’s knowledge of and bodily relation to foods available there and her communication with her parents about their culinary experiences in South America. The affective potentials of being in South America are spatialised entirely by Jane’s body’s relation to food. For example, she noted how the colours and textures of the food and the potential affects in relation to her own body are articulated as excitement and desire.

Some of the youth in my study also conveyed how their engagement with specific cultures is guided by the affective potentials that such food objectiles when connected to their bodies provide. Jane asserts, for example, when purchasing sushi for lunch at the school’s canteen (Figure 6.9):

I love it, it feels like I’m somewhere other than school when I eat it. The Japanese also make a lot of gluten-free food, which is great because I’m gluten intolerant.

In this practice of buying and eating sushi, Jane has conveyed and articulated an emergent intensity and feeling of being ‘somewhere other than school’. Here Jane has engaged in what Germann Molz (2007, p. 82) would describe as a cosmopolitan practice to ‘eat to feel displaced, voluntarily engaging in the sense of outsiderness or alienation that can result from eating strange and unfamiliar foods’. The practice of eating sushi has spatialised Jane’s body in terms of creating a feeling of displacement from the school environment that is both enacted and desired. Her body at a molecular level has enacted a material-discursive practice of obtaining knowledge about food practices of the Other to modify her own bodily
practices and to maintain a healthy lifestyle. The agency of Jane’s bodily matter has shaped the way and reasons for why she engages with the Japanese culture.

![Figure 6.9 Jane at school eating sushi](image)

The banality of such cosmopolitan eating practices is also evident in the youth’s food–body relations. Germann Molz (2007) has noted that cosmopolitan eaters are defined by their peers as being ‘cosmopolitan’ through eating practices that are distinguished by being the most contrasting with their own culture. For example, Jane notes that:

I’m not very adventurous. Like, a lot of, like, Italian food, Chinese food and Thai, but Mexican is the best.

Although demonstrating a vast array of different cuisines from around the world, these food objectiles are viewed by Jane as normalised intra-actions in her hometown and provide little contrast to her regular eating habits. Discourses of ‘adventure’ in relation to experiencing Otherness are directly linked to a person’s relation to the variety of foods they consume and are dictated by the visceral
experiences of their body that are deemed not readily accessible or unknown to them. This form of consumption is understood by Cappeliez and Johnston (2013, p. 444) as ‘pragmatic consumption’ and ‘hinges on the availability of cosmopolitan cuisines in diverse urban environments where people live’. These foods are also organised and become intelligible through their connection to other bodies where collective, national and ‘common’ eating habits have established normalised practices and spaces in which eating ‘Other’ globalised cuisines become an everyday and banal activity.

James and May comment about the excitement and affective intensities produced through the practice of trying food of the Other.

James: When you look at other countries and cultures the food has so much colour and spices. Then you look at Australian food and go, oh … [disappointed look on face].
May: You’re experiencing that culture just for a little bit of time. In a Vietnamese restaurant where the people there are predominantly Vietnamese and you’d order something off the menu. You may not know what you’re going to get, but it’s a great feeling.

James’ ideas about different cultural eating and cooking practices are based on the noticeable difference in the colour and spices used in the making of other cuisines compared to the ‘Australian’ food he has consumed. He discusses how the affects emergent from the practice of eating this food have highlighted how bland and disappointing Australian food is in relation to other cuisines. The idea of not knowing what you are going to eat is also appealing to May. Germann Molz (2007, p. 85) has argued that ‘[f]ood encounters are not just about consuming difference but also about playing with the cultural and bodily boundaries through which such differences are produced, challenged and reinforced’. There are no boundaries in terms of what May is willing to consume and she notes that the affectivities emergent from this experience are something that she desires. May also discusses the temporal experiences of consuming cuisines and cultures from other countries. The ‘dissipative materiality’ of food, for example, dictates the temporal aspects of this body–object assemblage (Bennett, 2010, p. 51). It is something that takes just a ‘little bit of time’ in her life and in the restaurant space, noting her easy access and freedom to try different cuisines that exist outside her usual eating practices. The
temporal elements of May’s experience of consuming Vietnamese foods could also be linked to the cosmopolitan’s continued movement between Other foods as a way of the food objectile retaining its exoticism and difference (Germann Molz, 2007; Hannerz, 1990).

May also notes how her parents took her regularly to restaurants owned by the Other when visiting Sydney.

May: It was great. My parents grew up in Sydney and I’d go out to restaurants with them and they’d ask the people where they were from and we’d learn a little bit about their own culture.

May highlights that because of this regular occurrence, she was not only able to consume the Other, but could converse and learn from the Other through her family’s desire to try different foods and restaurants in Sydney. In my discussion May, it was not only about consuming the food, but also the embodied encounter with the Other that prepares the food. The Other here is constituted as a teacher of culture, someone who is intellectually interesting and fascinating. This ‘rooted’ form of cosmopolitanism and pedagogical practice emergent from the event of consuming food is also discussed in terms of her family’s eating and cooking practices at home (Appiah, 2010). Germann Molz (2007, p. 67) notes that by ‘participating in a food system, the culinary tourist is expressing and reinforcing his or her own identity while exploring the identity of the other that is represented by that food system’. May, for example, also discusses how her national identity is reworked and discarded through her eating practices.

May: We hardly eat meat and three veg in our family. It’s always food from different cultures. My Mum’s half Polish, my grandmother came over after the war and we have Polish food sometimes. My sister is into cooking it at the moment as she enjoys cooking it with my Mum to find out a bit about her own culture. It’s never the Australian steak, you know barbeque, fish and chips, you know.

May notes that she always eats food from different cultures, and links this practice to her sister learning about the Polish culture through the practice of eating and
cooking Polish food. White Western culture is not necessarily taken as the norm in her own eating practices. For example, May discusses how her family has discarded and differentiated what she refers to as typically ‘Australian’ foods from their diet. Being or belonging to Australia is mapped in relation to eating steak, having a barbeque and fish and chips. Although a grounded practice, May’s discarding of Australian food from her diet resembles what Germann Molz (2007, p. 88) would describe as the way cosmopolitans, ‘[…] imagine themselves to be collecting and consuming signs and places that count as global.’ May’s cosmopolitan practices are therefore connected to and materialize through her family’s consumption of Other cultures and the seeking out of food knowledge from other cultures in their everyday eating and cooking practices.

Probyn (2000, p. 32) has argued that through body–food relations individuals are ‘alimentary assemblages, bodies that eat with vigorous class, ethnic and gendered appetites, mouth machines that ingest and regurgitate, articulate what we are, what we eat and what eats us’. In the above interviews, the youth’s eating practices and their bodies are always situated within other relational assemblages that guide and shape such practices. Moreover, the interviews showed that the affective dimensions that displace the body emergent from such experiences have been historicised by the youth and have continued affects in terms of the way the youth consume the Other. For example, the feelings of being ‘elsewhere’ or the positive feelings that emerged from my discussions with Jane’s and James’ experiences of eating food from other countries. I have also shown the way eating experiences can produce new spaces in which knowledge about the way we position ourselves and construct subjectivities of ‘self’ in relation to the Other and place are produced. The food and body were not only connected to spaces related to the visceral, but the pedagogical and national in which the difference of such eating practices was territorialised. This was shown in May’s and Jane’s discussion of how particular food objectile’s had the power of marking them as ‘adventurous’ and ‘Australian’. The food wasn’t just understood as edible matter, but matter with history and linked to the ways the youth marked themselves as cosmopolitan. Consumption of the food therefore not only reconfigured material boundaries of the body, but also imagined ones between the self and the Other.
The Other also materialised through these intra-actions as exotic, intellectually interesting and as a body entangled in the production of the food objectiles and their consumption. Different foods connected to different spaces and places, such as the restaurant, school, and the home kitchen, producing different materialisations of the Other. Their relation to such edible matter also provided spaces for connection with other bodies and enacted new events in which the Other could also be made and remade. Thus, the ways the edible matter intra-acted with the youth wasn’t just based entirely on an explicit openness to the Other, but provided a space for such an openness to the Other to come into being through the potentials of the affects emergent from such intra-actions. This was evident in May’s discussion about the entanglement of the Other in the consumption and making of the food in her restaurant experiences in Sydney with her family. The Other thus materialised and became intelligible to youth through and as a part of these mobilities and body–food intra-actions. It must also be noted that these food objectiles were made intelligible to the youth through, in Germann Molz’s (2007, p. 81) terms, ‘a variety of other mobilities, namely the movement of ingredients, recipes, and, often, migrants who reproduce “authentic” fare from abroad in the tourist’s own home’ and hometowns. In other words, the food objectile and Other are mobile in these intra-actions so that the grounded cosmopolitan does not have to be.

Concluding discussion

In this chapter I have drawn on both non-representational theory and vital materialist perspectives to rework the concepts of subjectivity, affect and (globalised and bodily) matter to gain a better understanding of the material-discursive entanglements co-constitutive of youth’s cosmopolitan becomings. In drawing from a vital materialist paradigm, a unified cosmopolitan subject was decentred in my analysis and read as being co-constituted through its intra-actions with both human and non-human entities that traverse places and the affectivities emergent from such intra-activity. Vital materialism has been drawn upon to understand how matter such as Buddhas, hats, flags, bodies, food and text are agentic and gain importance in the entanglements of material-discursive practices that co-constitute youth’s cosmopolitan becomings. In other words, this chapter has addressed and showed the ways that youth’s cosmopolitan practices have come into being through the ways these entities are made intelligible to each other, in a process in which a ‘part of the world becomes determinately bounded’ (Barad, 2003, p. 821).
These vital materialist concepts have been read through theories of affect to analyse how the co-constitutive forces of affective intensities enact material-discursive practices of critique in youth. Hickey-Moody and Page (2015, p. 16) have noted that ‘matter can often teach us through showing us otherwise’. This chapter addressed the way the study participants reflected on why they were affected by such body–place relations and how such reflective practices shaped their understanding of the Other and place differently. For example, the multiplicity of belonging that comes into existence through matter and its connection with the body in Adam’s feelings of ‘elsewhere’ in his Indian dance practice. Or the multiple ways in which the Buddha was understood and became intelligible to the youth as not only an object linked to an openness to ‘Other’ cultures, but as an orientalist practice of appropriation that Jane categorised in our discussion as insensitive and wrong.

This chapter also highlighted the way these affective flows, emergent from body–object relations, produced further affective intensities, such as those articulated in the youth’s reflexive practices – practices that were read in relation to their place-making projects as a broader ‘apparatus of knowing’. I focused on what entanglements of space, time and matter surfaced in their interviews and (re)presentations to alter what they could do and become in terms of their cosmopolitan practices. Put simply, I considered how the participant’s relations to bodies, particular objects and places were transformative and enacted a sense of difference in their material-discursive practices to make certain cosmopolitan practices possible. For example, I reflected on how affectivities emergent from such body–objectile relations in place enacted material-discursive practices that involved forms of curiosity, negotiation, and reciprocity in the youth. This was shown in the way the Vietnamese hat became intelligible to James in different spaces and places in Australia and the ways this connection produced a practice of negotiating the tension between his sense of belonging to the national space and his moral obligations to the Other.

In taking a more ‘flattened’ approach, I have been able to analyse the agency of matter and illuminate the ways that globalised objects do more than just represent the ‘global’ or the ‘Other’. I have also been able to broaden the scope in terms of the
way I intra-act with the material-discursive context of cosmopolitan matterings. By unpicking the dualism between words and things I became refocused or attuned to the objects that attached to the ways the youth forged a sense of place and ‘Other’. I wasn’t focused on the way knowing and being are owned and thought into existence by an individual, but the ways objects and the youth became intelligible to each other in the making of the youth’s cosmopolitan practices. My views and preconceptions about the agency of the human in youth’s cosmopolitan practices have now been re-examined. I became aware that it was not only the histories of my participants that played a part in forging what they could do in terms of becoming cosmopolitan, but the histories and multiplicities of the objects themselves. Moreover, I took account of the ways the objects came together with the humans to forge the latter’s cosmopolitan becomings and mark them as cosmopolitan. In these cosmopolitan moments, it was evident that the youth’s cosmopolitan becomings could only come into being through their intra-actions with these material objects and the histories and spaces in which they connected with the objects to make them intelligible.

In the next chapter I return to a focus on the place-making practices of youth and analyse the cosmopolitan practices that are emergent from the ways they make place in discussions about and (re)presentations of their future. I analyse how their cosmopolitan practices are entangled and shaped by material-discursive practices linked to ‘progress’ and difference that are based on the self-management of the individual to prepare and present themselves as employable in the global knowledge economy.
Chapter 7: Youth’s future cosmopolitan practices- difference, progress and mobility

This chapter contributes to research about the constitution of youth’s cosmopolitan practices in relation to how they imagine their future lives. I have outlined in Chapter 1 that youth have been positioned in Australian educational policy to bear both the benefits and risks of the nation’s and even the world’s future prosperity (Lawy & Biesta, 2006). This positioning maintains that youth need to learn cosmopolitan competencies to mediate an abstract ‘global’ space and deal with the demands and uncertainty of a globalised economy. I therefore thought it was pertinent that the youth in my study (re)present and discuss with me their ideas on how they aim to forge their futures in relation to certain spaces and places in their everyday social contexts. These discussions and (re)presentations were used to form an understanding of how certain cosmopolitan practices were (or in some cases were not) possible in the production of their imagined futures. The discussions took account of the ways the youth’s future imaginaries have involved ‘a spatial canvas that was wider than the local area’ (O’Connor, 2005, p. 14; Cairns, 2014). This meant producing knowledge about how they forged their ideas about the places they wished to travel to, work in and live in their future.

From these (re)presentations and discussions I examined the salience of the youth’s relations to place as a co-constituting force in the possible cosmopolitan becomings and ‘mobility trajectories’ youth forge in their imaginaries of their future (Cairns, 2014, p. 478). I argue in this chapter that youth construct their future cosmopolitan and mobile practices as individualised practices linked to their understandings of ‘progress’ and what their own ‘personal development’ should entail. In my analysis, I posit that some youth attribute ‘progress’ as involving a movement away from the constraints of their deindustrialized city and upwards in terms of securing their desired jobs and position in a globalised economy and workforce. The youth also associate moving outwards with experiencing places that are the most contrasting from the places they live. I also show the ways youth are constituting cosmopolitan or preparatory practices of ‘fitting-in’ based on their
grounded understandings of the destinations and places they wish to travel to (Germann Molz, 2006). I argue that youth’s cosmopolitan practices of ‘fitting-in’ are not only being constructed as a means of being able to demonstrate flexibility, adaptability, and a sensitivity towards the Other, but to maintain a sense of security in their experiences with difference. I also problematise the ways positive connotations of cosmopolitanism and mobility normalised in the classroom and my study might play a role in silencing youth that have alternative imaginaries and understandings of their future. I conclude my argument by establishing that youth’s future cosmopolitan practices resemble how they have been positioned in Australian educational policy and align with neoliberal ideals commonly advocated by education institutions and a globalised workforce.

In my analysis I understand the temporal dimensions of youth’s cosmopolitan futures not as a linear historical pathway, but as the multiple ways space, time and matter intersect and assemble in youth’s place-making practices. For example, a large body of literature on youth transitions has suggested that the ways youth perceive and construct their present social positioning and subjectivity can be illuminated through social imaginaries of their future (Cairns, 2014; Corbett, 2007; Prince, 2014). This assertion can be extended to the construction of the imagined cosmopolitan becomings of youth or the constitution of possible cosmopolitan ‘selves’. Massumi (2002, p. 200) states, for example, that ‘[t]he past and future are in continuity with each other, in a moving through-the-present: in transition. It is not the present that moves from the past to the future.’ In drawing from Massumi (2002), this chapter does not (re)present youth’s imagined cosmopolitan futures as purely imagined in isolation from their lived social worlds, but as co-constituted by the continuity and discontinuity of emplaced material-discursive practices.

I am concerned with three different cosmopolitan practices in analysing youth’s future cosmopolitan practices. In the first section of the chapter I examine the imperative and practice of moving to the city and other geographically distant places and how youth’s relations to places shapes such practices. I consider how this practice is linked to youth’s own interests in terms of increased opportunity and personal gain. This includes addressing youth’s imagined futures in terms of practices of working in a cosmopolitan space/place – in other words, enacting cosmopolitan practices through the role of employment. This section also takes
account of youth’s tourist cosmopolitan gaze, where youth base their ‘trajectories of mobility’ on a desire to try something culturally different and sometimes territorialise such differences through their place-making practices. In the second section of the chapter I analyse youth’s cosmopolitan practices that are forged through their ideas on what they need to do to feel they ‘fit-in’ the places they wish to travel to. This includes showing the way they draw from other youth’s understandings of place and global entities to forge such practices. Lastly, I analyse youth’s inability or unwillingness to think about their future and the ways they mediate their future affectively.

Moving outwards and upwards: progress and a ‘good’ life elsewhere

In representing places in their future, many of the youth in my study drew from imaginaries of global and cosmopolitan places that located their futures elsewhere. For example, imaginaries of the ‘global’ city were included in some of the youth’s narratives of their futures. These imaginaries were commonly constituted from images of cities in different places in the world and the flows of symbols, images and materials produced in them. The youth’s imperative to move to the ‘global’ city was also driven by narratives that described the city as more ‘cultural’, a place that assisted in providing opportunities and technological advancement, and was constitutive of affective intensities and atmospheres that were articulated as ‘intense’. As such, the city was understood as primarily a positive place in which to move to for work and pleasure. These imaginaries of the city resonate with Edward Said’s (1978) notion of ‘imagined geographies.’ This concept can be used to describe the way a young person’s subjective understanding of ‘progress’ and ‘happiness’ are constructed and mapped onto the ‘global’ city. These imaginaries are commonly linked to the ways the ‘global’ city has been reconfigured by globalisation and the deindustrialization of smaller cities to produce spatially condensed job opportunities and pathways to access the global knowledge economy and other globalised goods and services. The allure of the ‘global’ city has therefore been argued to lie in its image and production as a place that provides youth with the forms of cultural capital and ‘freedoms’ to become better positioned financially and culturally within a ‘global’ social context (Farrugia, 2014; Lefebvre, 1991; Sassen, 2012).
A ‘future’ self has been produced in Clement’s visual representations of place and his accompanying creative process diary. Clement has included the image in Figure 7.1 in his process diary as something he forgot in his original visual representation. The image is titled ‘The City of Self’. Clement has created a bionic self and has suggested that he will have both the means and mobility to travel, readily engage with technological advancements and expressed an imperative to move to the city.

**Clement’s process diary**: I found a missing place: THE CITY of self. The growth from country to CITY is shown here, also suggestive of future technological place-making. This is in the bionic/self.

In this place-making activity, Clement imagines a post-humanist future, where the dualism between man and machine has been erased. He has de-categorised the natural, human self and co-composed the narrative of the cyborg. Drawing from
Toffoletti (2007, p. 11), the image ‘interrogates the status of the body and the self in a technological age’. This imaginary has made possible an understanding of the city as a place of technological advancement and personal ‘growth’ through the movement of the participant from the rural to the urban. ‘Growth’ here is not only enacted through an imperative of mobility, but also tied into technological advancement and the individuation of such advancement through its metaphorical connection to the body. Clement imagines his body as becoming something more-than human in this event and geographical movement.

Virtual/geographical/embodied places are entangled in Clement’s imaginary and the material boundaries between such places are challenged through a desire to become more-than human. ‘Self’ here is also understood in a geographical sense, a body plugged into and connected globally through the relations Clement enacts through this geographical and virtual movement.

Clement also discusses the way his future mobile practices are based on an institutional and hierarchical power in relation to what he’s expected to do and become as a young person after school. This mobility practice is enacted through the imaginary of the city as a place to better position himself regarding his career choice. He notes his perceptions of the city in discussions during development stages of the video essay:

Clement: I really want to capture, like, a country suburban kind of upbringing, um … and then contrasting that with the present which is quite an inner-city living kind of thing and then the future even more to a major city so it will gradually get more intense I guess.

Clement discusses and imagines the city as ‘intense’ and describes this intensity as building through his virtual and imagined practice of moving from country suburbia to a major city. He notes how he has already transitioned to the inner city, but that he wants to move and transition ‘even more to a major city’. These transitions and his mobility trajectory recapitulate ideas of modernization and progress where the freedom to be mobile and other discourses related to mobility are hegemonic in terms of governing the practices in which individuals structure their lives and aspirations (Bauman, 1998). He articulates a movement of his body not only outwards and toward the city, but links this movement with an intensity that is continually worked upon and built up through his imaginary of the city space. He has
articulated in this moment the ways he imagines and mediates these major life transitions based on moving to major city affectively.

In his discussion with me about his video essay he also addresses the ways he understands the city in relation to the local places where he lives and the school.

Researcher: You said the city would be better to live in as you want to be an artist?
Clement: Like the lifestyle there [the city] too. Is a lot more accepting of that [art-based practices] I guess. Not that other places I guess would discriminate, but it’s more incorporated through … the lifestyle too, like. Um …
Researcher: How do you feel in these inner-city places compared to say the classroom or the school?
Clement: I think the classroom is quite restricted to what you need to get through, like the syllabus and curriculum kind of thing. So, when you’re finally outside of that you have the freedom to explore things that are not just limited to things that are what is expected of you to fulfil.
Researcher: And you were speaking of these places of accessibility. What kind of material objects are more accessible in these kinds of places? And why do you think that is?
Clement: Well I think, I know that where I used to come from there wasn’t even an art gallery or anything or near there at least. It would be like an hour’s drive to the closest one. So, to have opportunities in major cities where major governments would put them to get more populations through to keep them running means that you would have to go closer, not physically I guess, but to have that kind of lifestyle.
"Experiencing in the flesh, actually being there really encapsulates the experience the country brings."

"Contrasting that with the present, quite inner-city, living."

"Freedom to explore things that aren’t just expected for you to fulfill."
In Clement’s video essay (Figure 7.2), he articulates his imagined cosmopolitan future by drawing from several binaries: rural/urban, inside/outside, natural/technological and present/past. These involve transitions that are depicted both visually and metaphorically. Clement’s concern with these binaries is clear in my discussions with him. For example, his desire to move to a major city is conceptualised through material-discursive practices that enact an inside and outside in his imaginary. The city is understood here as an ‘outside’ and the classroom as an ‘inside’. ‘Inside’ is referred to in our interview as being ‘restricted to what you need to get through, like the syllabus and curriculum kind of thing’. Mobility is thus enacted in Clement’s imaginary by the material-discursive practices related to freeing himself from these practices. Clement notes moving to the city is for him a practice that provides him with the '[f]reedom to explore things that aren’t just expected for you to fulfil'. Clement’s ideas of the ‘global’ city existing as a place of ‘freedom’ and ‘acceptance’ aligns with ideals represented in liberalism where freedom and opportunity in the city equates to a ‘good’ life and fulfils his desire to become an artist. The city thus becomes a place for Clement to escape the regulation and monitoring that he associates with the classroom and opens up a space in which he can become responsible and the producer of his own life.
Clement also notes how entanglements of different temporalities and ‘transitions’ are evident in the video essay and the way he has constituted his ‘future’ mobile practices. For example, he speeds up the movement in his images, forging an ‘intensity’ as defined in his interview. The speed-up of time is also enacted in Clement’s video essay through the image of the clock moving at a faster than usual pace. Different temporalities are also evident in his selection of music. The music moves from a slow-paced romantic and classical sounding violin, to music with a faster tempo, rhythmic intensity, and a synthetic and electronic timbre. The concept of transitioning from rural to city life also emerges in the video essay through the way images of natural landscape transition into and overlap with the cityscape images, with the cityscape images then transitioning into images of the body engaged in technological practices. These rural and city spaces are entangled both metaphorically and literally in Clement’s place-in-the-making. For example, the image of the plane wing presents both a birds-eye-view and aerial map of high-density living in the city, which is then juxtaposed with an aerial view of the rural.

By extending my analysis to the embodied practices involved in the making of the video essay, what also arose was the way Clement travelled virtually on the internet in making this visual place. By analysing his reference list in terms of what and where he accessed and retrieved the images and sound recordings from, one could map and trace the way Clement formed a virtual relational network in the making of the ‘city’.

Credit the creator; Moss (Paul.F) & Thelma Schnee
Provide the title of the work; Bee City
Provide the URL where the work is hosted; https://archive.org/details/BeeCity1951
Indicate the type of license it is available under and provide a link to the license (so others can find out the license terms); Public Domain,
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/publicdomain/

Credit the creator; Lord Open/ The Moody Institute
Provide the title of the work; Mystery of Time
Provide the URL where the work is hosted; https://archive.org/details/loMysteryofTimefull
Indicate the type of license it is available under and provide a link to the license (so others can find out the license terms); Attribution 3.0,
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/
My cyberflaneur-like practice of travelling online through Clement’s reference list highlighted how the generation of the video essay itself was a cosmopolitan practice for Clement. His video essay was built upon visual and audio-visual re(presentations) of places globalised by online global archive systems and individuals. Cities that could be characterised as ‘global’ were drawn upon, including London, Berlin and New York. Clement also enlisted knowledge items, music, artwork and the histories of ‘Others’. This process highlighted how the histories of the ‘Other’ in place became remade in the video essay. They weren’t taken up, but reworked to create a new emergent reality that emphasised Clement’s juxtaposed feelings of being restricted by the constraints of his home city and the expectations of the education system (including in the classroom) and what he articulates as ‘freedom’ in the city.

The city was also featured in Mitch’s visual representation of places in his future (Figure 7.3). Mitch’s future is constructed through his imaginary of a particular city, New York. Although he doesn’t necessarily say why he would like to work and live there, we are able to see the way Mitch draws from iconic globalised objects, architecture and discourses circulated through visual media.

**Mitch’s process diary:** When I think of my future I see the “big city”. I know it sounds stupid, but if I could pick anywhere to live or work I would pick New York in a heart beat [sic]. Or anywhere in the states [sic] for that matter. I have drawn the city in the night because when I think of New York I think of big flashing lights. I have also drawn advertisements, finance, transportation, hotels etc. I have tried to portray as many American icons as possible.
New York in Mitch's future imaginary emerges through his inclusion of globalised images such as the Coca-Cola sign. He also understands and builds his imaginary of New York through 'finance, transportation, hotels etc.', aspects that he sees as representative of New York. The city thus emerges from material-discursive practices related to consumerist practices and commerce. American icons associated with and prevalent in globalised images of New York, such as Coca-Cola and high-rise buildings, are juxtaposed against the tropical, natural and spacious landscape of home. The proximity to other bodies is also enacted by open spaces in the tropical place juxtaposed against apartment and hotel-style living, or the way the body 'dwells' in place in the city. A night–binary is also evident here, linked to the way Mitch's imaginary of New York has 'big flashing lights'. As with Clement, Mitch’s mobile practices and movement to the city are constituted by material-discursive practices related to work and a general lifestyle that he desires. Mitch also notes that his desired future might 'sound stupid', articulating that he possibly views the likelihood of him moving to New York as an unrealistic or a stereotypical practice.

Some of the youth, however, are keen to return home from the city. Olive articulates that she was already living in the city as it provided better opportunities for herself and her mother in terms of having access to better education and employment.
**Olive's process diary:** My visual representation of past places, future and present show the mountain range of Gloucester in the foreground [sic] in bright green. This is my past, where I lived until where [sic] I moved to Newcastle to go to a better school and have more opportunities for myself and my mum. Gloucester is where I grew up, I was born there and it’s where I feel at home.

The city buildings represent my life in the present, the towers are behind the mountains to show how less connected and important my current place is. The lyrics within the buildings explain the longing I feel to return home and feelings associated with home, fond memories. Each song, Going Home by Asgeir, Dance to Another Tune by First Aid Kit and Old Pine by Ben Howard are songs I associate with memories of spring nights with Corby, my boyfriend. And memories of summer night walks around the back streets of Hamilton. The last song reminds me of camping and hikes in Gloucester with my best friend.

![Figure 7.4 Olive's future places representation](image-url)
Olive communicates in her representation that she is disconnected from the city and has represented this by foregrounding the rolling grass hills on top of the high-rise buildings in her representation (Figure 7.4). Interestingly, the city she lives in doesn’t have many high-rise buildings, but she has drawn from this image anyway. Olive’s representation of her future is based similarly on Mitch’s and Clement’s idea of the city as a place of opportunity. She discusses how her decisions about her future are based on the tension between her attachment to home and the opportunities afforded to her in the city. For example, Olive articulates that the city doesn’t necessarily ‘feel’ like home for her, despite the opportunities it offers her. Her affective and spatial attachments to home are overriding her need to relocate and continue living in a place based on its opportunities. Olive’s fondness of her first and quite ‘rural’ home highlights how the affective nature of places has played a role in shaping the possibilities of her future and becoming. Olive notes: ‘where I lived until where [sic] I moved to [insert city name] to go to a better school and have more opportunities for myself and my mum. Gloucester is where I grew up, I was born there and its [sic] where I feel at home.’ She also articulated such affects in her discussions with me, commenting on how the lyrics placed inside the high-rise buildings (see Figure 7.4) (re)present her attachment and the ways her memories of home and nature have produced a ‘longing’ or desire to return to her place of birth.

What can be observed from the (re)presentations of place made by Clement, Mitch and Olive is not so much how each youth’s understanding of the city they wish to move to differs to the others’, but the ways that their understanding of the city they currently live in shapes their cosmopolitan practices. Clement represents his home city as devoid of culture and lacking the populations that would benefit him in terms of his artwork being regularly viewed and accessed in art galleries. Mitch understands his present home city as unpopulated, open and set in a natural environment, and Olive feels like she is already constituting a neoliberal cosmopolitan practice in the sense that the city she currently lives in is already offering her and her family increased education and employment opportunities. We can see how youth’s mobile or not so mobile cosmopolitan practices are intimately tied to the places they live or have lived and how they understand their role and responsibility in living a ‘good’ life as mediating the social and structural constraints in these places by moving to the city.
The binaries (re)presented in each of the place-making projects discussed above between rural or suburban hometown and the ‘global’ city highlights, as Prince (2014, p. 711) states, ‘[t]he double-bind between external and internal values and beliefs ascribed to place’ and [how] ‘individuals’ lived experience of place will contribute to shaping their sense of future possibility’. For example, the affective dimensions of the youth’s place-making in these (re)presentations articulate these binaries and contribute to the youth’s mobile practices. This is especially communicated by Olive, who discusses how her feelings associated with home shape her decision to return home from what she understands as already an inner-city life, or by Clement, who perceives the intensity of the populated city as a factor in his decision to transition and relocate there. In the production of their representations, progress and personal development is therefore understood within a practice of moving outwards and upwards in these moments and involves mediating the tensions between youth’s attachment to ‘home’ and the mobile pathway entangled in realising such progress.

The youth also discussed how their future mobility was based on the hope of accumulating experiences that involved negotiating and investigating the dynamics of difference. The below (re)presentations and interviews are based on cosmopolitan practices that are linked to individualised needs and desires of the youth. Such practices involve accumulating and consuming experiences in ‘exotic’ and geographically different places, researching the education systems and ‘good’ standards of living in certain places, and continuing friendships and interests in places that were forged through previous travel experiences.

In her process diary, May had drawn 36 different national flags as a way of (re)presenting her imperative to travel extensively in her future. I had noticed this and asked her about why she had selected these countries and whether she had preferences in terms of what countries she would visit first.

Researcher: Do you think you want to travel?
May: Yeah.
Researcher: Where do you want to go? And why?
May: I have 36 countries.
Researcher: Are they listed in your diary? What are your top two?
May: Um, at the moment Sweden.
Researcher: Why Sweden?
May: Because I really love the Swedish culture and I want to visit because, yes, they are a first-world country, but they’ve got just, culturally they’ve been brought up with the Nordic. Because if you look at other European countries, they’re quite similar to what we have. They’re [Nordic countries] so close to all that, but so different.
Researcher: Do you know anything about their politics?
May: Not as much as I’d like, but I know they have a very good education system there and that’s something interesting. Considering Australia is supposed to have a first-class education system, the politics around it. Like they’re [Australian coalition government] trying to deregulate universities. It’s just something I’m interested in, so I want to see the comparison.

May’s present interest in experiencing difference is constitutive of her desire to travel to Sweden in her future. Sweden’s close proximity to the rest of Europe but also its dramatic cultural differences to that of Australia and the rest of Europe are something that drives May’s eagerness to travel there. Although I steered the direction of our conversation towards the specifics of Sweden’s political system, May discusses how she is sceptical of the idea of Australia’s university education institutions being ‘first-class’ and the Australian government’s intention to deregulate universities. Her interest in visiting Sweden is also discussed in terms of generating an experience in which she has something to compare this claim to. May’s interest in Sweden is linked to a personal and individualised practice of investigating the quality and effects of the education system she is about to enter. By travelling to Sweden, her decision about her post-secondary education can be compared and mediated in relation to a ‘global’ education space. Her cosmopolitan practices in this discussion are thus also based on her comparing and developing a life trajectory based on her research of a ‘good’ education.

The second country that she identifies as somewhere she would like to travel to is South Sudan. In the following discussion, May outlines how her interest in this country was produced through a learning activity that took place in an International Studies class.

Researcher: And what about your second one?
May: Um, I don’t know. I’d love to go to South Sudan. And that’s because I did a project on South Sudan where we had to create our own NGO. I was doing International Studies last year, um, and we picked the mother mortality
rates of South Sudan and we were sort of linking it to the FGM [female genital mutilation] rates and that’s why I’m so interested about it.
Researcher: Where did you find that information?
May: Um, often from websites. There’s this particular app, it’s called ‘World Facts’ and it’s like a current, up-to-date version of like, census-like things for all countries and it has all the different rates and things like that and I found it really helpful and I still look at it now. Like I’ll look at the different geographical elements of the country and lots of little things, the political, the human, the environment, that kind of thing.

There is a humanitarian and moral cosmopolitan practice associated with May’s focus on South Sudan. Providing solutions to the world’s and specifically third-world nations’ problems played a role in May’s initial interest in this place. May notes how her desire to travel to South Sudan was constituted by participating in the classroom activity that involved developing an NGO. May discusses how she has cultivated an understanding of South Sudan and Sudanese mothers’ mortality rates in this classroom activity by collecting globalised information on the internet and through an app called ‘World Facts’.

Her discussion of this activity also highlighted the way her moral obligation to South Sudanese mothers is also mediated affectively. Germann Molz (2017, p. 20) has noted that ‘the emotions that worldschooling children are encouraged to feel (for example, it is appropriate to feel tolerance or empathy toward others, but not envy) reinforce their privilege while the agency they exercise helps them internalize a sense of entitlement.’ Although based on analysing the cosmopolitan practices of students within the context of worldschooling, what Germann Molz draws attention to is the uneven power relations in which individuals are marked as and expected to feel as cosmopolitans. Accordingly, it also highlights similar uneven power relations in the ways individuals are marked as ‘abject’, needing ‘help’, and identified as lacking political agency. Thus, May’s sense of entitlement and privileged position, and the feelings of tolerance and empathy toward the Other that reinforce such a position, also shape her desire and interest in visiting South Sudan.

Similarly to the way May has constructed her future based on geographically and culturally contrasting places, Louise hopes to visit places that are physically different and contrasting to Australia.
Louise’s process diary: Though a physical place I want to be is Canada. Snow is my main priority also the fact they have the largest shopping centre in the whole world! But I’ve been fascinated with cold weather (snow, avalanche) since I was little. Cause I live in STRAYA – LAND OF SUN!

Louise’s fascination with the natural landscapes and climate of places as a practice of exoticism is emergent from her desire to travel to Canada. It is also based on her consumerist practices of finding the biggest shopping centre in the world. Mobile practices and the need to find the biggest and the best of things is directly linked to Louise’s ideas of what a ‘good’ life entails. Here, Louise’s future produces what Urry and Elliott (2010, p. 78) would describe as the way ‘cosmopolitanism of globals retain the more attractive qualities of the high culture propagated by political theorists and philosophers, but combine this with an understanding of “humanity” fashioned in the image of the consumerist space of designer brands and opulent living’. For example, Louise is open to experiencing difference, but in a way, that relies on an image of Canada as having the biggest and best the world has to offer in terms of shopping and geographically contrasting experiences.

The consumerist practice of finding the best of something in the world also emerges through Jill’s representation of her future.

Jill’s process diary: I’ve included travel because … The thing in life I want to do most is travel. I dream of seeing and experiencing all of the different cultures that I’ve only read about. There is so so much out there and I aspire to see as much of it as I can. There is so much of the world out there, so much that we can only imagine. You’re lying to yourself if you say you don’t want to experience as much of it as humanly possible.

The limits of the imaginary feature in Jill’s desire to travel. Here, ‘imagination engender[s] the hope and potentiality of becoming otherwise or of inhabiting an elsewhere’ (Burns, 2008, p. 351). Experiencing place through her mobility is thus viewed by Jane as a superior experience, more fulfilling than her local attachments and localised understandings of place. Jill’s imperative for mobility is based on travel being the epitome of self-realisation or constructing a self. This is communicated through Jill’s comment of ‘you’re lying to yourself if you say you don’t
want to experience as much as humanly possible’. This also aligns with Ahmed’s (2010, p. 13) assertion that ‘ideas of happiness involve social as well as moral distinctions insofar as they rest on ideas of who is worthy as well as capable of being happy “in the right way”’. Jill notes that if you don’t think the same way about experiencing the world you’re not being truthful or aligning with what she assumes is a normalised assumption that mobility necessarily makes people happy. Here Jill also notes there are limitations to this imaginary in terms of what her body can do, where it can go, but she intends on pushing it to such limits.

Felt and sensual experiences of being elsewhere are also enacted as a desire in Clement’s future imaginary. He draws upon the practice of place-making ‘in the flesh’ in his future mobility and cosmopolitan practices. He discusses this ‘in the flesh’ place-making practice by contrasting it to the practice of looking at different countries through a ‘street view’ on Google Maps.

Researcher: Are there any places outside Australia you would like to go to? Or do you know any people outside Australia?
Clement: I would love to travel the world because I think knowledge and experiencing in the flesh is important.
Researcher: What do you mean by experiencing ‘in the flesh’?
Clement: If you wanted to go visit a country on Google Maps on street view [you could], but you will never feel what it means to be in that country, you’ll never smell all the streets as you’re walking along, you’ll never touch it. So I think actually being there really encapsulates the experience a country brings and shows how different it is from your own upbringing and country.

In this interview, Clement’s desire to be mobile and travel the body is communicated to be agentic through its capacity to dwell in, smell and touch a material place. These practices emerge as being important in constituting the concept of what Clement refers to as being able to ‘[f]eel what it [place] means’. He asserts that being there and living in a place ‘encapsulates what a country brings and shows how different it is’, with a practice of comparison achieved in more detail. The possibilities of dwelling in different places and the potential of feeling different in these places are clearly understood and constitute Clement’s desire to be mobile in his imagined future. His cosmopolitan practices are based on pushing the boundaries and flexibility of his body. The recognised difference between the affective and representational dimensions of Clement’s subjective understanding of place are therefore shaping his desire to be mobile in his future.
Adam notes how his future mobile practices are based on him learning more about his interest in Hinduism and sustaining friendships that he developed with friends in India online.

Researcher: Was there another reason you wanted to get to India?
Adam: Ah, I wanted to experience Hinduism, um ... from where it's originated. I guess for ... I wanted to go to the places that the mythology was talking about. Um ...

Researcher: Are you Hindu?
Adam: Yep. Um ... and I learned a lot about Hinduism, in the south which is very, very, very pious. I've never seen people more religious. They're a lot more accepting in the south and I went to the north where religion isn't so important and ... if you're not of a high caste you can't go into the temples or whatever, which is pretty sad. Um, in the south it's quite inclusive, even though they are very religious.

Researcher: Yeah. Who'd you meet over there? Did you meet anyone in particular?
Adam: Yeah, I met my friend.

Researcher: Yeah and how did you meet your friend? Ah, originally?
Adam: Ah, I met him on 'IM Eagle' about three years ago and I got his kick, which is a message app.

Researcher: Yep.
Adam: And then he got rid of that, so then we became Facebook friends and we've been Facebook friends for ages. We talk all the time. Ah, we decided to meet up.
Researcher: Yeah.
Adam: And we met at the hotel and we went out for the afternoon, which was great. He said he'd host me next time I come back.

Researcher: That's really cool. Um ... do you have friends all over the world? Is this your only friend overseas?
Adam: I've had others that I don't talk to anymore. But, this is the only one that sort of I've kept.
Researcher: Okay.
Adam: We just really clicked.

Adam noted how his localised engagement with Hinduism was one of the main reasons for travelling to India. His imaginary of India and the Other was also enacted through mythological texts and his desire to 'live' these places. The conviviality of the Other was also discussed in relation to their religious piousness. He also discusses his shared practice of communicating with his Indian friend regularly on a messenger app and Facebook. Bauman (2000) notes how new
mobilities compress space and time to enable friendships to feel ‘closer’ to each other, and transforms how we come to understand other places and cultures, by removing them from the exotic realm. Adam communicates that his interest in sustaining this mutual friendship with his friend in India also played a role in his decision to travel there. Adam’s current and future mobile practices were based on forging a network in which his mobile practices and friendship could be sustained noting, “[h]e said he’d host me next time I come back.” The reciprocal practice of hosting each other in their respective countries aligns with a stoic form of cosmopolitanism and the practices of global hospitality that are advocated in the work of Kant (1991). This comment is also suggestive that Adam’s future plans to visit India are based on the level of hospitality and openness his friend in India has shown him.

Underpinning the youth’s future trajectories, is also the idea that cosmopolitan practices will lead to a happier and fulfilled life. Constituting a ‘good’ life is understood as one’s personal duty to generate their own happiness along a set of normalised practices and trajectories. As Ahmed (2007, p. 128) notes, ‘[t]he promise of happiness directs life in some ways, rather than others. For a life to count as a good life, then it must return the debt of its life by taking on the direction promised as a social good, which means imagining one’s futurity in terms of reaching certain points along a life course.’ A part of this life course and emergent from the youth’s representations of their futures was the constitution of cosmopolitan practices produced in relation to meeting the needs of a desired or ‘good’ job and education. In the following, May has elaborated in detail about her desire to study International Relations and Political Science at university.

**May's process diary:** I want to travel the world in the future. This is important to me because I want to experience the world and all its cultures. Considering I want to do a double degree in International Relations & Political Science. I believe it’s important for me to look at cultural relativity and experience it first hand. I want to through [sic] myself into other cultures.
May has drawn from material-discursive practices that were commonly used in the Society and Culture classroom. The practice of obtaining and experiencing ‘cultural relativity’, for example, is understood by May as a necessary practice of preparing herself for further study after school. When expressing this practice, May has drawn an image of the world and the flags of the countries she wishes to travel to most. This practice of being with difference and acknowledging difference through the frame of the ‘self’ is also viewed as assisting May to be more ‘prepared’ for her future cosmopolitan work aspirations. Corbett (2010, p. 233) has asserted that ‘CV-building experiences like international travel and personalized volunteer engagements illustrate the importance of uniqueness and commitment. At the same time, these kinds of engagements are effectively valorised as acts of virtues and indicators of caring and commitment.’ Travelling the world is thus understood as a way of working on the ‘self’, to be able to understand and live with Others and intensify encounters with them. It is also a practice of conditioning May to the social dynamics of the ‘global’ nature of her desired job.

May notes how her future imaginary includes specific cosmopolitan working practices. For example, she writes that she wants to be involved in research projects with the United Nations or policy work with the future national government.
**May's process diary:** I have put down the UN logo because after university I want to either want to do research for the UN or do policy work in the Australian Federal government. For me, the idea of working at the UN started after doing a research project where we had to set up a fake NGO. We based ours off trying to reduce the number of mother mortality incidents [sic] in South Sudan. It was really interesting, and I loved doing the research. At the time my teacher made a passing comment about how I would be a good UN researcher and I thought ‘Yeah I could do that’.

![United Nations logo](image.png)

**Figure 7.6 United Nations logo, image from May’s process diary**

May notes how her ideas about what she could become in her future were both interrupted and forged through her involvement in a research project based on international development. What emerged from her participating in the development of the fake NGO was a space in which her cosmopolitan practices could emerge. The classroom project and her teacher’s acknowledgement and encouragement to pursue such a cosmopolitan career forged a possibility of engaging in work practices that contribute to helping the less-fortunate Other and thus help May form a moral responsibility beyond the national imaginary. May notes how she loved and was interested in the idea of helping the Other in her future job aspirations. Germann Molz (2017, p. 20) notes that, ‘[t]hese emotions seem to be less about actual social relations than they are about cultivating a kind of emotional subjectivity that can travel around the world and across cultural differences with relative ease.’
For example, moving beyond the practice of helping Others, May also noted that her desire to work at the UN was based on a particular skillset in which her teacher commented that she was good at and showed promise in.

May’s above (re)presentation of her future is based on accumulating ‘experiences’ with difference and encouraging diversity. These cosmopolitan practices are examples of what Corbett (2010, p. 233) describes as the ‘play of cultural capital in developing an educational trajectory’. The desire to travel and experience difference are developed into a narrative of purpose in May’s discussions. Purpose in these (re)presentations illustrates an autonomous and entrepreneurial practice of self-realisation and particular modes of doing ‘good’. In attaching herself to a trajectory of studying International Relations and Political Science at university, May’s idea of success in meeting the requirements for this degree does not only involve a practice of moving upwards in terms of her securing a ‘good’ future, but also outwards where cosmopolitan practices are forged as a means of obtaining experiences that work towards presenting herself as open, flexible and independent to a ‘global’ workforce.

In the above interviews and (re)presentations, the youth’s cosmopolitan practices were linked to particular understandings of ‘progress’ and ‘good’ living. Their futures involved increased physical mobility and accumulating experiences with difference. These practices of mobility were related to an individualised responsibility to ensure a sense of ‘happiness’ and the ‘freedom’ to work outside or mediate the constraints of the cities and countries in which they were living. The valorisation and normalisation of youth’s increased mobility as a practice of living a ‘happy’ and ‘good’ life was especially represented in Jill’s process diary, which asserted that ‘[y]ou’re lying to yourself if you say you don’t want to experience as much of it as humanly possible’. Liberal (re)presentations of ‘freedom’ were also emergent from Clement’s discussion relating his imagined future life in the ‘global’ city to providing him with the dense populations and resources needed to become a successful artist. These practices of mobility and cosmopolitanism were central to fulfilling the youth’s aspirations and constructed in relation to gaining control over the ways they ‘lived’ their lives.
The youth’s ideas of ‘happiness’ were also articulated through their (re)presentations and images of living a morally justifiable lifestyle through their increased mobility to places that were understood as geographically and culturally contrasting to their local contexts, and where they had to develop and present themselves as flexible, adaptable and tolerant of difference. These imaginaries were highlighted in the constitution of May’s humanitarian practices and her aspirations to accumulate experiences of ‘cultural relativity’ to provide her with the appropriate cosmopolitan competencies to work in the area of International Relations. This imperative to experience places that were contrasting to the youth’s local places was also (re)presented in Clement’s desire to experience places in the flesh, how a place feels and the affective intensities emergent from his experiences with difference. These differences and forms of personal development were established as something that needed to be worked towards as an individualised imperative of becoming a decent, knowledgeable and ‘good’ human being.

It could therefore be argued, that the youth’s cosmopolitan practices in this section align nicely with what their educational context asks of them; a context that asks them in their future to become ‘flexible, creative, and not to blame failure on structural conditions but to see this as a result of their own underdeveloped entrepreneurial spirit’ (Woodman and Wyn 2015, p.47). Interestingly, none of the youth questioned how they would accumulate the capital or necessary resources that would make this mobility possible. For example, this mobility was understood as more of an imperative rather than a desire. This draws attention to the ways youth’s practices of mobility in these moments are normalised within and as a part of a social context of privilege in their classroom. All the young people in this section of my analysis had travelled to different places in the world and these forms of mobility had become a normalised practice that they would engage in with their families on a yearly basis. Structural inequality therefore did not play a part in the ways that they constituted their imagined futures in relation to particular mobile and cosmopolitan practices. This context of privilege is also evident in the next section of this chapter that is based on analysing the cosmopolitan practices of ‘fitting-in’ that youth discuss in the classroom and construct in relation to their situated understandings and experiences in place.
I begin this section by analysing some of my conversations with the youth about what they were doing to prepare to visit other places on holidays in their immediate futures. I show how they constructed their cosmopolitan practices around material-discursive practices to ‘fit-in’ in these places Germann Molz (2006). Drawing from Germann Molz (2006, p. 6), “fit” connotes propriety or suitability and refers to the traveller’s ability to blend in and navigate through a variety of geographical and cultural environments’. In the following discussions and interviews, I look at how these cosmopolitan practices of flexibility are constituted through the ways the youth form understandings about the places they hope to or are in fact about to visit and the ways these understandings are constructed through their relations to globalised entities.

I spoke to Adam a couple of days after he had returned from India. We began our conversation about his trip by discussing what he had done in his preparation before visiting India.

Researcher: What kinds of things did you do before you left for India? Adam: Well I went out shopping for clothing before I left. For my sisters especially. We went and got long cotton pants, and dresses. I didn’t think that I would need long pants, but I got some just in case. Um, I knew that it would be a conservative country.

Researcher: How did you know this? How did you know it would be more conservative?

Adam: I knew it was conservative from, through media, um, like watching shows like *Bend It Like Beckham*, ah … and even through reading books. Um, I read a book called *Deranged Marriage* and it was about an Indian woman and it talks about how it was conservative. I know about Islamic culture, there’s a lot of Islamic culture in India and I know about the head coverings, so we brought head coverings for the girls. We didn’t end up using them much.

In this discussion, Adam has communicated how his ‘banal’ cosmopolitan practice of engaging with movies and books constitutes a practice of openness to the ‘Other’. Moreover, he has indicated that he has related to these globalised entities by engaging in a modification of his own and his sisters’ bodies in order to
demonstrate this openness to the ‘Other’ and his ability to ‘fit-in’ in India (Beck, 2004; Szerszynski & Urry, 2002). He has demonstrated in this moment the way ‘travellers display a cosmopolitan competence in knowing how to consume the right commodities, places, or cultures in the right way. In knowing what to buy and how to use it, they display an aptitude for life on the road’ (Germann Molz, 2006, p. 9).

Adam’s understanding of the ‘Other’ from this practice has transformed what his body can do in India. By modifying his body through the practice of wearing and going shopping for different clothing to be used in India, he is demonstrating both a practice of respect for the Islamic culture and knowledge about Islamic practices.

Germann Molz (2006, p. 13) has noted that ‘travellers want to be like chameleons, adapting and blending as best they can into the various environments they pass through’. In this practice of bodily modification, Adam and his sisters are also mediating the individualised ‘risk’ associated with not ‘fitting-in’ with the religious and social norms of particular areas in the country in which they may pay penalties or face imprisonment.

Learning the language and social norms of the places you were planning to visit was discussed by the youth in a lesson based on learning the ‘world’ languages of the United Nations. Many of the youth offered advice on how to communicate in their countries of interest and other types of practices that could be used to ‘fit-in’ these places. During the lesson, Adam was called upon by his teacher to pronounce Hindi phrases to the class as a learning exercise.

Ms Johnston: I really think Adam should be saying these.
Amy: It means ‘God be with you’.
Ms Johnston: Adam, you know all these … go.
Adam: Um, Namaste, Aaf keejie, Kshama kare, Meri Hindi kucch khass, Nahi hai [some students repeating these back at him after he says them].
Jane: How do you know how to pronounce all of these?
Adam: I have a little app that tells me how to say them.
Ms Johnston: When do you leave for India again?
Adam: On the 11th [clapping from the class].
Adam: I’m more interested in Tamil than Hindi.
Mike: What is it?
Adam: Tamil.
Jane: Speak!
Adam was known by his classmates and teacher as a frequent traveller and someone who was in the process of organising a trip to India. Because of being marked as already a ‘traveller’ and ‘cosmopolitan’ he was asked to pronounce the Indian phrases by the teacher as she knew he was working on becoming proficient in the language. Demonstrating an interest in how Adam came to learn the language, Jane asked how he went about learning these phrases. Adam notes that he is using an app that helps him learn how to say important phrases that he could use for his visit. His preparation to visit India wasn’t so much on what India was like, but based on researching practices that would make his trip safer and easier. The clapping from the students as acknowledgement of his travel plans also reinforces his planned trip as desirable and is normalised as a ‘good’ practice by his fellow class members and friends.

In the following class discussion, a cosmopolitan practice of learning the ‘Other’s’ language also emerges. Beth opens the conversation with comments about some of the important phrases a traveller must learn in their target countries language before setting off.

Beth: [eagerly shaking her hand in the air to be noticed] You know the most important sentence to know in any language? [laughter]
Ms Johnston: What’s that?
Beth: Where is the toilet? [laughter]
Ms Johnston: It is an important sentence to know.
Laura: Wo ist die Toilette? [German] [laughter].
Ms Johnston: Another important [phrase], of course, when you’re travelling is, do you speak English? [majority of the class end this sentence in unison with her]
Claudia: Um, where is the hospital? [laughter]
Laura: It’s really rude not to ask this in their language.
Ms Johnston: It is, you should introduce yourself and ask in their language if they know English.

These important sentences the class discusses are based on their own survival and sense of security in these places, rather than an explicit eagerness to communicate with the ‘Other’. Questions like ‘Where is the toilet?’, ‘Do you speak English?’ and ‘Where is the hospital?’ are not relevant to them forming meaningful relationships with people, but demonstrates the way the youth construct mobility and travel as something that involves extensive preparation in mediating and limiting ‘risk’. Their
desire to adapt to and mediate the different cultural contexts of places by learning
the language of the target destination is thus a practice based on mediating the
tension between a desire and openness to experience difference, producing a
sense of security in these places and limiting the possibility of being Othered. Or to
communicate this idea another way, this practice is based on positioning oneself in
an advantageous position, despite the increased likelihood of being Othered and
feeling insecure in these places. It is not until the end of this discussion that a
recognition of their moral obligation to the Other is addressed. Laura notes that, It’s
really rude not to ask this in their language’ which is then reaffirmed by her teacher,
Miss Johnston as an appropriate intercultural communication practice.

In another lesson focused on the importance of body language in intercultural
communication, many of the youth were drawing from their own experiences and
encounters with the ‘Other’ in different places. More specifically, the youth had
discussed with their peers their experiences in other places and the ways the body
was symbolic and agentic in demonstrating a cosmopolitan openness and practice
of ‘fitting-in’ in other places.

Mike: Um, in Japan I went there like a year ago, and everyone like bows to
everyone as a sign of respect. Yep so everyone, you have to do it to
everyone! Otherwise it’s like really rude. You just do it and after a while it
becomes natural. Also like money, you have to put it down, you can’t like
give it person to person, you can’t give it to someone. Any money because
money is really ‘dirty’. You have to put it down on something and then they
pick it up.
Teacher: Oh, I don’t know the difference as they still have to pick it up.
Mike: They sometimes also put it in a tin, like at restaurants …
Laura: Isn’t that the same as slurping? [laughter]
Mike: Oh yeah, if you slurp it’s really good.
Laura: It’s like polite to slurp.
Mike: If you don’t slurp, it’s like well, you don’t like it.
Teacher: Yeah?

Mike’s learning of the everyday practices of the Other were understood as essential
to demonstrating respect for the Japanese culture. The embodied practice of
bowing to acknowledge a person’s presence is a practice of transforming one’s
normalised bodily practices and taking up the cultural norms and appropriate
etiquette in Japan. Mike classifies other embodied practices, such as placing money
down on the table when paying for something and making slurping sounds while eating, as essential to ‘fitting-in’ and making sure one does not offend Japanese individuals.

Beth discusses similar ‘advice’ to her peers when discussing the ‘appropriate’ eating practices in Japan.

Beth: It's worse if you stab your food with chopsticks and stick them up like this [holds up fingers in a cross-shape pattern]. It means death!
Class: [laughter]
Mike: Because it represents incense at a funeral.
Teacher: Ooh.
Beth: Bite your food definitely! [laughter].
Teacher: Are they insulting the chef by doing this as well?
Mike: It's like an omen.

Beth is referring to the risk of offending the Other through one’s eating practices. Cultural knowledge based on the consumption of food and the correct use of chopsticks is used to educate the youth on particular social faux pas in Japan. This practice is again not only based on the need to respect the Other in this culture, but to maintain the youth’s own dignity by preventing the risk of embarrassment.

What the above discussions highlight is an emphasis on practices and modes of ‘living’ that are needed to adapt to the places the youth and others wish to visit. These practices of flexibility and consumption are produced through particular understandings of place that are shaped by their intra-actions with globalised entities and mobile others. As Singh and Doherty (2007, p. 119) note, these ‘…transnational identities carry connotations of being “contingent orders” (Urry, 2000), ways of being and dwelling sutured from what is possible in the circumstances and what one aspires to.’ For example, Adam’s imaginary of India as a conservative place were based on him reading books and watching movies about India. His preparatory and consumerist practices of buying long cotton pants and head coverings for his sisters were shaped by his prior knowledge of India. They were practices based on the practical aspects or ‘pragmatics’ of world travel.
These discussions have also made known how their practices of ‘fitting-in’ are mediated affectively. For example, these practices were articulated as necessary place-based practices and constituted not only to demonstrate both their recognition, tolerance, and respect of the Other, but also to manage their sense of security, feelings of embarrassment or feeling ‘out-of-place’ in their targeted destinations. This understanding was especially shown in the way Laura and Claudia spoke about learning the language of their targeted destinations not as a way of conversing meaningfully with the Other, but to ensure their own safety and that they knew where the toilets and hospital were. This brought attention to the ways the youth associated travel and mobility with a level of uncertainty and risk and were aware of the particular limits and thresholds in terms of how they construct their practices of ‘fitting-in’. For example, their practices of ‘fitting-in’ are associated with banal practices such as the consumption of food and other products, greetings, and phrases that work towards ensuring their own sense of security in these places and mediating the ‘risks’ that for them travel entails. The practices of ‘fitting-in’ are thus developed in terms of what they would view as being advantageous for them in these places. The ambivalent nature of the youth trying to demonstrate their recognition of the appropriate cultural practices of their target destinations and the associated limits in terms of what would benefit them and is realistically possible in these places is evident.

It must be highlighted again, that the youth’s practices of ‘fitting-in’ are also privileged practices that involve the accumulation of resources and cultural capital to consumne the appropriate matter and ‘lessons’ prior to leaving for their targeted place or destination. The consumption of language lessons, apps and clothing are based on individualised consumerist practices that youth engage in when conducting their ‘homework’ on places. The lessons from fellow youth in the classroom also highlight a social context of privilege, where the expectation and practice of world travel has become normalised and something that they assume as a group they are expected to work towards, share and discuss. The normalisation of mobile and cosmopolitan practices in the classroom and research project leads me to the last analytical section of this chapter. The following section addresses those students who fear the future or do not align themselves or their futures with the normalised practices of travel and mobility that were commonly discussed in the classroom.
Absence and the unknown: Uncertainty and Fear

To ignore the voices of those youth who could not view or imagine their future would be to foreclose on those who may benefit from my research. This section is concerned with those youth who are yet to find new ways of ‘seeing’ and imagining their futures. Cairns (2013, p. 337) asserts that ‘[a]s future insecurity is converted into a landscape of possibility and self-determination, structural inequity is negotiated affectively’. For Julia and Megan, the affective intensities and potentials emergent from the practice of imagining themselves this way and the task of imagining their futures were evident in the ways they were hesitant or unable to imagine themselves in place.

**Julia’s process diary:**  *The reason I have nothing for the future is I can’t picture myself anywhere and if I think of a place I can see myself there but still not sure.*

Picturing oneself in place is a difficult task for Julia. Julia acknowledged that in enacting our future imaginary the practice of ‘deciding’ or decision-making interferes with forging her future. She notes she can imagine and see herself ‘there’, but is leaving this decision open and doesn’t commit herself to being anywhere in particular in her future. A similar practice is evident in Megan’s process diary.

**Megan’s process diary:**  *I only included the short term goals for the future because thinking future into the future is daunting [sic]. Plus things change, I don’t want to dream up something big for the future and be disappointed.*

Looking to her future or ‘thinking future’ is a ‘dawnting’ [sic] prospect for Megan. The temporality of her reality and situation is enacted in her reflective practices. Her body can only enact goals for the short-term future rather than long-term. The practice of ‘dream[ing] up something big’ is not elaborated on by Megan, but is not desired by her. She notes how this is due to the affective potentials that could emerge from the fact of something changing, such as the disappointment of something not materialising in her future if she were to construct such an imaginary. Beck (1994, p. vii) highlights that, ‘[i]n most aspects of our lives, individual and
collective, we have to regularly construct potential futures, knowing that such very construction may in fact prevent them coming about. New areas of unpredictability are created quite often by the very attempts to control them.' The empirical examples of Julia and Megan enact an understanding of the future and global imaginary as disempowering, where the youth’s social world may change or not allow the possibility to fulfil future imaginaries and aspirations. Unlike their peers, Julia and Megan do not have a sense of control over their futures. Their ‘global’ imaginary and the way in which they position themselves is based on fear, which closes off their potential to become cosmopolitan. Facing the juxtaposed feelings of being both free and scared in this practice of individualism has produced ‘a labyrinth of self-doubt and uncertainty’ for Julia and Megan (Elliott & Lemert, 2006 p. 99).

It could also be argued that Julia and Megan were unable to express their desired futures to me as they saw me as aligning with the normative ‘positive’ connotations of cosmopolitanism that were evident in the context of the classroom. They may have positioned me as someone with similar expectations to that of their teachers and the education system where life choices based on cosmopolitan practices and increased mobility are valued and expected. Francis and Hey (2009, p. 226) note how ‘neoliberal discourses of meritocracy and individuality project responsibility for failure away from social structures and institutions and onto individuals’. For example, my discussions about cosmopolitan practices in the classroom and my continued questioning about their mobile practices could have possibly normalised these practices as ‘good’ ways of being and becoming an adult and therefore could have closed-down or made them question the validity of their ‘alternative’ ways of imagining their future.

Concluding comments

In addressing the imagined futures of the youth, I have looked to make visible the way youth ‘re-work’ the continuity and discontinuity of their emplaced material-discursive practices, and intra-actions with specific globalised entities to produce a space in which a cosmopolitan future and cosmopolitan practices emerge. The youth’s cosmopolitan practices that emerged from these discussions and (re)presentations were predominantly related to practices of individualism and understandings of the ‘self’ that vitiate their liberal cosmopolitan practices. Gemmell...
Molz (2017, p. 21) has argued that cosmopolitanism and its related qualities ‘give individuals a competitive edge in a neoliberal labor market that values people who can move fluidly across borders, are emotionally flexible, and adapt easily to rapid changes.’ It was evident that their choices in terms of their mobile practices and future place-making were constituted through a gaze on the self and their personal development. These practices were based on cultivating an image of living a ‘good’ life and securing their moral worth through accumulating experiences of cultural relativity, pushing the boundaries of the body or the ways one could feel in place, and taking advantage of what their targeted places offered in terms of generating a sense of ‘happiness’ and fulfilling their aspirations.

The positive connotations of cosmopolitanism were also associated with mobilities and the self-management of the youth’s futures and careers. Drawing from Urry and Elliott (2010, p. 79), the youth’s future mobile and cosmopolitan practices were produced in relation to what afforded them a ‘sense of independence as well as feelings of emotional security’. The ways they framed their futures was commonly based around mobile discourses of freedom, adventure, and opportunity, which their local places could not provide (except for the case of Olive who understood her hometown as already representative of opportunity and what a globalised city could offer). Their positionality as future adult workers also played a large role in the ways they (re)presented their cosmopolitan practices. This was especially evident in May’s desire to accumulate experiences of ‘cultural relativity’ and Clement’s need to move to the global city in order to fulfil his dreams of accessing large populations to view his work as an artist. Their future mobility and cosmopolitan practices were therefore constituted in relation to their need to secure their moral worth and a particular way of being a ‘good’ person and having a ‘good’ life. Being and becoming ‘good’ was understood by the youth as an individualised responsibility; their future cosmopolitan practices would allow them to accumulate experiences in their future that positioned them as flexible, fulfilled, detached and autonomous consumers, learners and employees in a globalised world. Progress was measured and mediated through the accumulation of ‘global’ experiences and mobile practices that assisted the youth in arbitrating risk and the constraints imposed by their local places. More broadly, they were based on managing the ‘risk’ and ‘uncertainty’ that a globalised world brings.
A focus on the youth’s practices of individualisation and self-management of their futures in relation to a ‘global’ space, also brought to my attention the feelings of uncertainty and fear emergent from such decision-making and how the youth went about mediating and limiting ‘risk’ through certain cosmopolitan practices in their future. For example, their practices of ‘fitting-in’ were not only a practice of recognition and respect for the Other, but emerged in relation to ensuring their own comfort and security in other places. The education that the youth provided to their fellow classmates was also used as a practice to school them as frequent travellers on the expectations and adaptability needed when travelling. As outlined in the last section of this chapter, two of the youth noted that they would or could not look to the future because they could not deal with or mediate the possibility of disappointment or failure. Future place-making was too big a risk and was mediated through the way they might feel rather than addressed in relation to broader structural inequalities that might prevent them from obtaining their desired future. Their cosmopolitan practices were therefore based on a fear generated by their future lives being understood in relation to a predefined binary of success and failure (Cairns, 2014). Failure was understood in the majority of the youth’s future cosmopolitan practices as not being able to adapt to, appreciate, consume what the world has to offer.

By focusing on the temporal dimensions, or futurity in the constitution of youth’s cosmopolitan practices, the concept of becoming has been used as a way of understanding how the young people in my research feel there is a transition taking place in relation to the ways they will construct their mobile and cosmopolitan practices in their future. In response to being asked to think about their relations to places in their future, the youth did not (or could not) construct this transition and their cosmopolitan projects outside neoliberal practices in which the ‘self’ and its position within a global knowledge economy could be ignored. The youth’s mobile trajectories and cosmopolitan practices align with what Australian educational policies urge the youth to become and are the types of experiences needed in order to position themselves as a ‘global’ worker in a globalised workforce and economy. I thought about what it would take for this to be even possible, given that I was ‘trapped’ in a similar education system in writing this thesis and participating in similar neoliberal practices to form my understanding of cosmopolitanism. Giving the youth a ‘voice’ about their own cosmopolitan practices was, for example, a reactionary response to my frustration with neoliberal processes and ways of
looking at the world evident in school policy and curriculum. But at the same time, I am writing this thesis to gain traction in a global economy and my own cosmopolitan practices are inevitably entangled in a neoliberal system, so why would I assume or approach youth as living outside this system? In saying this, I wished I had asked the youth (and aim to do so in future research) to present a ‘desired’ future outside their need for money or the expectation to contribute to a national or global workforce. This might mean drawing from Grosz (1991, p. 11) providing the youth with a space that lets them give ‘up any presumption that the future follows from the present’ and ‘suggests that a politics which welcomes the future might be one that resists defining goals or setting agendas’. This might be a difficult task given that one’s future life is now attributed a very specific agenda as entrepreneur and consumer through the governing practices of neoliberalism. It may even be more difficult given the way a ‘youth-as-abject’ is bounded by the consequence of being labelled a delinquent or no-hoper if choosing not to align with the so-called needs of the country or globalised economy and instead pursuing a different mode of living (Popkewitz, 1998).
Chapter 8: Reflections on researching the cosmopolitan practices of youth

Introduction:

Kathrin Thiele (2015, p. 99; original emphasis) has noted that ‘theorizing is worlding’ In this thesis I have looked to address the limitations of studying cosmopolitanism as purely an abstract and universal ideal by entangling the body, matter and place in an apparatus of ‘knowing’ and ‘being’. In so doing, I have challenged an over-reliance on the agency of the ‘thinking’ subject and an understanding of cosmopolitanism as purely a humanist (i.e. intellectualising) practice. By focusing on the intra-actions between globalised entities and youth, I have aimed to show how affects and the materiality of youth’s social lives are also implicated and play a significant role in shaping youth’s place-making and cosmopolitan practices. Non-representational and vital materialist theories of affect have offered a way to extend the possibilities of how youth could be and become cosmopolitan. By adopting these theories I saw that youth’s sense of belonging to the world manifests not through a reading of an abstract space, but through youth’s direct relations to globalised entities in their personal and local contexts. By enacting the empirical material in my analytical chapters, I have argued that youth’s cosmopolitan practices are not emergent from a singular subject, but co-constituted through different entanglements of space, time and matter through the apparatus of their everyday and creative place-making practices. I insist that rather than understanding cosmopolitanism through a unified discursive subject, we should find new approaches to understanding the nuanced ways that everyday cosmopolitanism is enacted and practised. Cosmopolitanism, in my view, should not be regarded as a sedimentation of an outlook of individuals, but as a performance, of a cosmopolitan-in-the-making who is enacted, fluid and in a continual process of becoming, sometimes fleeting and at times emergent from banal and embodied experiences.
Another cosmopolitanism?

Calhoun (2003, p. 546) discusses the idea that we should want to transform cosmopolitanism rather than abandoning it. He notes, for example, that '[w]hether we theorise cosmopolitanism or not, we are embedded in social fields and practical projects in which we have little choice but to make use of some of the notions basic to cosmopolitanism and thereby reproduce it'. The form cosmopolitanism takes when (re)produced has been shown in this thesis to be dependent on the entanglement of material-discursive practices in which it emerges. An emergent approach to cosmopolitanism has accordingly allowed me to understand the many ways in which cosmopolitanism manifests in particular social contexts. As Pollock et al. (2000, p. 10) assert:

Most discussions of cosmopolitanism as a historical concept and activity largely predetermine the outcome by their very choice of materials. If it is already clear that cosmopolitanism begins with the Stoics, who invented the term, or with Kant, who reinvented it, then philosophical reflection on these moments is going to enable us always to find what we are looking for. Yet what if we were to try to be archivally cosmopolitan and to say, ‘Let’s look simply at the world across time and space and see how people have thought and acted beyond the local.’ We would then encounter an extravagant array of possibilities.

I have looked not only at the ways youth act beyond the local, but also the ways in which youth’s intra-actions with globalised entities are emplaced. The different cosmopolitan practices I have encountered in my research project demonstrate the ambiguous nature of cosmopolitanism as a practice – one that is not always based on transcending a national spatial imaginary, but on how ‘Otherness’ and associated practices are remade in relation to local and national factors. As Germann Molz (2006, p. 18) asserts, ‘[i]n addressing the way cosmopolitanism is materially and physically constrained or enabled, empirical accounts of cosmopolitanism retain the political currency of the concept of cosmopolitanism without resorting to universal claims’. By focusing on the material and affective dimensions of youth’s cosmopolitan practices, I have offered in this thesis an analytical engagement with youth’s cosmopolitan practices that demonstrates the
ways the practices are emergent from and sit within binaries: for example, of universal and particular, local and global, and subject and object. The purpose of this thesis is not to make a universalist claim for another ‘cosmopolitanism’, but to suggest that in approaching our research into cosmopolitanism from a situated and emergent perspective we can remain open to thinking it differently and discovering multiple forms in which it might come into being and be practised.

Through my analysis, I came to see the work of Barad (2003), Harrison (2000), Thrift (1999), and Skey (2012), as providing a way of attending to the core philosophical and sociological problems associated with studying and understanding cosmopolitanism empirically. I could distance myself from the abstractions and universals related to normative and liberal forms of cosmopolitanism so often perpetuated in cosmopolitan research that only focused on social categories. By attending to youth’s cosmopolitan practices as situated, I was also able to analyse youth’s cosmopolitan practices as they were emergent in my intra-actions with them, their peers and their everyday material-discursive practices at school. I have shown how the different bodies that were entangled in the research project had an impact on how the youth practised cosmopolitanism in our discussions together. For example, the common lines of ‘I don’t want to sound wrong’ or ‘I don’t know if this is right’ were something that indicated their uneasiness in discussing difference or the pressures emergent from their intra-actions with the bodies that were entangled in the research. These moments revealed to me that you cannot escape these forces during your research, but you can theorise them. This theorisation has shifted the way I engage with the landscape of my research when analysing cosmopolitanism and has highlighted how a non-representational and materialist approach was invaluable in addressing these situations. Thinking about how youth’s cosmopolitan practices are remade rather than represented in the research opened the possibilities for addressing the power relations that also shape knowledge production and thus their cosmopolitan practices (Skey, 2012).

Methodological apparatus

By using youth’s place-making practices as part of ‘apparatus’ to understand their world-making, I was able to provide a space for the youth to produce cosmopolitanism as a phenomenon. The various apparatuses produced a space (an
agential cut) in which students could produce situated knowledges to render tangible the material-discursive forces at play in their place-making and cosmopolitan practices. The whole process decentred the practice of students learning and questioning such practices and instead provided a space for them to perform situated knowledges ‘in and through’ place-making, in turn creating a new emergent reality and potential for what the body can do and become. This onto-epistemological approach and methodology provided a way of breaking down the boundaries between theory and practice and addressed the problems associated with representations or a ‘mirrored’ reality.

The (re)presentation activity and video essay were used as apparatuses to ‘slow down’ the youth’s place-making practices for them to analyse the way different globalised entities (non-human and human and, in some cases, ‘more than’ human) emerged as agentic in their cosmopolitan becoming. Or, as Sauzet (2015, p. 50) would explain, these methods of data production enacted ‘details and descriptions in their incompleteness’. Such activities don’t just offer a space for ‘what is’; they provide the potential space for what could be, what the youth’s bodies could ‘do’, what they could become. For example, the video essay was a research method that provided a space through which the youth’s place-making projects were reanalysed/understood through the social imaginaries of ‘Others’. The video essay also provided a space in which the youth enacted shared practices with the ‘Other’ and other banal images globalised through the internet to produce and rework social imaginaries emergent from their visual representations and process diaries. Use of this apparatus demonstrated the way method, theory and practice are always entangled in ethnographic research and the production of knowledge.

Re(presenting) affect

The pedagogical nature of affect has also been (re)presented in this thesis. By attending to the affective dimensions of youth’s place-making practices, I have demonstrated how the body is implicated in how youth ‘do’ or become cosmopolitan. This was first made clear by the tensions highlighted in my second empirical chapter between what the youth ‘felt’ and the liberal cosmopolitan discourses youth drew from to understand difference. I showed that the ways youth’s bodies came to know the ‘Other’ in these moments did not always align with
or could not be understood within the ideals presented in liberal understandings of cosmopolitanism. I have also been able to (re)present how the emotional geographies of cosmopolitan extend far beyond comfort and empathy, also taking in intensities articulated as discomfort, shock and anger. I have illuminated the ways such ‘alternative’ affective dimensions of youth’s body–place relations have provided in these moments spaces to critically engage with global entities and the political implications of mobility. The ways the youth in my project both constituted and mediated their ‘future’ cosmopolitan practices and mobile trajectories were also at times affective. In trying to limit ‘risk’ and the possibility of feeling discomfort in their targeted places and destinations, the youth elaborated on the practices of consumption and other practices of ‘fitting-in’ that allowed them to manage how ‘out of place’ they might appear or feel.

Relevance and agency of matter

Focusing on the materiality of youth’s social lives has led me to rethink the agency and primacy of the ‘thinking’ subject in the cosmopolitan becomings of youth. In parts of my analysis I have tried to explain how matter and my own embodiment in the research process, as well as the entanglement of other bodies in the research, produced affects and forces that shaped the possibilities of how I researched the youth’s practices and what the youth could do in terms of becoming cosmopolitanism. In unpicking the separation of the object–subject binary I have been able to deal with the problematic of ‘agency’ and re-evaluated my position as a researcher and ‘knowing’ participant in this research. Throughout my analysis I have tried to outline the way matter made itself intelligible to me and the youth by intra-acting with different spaces and times in the classroom and in my discussions and interviews with them.

In using an emergent place-based approach to the study of cosmopolitanism I have aimed to show and problematise the normalising effects of universal liberal understandings of cosmopolitanism in the educational context. The abstract and universalising nature of liberal forms of cosmopolitanism do not permit or provide the space for engaging with the differentiated politics and cultural spaces implicated in youth’s mobile practices. By attending to matter and the affective dimensions of youth’s cosmopolitan practices, the accounts of the youth in my project have
currency in addressing the political and cultural specificities that shape the ways youth are becoming cosmopolitan. The theoretical ‘elasticity’ of cosmopolitanism (Skey, 2012) is therefore less of a problem in my empirical study; rather, it provides an avenue to the new and alternative versions of cosmopolitanism that might emerge from the educational and other social contexts.

**Becoming cosmopolitan with youth**

Drawing from Somerville’s (2007, p. 232) concept of ‘postmodern emergence’, I have also come to understand how my own subjectivity has changed or ‘I am [and continue] becoming-other to my ‘self” during this research project. I have come to see how I can no longer ‘detach’ myself or my research apparatus from the cosmopolitan becomings of the youth. For example, I was conscious of the positive connotations of cosmopolitanism that had become normalised within Australian education institutions, but originally and naively placed myself as existing outside these practices in the classroom. During particular moments in my analytical writing and thinking however, my position as researcher and ‘knowing’ subject became ‘undone’. Or as St Pierre describes, I became aware of ‘those certain places that provide especially fertile conditions, exquisitely dynamic intensities that make us available to a transformation of who we are’ (2000, p. 260). I became increasingly aware of how I was interwoven and remade in different ways in these cosmopolitan moments that unfolded in the intra-actions with the youth and myself within the context of the classroom and school.

The youth as ‘defended subjects’ continually communicated that they didn’t want to sound ‘wrong’ in front of me and positioned me as someone to please and present the ‘best’ of themselves to. In these moments, I began to see the limitations of my research approach and methodology. I became attuned to the ways my eagerness to investigate their cosmopolitan practices, and their own alignment and eagerness to attach themselves to this research project, could have potentially silenced alternative ways of knowing and being cosmopolitanism. I originally engaged primarily with these moments as absent or imagined my ‘self’ as existing ‘outside’ my analytical lens. These limitations only became apparent in that ‘liminal’ moment of analysis and writing where I began to ponder and theorize the ways I was positioned in particular research moments by the youth. In this thinking, I was
“suspended in the threshold between knowing and unknowing, that prevents wonder from being wholly contained or recuperated as knowledge, and this affords an opening onto the new” (MacLure, 2013, p. 228). In these moments, the significance of the researcher’s ‘self’ unfolded and I began to engage and think differently about myself as a social force co-constituting youth’s cosmopolitan practices. Moreover, what became known was how the youth’s social practices in the research could not be detached from my own becoming. These ‘stammers’ during the production of my thesis made me intra-act with the research landscape and data differently (Somerville, 2007). My own embodiment as a ‘cosmopolitan researcher’ in the study began to function in the words of Skey (2012), as a ‘dilemmatic’ element in the ways youth’s cosmopolitan practices were both understood and produced in my research.

Somerville (2007) has noted that emergence as becoming-other also involves our relations with the non-human. In my opening empirical chapter, Chapter 4, I noted how objects in the classroom ‘glowed’ or drew my attention as I entered the classroom. This data made itself intelligible to me and was a force that shaped the way I organized the questions I asked the youth and the ‘matter’ that was discussed. Similar intensities or affects produced through the relations between the youth and myself were also forces that shaped how I engaged with the research landscape. Initially, I became ‘attached’ to those youth that displayed an energy and vibrancy in the classroom. I have found it difficult to articulate these intensities clearly in my analysis, but they were nonetheless a force that drove me to focus my attention on particular youth in interviews and group discussions. By focusing on these research moments with the youth, I became to understand the ways my ‘self’ and the body was attached to the non-representational dimensions of social life that are entangled in the production of something new, but aren’t necessarily the cause of such knowledge (Somerville, 2007; Grosz, 1999). As Somerville (2007, p.240) notes, ‘[a]n ontology of becoming in postmodern emergence focuses on the irrational, the unfolding, the embodied and the messiness of research engagement.’

In beginning to recognize and focus on these affects in my research, I tried to detach myself from those young people that ‘glowed’ and had a strong presence in the classroom and engage more readily with the still, reserved and silent youth in my research. In doing this, new possibilities of becoming cosmopolitan opened in my engagements with the participants. For example, a very quiet student, Laura, who was originally hesitant about discussing her ideas because she had never travelled outside Australia, engaged in a very meaningful discussion with me. Laura
discussed the way her openness to the Other and world was produced through the tension between affects articulated as fear and anxiety of being alone in this world, but also the ‘risk’ of being open to the war, terror and pain that is also a part of addressing our moral obligations to the Other. Unlike the mediations of places online that were discussed by most of her peers, Laura also shared with me the ways her interest in and understanding of places elsewhere such as, Germany, were cultivated through her reading of German poetry and novels. By engaging and focusing on these irrational intensities and my own embodiment in my research project, I was able to gesture at the different modes and moments in my research in which I was ‘becoming-other to my ‘self’ and that led to me rethinking my approach to researching cosmopolitanism with the youth.

So, what about the classroom?

Rizvi and Beech (2017) have recently published an article on the value of an empirical and situated approach to what they call ‘cosmopolitan learning’. As (re)presented in my project, the youth’s cosmopolitan practices emerged commonly in interviews, discussions and video essays as ways of ‘dealing’ or ‘mediating’ problems and uneven power geometries associated with their mobility online and through other media. Rizvi and Beech’s ‘more than’ approach doesn’t put forward another governing prescriptive framework, but proposes the idea that the multiple ways youth become ‘cosmopolitan’ could be analysed and used in the collective practices and potentials of learning. Their call for an open and fluid approach to ‘cosmopolitan learning’, similar to the one proposed in this thesis, challenges, in Todd’s (2009 p.220) terms, the ‘rules and standards’ of cosmopolitanism that our embodied cosmopolitan practices and moral obligations to the Other often sit at odds with. For example, this approach could be used to address the stifling effects of the universalised understandings of difference found in liberal forms of cosmopolitanism that were shown in Chapter 5 of this thesis.

In addressing the affective geographies of youth’s cosmopolitan practices, it was apparent in this project that many of the youth struggled to address the ways that structural inequalities played a role in how they territorialised difference. This was because they understood difference in relation to an individual morality that was shaped by discourses around acceptance of all difference rather than engagement
with the particularities of such differences. These universalising cosmopolitan discourses acted as a ‘rule and standard’ of approaching difference and did not allow the youth to address the structural inequality that played a part of their subjective understanding of the ‘Other’. Nor could the youth articulate what they felt through these liberal cosmopolitan discourses. What this thesis has highlighted, however, is that affects can provide new spaces in which youth can think critically about their moral and ethical obligations to the Other. These affects can provide spaces that move beyond an individualised sense of morality and extend to the political and economic spaces that perpetuate difference and structural inequality. Such an approach might involve broadening what it means to ‘feel’ and become cosmopolitan. Problematising and unpicking universalised understandings of empathy, acceptance and openness in the classroom might act as a starting point to expand the possibilities in which youth come to know the ‘Other’. A new approach might also involve questioning the governing practices in educational policy that facilitate a universalistic understanding of the world and the youth learner and being open to other ways of being cosmopolitan.

The dismantling of universal understanding of difference and social categories/binaries may also have to include problematising the way we come to know the local places we live in. In some cases, the youth’s striated understanding of the nation and their local city placed limitations and shaped how they could be or become cosmopolitan in their local places and futures. I do realise that immobility plays a large part in shaping what is or could be possible in terms of being cosmopolitan; however, understanding local places not as fixed, but as spaces that become made and remade through our relations to other places, might allow for a more open understanding of the places youth live in and the people living in their hometowns.

During my initial analysis I naively expected that ‘alternative’ cosmopolitan practices would be emergent from the empirical material, practices that interrupted normative lifepaths based on a neoliberal logic. I was hoping to illuminate ‘a mode of utopian thinking: thinking that refuses mere compliance, that looks down roads not yet taken to the shapes of a more fulfilling social order, to more vibrant ways of being in the world’ (Greene, 1995, p. 5). I was quick to realise that these types of imaginaries were scarce in the empirical material. In addition, I noticed that although some youth
engaged with the idea of combatting structural inequality and difference in earlier discussions and through their lived everyday practices in the classroom, the way they forged their future cosmopolitan imaginaries was through neoliberal cosmopolitan practices focused on individualisation. These cosmopolitan practices were constructed in terms of their responsibility to the ‘Other’ and ability to be at ‘home’ in difference and at the same time were developed through activities that could position the youth as global elites, employees and consumers.

Although cosmopolitanism has commonly been represented as an individualised humanist ideal, bringing new materialist and non-representational theories into the analysis of cosmopolitan phenomena has opened up the possibilities for addressing the multiple ways in which youth’s embodied practices, matter and the affects emergent from such entanglements have agency in the ways youth become cosmopolitan. We have been able to see that although many of these youths live a life of privilege, such privilege comes into being as a situated and contingent force. The material and social conditions that shape youth’s cosmopolitan practices are thus always emplaced and become intelligible to the youth in different ways and places (Calhoun, 2003). Moreover, elite and privileged accounts of cosmopolitanism aren’t necessarily deployed by drawing from universal and abstract understandings of cosmopolitanism, but come into being through youth’s emplaced material-discursive practices (Germann Molz, 2006).

Concluding remarks- Further directions

Other areas of research in which the theoretical concepts of Skey (2012), Harrison (2000), Thrift (1999) and Barad (2003) could be used are of course endless. However, I believe that these theoretical influences drawn upon in my thesis to understand the non-representational and material aspects of youth’s cosmopolitan and place-making practices, provide the potential to explore further issues related to abstractions and normative approaches in cosmopolitan research. As noted by Germann Molz (2006, p. 18) ‘by challenging normative accounts of cosmopolitanism as an abstract, detached and disembodied perspective, actually existing cosmopolitanisms open up a domain for political theory and action.’ In my thesis, I have primarily engaged with how matter and the affects emergent from youth’s emplaced intra-actions with globalised entities and the Other play a role in the
constitution of their cosmopolitan practices. By focusing on the material and embodied aspects of cosmopolitanism in future research we can continue to distance our research from the universals commonly associated with normative notions of cosmopolitanism and could engage with the ways other forces such as race, class, and gender that structure inequalities and difference, shape our cosmopolitan practices and moral obligations to the Other (Calhoun, 2003; Germann Molz, 2006). These theoretical influences might yield the much-needed attention given to those individuals and cosmopolitan practices that are not associated with Western elitist versions of cosmopolitanism, but that might open the field of cosmopolitanism up to other ‘radical’ and ‘alternative’ imaginaries of coexisting with the Other and how we come to understand difference. This has already started to be addressed in Cheah and Robbin’s (1998) research on ‘actually existing cosmopolitanism’, by Skrbis and Woodward (2007) in what they refer to as ‘ordinary cosmopolitanism’, and Beck’s (2004) concept of ‘cosmopolitical realism’. However, such emergent and situated approaches to understanding cosmopolitanism are yet to be adopted or addressed in the development and understanding of young people’s cosmopolitan practices in the education context.

Ahmed (2002, p. 569) notes that ‘[t]he question is not so much how not to set agendas, but how to allow the agendas that are set to be kept open for negotiation by others, as well kept open in the face of transformations in the present that are surprising’. Cosmopolitanism’s agenda within the arena of education, especially in its liberal political and moral forms, has been focused on setting rules and standards that close down rather than open up the possibilities for becoming cosmopolitan. A more open approach to cosmopolitanism would allow us to embrace and learn from the multiple ways we come to know the ‘Other’ and form our moral obligations to them. By addressing and discussing the reasons for the anxiousness and worry of the youth I worked with, emergent from their efforts to not to sound ‘wrong’ in their engagements with difference, we might be able to provide young people with the space to develop vocabularies for understanding and mediating the particularities of difference that liberal practices of cosmopolitanism don’t afford them. In focusing on how youth ‘actually’ mediate globalised entities we may also learn something from them as educators. An emergent and emplaced approach to understanding youth’s cosmopolitan becomings holds promise for practitioners and researchers invested in understanding the multiple ways youth understand and position themselves and the Other in a ‘global’ world as well as highlighting educational strategies that could
assist young people in mediating the mobilities and globalised entities they access every day. The knowledge produced in this thesis has highlighted how the pedagogical aspects of affect could be a starting point to rework the spaces in which we come to know the Other. Implicating the body and matter in our understanding of the world and Other might offer new possibilities for accommodating the specific needs of youth in the classroom and allow them to explore and be open to new ways of practising cosmopolitanism and ‘alternative’ modes of living in a ‘global’ world.
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