UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET

Master thesis in Sustainable Development 2021/36
Examensarbete i Hållbar utveckling

Researching sustainability education through the lens of anti-oppressive pedagogy:

a critical discourse analysis of the education policies of three international high schools with sustainability foci

Margherita Tommasini

DEPARTMENT OF
EARTH SCIENCES

INSTITUTIONEN FÖR
GEOVETENSKAPER

Master thesis in Sustainable Development 2021/36
Examensarbete i Hållbar utveckling

Researching sustainability education through the lens of anti-oppressive pedagogy: a critical discourse analysis of the education policies of three international high schools with sustainability foci

Margherita Tommasini

Supervisor: Rebecca Adami
Subject Reviewer: Beniamin Knutsson

Copyright © Margherita Tommasini and the Department of Earth Sciences, Uppsala University.
Published at Department of Earth Sciences, Uppsala University (www.geo.uu.se), Uppsala, 2021.

Contents

Contents V
1. Introduction 1
1.1. Aim and research questions 1
1.2. Structure 2
2. Background 3
2.1. Earlier Research 3
2.1.1. Insight into discourses of sustainability education at the policy and research level 3
2.1.2. Insight into discourses of sustainability education at the school level 4
2.2. Theoretical and conceptual frameworks 5
2.2.1. Anti-oppressive pedagogy 5
2.2.2. Critical considerations for international education 6
2.2.3. Critical Discourse Analysis 7
3. Methodology and Method 8
3.1. Methodology 8
3.2. Method 11
3.3. Selected Educational Organizations 12
3.3.1. Green School 12
3.3.2. UWC (United World Colleges) 12
3.3.3. Amala Education 13
3.4. Materials 13
3.5. Methodological Reflexivity 15
4. Results and analysis 16
4.1. Discourses of Sustainability Education 16
4.2. Discourses of Anti-oppressive Pedagogy 20
5. Discussion 26
6. Concluding remarks 28
7. Acknowledgements 28
8. References 29
8.1. References of CDA Material 34
9. Appendix: CDA Tables 36

Researching sustainability education through the lens of anti-oppressive pedagogy: a critical discourse analysis of the education policies of three international high schools with sustainability foci

MARGHERITA TOMMASINI

Tommasini, M., 2021: Researching sustainability education through the lens of anti-oppressive pedagogy: a critical discourse analysis of the education policies of three international high schools with sustainability foci. *Master thesis in Sustainable Development at Uppsala University,* No. 2021/36, 48 pp, 30 ECTS/hp

Abstract: As the notion of sustainability has gained prominence in the past decade, so have different disciplines that have addressed sustainability issues from an educational standpoint, for example Environmental Education and Education for Sustainable Development. Both fields have been called out for shortcomings such as omitting social considerations to sustainability issues and reproducing neoliberal framings that go hand in hand with oppressive power structures and systemic inequality. To better grasp how sustainability education is framed in relation to anti-oppressive pedagogy, this research conducted a Critical Discourse Analysis on selected materials that were publicly available on the websites of three international high schools with sustainability-oriented curricula—Green School, United World Colleges, and Amala Education. From the analysis of the selected documents, the three educational organizations' discourses of sustainability align with the narrative of Education for Sustainable Development and lack critical considerations on the embeddedness of their sustainability education, and the larger sustainability challenge, in neoliberal framings and systems of oppression that reproduce inequality and marginalization and that constrain processes of transformation. While language that relates to the framings of anti-oppressive pedagogy was present, to different extents, in the texts of the three organizations, it was not framed in relation to sustainability, but as a separate layer of educational practice, lacking problematization on the role of sustainability education discourses in the making of anti-oppressive sustainability education, and on the critical significance of considering anti-oppressive pedagogy for the making of sustainability education.

Keywords: sustainable development, sustainability education, anti-oppressive pedagogy, critical discourse analysis, international education

Margherita Tommasini, Department of Earth Sciences, Uppsala University, Villavägen 16, SE- 752 36 Uppsala, Sweden

Researching sustainability education through the lens of anti-oppressive pedagogy: a critical discourse analysis of the education policies of three international high schools with sustainability foci

MARGHERITA TOMMASINI

Tommasini, M., 2021: Researching sustainability education through the lens of anti-oppressive pedagogy: a critical discourse analysis of the education policies of three international high schools with sustainability foci. *Master thesis in Sustainable Development at Uppsala University,* No. 2021/36, 48 pp, 30 ECTS/hp

Summary: As a concept, discipline, and practice, sustainability has gained prominence in the past decade. Simultaneously, different disciplines that address sustainability issues from an educational standpoint have expanded, for example Environmental Education and Education for Sustainable Development. Both fields have been called out for shortcomings such as focusing on ecological considerations and not taking into account issues that relate to the social and economic spheres of sustainability, and in doing so contributing to the neoliberal worldview and the power structures and systems of oppression it rests upon. To better grasp how sustainability education relates to anti-oppressive pedagogy, this research conducted a Critical Discourse Analysis on selected materials that were publicly available on the websites of three international high schools with sustainability-oriented curricula—Green School, United World Colleges, and Amala Education. From the analysis of the selected documents, the three educational organizations' discourses of sustainability align with the narrative of Education for Sustainable Development and lack critical considerations on the role of sustainability education, and specifically their education, in contrasting systems of oppressions that reproduce inequality and marginalization and that constrain processes of transformation to a more just and sustainable society. While language that relates to the framings of anti-oppressive pedagogy was present, to different extents, in the texts of the three organizations, it was not framed in relation to sustainability, but as a separate layer of educational practice, lacking problematization on the role of sustainability education discourses in the making of anti-oppressive sustainability education, and on the critical significance of considering anti-oppressive pedagogy for the making of sustainability education.

Keywords: sustainable development, sustainability education, anti-oppressive pedagogy, critical discourse analysis, international education

Margherita Tommasini, Department of Earth Sciences, Uppsala University, Villavägen 16, SE- 752 36 Uppsala, Sweden

List of Abbreviations

AOP: Anti-oppressive pedagogy

CDA: Critical Discourse Analysis

EE: Environmental Education

ESD: Education for Sustainable Development

GAP: Global Action Programme on Education for Sustainable Development

UN: United Nations

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

UWC: United World Colleges

1. Introduction

In the past decade, the notion of sustainability has been gaining traction across individuals, households, organizations, and governing bodies throughout the world (Caradonna, 2014), hand-in-hand with the widening and expanding of the field of sustainability education, whose theory and practice stand at the intersection of the ongoing environmental and climate unraveling, globalization challenges and pandemics, systemic issues of racism, inequality, and injustice, the crackling of democratic processes and institutions, and the rise of fascism.

As a discipline that claims to be cross-disciplinary and a powerful catalyst for social change (UNESCO, 2018; Cars and West, 2015), it is necessary to look into its application, with regards to the embeddedness of anti-oppressive discourses within sustainability education. For instance, Misiaszek (2020) highlights the need to situate the teaching of sustainability in inquiries over who benefits and who is most impacted by environmental [and social] issues, in line with Ellsworth's (1997) proposition that teaching is a performative act, rather than a representational one, not a blank transfer of knowledge, but a process that shapes the constituting of a learner's reality.

With the hope of contributing to the larger conversation on the urgent need for sustainability education that fosters diversity, equity, and inclusion, this research will conduct a Critical Discourse Analysis to investigate whether (and if so, in what ways) three selected international high schools' programs (Green School, United World Colleges, Amala Education), whose educational principles and models are sustainability-oriented, embed anti-oppressive language in their educational policy. By looking closely at selected existing documents of said institutions, this research hopes to better grasp what has been articulated and what has been left out with regards to anti-oppressive language in said educational policy.

Given the inherent differences among the organizations and their conceptual relationship to education and sustainability, this research does not aim to be a comparative study; rather, this is a discourse analysis in which I seek to describe the educational policy of the selected institutions to get insight on real life examples of how different educational institutions frame their takes on sustainability education, and whether that includes anti-oppressive considerations. Thus, this study will first attempt to discern the organizations' stances on sustainability education, then analyze possible embedded anti-oppressive language in the selected texts, and finally draw insight on larger anti-oppressive considerations for sustainability education.

1.1. Aim and research questions

Recognizing the interconnectedness of the ongoing (and upcoming) ecological and social crises and the urgent need to address issues of power and inequality that worsen said crises and constrain possible transformations towards a more just and sustainable society, I chose to inquire on the overlapping of sustainability education and anti-oppressive pedagogy.

In more specific terms, the focus of this research lies on the language used by three international high schools with sustainability foci—Green School, United World Colleges, and Amala Education—in presenting their educational models and ethoses, looking at whether, and if so how, they include anti-oppressive considerations within their narratives of sustainability.

The aim is to explore and better grasp what has been articulated and what has been left out, to then draw insight on larger anti-oppressive considerations for sustainability education.

The research questions for this thesis are the following:

> *Question 1:* In what ways do the selected sustainability-oriented educational programs represent their stances on sustainability and sustainability education?
>
> *Question 2:* In what ways do the selected sustainability-oriented educational programs embed anti-oppressive pedagogy language in their discourses of sustainability?

1.2. Structure

The second chapter reviews earlier research on sustainability education as a research and policy field and on sustainability education as practice and policy at the school level. It also presents the theoretical and conceptual frameworks that provide the lenses of analysis for this paper, specifically anti-oppressive pedagogy, critical considerations for international education, and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). In chapter three CDA is explored in depth, with a review of its employment in educational research, and then the specific approach adopted in this study is presented. The chapter also includes a brief description of the selected educational organizations and the material analyzed. Chapter four includes the CDA results with regards to the two research questions, and in chapter five these findings are discussed. Chapter six concludes this paper by summarizing the research and highlighting opportunities for further exploration.

2. Background

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section reviews the early research from the field of sustainability education, diving both into the field and its research and policy at the broad multilateral level, as well as research conducted at the school level. The second provides an overview of the key theoretical and conceptual frameworks, which form the lenses through which the research is carried out and the results are interpreted.

2.1. Earlier Research

This literature review seeks to provide an overview of the critical scholarship on sustainability education at two levels: firstly, looking at the larger field of sustainability education and the ongoing research and policy efforts, secondarily diving into sustainability education research at the school level.

2.1.1. Insight into discourses of sustainability education at the policy and research level

Alongside practices and policies of sustainability, the field of education has also seen the expansion of sustainability education with an array of schools of thought that have trailblazed, expanded, mainstreamed, and contextualized the ongoing environmental and societal struggles, bridging sustainability questions into educational policy and practice—such as: environmental education; outdoor/experiential education; place-based education; education for sustainability; ecoliteracy; Education for Sustainable development; environmental justice; critical animal studies; ecopedagogy; eco-ability and critical disabilities studies; ecojustice education; and Indigenous education (Martusewicz, Edmundson and Lupinacci, 2021).

Not only has the field of sustainability education expanded, but it has also undergone institutionalization, mainly in the form of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), moving beyond Environmental Education (EE) to overlap three spheres of learning inquiry: environment, society, and economy. Yet, on one hand, EE has been historically criticized for omitting social considerations to environmental issues (McKeown and Hopkins, 2003) and on the other, while becoming ever so popular through the work of the United Nations and specifically UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), ESD has been called out for its ambiguity and vagueness, which allow for a multiplicity of interpretations of its principles, often including opposite agendas to be included under its framework (Bonal and Fontdevila, 2017). Specifically, ESD calls for education that fosters learner-center critical inquiries, that is exploratory and action-oriented in nature, and that empowers learners to engage in transformative practices for sustainable development (UNESCO, 2018) and that seeks to bridge the gap between knowledge on sustainability and action (Leicht, Heiss and Byun, 2018).

Yet, simultaneously, ESD is tightly related to the multilateral United Nations framework and to the Sustainable Development Goals, approaching sustainable development—as opposed to sustainability—as the "ability to grow and thus consume more of the planet in a manner that can be sustained indefinitely" (Martusewicz, Edmundson and Lupinacci, 2021, p.13). Furthermore, criticism has been drawn on the *for* in both Education *for* Sustainable Development, and Education *for*

Sustainability. Jickling (1992) highlighted how teaching *for* something, turns education as a tool for the unquestioned advancement of that something, and instead the focus should be placed on fostering sustainability learning embedded in critical and autonomous thinking.

The EE-ESD dichotomy has been widely discussed, with some scholars welcoming ESD, as its interlinkage with globalization has been seen as an impactful entry point for the examination of issues of inequity and the Global North-Global South relationships. Others have contested the newer field on the premise of that very same interlinkage with globalization and the notion of sustainable development which is seen as a hegemonic and homogenizing policy construct (Jicking and Wals, 2008, Kopnina, 2012).

Particularly, within the ESD framework, sustainability is "often taught in line with socio-economic reproduction of current local-to-global power structures […], in/directly aiding in systematically reproducing economic oppressions within neoliberal framings" (Misiaszek, 2020, p. 616). For instance, in their analysis of the UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development, Huckle and Wals (2015) pointed to how the decade did not address nor tackle neoliberalism, hence leaving it be a hegemonic force that inhibits transformation towards genuine sustainability. In attempting to reconcile clashing narratives of sustainability within its framework, ESD settled "in favor of a neoliberal economic thought and its concomitant political ideas which serve as an impediment for social change" (Van Poeck, Vandenabeele and Bruyninckx, 2013, p. 706), causing the discipline to fail to acknowledge the existing power structures and their dominance, and overlook systemic issues such as discrimination, exclusion, and inequality (Bonal & Fontdevila, 2017). Researching the frameworks that have followed the Decade—the Global Action Program on ESD (GAP 2015-2019), and the latest framework, ESD for 2030—Knutsson (2020, 2021) poses similar problematizations, specifically on how ESD appears to adjust to inequality through practices of biopolitical differentiation, with inequality appearing "largely normalized, i.e., accepted as a 'reality' that [ESD] implementers simply have to adapt to" (Knutsson, 2020, p. 660).

2.1.2. Insight into discourses of sustainability education at the school level

While insight into the larger trends of sustainability education research and policy helps to frame the overarching field, it is also worth noting that at the level of educational practitioners, these debates are often put aside by simply integrating different takes of sustainability education in their curricula (Lotz-Sisitza, 2011).

At the school level, beyond its conceptualization, sustainability education is enacted through different pedagogical methodologies, ranging from specific extra-curricular environmental leadership programs (as illustrated in Blythe and Harré, 2020), to wider considerations with regards to how the specific content of a class and its teaching methods can be adapted throughout a specific subject to promote sustainability at every step of the curriculum (examples for natural science disciplines: Vilches and Gil-Pérez, 2013; Jeronen, 2017). Nevertheless, regardless of the practitioner's pedagogical take, the substance of their sustainability teaching exists in relation to the larger discourses of sustainability education.

Diving into research that addresses the making of sustainability discourses in practical education settings, I turn to Cachelin and Ruddel (2013). They explored different framings—socially constructed external concepts that mold individuals' reality and sense making—in sustainability education. In their study, a sample of texts represented different framings with varied formulations of environmental messages, for example metaphors that paint the image of nature in terms of resources in service to humans on one hand and on the other language that indicates humans as

embedded in the larger systems of ecological interlinkages. Students participating in the study were asked to read portions of the framing text, and then complete a thought-listing-form on the provided reading. The participants' thoughts were then coded to map how the different sustainability narratives elicited students' critical thinking and critical elaboration (ibid.), which are seen as 'traditional' competencies of sustainability education (Wiek, Withycombe and Redman, 2011).

Cachelin, Rose and Paisley (2015) have expanded that work, specifically focusing on neoliberal constraints onto sustainability education, which have brought narratives of profit and economic gain hand in hand with modernization and development at the core of the discipline. Sustainability frameworks embedded in neoliberal ideology build on the conception of humans being an entity separated from nature; "as language and metaphors shape the construction of reality, educators must establish and identify discourse that more accurately, more productively, and more justly contradict and counteract neoliberal discourses" (ibid, p. 1130). By using thought-listing once more the researchers provided participants with constructed texts that either reinforced or challenged the view that sees humans above the ecological system. The thoughts highlighted several patterns and themes, and as in the earlier study, the different framings did elicit different thought-responses from the participants (Cachelin, Rose and Paisley, 2015).

2.2. Theoretical and conceptual frameworks

This section seeks to provide an overview of the key theoretical and conceptual framework that have informed this research.

2.2.1. Anti-oppressive pedagogy

Anti-oppressive pedagogy is defined by Kumashiro (2000) as education that actively works against various forms of oppression. More specifically, anti-oppressive pedagogy acknowledges that education is situated in realities that are bounded by processes, systems, and dynamics of oppression. Teaching and learning in this education field as a whole must therefore work "against the many forms of social oppression that play out in the lives of students" and across the interwoven strata of society (ibid., p. 25). Freire (2000) indicated that education can be in its essence both an instrument of oppression and a practice of freedom, with the latter embracing dialogue to move beyond an individualistic conception of learning and towards the collective nature of the process of producing and reproducing knowledge. In practice, not only does dialogical teaching call for considerations on the social character of educational frameworks, but also involves reflecting and theorizing from the actual shared experience that constitutes the dialogical process (ibid.).

In educational settings, work against oppression has generally been conceptualized in four branches: education for the Other, education about the Other, education that is critical of privileging and Othering, and education that changes students and society (Kumashiro, 2002). Each approach—although in practice educators often blend them and actualize them through their own lenses and experiences—conceptualizes oppression differently, and their adoption brings forth different "implications for bringing about change" through their strengths and weaknesses (ibid., p. 32). The learning experience is interwoven with the experience of identity, and both are in themselves and in their interconnectedness tied to systems of agency and power (Freire, 2000). Such identity processes are often structured through decades, if not centuries, of normalized and legitimized oppression. hooks (1994) expands on the notion of education as a practice of freedom, considering that the work of an educator:

> "[I]s not merely to share information but to share in the intellectual and spiritual growth of our students. To teach in a manner that respects and cares for the souls of our students is essential if we are to provide the necessary conditions where learning can most deeply and intimately begin" (ibid., p. 13).

It is important to acknowledge and consider the specific role of educators—their power and authority (Francis and le Roux, 2011). Education is in itself responsible for dynamics of privilege and marginalization (Kumashiro, 2000), and thus it is necessary for teachers to adopt a "pedagogy of positionality" that sees learners and educators acknowledging and problematizing how one is positioned and how one positions others in the overarching [oppressive] social structures (Maher & Tetrault, 1994, in Kumashiro, 2000). Following Freirean thought, education is an inherently political act conducive to one's ability to read reality. The cruciality of education thus lies in fostering the "ability for each individual to place their experiences in historical and political context and, through this, be able to understand their relationship with the world, [...] with knowledge, and with the forces of oppression" (Kina & Gonçalves, 2018, pp. 364-366). Sustainability education, in its conception and praxis, must thus embrace and bring forth the problematization of hidden hegemonic curricula (Misiaszek, 2020), to actively resist and oppose *unsustainable* sustainability education.

For sustainability education to soundly challenge the dominant inequal structures (e.g., colonialism, capitalism, patriarchy, racism, anthropocentrism, etc.), it needs to consider and act from an intersectional standpoint (Maina-Okori, Koushik and Wilson, 2018). Intersectionality acknowledges that people experience multiple layered forms of oppression simultaneously and calls for complex and integrated analysis of issues rather than singular angles or perspectives, which problematically single out one specific issue from the rest of the interwoven systemic issues (Crenshaw, 1989). As the term is typically used to shed light on the complexity of people's identity and the resulting experiences of privilege and marginalization, carrying its meaning over in an educational setting means considering the layers of one's identity and how they impact the learning experience, advocating for "an integrated consideration of issues rather than a single-axis or single-issue based analysis" (Crenshaw, 1989, in Maina-Okori, Koushik and Wilson, 2018 p. 288). At the crossroad of anti-oppressive pedagogy and sustainability education, intersectional considerations provide insight on how individuals' and groups' positionality within the larger power structures shape not only their lives, but also their understanding and experience of sustainability (Walsh et al., 2020).

2.2.2. Critical considerations for international education

While focusing on international schools, this paper acknowledges and critically considers the interconnectedness of the globalized world, and the accelerated interaction, movement, and integration of different peoples throughout the past half-century. Particularly, it recognizes the "potentially dangerous tendency toward the romantic versions of everyone's points of views are valid and let us respect each other's viewpoints in intercultural education" (Shim, 2012, p. 210) and leans towards bodies of work which argue that "the goal of intercultural education must be to work against inequality and inhumanity linked to the system of domination and to foreground social justice" (ibid.). Particularly, international education often rests upon and exists in symbiosis with unequal distribution of wealth, opportunities, resources; looking at the work of Gayatri Spivak, Andreotti (2011b) indicates that at the intersection of "class, race, gender and geographical positioning, [past and present colonial and imperialist processes rooted in social practices of epistemic violence] subalternize and exploit the 'Others' of Western humanism" (p. 307). Educational settings, as sites of social and cultural reproduction, come to reflect the dominant social structures, thus favoring specific kinds of knowledge, modes of thought and expression, and [ever so relevant for intercultural education] cultural standards (Shim, 2012).

Hellberg's and Knutsson's (2018) remarks on ESD offer a point for reflection for international education that is oriented towards sustainability. They argue that while the discipline is often spoken of as a "cosmopolitan ethical enterprise" (p. 93), it reinforces the global biopolitical regime that furthers the divide between different populations. More specifically, education is framed differently according to the context in which it takes place in a way that it prepares "different populations for entirely different lives and lifestyles" (ibid.). This problematization deepens the conversation on inequality and how it is perpetuated even in well-meaning actualizations of sustainability education. Relating this to intercultural educational settings that aim to tackle sustainability issues, we can return to Andreotti's (2011b) elaboration of Spivak's work (2008), specifically how the latter author points to the rise of an "international class, with nationalist knowledge bases consisting of transnationally mobile people who think nationally, but operate at an international level imposing what belongs to their class (which, she reminds us, is also your class and mine) upon the whole world" (Andreotti, 2011b, p. 307).

Classrooms are inherently "political sites that represent contestations over knowledge and pedagogy by differently empowered social constituencies mediated by differently empowered individuals" (Shim, 2012, pp. 215-216). Hence, for international education that engages in narratives of cosmopolitanism and global belonging, it is important to consider how the intersection of the geopolitical and class inequalities impacts the making of the learning space, simultaneously navigating the "management of difference and the biopolitics of inequality" (Bylund and Knutsson, 2020, p. 98).

2.2.3. Critical Discourse Analysis

This thesis builds on, and seeks to contribute to, previous CDA-informed studies of education in general and sustainability education in particular. Within the field of educational research, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has been increasingly employed to study the making of meaning in educational contexts (Rogers et al., 2005). Understanding education as an innately partisan practice and experience, researchers employing CDA seek to unpack the production and reproduction of representations of realities, highlighting how these processes are intrinsically shaped by relations of power (Taylor, 2004). This can be done by focusing on how "language as a cultural tool mediates relationships of power and privilege in social interactions, institutions, and bodies of knowledge" (Rogers et al., 2005, p. 367). CDA is thus chosen as a theoretical framework and as research method as it is a tool that aids in highlighting the significance of power structures and relations in shaping representations of the world, whilst also uncovering the potential for progressive social change (Taylor, 2004).

CDA points to language as an expression of ideology and power, being able simultaneously to be both the result and the practice of the production of social processes and structures (Machin and Mayr, 2012). Engaging in research that seeks to address issues of oppression, this study's CDA considers and builds on feminist and post-colonial research (expanded on in the methodology and method section), rejecting neutrality and actively taking a stance (Lazar, 2007). By looking at discourses of sustainability education through the lenses of anti-oppressive pedagogy, this research adopts a critical and post-structural stance. Andreotti (2011a) highlights that "post-structuralism assumes that language is a discursive practice that is ideological and unstable, which implies that interpretations of the world create the world or reality itself" (p. 87). In the context of this research CDA is used to study not only how language interpretations shape reality but also to critically analyze the actual language put forth, in this case by the selected educational organizations.

3. Methodology and Method

The first part of this chapter presents an overview of CDA research in the field of education, which was compiled to draw insight and describe considerations for the choosing of a specific CDA approach adopted in this study. The approach is then laid out in the second part of this chapter. The third part presents a brief overview of the selected educational institutions and the materials that are analyzed in the study.

3.1. Methodology

In line with Fairclough's work (2003), Critical Discourse Analysis is chosen to explore what narratives of sustainability the selected organizations produce and reproduce and to what extent and in what ways anti-oppressive language is part of these narratives.

Looking closely at three decades worth of CDA being employed within the larger field of educational research, Rogers et al. (2005; 2016) have collected and coded the ensemble of literature, mapping the characteristics and findings of existing scholarship. In their later study, Rogers et al. highlighted how CDA is more often used in research on higher education compared to studies investigating earlier learning years. Over 80% of the articles that comprised the body of literature of CDA in education research were case studies; and 64% relied on written data sources, for example textbooks, curricula, policy documents, or syllabi. It is also worth noting that a so called 'socio-political' focus was included in almost half of the total scholarship employing CDA, investigating cultural and linguistic diversity within the learning environment in relation to local or national worldview systems. More specifically:

> "[A]rticles that focused on racism comprised 11% of the database. The categories of democracy and citizenship, disability, and sexualities and gender all had fewer than 10% of the articles. […] The majoring of articles in the area of democracy were published in 2010 or later, reflecting a more recent area of concern. Researchers' interest in neoliberalism spiked in 2008, more than tripling in articles published the year prior. This area has remained strong with 21% of all articles in this area published in 2012" (Rogers et., 2016, p. 1199).

This macro analysis of the uses of CDA in educational research provides valuable insights on trends within the larger field. Now, looking more closely at specific studies that have conducted similar research to the one in this paper, how has CDA been used to investigate discourses at the intersection of anti-oppressive pedagogies and sustainability education?

Taylor (2004) illustrates the use of CDA for the analysis of three education policy documents of the state of Queensland in Australia, with the aim of looking closely at the genres and discourses of equity issues within extracts of the selected texts. Following Fairclough's CDA framework, Taylor considered both the social and the semiotic aspects of the policies, acknowledging "how the semiotic, including linguistic, properties of a text connect with what is going on socially in the interaction" (Fairclough, 2001, p. 240, in Taylor, 2004, p. 437). To shed light on the construction of the policy text and their entanglement with power relations and ideology, the author examines the following aspects of the selected texts: whole text organization, clause combination, grammatical and semantic features, and words (e.g., vocabulary, metaphors, etc.) (Taylor, 2004). A significant feature in Taylor's study is how three policy documents from a genre chain were selected to identify discursive shifts from the original policy text to the implementation guidelines.

Galloway et al. (2019) research teachers' sense-making of culturally responsive, antiracist, and anti-oppressive pedagogy. Methodologically, this study explores coded transcripts of semi-structured

interviews, rather than policy printed material—as in the case of Taylor (2004). Educators from three different high schools with different demographics were interviewed on themes such as 'the educator's role', 'perception and school culture related to issues of equity', and 'the educators' understanding and praxis of culturally responsive, antiracist, and anti-oppressive pedagogy' (Galloway et al., 2019). Interviews' transcripts were reviewed by the research team and key concepts (specific terms or phrases) were mapped with the intention to illustrate the participants' understanding of theories and practices from the above-mentioned pedagogies. Patterns and connections were pinpointed, and the overarching result was that participants did tend to use different language depending on whether they were asked to talk about culturally responsive or antiracist pedagogy and praxis (ibid.). The work from Galloway et al., provides insight in conducting research that specifically analyzes language choices to make sense of learning spaces and the framing of culturally responsive, antiracist, and anti-oppressive education in the selected institutions.

Another recent study that investigates the discourse of politics, identity, and race in an educational context was carried out by Sugrue (2019). This research—although focusing on the role of parents as consumers and funders of education in influencing policies and practices—provides an example of conducting CDA on a rather short-text source. In particular, Sugrue analyzed a specific online petition that was initiated by a group of parents of an elementary school. They opposed an initiative that had the school partnering with a non-profit organization that would bring in an educator who would facilitate recess-time with inclusive and accessible activities. The text in question was only 318 words, and to better grasp the context of the petition Sugrue familiarized themselves with local news articles that broadcasted these happenings, a parent's blogposts, and parents' testimonials from a school board meeting. Using Gee's (2014) seven building tasks through which language choices construct reality, Sugrue coded words and phrases to shed light on how the authors of the petition "engage[d] in political and identity tasks that assert and reinforce their race- and class-based status and power" (2019, p. 231).

In terms of global narratives, which are very much intrinsic of international schools, Andreotti (2011a) conducted five *colonial* discourse analyses on educational policies and practices that put forth specific framings of the global South. Drawing from post-structuralism and post-colonial theory, colonial discourse analysis is employed to "examine processes of knowledge production and their role in the creation and perpetuation of (neo)colonial violences and inequalities" (ibid., p. 85). It challenges the neutrality of academia and the relevance of its role in constructing "stereotypes, images, and knowledge of colonial subjects and cultures" (ibid., p. 86), which in turn support the institutionalization and legitimization of systems of oppression (Loomba, 2015). In the first part of her analysis, Andreotti studied the policy that framed the teaching of "global dimensions" in England, integrated into the national curriculum of the time, by looking into how the themes of culture and development-poverty were approached:

> "Both the approach to culture and the approach to poverty and development reproduce Enlightenment humanist tendencies, including narratives of a linear theological collective history, of a common humanity (who mirror the Western subject), and of a seamless narrative of progress. Underlying its pedagogical project, is an assumption that there is only one version of reality that is considered "knowledge", which should be pursued by (Cartesian) knowledge producers who are unmarked by culture. Therefore, from a postcolonial lens, both discourses identified, despite claims to challenge Eurocentrism, still operate within Eurocentric hegemonic epistemologies" (2011a, p. 101).

Andreotti's second part of the analysis examined an international strategy paper from the UK's Department of Education and Skills. Here the focus revolved around the neoliberal framing of the policy. In the document, the notion of a "world community" is accompanied by the universalization of one single angle of reality that then becomes the universal frame of reference, one single worldview that relies on a neoliberal take on modernity, pushing for capitalism, advancement, and

development as the dominant paradigm for the whole "world community" (Andreotti, 2011a).

The literature presented in this section paints a complex picture of the adoption of CDA in research adjacent to the scope of this project. Including governmental policy documents, a parents' online petition, constructed textbook material, and transcript of interviews with educational practitioners, discourse analysis has been employed to assess how different stakeholders in the making of the educational experience, shape the understanding of reality. It is important to note that the above-presented research was only conducted in three global North, English-speaking countries (Australia, United States, and United Kingdom). The research differed in terms of schoolyears and the type of material being analyzed, with diverse angles on CDA and discourses in education. Nevertheless, this brief overview highlights the relevance of the specific meaning of language choices and the consequent implications for the reader's sense-making (Galloway et al., 2019; Cachelin and Ruddel, 2013; Cachelin, Rose and Paisely, 2015), as well as the lack of anti-oppressive narratives, hand in hand with the reinforcing of racist and colonial framings in educational policy, has been highlighted (Sugrue, 2019; Andreotti, 2011a).

I chose to look more closely at the Sugrue's and Andreotti's works to gather an even deeper grasp of CDA that is relevant for anti-oppressive discourses. In their work, Sugrue (2019) used Gee's (2014) analytical framework of Critical Discourse Analysis, situating it within the conceptual framework of Critical Race Theory. To better situate the text in the surrounding context that (in)avertedly shaped the language choices, the author read and watched other publicly available material that related to the online petition—the document serving as basis for the CDA—such as newspaper articles, blog posts, and testimonies (Sugrue, 2019); after reading the petition several times, Sugrue "began to note words or phrases that reflected any of Gee's (2014) seven building tasks (significance, practices, identities, relationships, politics, connections, and sign systems)" and then "applied Gee's (2014) 'tools of inquiry and discourse,' including situated meanings, figured worlds, and conversations, to further explore what the building tasks were accomplishing in the petition" (Sugrue, 2019, pp. 227-228). In other words, Sugrue first sought to understand the context of the online petition, and then conducted the analysis following Gee's framework, and concluded by sharing their analysis with colleagues as a way to check their interpretations and application of theory and methodology.

Andreotti (2011a) carried out *colonial* discourse analysis on the selected materials, in line with post-structuralist thought that language and discourse are unstable, and that systemic structures are in place to "control and delimit both the mode and the means of representation in a given society" (Gandhi, 1998, p. 77). Andreotti (2011a) provides descriptions for the selected documents, before proceeding to conduct the content research, focusing the discourse analysis beyond the classic semantic examination, highlighting the ideological nature and implications of the text. Andreotti also points to how researchers cannot separate themselves from their experiences and thus how they are not able to eliminate their biases. It is then of the utmost importance, when delving into discourse analysis, to challenge personal assumptions of reality, to be able to maintain a critical outlook on how meaning production is affected by power structures, and thus not limit the ground for other modes of signification to come through (Foucault, 1980). Andreotti (2011a) does so by acknowledging the situatedness of her interpretations in her social, cultural, and historical contexts, as well as her lived experiences, pointing out that all of these factors create a unique set of lenses from which the author looks out on theories, methodologies, and their research subjects; any other individual, would have their own unique set of lenses, thus producing very different interpretations. Addressing this, Andreotti invites "readers to produce their own interpretations and 'disagree' with me and one another, in support of Mouffe's (2005) and Todd's (2009) call for a lively contestatory radical democracy" (Andreotti, 2011a, p. 89).

Taking inspiration from the works of both Sugrue (2019) and Andreotti (2011a), CDA is here adopted also acknowledging the remarks from Rogers et al. (2005). They argued that for CDA not to seclude itself epistemologically within Euro-American traditions and thus continue to "silence and oppress

historically marginalized groups of people" (ibid., p. 385), researchers using CDA as theory and method need to "attend to the following: (a) the links between the micro and the macro [levels of analysis]; (b) explaining why certain linguistic resources are analyzed and not others, and provide (c) clear analytic procedures outlining the decision making of the researcher" (ibid., p. 387).

3.2. Method

This study focuses on critical theory in the form of anti-oppressive pedagogy, with the anti-oppressive framework to include oppression across colonial impositions, including oppression related to, but not limited to, race, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic background, faith, nationality, age, ability and health, and other identities. In doing so, it is significant to note, in line with Rogers et al. (2016), how the dominant mainstream traditions of CDA scholarships are based on the works of Fairclough, Gee, and Luke—representing Europe, North America, and Australia respectively—, and how this cluster of research "reflects the hegemony of a small group of people who have influenced CDA in education research, which could result in a narrowing of perspectives and approaches" (Rogers et al., 2016, p. 1217). Contemporarily, considering the larger field of sociolinguistics, Milani and Lazar (2017) point to a "structural asymmetry in the geopolitics of knowledge" (p. 308).

For this reason, while naturally acknowledging (and still resting on) the remarkable work of Fairclough, Gee, and Luke, this research attempts to engage beyond the mentioned predominant CDA frameworks, and to follow an approach that fits more closely with the anti-oppressive lens that this research seeks to employ. After consulting works from Jan Blommaert, Carmen Caldas-Coulhardt, and Michelle Lazar, all of which provide further considerations of discourse analysis in relation to either globalization, Global South-Global North trajectories, or gender, this research seeks to be inspired predominantly by the latter—as Lazar's work with CDA actively considers all three aspects— and to then frame CDA in relation to Kumashiro's (2002) conceptualization of anti-oppressive pedagogy.

In more practical terms, I choose to conduct CDA broadly following the steps indicated by Mullet (2018), while simultaneously and actively considering Lazar's and Kumashiro's works—accounting for the complexity of various forms of marginalization and acknowledging existing power structures and systems of oppression. Firstly, I choose to focus on the sustainability discourses of the selected educational organization to investigate their relationships to anti-oppressive pedagogy, and I then gathered materials to use for the CDA from the selected institutions' websites.

The overarching content of the website was explored, as to have a better understanding of the context surrounding the analyzed material. In terms of the actual analysis, I identified themes in the text, both deductively—from the theoretical and conceptual lenses of this paper (theoretical codes)—and inductively—reflecting on overarching topics and messages stemming from the text (open codes) (Thornberg and Charmaz, 2014). Overarching themes were considered first-order codes, and different themes which related to a larger umbrella theme were considered sub-codes; for example, anti-oppressive pedagogy approaches are considered a first order code and the four conceptualizations of anti-oppressive pedagogy by Kumashiro (2002) are considered sub-codes.

I then analyzed the text with regards to external factors (e.g., social relations) that might have shaped the production of the text (Mullet for example highlights the questions "how do social practices inform the arguments in the text?" and "how does the text in turn influence social practices?" (2018, p. 122). Next was the analysis of the internal factors of the text, for example how the language might indicate the aims of the text, social representations, and the speaker's positionality (ibid.).

Finally, I interpreted the data, in relation to the theoretical and conceptual framework of this research and the relevant literature. For a detailed look into the coded portions of the materials, the coding tables are available in the appendix section of this thesis.

Throughout the research process, I considered what Mullet (2018) describes as "guidelines for evaluating qualitative rigor in critical discourse analysis research" (p. 121). Specifically, this research sought to account for reflexivity and subjectivity to offer transparency of the authors own positionality and biases (Morrow, 2005, in Mullet, 2018) and consequential validity to contribute with this research to social change (Patton, 2002, in Mullet, 2018) by amplifying narratives of anti-oppressive pedagogies, and considered the guidelines for adequacy of data (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, in Mullet 2018) and adequacy of interpretation (Morrow, 2005, in Mullet, 2018).

3.3. Selected Educational Organizations

This section introduces the selected educational organizations that are the object of this research. The organizations were chosen based on their educational models and ethoses related to sustainability education. (1) Green School and its "'living' curriculum [that] educates for sustainability through community-integrated, entrepreneurial learning, in a natural environment" (Green School International, 2020a) seemingly focusing on the embeddedness of humans and communities in the larger ecological systems. (2) UWC strives to make "education a force to unite people, nations and cultures for peace and a sustainable future" (UWC, 2017a) seeking to foster human-to-human connections beyond diversity and within the acknowledged frame of planetary boundaries. (3) Lastly, Amala Education "has developed the first international high school curriculum for young people who are displaced" (Amala, 2019a), tackling a specific set of issues moving beyond the ecological conception of sustainability, and addressing society-rooted issues.

3.3.1. Green School

Green School International presents itself as an educational movement that offers a holistic view of education for sustainability, centering on the nurturing and thriving of every learner, the ever-changing planet, and their interconnectedness. The first school was open in Bali in 2006, and since then three other institutions have come to be (New Zealand, South Africa, and Mexico). The school includes programs from pre-k to high school, which upon completion awards its own Green School Diploma.

3.3.2. UWC (United World Colleges)

UWC is a global education movement, started in 1962 with the founding of UWC Atlantic College in Wales by educator Kurt Hahn, and is today a network of 18 schools spread across four continents, and national committees in more than 150 countries, which domestically select students for the different schools based on their promise and potential. Students receive need-based financial aid, making it possible to attend UWC, regardless of their socio-economic background. Most schools only have grade 11-12, and all have the International Baccalaureate Diploma as their formal curriculum. Beyond the classroom, the UWC experience includes residential life and community building with roommates and housemates from all over the world, experiential learning, outdoor activities, and social service.

3.3.3. Amala Education

Started in 2016, Amala Education seeks to tackle the lack of quality education opportunities for young refugees by offering the Amala High School Diploma. The programme centers around innovation and problem-solving and aims to provide its students with concrete skills, opportunities, and pathways to make a positive impact in their communities.

3.4. Materials

The materials selected for the Critical Discourse Analysis are introduced in this section. For the purpose of this study, documents were obtained from the organizations' websites. Given the language and discourse focus of this research, it seemed significant to work with documents and texts that are publicly available, as to focus on how the organizations present their narratives to the external world. To better understand the contexts from which the texts are developed, I also sought to familiarize myself with each educational program, looking at the larger website content. I chose the materials listed below in Table 1 because of the informational nature of their content, specifically in terms of providing an overview of the organizations' principles, educational model, curricula, strategy and—specifically in the case of UWC (which was the only one of the three organizations to include it in its website)—action linked to unfolding events that reinforce the urgency for anti-oppressive education.

The material analyzed from Green School is a combination of texts from the school's webpages and documents, also available through the website, which detailed the educational model and the curriculum. All but three portions of analyzed text are available (at the moment of this writing process) on the Green School Bali website; the *Green School Principles* and *What is the Green School curriculum?* and *Investing in the biocentric child* materials are available (at the moment of this writing process) on the Green School International website. The Green School Bali website has two language options, English and Bahasa Indonesian; the material for the analysis was found only on the English portion of the website (and two pieces from the Green School International website), due to my language knowledge being limited. Nevertheless, I did scout around the Bahasa Indonesian portion of the site to see if the two would simply mirror each other's content in the two different languages, but the English portion of the website appeared much more expanded content-wise than the Bahasa Indonesian.

For UWC, the material the material analyzed is comprised of two policy documents, the *UWC Educational Model* and the *UWC Strategy 2018 and Beyond,* plus four texts from the UWC website. The first one is a letter published in June 2020 and signed by the Chair of the UWC International Board, the Chair of the UWC International Council, and the Executive Director of UWC International in response to the killing of George Floyd by Derek Chauvin from the Minneapolis police. The second is a written conversation between two students at Waterford Kamhlaba UWC of Southern Africa and the head of UWC Isak Japan (two of the eighteen UWC schools) on the issues of racism globally and at UWC, and the efforts to tackle those. The last two are entries from the UWC website that call for application and then introduce the newly formed Anti-Racism, Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Steering Group and its members. In addition, for context on the International Baccalaureate, which is the formal diploma taught at UWC schools, the *International Baccalaureate Curriculum* webpage was consulted. At the moment of this writing process, all materials are available on the UWC and the International Baccalaureate websites.

Lastly, the material analyzed from Amala Education was also retrieved from the organization's

website (available at the time of this writing). It includes several webpages with information on their educational programmes and curriculum, as well as their 2020 impact report and a brochure illustrating their educational model and ethos. It is worth noting that Amala Education had less content available on their website compared to the other two organizations, perhaps due to it being a rather young organization and their high school diploma having run for the first time in 2020.

Green School	Green School Bali. (2016). *Learning program.* Green School Bali. (2018). *Green School skills.* Green School Bali. (2019a). *Curriculum overview: high school.* Green School Bali. (2019b). *Become a Green School student.* Green School Bali. (n.d. a). *Green School ambitions.* Green School Bali. (n.d. b). *Literacy Curriculum overview.* Green School International. (2018). *What is the Green School curriculum?* Green School International. (2020). *Investing in the biocentric child.* Green School International. (n.d.). *Green School Principles.*
UWC	UWC. (2017b). *UWC Strategy 2018 and beyond.* UWC. (2019). *UWC Educational Model*. UWC. (2020a). *A letter to the UWC Community.* UWC. (2020b). *Open Call for Membership to the UWC Anti-Racisms Diversity, Equity and inclusion Steering Group*. UWC. (2021a). *A Cross-UWC Conversation on Anti-Racism, Diversity, Equity and Inclusion.* UWC. (2021b). *Meet the members of the UWC Anti-Racism, Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Steering Group International Baccalaureate Curriculum.* International Baccalaureate. (n.d). *DP Curriculum*.
Amala	Amala. (2019). *Our Learning*. Amala. (2020). Our *Programmes*. Amala. (2021). *The Amala High School Diploma.* Amala. (n.d. a). *Education brochure*. Amala. (n.d. b). *Our impact 2020*.

Table 1: Overview of documents and texts for each educational organization.

3.5. Methodological Reflexivity

My personal experiences with United World Colleges (UWC) as alumnx, short course facilitator, and national committee member is taken in consideration as a potential factor shaping the understanding and interpretation of the narratives of said organization. Naturally, my experiences with privilege, race, class, identity, power (including their manifestations in the UWC contexts I have engaged in) have informed my interest on the subject of sustainability education and anti-oppressive pedagogy. Nevertheless, as the point of this analysis is not a value-judgement, nor a comparison, nor a ranking, but a study to engage and contribute to the conversation of sustainability education and anti-oppressive pedagogy, the research itself does not relate to my experience, and seeks to be rooted in the theoretical and conceptual framework described, and the publicly available material that was chosen for the Critical Discourse Analysis.

4. Results and analysis

This chapter presents the findings of this research project, specifically the prominent themes of the documents, the texts' situatedness in distinct social structures and practices, the specific language characteristics, and their overarching interpretation.

4.1. Discourses of Sustainability Education

From the analysis of the selected material, the three educational organizations represent their stances of sustainability and sustainability education as follows.

With regards to the organization's conception of sustainability, several themes surfaced throughout the analyzed texts from Green School. The selected texts include framings that point to their sustainability education being represented as *learner-centered* ("designing learning with the child at the centre", "we can increase wellbeing and reduce fear" (Green School International, 2018)), *exploratory and action oriented* ("Green School prioritizes interconnected experiences driven by real-world needs and the prospect of a sustainable future" (Green School International, n. d.)), *fostering empowerment and transformation* ("Green School anticipates and adapts to the evolving needs of learners, their environment, and community; change happens in a sustainable way" (ibid.)), and *related to locality* ("Green School thinks globally but acts locally first; we immerse learning in our immediate surroundings, culture and community" (ibid.)). These themes go hand in hand with the conceptualization of sustainability through ESD lenses, as constructed by UNESCO. And just as multilateral ESD, the analyzed texts lack a critical take on the neoliberal system in which they are nested, and on the power structures that uphold biopolitical differentiation and inequalities.

Other themes that transpired from the analysis of the Green School materials were narratives of sustainability education in relation to *community*, *interconnectedness,* and *biocentrism*. *Community* and *interconnectedness* are at times mentioned directly and at times hinted to, appearing as overarching concepts throughout the texts. Looking closely at how they are framed, for instance in the section of text that follows

> "We have a strong sense of community and our connection to the earth. As we understand environmental challenges, we strive to use systems thinking, sustainable solutions, ecology, and technology to model a better future" (Green School Bali, n.d. a)

it seems as if such terms are used mostly in terms of human-nature relationships, and not so much in terms of human-human ones. This narrative of human-nature relationships, where the human species is embedded in the natural systems, is significant, as it counterposes the utilitarian discourse that sees nature as submissive to the dominant human species and valued in terms of the services it can provide to humans. Green School expands on this humans-embedded-in-nature narrative with portions of text that clearly call for *biocentrism,* for example saying that the organization "believe[s] in nurturing biocentric ethics, which calls for a rethinking of the relationship between humans and nature" (Green School International, 2020b) and that it strives to

> "Facilitat[e] the conscious re-thinking of what it means to be human and nature, and integrating the two, open[ing] effective learning spaces for children where they can grow their love for nature and nurture themselves at the same time." (ibid.)

Across the board, these texts highlight the earth-centric sustainability take of the organization. On the other hand, the lack of references to systemic social issues, which are equally essential to relevant sustainability education, is evident, leaving us to reflect on the shortcomings of a discourse that

considers the human species as one single entity embedded in nature, without first addressing the socio-economic tensions arising from centuries of oppressions of marginalized groups of people. This ties back to the work of Bylund and Knutsson (2020) and calls for the problematization of the differentiation of sustainability educations and their beneficiaries. In this case, the question that arises is whether this specific biocentric sustainability education is catered to a very narrow subset of privileged humans.

While wondering for whom this Green School sustainability education is framed, the words employed to refer to the students in the selected material becomes relevant. In several portions of the text, students are addressed as "children". While this is somewhat understandable in the context of a learning experience that starts at and includes the pre-k years, language such as "the world our children will inherit […]" and "for our children to prosper and humankind to inherit […]" (Green School Bali, 2016) points out to the fact that the intended audience of the material is the parents—and once more, all parents?—, rather than the students themselves, even for the older-years programs. The second quote also illustrates some word choices—in this case *prosper*, in other passages *nurture, balance, wellbeing, human experience, purpose,* and *holistic* as some examples—which result in an overarching soft tone and mellow narrative of sustainability, compared for example to other takes that call for urgency, environmental and social crises, inequality issues, etc. This choice of words seems in line with the overarching idealistic and idyllic sustainability scenery painted in the selected texts which, as mentioned, does not seem to address the inherently unequal, marginalizing, and oppressive systems on which current mainstream sustainability discourses rest.

Lastly, in its exposition of its education ethos, Green School's Curriculum Overview offers a poignant metaphor indicating education as "lighting a fire", thus framing their educational experience as a catalyst for continued and perpetual learning.

> "Our perspective on education […] is that we are not filling a bucket, but rather lighting a fire. We cannot possibly teach everything that there is to be learned. Thus, we endeavor to teach students to "learn how to learn" by giving them the skills to do so. Most importantly, we aim to instill in our students a love of learning as a passionate pursuit in and of itself" (Green School Bali, 2019).

Beyond the evocative picture, this passage explicitly highlights this intended characteristic of the conceptualization of the Green School education, one that is relevant for sustainability education and anti-oppressive pedagogy: impactful education is not just about learning a specific set of prescribed knowledge, on the contrary, it needs to address the very nature of the learning practice itself. Nevertheless, in highlighting the significance of this meta-level level of analysis, the selected text does not bring up consideration of learners' and teachers' positionality and their situatedness, both of which significantly shape the learning experience.

From the analysis of UWC's materials, several themes emerged with regards to their takes on sustainability. Already at a first glance, the organization appears vocal in calling for "sustainability as a core theme in UWC educational programmes" (UWC, 2017b) with plans to "motivate[e] all UWC schools to develop and implement individual plans that embed sustainability in their education and their actions" (ibid.). Furthermore, in conceptualizing sustainability, UWC's strategy directly points to the need to "understand sustainability to include environmental, economic and social sustainability" (ibid.). This short passage is a rather significant one, as it points to UWC's understanding of sustainability as a complex and interdisciplinary practice that requires different angles of consideration and practice.

With regards to the making of sustainability education at UWC, from the analyzed text, the following framings surface: sustainability education at UWC is *learner-centered* ("this education enshrines a commitment to the balanced development of the whole person" (UWC, 2019)), *exploratory and*

action oriented ("UWC provides a safe and supportive environment from which to learn through direct experience" (UWC, 2019)), fostering *empowerment and transformation* ("a UWC experience acts as a catalyst for people both individually and collectively to work towards a more peaceful, just and sustainable world" (UWC, 2017b)). Building the educational model on the movement and encounter of different peoples, UWC recognizes that it rests on the impact and environmental consequences of such model, and "endeavors to compensate for them as best as we can" (UWC, 2017b). From the analyzed material, while "sustainable futures" are part of the UWC mission, there does not seem to be any elaboration on how the organization depicts nature and the relation between humans and the environmental system.

Similarly to Green School, UWC's themes are closely related to the institutionalized ESD narrative. While the material analyzed does not seem to problematize the embeddedness of the organization in the larger neoliberal system and its impact on how sustainability and sustainability education are then conceptualized, at the same time it does condemn and it does bring to the center of the conversations issues of inequality and systemic power structures.

While sustainability is still included in the educational model and curriculum, Amala's making of [sustainability] education has a different entry point than the ecological sphere of environmental issues. The themes that transpire from the analysis are the making of education that is *learner-centered* ("we provide education that creates positive change in the lives of learners today, and opens up opportunities for the future" (Amala, 2019b)), *exploratory and action oriented* ("Each course involves learners actively applying their learning within their communities to create positive change" (Amala, n.d. a)), *fostering empowerment and transformation* ("we use transformative education to create opportunities and inspire positive change in the lives of refugees" (ibid.)) and *related to locality* ("[the programme] is designed to enable students to thrive in higher education, work and entrepreneurship, and to make positive change in their own lives and in their communities"(ibid.)).

As with the other two organizations, this framing of sustainability education relates to the conceptualization of the ESD mainstream UNESCO narrative. The text in the selected materials did not present critical elaborations neither on power structures, nor on the neoliberal system. Amala's education specifically targets a marginalized population, that of young refugees. Considering global trends of biopolitical differentiation, the organization attempts to bridge an opportunity gap in terms of access to education and personal development opportunities. While potentially falling in the trap of attempting to replicate Global North frameworks of education, thus reproducing the hegemonic social and cultural structures (as indicated by Shim, 2012), Amala seems to situate their learning in the lived experience of the students and their communities (Amala, 2019b).

Other themes that surfaced from the analysis of the material are *community* and *agency.* The first one relates to transformation potential and changemaking, with the idea of having students who complete the program apply what they learn into work and projects that tackle issues and benefit themselves and their communities. The latter is set at the center of Amala's learning model, framed against the ongoing entangled uncertainty: "in a world in which the future for our students is increasingly uncertain, the development of agency is key to enabling learners to embrace challenges and create and access opportunities" (Amala, n.d. a). The concept is also included in the organization's vision for:

> "a world in which refugees have the opportunity to build a future they can value. For this reason, agency for positive change is at the heart of our learning model. To develop agency, we focus on developing three key competencies which are crucial for our learners to thrive: the ability to create new value, take responsibility and manage complexity" (Amala, 2019b).

Uncertainty and complexity are core concepts of sustainability, especially in relation to sustainability issues being wicked problems. On one hand Amala education appears, as framed by the language of the selected material, to address sustainability head on. On the other, at least on paper, it lacks the problematization of the exploitative systems (to both nature and human lives) that cause these sustainability issues and concomitantly the displacement of marginalized peoples.

A summary of the results and analysis for the discourses of sustainability education is presented in Table 2.

Green School	• In line with ESD conceptualization • Lack of critical take on neoliberal system and power structures • Themes: community, interconnectedness, biocentrism • Earth-centric narrative • Lack of references to systemic social issues • Catering sustainability education to a narrow subset of privileged humans?
UWC	• Calling for sustainability to be a core theme for its educational programmes • In line with ESD • No mention to human-nature relationships • Does not problematize embeddedness in neoliberal system • Condemns injustices and inequality but not hand in hand with sustainability
Amala	• Also in line with ESD • Themes: community, agency • Refers to uncertainty and complexity • Mentions situated learning in student’s experiences • No critical considerations of power structures nor the neoliberal system

Table 2: Overview of results and analysis of discourses of sustainability education.

4.2. Discourses of Anti-oppressive Pedagogy

From the analysis of the selected material, the three educational organizations embed anti-oppressive pedagogy language in their education as follows.

With regards to discourses of anti-oppressive pedagogy, the analysis of the selected material from Green School shows several indications of the framing of diversity along the lines of *education about the other* (Kumashiro, 2000). One example is the following passage:

> "Students study literacy to enable them to act with purpose in the world. When a person has the ability to communicate well for a wide range of purposes and to understand self through writing it allows them to develop empathy and interact across spectrums of people from different socio-economic, age, gender, and cultural backgrounds." (Green School Bali, n. d. b).

In this portion of text and in other sections that could be loosely linked to language and themes of anti-oppressive pedagogy, no critical stance is taken, and no reference is made to systematic issues of oppression, and the processes of privileging and othering. Diversity is referred to, as are some of the layers that make up people's identity, but in this wording, it appears as something external, something a student is learning about others, and not about themselves and how they are part of the system that oppresses certain identities and privileges others.

Another conceptualization that surfaced from the larger collection of texts is a narrative of care and respect as guiding pillars of the educational experience as a practice of freedom (see hooks, 1994). On the other hand, there seemed to be no references to power structures and their problematization, neither in the addressing the role of educators and the hierarchies inherent to the organization, nor questions of positionality addressing the layered dynamics of marginalization and privilege.

Returning to the question of who is this education envisioned for, a practical consideration to address is school admission, and specifically the monetary aspect of this educational experience. The following text from the school's admission information page reports the tuition fees for the Green School programs:

> "Total tuition and fees range from 167,000,000 IDR (about $12,000 USD) for our youngest students to 333,000,000 IDR (about $24,000 USD) for our High School seniors. We require a commitment of at least one school year (two semesters) for students aged 6 and above. Single-semester admission is only possible in our Early Years Programme (3–5-year-old), when space is available. Early Years students may enter school throughout the calendar year, though payment for a full semester is required (tuition is not pro-rated)" (Green School Bali, 2019b)

Beyond the above-mentioned private school general admission and tuition price tag, Green School offers a limited number—around 40+ within the larger 515-headcount student body (Green School Bali, 2017a)—of scholarships for local students. I searched for more information on this scholarship program, but in the English portion of the website it was only briefly mentioned under the information for donors, which includes language that encourages philanthropists to sponsor Balinese students in their studies at Green School, to empower them to contribute to the sustainability work of their community and country (Green School Bali, 2017b). While I did use a translation tool to search the Bahasa Indonesian portion of the website to see if more information could be found, my search was inconclusive. The following text was available on the information for donors website:

> "Applicant families are invited to share their expectations and final selections are based on financial need, alignment of expectations as well as academic and social and emotional assessment. We have a preference for families who live locally, within the villages surrounding

> the School but any Indonesian child is eligible to apply" (Green School Bali, 2017b).

The passage does not clarify the application process and scholarship scheme, but it reinforces the earlier mentioned narratives of community and locality. Speaking of scholarships, in 2021 Green School Bali has launched the Young Green Leaders Award, for youth making a change through innovative solutions to sustainability issues that contribute to the work of any of the United Nations' Sustainable Development Goals. Among the prizes awarded, there are two one-year scholarships to Green School Bali, for an Indonesian and an international student each (Green School Bali, 2021). Here we can once more note the alignment of Green School's sustainability discourse with the multilateral narrative of the United Nations, and simultaneously, the framing of this educational experience as unique yet hardly accessible.

Noting the difference in the content of the website in the two languages, as well as the admission policy and fees, is relevant as I continue the analysis of the materials, and specifically their relationship with external social systems. Across the documents selected, the tone of the text points to a family-focus, specifically catering to wealthy Western families as audience for what Green School has to offer. This analysis becomes evident in passages of text that address the school community as "wonderfully diverse […]. Our cosmopolitan world-travelers live and learn alongside local families allowing for opportunities to expand horizons and open hearts and minds" (Green School Bali, 2019b) even suggesting that some families have parents taking sabbatical time from work to "focus reconnecting with each other and with nature" (ibid.). In a section that addresses frequently asked questions, the following text is presented:

> **"**Green School families opt for a wide range of lifestyles, from modest homes in local villages to luxury villas with ocean views. […] Bali is generally affordable by western standards […] Modern amenities like western-style grocery stores and shopping malls can be found on the island. However, families often learn to simplify their lives and acclimatize to the locally produced food and warm, humid weather. People who are happiest here tend to let go of their achievement-oriented western expectations and embrace a mindset of gratitude and wonder" (ibid.).

This passage clearly sees Western parents as the consumers of the educational experience (as addressed by Sugrue, 2019). On one hand, it seems a reasonable framework, as this is after all the—somewhat promotional—information in the English section of the website, but on the other, the text still points to a larger question of local versus international framing in the making of sustainability education, and more specifically the *for whom is this sustainability education?* (as problematized by Bylund and Knutsson, 2020), as well the perpetuation of processes of othering (as highlighted by Kumashiro, 2002). Looking at the internal features of the text, some more aspects come to light. The text takes a collective and inviting tone by using "we" as the subject across the board. Yet once more, the question of who is this collective *we*, and more importantly, who does it welcome into the community (either directly in the way it frames inclusivity, but also indirectly in how the learning experience is or is not accessible to different demographics).

Overarchingly, from the analysis of the selected documents, Green School's texts present language that on one hand addresses *education about the other* (Kumashiro, 2000), while on the other it misses more critical and explicit anti-oppressive pedagogy considerations, specifically *education that is critical of privileging and othering* as well as *education that changes students and society* (ibid.). Similarly, it does not seem to account for the complexity of the learners' and teachers' identities and how the interconnectedness of these layers interacts in the making of education.

With regards to UWC's use of language in relationship to anti-oppressive pedagogy, some of the selected texts do bring into focus issues of inequality and systemic power structures. One example is the language of the open letter to the UWC movement that addresses the murder of George Floyd by

Derek Chauvin from the Minneapolis police and the content that spotlights the work that the schools and the larger movement as a whole are carrying out with regards to anti-racism, diversity, equity, and inclusion.

> "We stand in solidarity with millions of Black people who have historically experienced violence and brutality because of their race. We stand in solidarity with all those that live in fear of death, discrimination, dehumanization and abuse just because of their race. We stand in solidarity with communities who every day live in fear as to whether they will return home alive at the end of the day. The world does not have to be this way. We join in solidarity with those advocating for racial justice all over the world. […] We acknowledge that racism in any form is injustice and we have a responsibility to know when we practice or enable injustice. The UWC values call on us to work towards peace and justice for all people" (UWC, 2020a).

While the passage here presented is a clear stance of UWC calling for solidarity and action for racial justice, a deeper look into the analysis shows two somewhat separate layers of framings.

The first one stems from the UWC Educational Model and UWC Strategy 2018 and Beyond documents, the second one from the collated texts on the anti-racism, diversity, equity, and inclusion work. In the first framing, the texts revolve mainly around the theme of diversity, along the lines of *education for the other* (Kumashiro, 2000) with "our national committees enable UWC to reach potential IBDP students, sometimes from the most marginalised groups and backgrounds, to be selected for a UWC education" (UWC, 2017b) and *education about the other* (Kumashiro, 2000), with the UWC experience framed as a fertile ground for encounter, exchange, and connection of young people of different backgrounds:

> "Students are then chosen to join school communities to ensure cultural, racial, gender, socioeconomic, and language diversity in pursuit of a common mission. In this way, each campus reflects a global diversity that enhances connection, sharing, debate, and community living; and thus encourages opportunities for growth, empathy, and understanding. […] This education requires active promotion of intercultural understanding and the development of genuine concern for others founded on shared life experiences, and cooperative and collaborative living. This includes reflective dialogue on global issues and critical and courageous engagement in the pursuit of peace" (UWC, 2019).

The second framing layer, which stems from the more recent website content with which UWC joined the global outcry of spring 2020 addressing systemic racism and police brutality in the US and across the world, includes different language, and more directly addresses systems of inequality and oppression, and the urgency of anti-oppressive practices. The passages that point to this framing layer include language from current students and faculty calling for anti-racism to "become a core and mandatory part of the curriculum and that it's taught at various stages of a UWC education" (UWC, 2021a), and language from the leadership bodies of the movement acknowledging the need for UWC to proactively work against its complicity to this systematic structures of oppression, and that the responsibility for such work should not fall back onto those who are experiencing this oppression, or those who are already working against it.

> "We pledge to create more opportunities for conversations - across the UWC movement and including at UWC schools and colleges, national committees and within the UWC International Board and Council - to help us understand and address our own blind spots that enable racism, while recognizing that it is not in the responsibility of the wounded to take on the burden of educating others. We pledge to critically examine how we can dismantle racial injustice, neo-colonialism, and ongoing manifestations of white supremacy. We will seek to explore the set of transformations necessary to ensure our systems are re-calibrated for a future that is more cohesive, more sustainable, and more just for all." (UWC, 2020a).

Looking at the two layers of framing of anti-oppressive pedagogy, their content, and their function as texts, we notice that the first one appears as more stationary, rigid officially approved-by-the-governing-bodies policy documents that illustrate the way things have been, the way things are, and hopes for the way to be. On the other hand, the second layer seems to be related to a more proactive call for change and education that does tackle ongoing issues of oppression, even within UWC itself, for example with the development of UWC's Anti-Racism, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Steering Group "a group of UWCers that are going to work towards greater representation, access, cross-movement collaboration, trust, and transparency in UWC's diversity, equity, and inclusion work" (UWC, 2020b). A question remains on how the two layers can be bridged and how can the overarching action of the UWC movement lead to impactful anti-oppressive work.

Another point of reflection comes from noting that overarchingly, while including language that addresses sustainability and anti-oppressive pedagogy, the two seem somewhat distant concepts in the discourses of UWC. They are not directly mentioned together, nor in relationship with each other, and this points to somewhat of a shallower take on both fields, as the two are irremediably linked and impact each other. The UWC Strategy 2018 and Beyond document includes a brief mention to the Sustainable Development Goals and the role of education in addressing current challenges our societies face, and that "education needs to shift away from mirroring the very challenges it should be addressing" (UWC, 2017b). The discourse put forth by the second layer of framing of anti-oppressive pedagogy seems to head in this direction, but it still remains a point to be critically considered as UWC continues to exist and shape education, sustainability, and systems of oppression and inequality.

In terms of accessibility, we can consider UWC's admission process and the monetary aspect of attending such institutions. The organization's website that includes information about admission and UWC's scholarship model reports that:

> "Most students in the IBDP years [grade 11 and 12] at UWC are selected through one of UWC's national committees. Representing UWC in over 150 countries and territories, UWC national committees form a global network which seeks and selects students with great potential from around the world, often in the most unlikely places. […] Over 80% of students selected through the UWC national committee system are offered some level of financial assistance, on the basis of each individual's financial needs, which are assessed via a financial assessment. […] Everyone has the right to a quality education, whether they can pay for it or not. That's why we offer one of the most comprehensive scholarship programmes in the world. […] Students at UWC are selected on promise and potential - not on their capacity to pay. […]" (UWC, 2020c).

School fees to attend UWC for the two years IBDP program range from $30,000 to $120,000 depending on school (UWC, 2020c), but as indicated in the passage above, UWC's admission would seem to go hand in hand with a student demonstrated need for financial assistance. Recently, a parallel admission process was created, the UWC Global Selection Programme, for those who wish to forgo financial assistance, or apply to a specific school [usually, when a student applies to a National Committee they can lists schools preferences but it is the Committee that decides to which of the 18 UWC schools to nominate the student, based on spots and scholarships available and the student's profile], highlighting the two different gateways to UWC, which differentiate the entry to the schools based on one's economic capabilities.

From the analysis of the selected material, UWC seems to overarchingly be aware of systematic issues that produce oppression, and it offers educational opportunities that do consider and embrace people's diversity. "Deliberate diversity" and "impact" are key words and concepts across the documents, and so is language that frames unity and movement towards action for a better future. Nevertheless, as it does not altogether address the Western-centric and neoliberal frames that rest on

colonial structures and in which the organization exists, we should continue to pay attention to the actual impact of fostering diversity, and whether different individuals of UWC's diverse student body experience this education differently depending on their experiences and degree of privilege and oppression. Finally, it is important to mention that the formal high school curriculum is the International Baccalaureate Diploma, which is, in its own, subject of critical conversations for reproducing Western and capitalist narratives in its curricula (Gardner-McTaggart, 2014; Hughes, 2009).

With regards to Amala's use of language that points to discourses of anti-oppressive pedagogy, the texts provided few passages, highlighting the framing of *education about the other* (Kumashiro, 2000) with "the Amala diploma programme enable[ing] students to be active, responsible and compassionate problem solvers. It aims to develop creative innovators, who are adept at embracing diversity and ambiguity" (Amala, n.d. a). While seemingly meager, the text still provides meaningful insight into education and skill-building as catalysts for peace and sustainable societies. Simultaneously, while addressing a specific target population, Amala's education does not seem to fall in the trap of branding itself as *education for the other* (Kumashiro, 2000), thus not lumping the students as one rigid group defined by their status as refugees, and leaving room for intersectional takes to their education, acknowledging and honoring the complexity of their identities.

Concerning admission and the monetary cost of Amala's education, all of their learning programs are provided free of charge, and the organization relies on fundraising to ensure that scholarships are available for those who are admitted (Amala, n. d. a). Keeping this in mind, the scope of the texts is likely to be both towards potential applicants and potential donors, which could have then resulted in the limitedness of critical takes and problematization of the systems and structures that reproduce inequality and injustice.

A summary of the results and analysis for the discourses of anti-oppressive pedagogy is presented in Table 3.

Green School	• Education about the other (Kumashiro, 2002) • Diversity presented as an external factor • Lack of problematization to power structures and hierarchies impacting the learning process • Wealthy Western parents as the audience/consumers
UWC	• Brings to focus inequality and systemic oppression • Two differentiated layers of framing • Education for the other and Education about the other (Kumashiro, 2002) in official policy documents • Anti-racism, diversity, equity, and inclusion in text addressing the aftermath of George Floyd murder • How to bridge the two, within a narrative of sustainability?
Amala	• Education about the other (Kumashiro, 2002) • Situated in student experience: intersectional approach • No problematization of systemic oppression, audience applicants and donors?

Table 3: Overview of results and analysis of discourses of anti-oppressive pedagogy.

5. Discussion

This chapter presents the interpretation and contextualization of the results with regards to the earlier research presented in this paper. It then discusses the implications of the results, as well as the research's limitations, and further questions that this work has raised.

The aim of this study was to investigate the language employed by the selected educational organizations—Green School, UWC, Amala—to depict their narratives of sustainability and examine whether, and if so in what ways, the organizations embed considerations from anti-oppressive pedagogy in said narratives of sustainability education. The choice of actively overlapping sustainability education and anti-oppressive pedagogy in this research stems from recognizing the interconnectedness of the ongoing (and upcoming) ecological and social crises (Martusewicz, Edmundson and Lupinacci, 2021) and the need for education that critically addresses the power structures and systems that allow for the making of such socio-environmental injustices and violence (Misiaszek, 2020). Conducting Critical Discourse Analysis on material available online from the selected educational organization led to the following results.

In the selected material, Green School's represented their stance on sustainability in line with the institutionalized ESD UNESCO's approach, lacking to problematize its embeddedness in neoliberal systems. Green School also presented a biocentric narrative that called for the reimagination of humans-to-nature relationship, but it did so without considering the uneven playing field that excludes marginalized and oppressed groups from this equation. Presenting a rather idealistic and idyllic view of sustainability education, Green School reflects on the meta-level practices of learning but once more, does not consider how one's intersectionality and layering of identity creates unique experiences of oppression and privilege that are core elements in shaping the learning experience. Green School's narrative relates to the anti-oppressive pedagogy approach of *education about the other*, but it lacks references to power structures and the role of one's positionality with regards to the processes of othering and privileging, and their impact on education. Finally, as a private international school, it reinforces the divide of "what kind of sustainability education is accessible to whom", as it caters for the most part to wealthy Western families as consumers of their education.

UWC's stance on sustainability also appears in line with the multilateral ESD framework, and while it does mention issues of systemic oppression, it does not bridge it in its discourse of sustainability. In the selected documents, UWC presents two layers of narratives, a more stationary one in the official policy and strategy documents, and a more critical and vocal one in the material that revolved around anti-racism, diversity, equity, and inclusion work. Their educational model is built on "deliberate diversity" and "impact", linking *education for the other* and *education about the other*. But even so, in the selected material UWC, does not seem to elaborate on how people's diversity can lead to very different educational experiences on the basis of their background and privilege. Lastly, while considering its admission process and scholarship scheme, while more accessible than other private institutions, it still remains a rather unique and privileging education.

Amala's stance on sustainability revolves around community and a sense of agency and empowerment, situating the learning experience in the learner's lived experience rather than in a blatant reproduction of Global North frameworks of education. Yet, once more, no problematization of the neoliberal system, and its impact on the making of sustainability education, is presented. Building on a narrative of uncertain and complex presents and futures, Amala's materials relate to the approach of *education about the other*, and while Amala does target a specific marginalized group, it does not frame its educational offer entirely on this one layer of students' identities, leaving room for a parallel intersectional approach.

Returning to the earlier research presented in this paper, we can see how these results relate to the larger field of sustainability education. The discourses of the presented educational organization

appear to have the same shortcomings as EE and ESD, being still largely ambiguous and not directly addressing the urgency of centering sustainability education in anti-oppressive pedagogy. UWC does call for anti-racist work and work to foster diversity, equity, and inclusion, but it is yet to see whether and how that can permeate the different levels of education and operation within the movement. On the other hand, Green School and Amala seem, to a certain degree, to go along with inequality as the set reality (as discussed by Knutsson, 2020). Specifically, this becomes quite evident with Green School's lack of problematization of systemic structures of oppression while catering to a very specific group of privileged people, and Amala's addressing the gap of educational opportunities for displaced youth, but not framing their education to directly challenge the very same systems that cause said gap and the youth displacement in the first place.

Overarchingly, these results highlight the neoliberal constraints onto sustainability education (also researched by Cachelin, Rose and Paisley, 2015), and that despite the efforts of framing sustainability education around key concept such as agency, impact, and transformation, the larger systems in which the educational experience is nested remain an impediment for social change (as indicated by Van Poeck, Vandenabeele and Bruyninckx, 2013 and Bonal and Fontdevila, 2017). Without explicitly problematizing systems of oppressions and embedding sustainability education in active praxis of anti-oppressive pedagogy, the organizations' discourses of sustainability remain weak ones.

The results of the Critical Discourse Analysis and their interpretation in relation to the earlier research in the field, paint a picture of the complexity and the many aspects that are interwoven in the making of sustainability, sustainability education, and their discourses. Generally, the results point to the fact that sustainability education is usually not conceptualized hand in hand with issues of injustice and oppression. Two of the three organizations (Green School and UWC) are private schools that, even with noble efforts to make the world a better place and different degrees of scholarships and accessibility, corroborate the narrative of differentiated learning experiences that in themselves end up privileging specific groups of people, their students, as they pave the road to mainstream higher education and career making, once more indirectly fueling the neoliberal engine. The third one (Amala), as mentioned earlier, while addressing some of the impact and provide educational opportunities to displaced youth, does not explicitly bring such systems of oppression and their problematization at the core of its education. Ultimately, these problematizations should be considered, as they get to the core of sustainability education, what it does and could entail, and what it does and could do in the world, particularly if it were to go hand-in-hand with anti-oppressive pedagogies and sow seeds of transformation jointly across socio-ecological systems.

While reflecting on the contributions of these results, we should consider that even though the three organizations, while being rather different, did point to a similar lack of anti-oppressive pedagogy in their discourses of sustainability, they make up a small percentage of the initiatives and practitioners that seek to address these issues, and they do so with the very specific format of being international private schools. It is also important to keep in mind that the analysis of the three selected organization relied on openly accessible texts, which are a partial selection of the ways in which the organizations can present and shape their discourses. The other half of the coin—the actual practice of education—was not part of this research's investigation. It would be useful to continue to look at these research questions by involving educators, practitioners, and students to be able to dive in the actual processes of educational praxis and impact with regards to sustainability education and anti-oppressive pedagogy at the selected schools. This conversation could also be expanded upon by researching other sustainability-oriented educational organizations with different characteristics, for instance public schools or non-formal educational programs, as to see overarchingly if, and if so how, the different educational experiences produce anti-oppressive sustainability education, in order to better understand the discursive path of the field of sustainability education.

6. Concluding remarks

Adopting CDA to closely look at three international high schools' discourses of sustainability education and their relation to anti-oppressive pedagogy, this research has identified that the selected sustainability oriented educational programs (Green School, UWC, and Amala Education) represent their stance on sustainability education in line with the narrative of mainstream ESD and the UNESCO framework, while lacking to explicitly challenge the systems of oppressions and power structures that frame the ongoing environmental and social challenges. The findings of this research, while being directly related to the three schools that served as unit of analysis, can contribute to further the critical conversation around sustainability education as a whole and its relevance with regards to systematic issues of inequality, exclusion, and discrimination. Further research may conduct similar work with other educational organization, and/or expand on the discourses of Green School, UWC, and Amala Education, unpacking their educational practice as it shapes the discourse of sustainability education. Zooming out, as sustainability and sustainability education set out to contribute to the making of a world in which all present and future natures—and humans within it—can thrive, it should do so by critically assessing its own theories and practices, and how they can contribute to the production and reproduction of discourses of anti-oppressive pedagogy.

7. Acknowledgements

I want to express my most heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor professor Rebecca Adami for the constant support, kind encouragement, and meaningful direction, and to my subject reviewer professor Beniamin Knutsson for the precise guidance and insight. I would also like to thank the people who, close and far, have walked with me this journey, and lastly my one remaining parotid gland, for its grit and resilience, and for still holding on.

8. References

Amala. (2019a). *Education for change*. [online] Available at: <https://amalaeducation.org/> [Accessed 26 February 2021].

Andreotti, V. (2011a). *Actionable postcolonial theory in education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Andreotti, V. (2011b). The political economy of global citizenship education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education.* 9(3-4), pp. 307-310.

Blythe, C. & Harré, N. (2020). Encouraging transformation and action competence: A Theory of Change evaluation of a sustainability leadership program for high school students. *The Journal of Environmental Education,* 51(1), pp. 83-96.

Bonal, X. & Fontdevila, C. (2017). Is Education for Sustainable Development the means to bring about inclusive development? Between idealist and alternative positions. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability,* 24, pp. 73-77.

Bylund, L. & Knutsson, B. (2020). The Who? Didactics, differentiation and the biopolitics of inequality. *Utbildning & Demokrati,* 29(3), pp. 89-108.

Cachelin, A., & Ruddel, E. (2013). Framing for sustainability: the impact of language choice. *J Environ Stud Sci*, 3, pp. 306-315.

Cachelin, A., Rose, J. & Paisley, K. (2015). Disrupting neoliberal discourse in critical sustainability education: a qualitative analysis of international language framing. *Environmental Education Research*, 21(8), pp. 1127-1142.

Caradonna, J. (2014). *Sustainability: a history.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cars, M. & West, E. E. (2015). Education for sustainable society: attainments and good practices in Sweden during the United Nations Decade for Sustainable Development (UNDESD). *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 17, pp. 1-21.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), pp. 139–167.

Ellsworth, E. (1997). *Teaching positions: Difference, pedagogy, and the power of address.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research.* New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews & other writings 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Francis D., & le Roux, A. (2011). Teaching for social justice education: the intersection between identity, critical agency, and social justice education. *South African Journal of Education*, 31, pp. 299-311.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Galloway, M. K., Callin, P., James, S., Vimegnon, H., & McCall, L. (2019). Culturally responsive, antiracist, or anti-oppressive? How language matters for school change efforts. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 52(4), pp. 485-501.

Gandhi, L. (1998). *Postcolonial theory: A critical introduction*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gardner-McTaggart, A. (2014). International elite, or global citizens? Equity, distinction and power: the International Baccalaureate and the rise of the South. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 14(1), pp. 1-29.

Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.). London: Routledge.

Green School Bali. (2017a). *Green School Bali, Indonesia: School of the Future.* [online] Available at: <https://www.greenschool.org/bali/> [Accessed 22 February 2021].

Green School Bali. (2017b). *Activating Future Green Leaders.* [online] Available at: <https://www.greenschool.org/bali/support-us/local-scholars/> [Accessed 30 March 2021].

Green School Bali. (2021). *Young Green Leaders Award*. [online] Available at: <https://www.greenschool.org/bali/young-green-leaders/> [Accessed 23 April 2021].

Green School International. (2020a). *About us*. [online] Available at: <https://www.greenschool.org/about-us/> [Accessed 22 February 2021].

Hellberg, S & Knutsson, B. (2018). Sustaining the life-chance divide? Education for sustainable development and the global biopolitical regime. *Critical Studies in Education*, 59(1), 93-107.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Huckle, J. & Wals, A. E. J. (2015). The UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development: business as usual in the end. *Environmental Education Research*, 21(3), pp. 491-505.

Hughes, C. (2009). International education and the International Baccalaureate Diploma Program: a view from the perspective of postcolonial thought. Journal of Research in International Education, 8(2), pp. 123-141.

Jeronen, E. ed. (2017). *Teaching methods in science subjects promoting sustainability.* Basel: MDPI.

Jickling, B. (1992). Why I don't what my children to be educated for sustainable development. *Journal of Environmental Education*, 23(4), pp. 5-8.

Jickling, B. & Wals, A. E. (2008). Globalization and environmental education: looking beyond sustainable development. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 40(1), pp. 1-21.

Kina, V. J. & Gonçalves, A. (2018). The continuing relevance of Paulo Freire: celebrating 50 years since the publication of Pedagogy of the oppressed. *Critical and Radical Social Work*. 6(3), pp. 363-376.

Knutsson, B. (2020). Managing the GAP between rich and poor? Biopolitics and (ab)normalized inequality in South African education for sustainable development. *Environmental Education Research*, 26(5), pp. 650-665.

Knutsson, B. (2021). Segmented prizing: biopolitical differentiation in education for sustainable development. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 51(3), pp. 431-447.

Kopnina, H. (2012). Education for sustainable development (ESD): the turn away from 'environment' in environmental education. *Environmental Education Research*, 18(5), pp. 699-717.

Kumashiro, K. (2000). Toward a theory of anti-oppressive education. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(1), pp. 25-53.

Kumashiro, K. (2002). *Troubling education: queer activism and antioppressive pedagogy*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Lazar, M. M. (2007). Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Articulating a Feminist Discourse Praxis. *Critical Discourse Studies,* 4(2), pp. 141–164.

Leicht, A., Heiss, J. & Byun, W. J. eds. (2018*) Issues and trends in Education for Sustainable Development*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Loomba, A. (2015). *Colonialism/postcolonialism*. 3rd ed. New York: Routledge.

Lotz-Sisitza, H. (2011). Teacher professional development with an education for sustainable development focus in South Africa: development of a network, curriculum framework and resources for teacher education. Southern African Journal of Environmental Education, 28, pp. 30-71.

Machin, D., & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do Critical Discourse Analysis: a multimodal introduction.* London: SAGE Publications.

Maina-Okori, N. M., Koushik, J. R. & Wilson, A. (2018). Reimagining intersectionality in environmental and sustainability education: a critical literature review. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 49(4), p. 286-296.

Martusewicz, R. A., Edmundson, J. & Lupinacci J. (2021). *EcoJustice education: towards diverse, democratic, and sustainable communities.* New York: Routledge.

McKeown, R. & Hopkins, C. (2003). EE p ESD: defusing the worry. *Environmental Education* Research, 9(1), pp. 117-128.

Milani, T. M. & Lazar, M. M. (2017). Seeing from the South: discourse, gender and sexuality from southern perspectives. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 21(3), pp. 307-319.

Misiaszek, G. W. (2020). Ecopedagogy: teaching critical literacies of 'development', 'sustainability', and 'sustainable development'. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 25(5), pp. 615-632.

Mouffe, C. (2005). *On the political.* Abindgon and New York: Routledge.

Mullet, D. R. (2018). A general critical discourse analysis framework for educational research. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 29(2), pp. 116-142.

Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & O'Garro Joseph, G. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in education: a review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research.* 75(3), pp. 365-416.

Rogers, R., Schaenen, I., Schott, C., O'Brien, K., Trigos-Carrillo, L., Starkey K., & Carter Chasteen, C. (2016). Critical Discourse Analysis: a review of the literature, 2004 to 2012. *Review of Educational Research.* 86(4), pp. 1192-1226.

Shim, J. M. (2012). Pierre Bourdieu and intercultural education: it is not just about lack of knowledge about others. *Intercultural Education,* 23(3), pp-209-220.

Spivak, Gayatri C. (2008). *Other Asias.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Sugrue, E. P. (2019). A ‘bad fit’ for ‘our’ kids: politics, identity, race and power in parental discourse on educational programming & child well- being. *Critical Discourses Studies,* 16(2), pp. 222-236.

Taylor, S. (2004). Researching educational policy and change in 'new times': using critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Education Policy*, 19(4), pp. 433-451.

Thornberg, R. & Charmaz, K. (2014). Grounded theory and theoretical coding. In: Flick, U. ed. (2014). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis.* Los Angeles: SAGE.

Todd, S. (2009). *Toward an imperfect education: Facing humanity, rethinking cosmopolitanism.* London: Paradigm.

UNESCO. (2018). *What is ESD?* [online] Available at: <https://en.unesco.org/themes/education-sustainable-development/what-is-esd> [Accessed 13 February 2021].

UWC. (2017a). *About*. [online] Available at: <https://www.uwc.org/about> [Accessed 22 February 2021].

UWC. (2020c). *Apply to study the IB Diploma Programme (IBDP) at UWC.* [online] Available at: <https://www.uwc.org/ibdp> [Accessed 25 April 2021].

Van Poeck, K., Vandenabeele, J. & Bruyninckx, H. (2013). Taking stock of the UN Decade of education for sustainable development: the policy-making process in Flanders. *Environmental Education Research*, 20(5), pp. 695-717.

Vilches, A. & Gil-Pérez. (2013). Creating a sustainable future: some philosophical and educational considerations for chemistry teaching. *Science & Education*, 22, pp. 1857-1872.

Walsh, Z., Böhme, J., Lavelle, B. D. & Wamsler. C. (2020). Transformative education: towards a relational, justice-oriented approach to sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 21(7), pp. 1587-1606.

Wiek, A., Withycombe, L., & Redman, C. L. (2011). Key competencies in sustainability: a reference framework for academic program development. *Sustain Sci*, 6, pp. 203-218.

8.1. References of CDA Material

Amala. (2019b). *Our Learning*. [online] Available at: <https://amalaeducation.org/our-learning> [Accessed on 24 February 2021].

Amala. (2020). *Our programmes*. [online] Available at: <https://amalaeducation.org/our-programmes> [Accessed on 24 February 2021].

Amala. (2021). *The Amala High School Diploma.* [online] Available at: <https://amalaeducation.org/diploma> [Accessed on 24 February 2021].

Amala. (n.d. a). *Education brochure*. [online] Available at: <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/586b9bc4c534a5731df43ce1/t/5e4fa828eee36f21a08c8198/1582278724014/Amala+Education+Brochure+%282%29.pdf> [Accessed on 25 February 2021].

Amala. (n.d. b). *Our impact 2020*. [online] Available at: <https://amalaeducation.org/news-blog/2020-impact-report> [Accessed on 25 February 2021].

Green School Bali. (2016). *Learning program.* [online] Available at: <https://www.greenschool.org/bali/programme/> [Accessed on 23 February 2021].

Green School Bali. (2018). *Green School skills.* [online] Available at: <https://www.greenschool.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Green-School-Skills.pdf> [Accessed on 23 February 2021].

Green School Bali. (2019a). *Curriculum overview: high school.* [online] Available at: <https://www.greenschool.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/High-School.pdf> [Accessed on 23 February 2021].

Green School Bali. (2019b). *Become a Green School student.* [online] Available at: <https://www.greenschool.org/bali/admissions/> [Accessed on 27 April 2021].

Green School Bali. (n.d. a). *Green School ambitions.* [online] Available at: <https://www.greenschool.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Green-School-Ambitions.pdf> [Accessed on 23 February 2021].

Green School Bali. (n.d. b). *Literacy Curriculum overview.* [online] Available at: <https://www.greenschool.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Literature-Curriculum.pdf> [Accessed on 23 February 2021].

Green School International. (2018). *What is the Green School curriculum?* [online] Available at: <https://www.greenschool.org/insights/what-is-the-green-school-curriculum/> [Accessed on 25 February 2021].

Green School International. (2020b). *Investing in the biocentric child.* [online] Available at: <https://www.greenschool.org/insights/investing-in-the-biocentric-child/> [Accessed on 25 February 2021].

Green School International. (n.d.). *Green School Principles.* [online] Available at: <https://www.greenschool.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Green-School-Principles.pdf> [Accessed on 23 February 2021].

UWC. (2017b). *UWC Strategy 2018 and beyond.* [online] Available at: <https://www.uwc.org/about-uwc/news/uwc-strategy> [Accessed on 23 February 2021].

UWC. (2019). *UWC Educational Model*. [online] Available at: <https://www.uwc.org/educationalmodel> [Accessed on 23 February 2021].

UWC. (2020a). *A letter to the UWC Community.* [online] Available at: <https://www.uwc.org/about-uwc/news/a-letter-to-the-uwc-community-from-dr-musimbi-kanyoro-dr-quique-bassat-and-jens-waltermann> [Accessed on 4 March 2021].

UWC. (2020b). *Open Call for Membership to the UWC Anti-Racisms Diversity, Equity and inclusion Steering Group*. [online] Available at: <https://www.uwc.org/about-uwc/news/open-call-for-membership-to-the-uwc-anti-racism-diversity-equity-and-inclusion-steering-group> [Accessed on 4 March 2021].

UWC. (2021a). *A Cross-UWC Conversation on Anti-Racism, Diversity, Equity and Inclusion.* [online] Available at: <https://www.uwc.org/impact/a-cross-uwc-conversation-on-anti-racism-diversity-equity-and-inclusion-1> [Accessed on 20 April 2021].

UWC. (2021b). *Meet the members of the UWC Anti-Racism, Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Steering Group International Baccalaureate Curriculum.* [online] Available at: <https://www.uwc.org/about-uwc/news/meet-the-members-of-the-uwc-anti-racism-diversity-equity-and-inclusion-steering-group-ardei-sg> [Accessed on 4 March 2021].

International Baccalaureate. (n.d). *DP Curriculum*. [online] Available at: <https://ibo.org/programmes/diploma-programme/curriculum/> [Accessed on 4 March 2021].

9. Appendix: CDA Tables

Green School

First order codes From key theoretical concept	Sub-codes	Empirical text from material All direct quotes unless [my short notes]
The making of sustainability education	Learner-centered	"By creating a strong sense of community, emphasizing the relationship between students and teachers and designing learning with the child at the centre, we can increase wellbeing and reduce fear." (Green School International, 2018)
	Exploratory and action oriented	"Green School prioritizes interconnected experiences driven by real-world needs and the prospect of a sustainable future; The world is a diverse and complex network of systems, and our programme, community, and environment embody an integrated, systems-thinking approach." (Green School International, n.d.) "Green Studies at Green School seeks to engage children with nature through various projects and activities led by experiential learning. We seek to actively develop their thinking, emotions, feelings and inner wellbeing while becoming one with nature." (Green School International, 2020).
	Empowerment and transformation	"Green School anticipates and adapts to the evolving needs of learners, their environment, and community; change happens in a sustainable way" (Green School International, n.d.)
	Relation to locality	"Green Studies at Green School seeks to engage children with nature through various projects and activities led by experiential learning. We seek to actively develop their thinking, emotions, feelings and inner wellbeing while becoming one with nature." (Green School International, 2020) "Green School thinks globally but acts locally first; we immerse learning in our immediate

		surroundings, culture and community." (Green School International, n.d."
Sustainability education problematization	Power structures	
	Neoliberalism	
	Biopolitical differentiation	
Anti-oppressive pedagogy	Education against oppression	
AOP approaches	Education for the other	"Respecting everyone as an individual and valuing fairness" (Green School Bali, 2019)
	Education about the other	"Students are offered diverse ways in which to explore holistically, expressing their own views intellectually, physically, socially/emotionally and spiritually. These aspects act as lenses through which to understand the social, cultural, ethical, moral, spiritual and aesthetic dimensions of the human experience." (Green School Bali, n.d. b) "Students study literacy to enable them to act with purpose in the world. When a person has the ability to communicate well for a wide range of purposes and to understand self through writing it allows them to develop empathy and interact across spectrums of people from different socio-economic, age, gender, and cultural backgrounds." (Green School Bali, n.d. b)
	Education that is critical of privileging and othering	
	Education that changes students and society	
	Teaching with care and	"Green School prioritizes and sustains relationships between all learners, their

	respect (see hooks)	environment, and their community; our programs are holistic and engage the whole person including social-emotional, intrapersonal, intellectual and kinesthetic connections." (Green School International, 2020)
Pedagogy of positionality	Power position of teachers	
	Problematizing positionality	
		"Our decisions are a reflection of our values and beliefs. Strong values enable us to take responsibility for our learning, have a positive impact on our community, and to show care for our environment." (Green School Bali, 2006)
Intersectionality		

First order open codes	Sub-codes	Empirical text from material All direct quotes unless [my short notes]
Community		"We have a strong sense of community and our connection to the earth. As we understand environmental challenges, we strive to use systems thinking, sustainable solutions, ecology, and technology to model a better future" (Green School Bali, n.d. a)
"biocentrism"		"we believe in nurturing biocentric ethics, which calls for a rethinking of the relationship between humans and nature." (Green School International, 2020) "Facilitating the conscious re-thinking of what it means to be human and nature, and integrating the two, opens effective learning spaces for children where they can grow their love for nature and nurture themselves at the same time. It influences both feelings and emotions as well as enhances knowledge and skills, going beyond classroom learning and ensuring that there is a higher level of inner and outer engagement." (Green School International, 2020)

Interconnectedness		"With adaptation of thought, we will need education as a conducive platform where our biocentric children can consciously coexist, and build authentic relationships." (Green School International, 2020) "we believe in nurturing biocentric ethics, which calls for a rethinking of the relationship between humans and nature." (Green School International, 2020) "a community of learners making *our* world sustainable" (Green School Bali, 2006)

UWC

First order codes From key theoretical concept	Sub-codes	Empirical text from material All direct quotes unless [my short notes]
Conceptualizing sustainability education	Call for sustainability education	"Motivating all UWC schools and colleges to develop and implement individual plans that embed sustainability in their education and their actions ("Teach the right thing – do the right thing)" (UWC, 2017b) "Include sustainability as a core theme in UWC educational programmes." (UWC, 2017b)
	Three spheres	"Understand 'sustainability' to include environmental, economic and social sustainability" (UWC, 2017b)
The making of sustainability education	Learner-centered	"This education enshrines a commitment to the balanced development of the whole person; that is, its task is to encourage an integrated development of human potential across a range of different dimensions, including the intellectual, moral, aesthetic, emotional, social, spiritual, and physical." (UWC, 2019)
	Exploratory and action oriented	"Experiential learning is fundamental to UWC. Experiential learning is the process of making meaning from direct experience. Young people are thrust into a dynamic and diverse

		community. This situation provides a plethora of challenging experiences to inspire a range of emotions and learning opportunities. These experiences can be challenging, joyful, frustrating, and life-changing. UWC provides a safe and supportive environment from which to learn through direct experience. By living and working together, students develop empathy and make sense of their experiences through such means as reflection, dialogue, trial-and-error, and perspective taking" (UWC, 2019)
	Empowerment and transformation	"Students are able to engage in continuing, positive action towards issues of sustainability, on both an institutional and individual level." (UWC, 2019) "A UWC experience acts as a catalyst for people both individually and collectively to work towards a more peaceful, just and sustainable world. UWC's alumni, staff and volunteers do this in varied ways throughout their live" (UWC, 2017b)
	Footprint	"Recognise that a model of encounter-based learning requires bringing many people together in one place to learn and live as a community – we acknowledge the environmental consequences of this model and endeavor to compensate for them as best we can" (UWC, 2017b)
Sustainability education problematization	Power structures	"We stand in solidarity with millions of Black people who have historically experienced violence and brutality because of their race. We stand in solidarity with all those that live in fear of death, discrimination, dehumanization and abuse just because of their race. We stand in solidarity with communities who every day live in fear as to whether they will return home alive at the end of the day. The world does not have to be this way. We join in solidarity with those advocating for racial justice all over the world." (UWC, 2020a)

	Neoliberalism	
	Inequality	“We live in a complex world: ever faster technological and scientific progress is coupled with rising socio-economic inequality. UWC was founded in 1962 at the height of the Cold War. This reality has given way to a multipolar world but civil wars and terrorism continue – often fueled by socio-economic inequality and fundamentalism – making UWC’s mission to unite people, nations and cultures for peace as relevant as ever. In parallel, we are faced with an environmental challenge of global warming and natural resource depletion that is unprecedented in human history, giving UWC’s mission to make education a force for a sustainable future great urgency.” (UWC, 2017b)
Anti-oppressive pedagogy	Education against oppression	“We acknowledge that racism in any form is injustice and we have a responsibility to know when we practice or enable injustice. The UWC values call on us to work towards peace and justice for all people” (UWC, 2020a) “the three agreed that issues of racism cannot be dismissed as political, emotional or put down to ignorance […]. It’s so important that anti-racism becomes a core and mandatory part of the curriculum and that it’s taught at various stages of a UWC education. Conversations around racism cannot be the reserve of those who are directly affected by it, or those who are already engaged in tackling it.” (UWC, 2021a) “Inclusive, equitable and intentionally diverse communities are at the heart of the UWC mission. The Hahnian vision for a peaceful and sustainable future has brought generations of diverse young people together in ways that compel them to listen, to seek, to understand,

		and form lifelong relationships with people who are different from themselves.” (UWC, 2020b) “The killing of George Floyd on 25 May 2020 reverberated throughout the UWC movement and indeed the world. Inspired and motivated by the subsequent global protests, and by manifestations of inquietude and injustices within our institution, various stakeholders within the movement have been working together to create a means by which we can collectively take a brave step forward in becoming a truly anti-racist and equitable organization. This has so far led to the development of the UWC Anti-Racism, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Steering Group (ARDEI SG), a group of UWCers that are going to work towards greater representation, access, cross-movement collaboration, trust, and transparency in UWC’s diversity, equity, and inclusion work.” (UWC, 2020b)
AOP approaches	Education for the other	“Our national committees enable UWC to reach potential IBDP students, sometimes from the most marginalised groups and backgrounds, to be selected for a UWC education and provide UWC with a footprint and direct impact in three quarters of the world’s nations.” (UWC, 2017b) “Since its foundation UWC has been focused on providing an education like no other and finding exceptional students to go through it. Our theory of change has been based on these students having positive impact both during their time as students at UWC by providing service to different, often challenged or disadvantaged communities, and as alumni in continuing to live the UWC mission” (UWC, 2017b)
	Education about the other	“Students are then chosen to join school communities to ensure cultural, racial, gender, socioeconomic, and language diversity in pursuit of a common mission. In this way, each campus reflects a global diversity that enhances

		connection, sharing, debate, and community living; and, thus encourages opportunities for growth, empathy, and understanding. Faculty and staff actively engage in community life as teachers, tutors, mentors and learners." (UWC, 2019) "This education requires active promotion of intercultural understanding and the development of genuine concern for others founded on shared life experiences, and cooperative and collaborative living. This includes reflective dialogue on global issues and critical and courageous engagement in the pursuit of peace" (UWC, 2019)
	Education that is critical of privileging and othering	
	Education that changes students and society	"We pledge our commitment to safeguarding those whose race makes them vulnerable in our institutions. We pledge to create more opportunities for conversations - across the UWC movement and including at UWC schools and colleges, national committees and within the UWC International Board and Council - to help us understand and address our own blind spots that enable racism, while recognizing that it is not in the responsibility of the wounded to take on the burden of educating others. We pledge to critically examine how we can dismantle racial injustice, neo-colonialism, and ongoing manifestations of white supremacy. We will seek to explore the set of transformations necessary to ensure our systems are re-calibrated for a future that is more cohesive, more sustainable, and more just for all." (UWC, 2020a)
	Teaching with care and respect (see hooks)	"Faculty and staff actively engage in community life as teachers, tutors, mentors and learners." (UWC, 2019)
Pedagogy of positionality	Power position of teachers	"Create deliberately diverse and balanced staff bodies, committed to excellence in UWC education." (UWC, 2017b)

	Problematizing positionality	
Intersectionality		"If education should be a practice of freedom, this is the time for UWC to reflect deeply and act accordingly with an intersectional lens" quote from Inês Colaço in (UWC, 2021b)

First order open codes	Sub-codes	Empirical text from material All direct quotes unless [my short notes]
Community		"Community interaction is placed at the heart of college life. This requires the full and active participation of all members of the school or college" (UWC, 2019) "By bringing together a diverse and motivated student body, immersing them in a global community experience based on the UWC values, and challenging them formally and informally, students grow in their abilities to be active global citizens. The holistic UWC experience leads to learning skills, competencies, and outcomes toward the UWC mission to make "education a force to unite people, nations and cultures for peace and a sustainable future." (UWC, 2019)
Diversity		"This education should take place within a diverse community. The selection of students should ensure representation from regions and social groups that reflect the wide range of tensions among and between people" (UWC, 2019) "We work together as an ever closer and united movement, built on the UWC mission, values and principles, based on mutual trust and respect, and honoring our commitment to the celebration of diversity – not just in our student, staff and governing bodies, but also in the ways we develop our "UWC-ness" (UWC, 2017b)

		"In Goal 4.7 the UN Sustainable Development Agenda states that education itself has a key role to play in developing awareness of all other Sustainable Development Goals. Education is indeed key to addressing many of the world's challenges. In order to do this, education needs to shift away from mirroring the very challenges it should be addressing: economic inequality, unbridled competition and a focus on national, ethnic and religious difference. Education must embrace diversity – in ethnicity and religious beliefs as much as in opinions. It must foster empathy and cooperation across social, ethnic and religious boundaries and it must identify and develop talent no matter whether the student was born in a shack, social housing or a mansion. These qualities and this inclusiveness are essential, if education is to become, in the words of the late Nelson Mandela, UWC's Honorary President, "the most powerful weapon we can use to change the world." (UWC, 2017b) "National, cultural and religious diversity within our student bodies is something UWC has always achieved thanks to the selections conducted by UWC national committees. Achieving socio-economic diversity has proven more challenging, particularly when scholarship funding was limited. Contact theory tells us that in order to effectively address prejudice and achieve lasting trust and connection, diverse groups need to meet at eye-level with no particular group being dominant. Continuous focus and hard work are required in order to ensure – at least in all UWC residential programmes – a socio-economically diverse spectrum of students with no dominant group – neither rich, nor poor, nor middle-class. The UWC national committees will, through their geographic diversity, play the key role in achieving this, but we also need to ensure that schools and colleges have access to funding which will ensure they do not have to default to

		direct admission of full fee paying IBDP residential students to guarantee their financial sustainability." (UWC, 2017b)

Amala Education

First order codes From key theoretical concept	Sub-codes	Empirical text from material All direct quotes unless [my short notes]
The making of sustainability education	Learner-centered	"We provide education that creates positive change in the lives of learners today, and opens up opportunities for the future." (Amala, 2019)
	Exploratory and action oriented	"Each course involves learners actively applying their learning within their communities to create positive change." (Amala, n.d. a) "The Amala High School Diploma is a general high school program, with a focus on innovation and problem solving." (Amala, 2021)
	Empowerment and transformation	"We use transformative education to create opportunities and inspire positive change in the lives of refugees" (Amala, n.d. a)
	Relation to locality	"Holistic and robust programme that is designed to enable students to thrive in higher education, work and entrepreneurship, and to make positive change in their own lives and in their communities." (Amala, n.d. a) "Curriculum "context-proof", meaning that it can be run and localized virtually anywhere. We work with partners around the world to implement our programs" (Amala, 2019)
Sustainability education problematization	Power structures	
	Neoliberalism	

	Biopolitical differentiation	
Anti-oppressive pedagogy	Education against oppression	
AOP approaches	Education for the other	
	Education about the other	“The Amala diploma programme enables students to be active, responsible and compassionate problem solvers. It aims to develop creative innovators, who are adept at embracing diversity and ambiguity.” (Amala, n.d. a)
	Education that is critical of privileging and othering	
	Education that changes students and society	[The overarching theme of peace?]
	Teaching with care and respect (see hooks)	
Pedagogy of positionality	Power position of teachers	
	Problematizing positionality	
Intersectionality	Intersectionality	

First order open codes	Sub-codes	Empirical text from material All direct quotes unless [my short notes]
Community		[Not in relation to locality as part of where the students learn but rather where the students will lead change]

Agency		"in a world in which the future for our students is increasingly uncertain, the development of agency is key to enabling learners to embrace challenges and create and access opportunities" (Amala, n.d. a) "Our vision is a world in which refugees have the opportunity to build a future they can value. For this reason, agency for positive change is at the heart of our learning model. To develop agency, we focus on developing three key competencies which are crucial for our learners to thrive: the ability to create new value, take responsibility and manage complexity" (Amala, 2019)