

Global Waves

Our global engagements are undergoing significant shifts—akin to awakenings—that include the following:

- Awakening to our place in the universe and on the planet;
- Awareness of the world as everchanging;
- Acknowledgement of and respect for ecology and diversity including people, languages and ways of knowing;
- Recognition of how we negotiate our pursuits in the world—as we reposition ourselves and others in ways that afford possibilities of expression and engagement and afford others their voices, rights of self-determination and sovereignty rather than subjugation, oppression, colonizing or displacement;
- Recognition of ourselves as global persons with virtual and concrete connections with rights and responsibilities as global citizens defined in different ways but respectful of others and their ways.

These shifts move us toward a new form of multiculturalism, befitting a world committed to pluralism and the tenets of ecology, diversity, transliteracies and cosmopolitanism (Stornaiuolo et al., 2009; Stornaiuolo & Phillips, 2019). The shifts represent a postcolonial orientation that interrogates the mobility of ideas, especially the bridges between local and global as well as the relationship between colonial structures and Indigenous peoples. They represent the pursuit of respect, recognition, reconciliation, and accommodation versus that of patrimony, marginalization, discrimination and assimilation.

Our Place on the Planet

Worldly engagements are dynamic and have been across time. Migration from Africa by *Homo erectus* began 2.5 million years ago. Current estimates reflect that there are 250 million immigrants globally. For thousands of years, through colonization, exploration, and oppression, nations have been involved in border crossings and pilgrimages in search of trade, possessions or better lives. The world seems as if it is always in a state of change and exchange, as trade ebbs and flows, and people experience variable degrees of freedom,

opportunity and possibilities as they move between countries or within their own communities, neighborhoods, and media hubs.

The world of literacy is no exception. For better and worse, the history of literacy has operated “hand in glove” with matters pertaining to globalization—a link that dates back several millennia. It is a history tied to trade, migration, empire-building, the spread of ideas, and matters of faith. It has as well as been tied to conquest and cooperation—where literacy has been salient to social, political, cultural, linguistic and economic development.

Literacy is a combination of pursuits—for interdependencies, relationships and mutuality, both locally and globally. It has involved developments and exchanges in ideas largely supported by trade, colonization and corporate interests across a world once navigated by caravans and now by bandwidth, featuring a combination of alliances and the growth of international agencies and affinity groups clustered or networked in our everchanging, virtual worlds.

Alliances and Networks

To some extent, alliances set the stage for shared planetary engagements and pursuits. At a macro-political level, our interdependencies are realized through international groups such as the United Nations (UN) and other agencies. These groups are established to formulate, realize, monitor, moderate, facilitate global activities (e.g., labor mobility, trade, crisis management, medical support, educational development and meeting social needs, such as poverty). The UN, for example, helps with the formulation and traction of global declarations through participating countries’ ratification of principles related to basic literacy, informational technology and human rights (e.g., World Summit, 2005). Nowadays, these and other networks are increasingly salient whenever we are dealing with a health pandemic, natural disasters, migration, food crises, literacy campaigns or other essential and immediate needs. These networks of international and national affiliates have acted as organizing forces contributing to how developments are orchestrated within and across countries. They offer developments tied to a planetary perspective, affording coordination and collaboration and, increasingly, respect and advocacy for diversity, including ways of knowing and languages.

Less formally, networks have coalesced around shared interests and common goals—piggybacking on developments and issues that arise. For example, in the 1970s, there was a global civil rights network that connected the U.S. Black Panther movement with mobilizing social rights initiatives by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community in Australia,

the Maori community in New Zealand, the anti-Apartheid movement in South Africa, as well as movements in Asia. More recently, the Black Lives Matter movement has bridged to groups worldwide as a way of mobilizing against systemic racism. Protests against police brutality have resonated with the plight of Maoris, Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, Thais, Nigerians and other groups in Europe, Eurasia, Asia and Latin America. Across countless initiatives, we have seen the emergence of numerous virtual spaces for dialogue and to exchange resources and support. Indeed, oftentimes these networks are supported by and operate exclusively in virtual spaces.

In terms of literacy, among the most notable networks has been the International Reading Association, established in the 1950s. Now called the International Literacy Association (ILA), it was created to be a professional organization of reading educators and scholars that touted itself as international and committed to literacy research and practice worldwide. In a developmental fashion, the International Literacy Association, often in collaboration with the United Nations Educational Social and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and various other non-profit organizations, has been responsible for major developments in literacy in different parts of the world—especially through ILA’s seven international affiliates (i.e., Africa, Europe, Asia, Latin America, Caribbean, Oceania, and Eurasia). These grassroots networks have thousands of affiliates that work across their continents and within nations to advance literacy support for educators (Side Comment III.9b.1).

Side Comment III.9b.1.

For example, the Africa network has affiliates in over 50 African countries that come together, along with a number of strong national groups. In Nigeria, under the leadership of Chukwuemeka Eze Onukaogu and his colleagues, teacher leadership as well as literacy for social change have been foci. In Uganda, various book projects and other initiatives have been launched under the leadership of Annette K. Mpuga and others.

Trade

The exchange of goods, the spread of ideas and philosophy are one of the key foundations to achieving a global presence and connections tied to meeting local needs. Trade has been the cornerstone of global developments for thousands of years. Indeed, trade and access to goods has been one of the major catalysts for migration, alliance-building and

colonization. At the same time that global diversity was being enhanced by trade, however, it was also being diminished—especially as empires (e.g., Spain, Portugal, Holland, Britain) advanced colonization, subjugation, enculturation, conversion and education of peoples in the colonizer's image. Literacies were not exempted; indeed, they were a tool for colonization by controlling what was written and recorded about as well as who read, what, why and how.

Nowadays, a number of countries are divesting themselves of their colonial pasts as other interests take hold. At one level, in most countries, these new forces are tied to governmental regulations and corporate interests. These include groups such as internet providers or platforms (e.g., Amazon, Alibaba, Google, Mozilla, Apple, and Samsung) or multinational industries such as those in petroleum or automobile manufacturing (e.g., BP, Exxon, Royal Dutch, Volkswagen, and Toyota) who seek leverage, access, and advantage in terms of global markets. At another level, such forces reflect the remnants of ongoing hierarchies of privilege and power within and across societies. Within countries, certain groups have retained certain privileges and power over others. Across countries, centralized powers including the U.S., Britain, Europe and increasingly China have enormous clout in part achieved by support and trade.

In terms of literacies, the global trade in ideas has shifted from paper to virtual productions that are mass-produced by governments, corporations, or forms of cottage industry. Indeed, the advent of the internet has led to a massive global production of ideas and their access. This shift has included the sources of production and the character of trade, but also has led to changes in the nature of consumerism, communication around events, and cultural sharings. These exchanges can lead to global encounters that support, disrupt, or alienate.

Trade in Scholarly Ideas and Educational Practices. In the scholarly domain or in terms of the global knowledge economy, trade seems to be more under the control of certain groups with a bias toward the west that is quite dated. Of relevance to historical scholarship in literacy, scholars worldwide (including U.S. and Chinese literacy scholars) travelled to work with Wilhelm Wundt in Germany as psychological studies of reading were being pursued in the 1850s. This seeding of psychology across countries account for much of the intellectual character and foci of literacy today. In the 1900s, scholarly exchanges occurred with developmentalists in Italy and France as well as between British, German and French sociologists. These account for many of the frames of reference that scholars now enlist in their inquiries related to educational endeavors. Likewise, in terms of schooling, these early

scholars developed a reverence, verging on a monopoly, for the teaching of Western thought in school. Subjects such as History, Economics, and Literature were almost exclusively Western (for a more in-depth discussion, see “The Enculturated Reader”).

A number of sociologists and international scholars would contend that nowadays global scholarship has not internationalized; instead, it remains Western. The local is excluded if it falls outside of this realm. Certainly, looked at through the lens of a global economy, literacy has been and still is to a large extent controlled by Western interests. It is as if the global knowledge economy serves Western interests exclusively. Indeed, when Westerners turn the lens on themselves, the sidelining of and exclusion of non-Westerners is apparent. Global forces are not innocent, nor are they neutral. Scholarly Western interests seem complicit with the epistemicide or extinction of non-Western ways of knowing or an approach to engagement that involves forms of epistemological imposition or re-education (in a way that seems quite contrary to aspirations that disavow colonizing others). Rather, non-Westerners are positioned as scholarly outsiders—guests in the global scholarly community who are granted access or voice in the global knowledge economy so long as they can represent themselves in a Western image. Despite a significant non-Western readership and a large number of non-Western submissions to Western journals, articles by non-Westerners are rarely accepted and in turn rarely published. If they are published, they are expected to align with and pursue frames involving Western scholarly pursuits and perspectives.

Thus, although the Western scholarly community may tout global values, its approach befits assimilative interests rather than an accommodation of diversity. Editorial boards of the key Western journals consist primarily of Western scholars, and articles are written with an American slant. There appears to be little attempt to respect the readership of Eastern and Southern countries, or to support their local epistemologies. In other words, there appears to be few accommodations for supporting “foreign” research pursuits in the global competition for status in the knowledge economy market. The end result is that Eastern and Southern scholars are encouraged to reshape their research enterprises for Western audiences. Indeed, the competitiveness of some countries presents a palpably different orientation, which is often narcissistic.

Postcolonial critiques abound as scholars have recognized this bias and its consequences. As de Santos has noted (2007; 2008; 2013), our support of Western ways of knowing and Western science alone may contribute to the loss of global locals and non-Western ways of knowing—in effect leading to a form of knowledge genocide. As Raewyn

Connell (2007) argued in her book, *Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*—reflected by Takayama, Sriprakash, and Connell (2017) in their article, “Toward a Postcolonial Comparative and International Education”—there is a huge imbalance that has led to a sidelining and ignorance of non-Western inquiry and ways of knowing. This void in global ways of knowing suggests the need for:

...knowledge projects that decenter the global North in knowledge production, undermine the uneven power relations that naturalize the intellectual division of labor, provincialize the universalist ontology and epistemology that underpin official knowledge, and revalue knowledges that have been subjugated by global hegemony. (Takayama, Sriprakash, & Connell, 2017, p. S13)

This plight of non-Western scholars reflects the lament First Nations Coastal Salish writer Lee Maracle (1993) expressed in his book, *Ravensong*: “Where do you begin telling someone that their world is not the only one” (p. 72)?

Similarly, the major trading routes for the exchange of educational practices across countries are predominately Western. Emanating from Australia were the seeds of critical literacy from Bronwyn Davies, Carmen Luke, Allan Luke and others, as well socio-semiotics perspectives that fueled genre-based approaches to literacy. Elsewhere in the Pacific, New Zealand educators, such as Sylvia Ashton Warner, introduced educators to organic teaching approaches, Warwick Elley engaged in “book flood” initiatives, and Marie Clay together with other New Zealanders advanced Reading Recovery worldwide. (Reading Recovery eventually became perhaps the most successful approach for students who were “at risk” of falling behind as readers at an early age.) Other New Zealanders, such as Donald Holdaway and David Doake, introduced the shared book experience as a major practice for beginning reading.

Additionally, South America—especially Brazil—was foundational to critical literacy and community-based literacy work in accordance with Paulo Freire and Augusto Boal. Emilia Ferreiro from Mexico contributed a pioneering study on early literacy development. In Europe, Italy was a major source of child and community-centered education in conjunction with the Montessori approach and Reggio Emilia project, while French and German sociologists provided frameworks for examining socio-political dimensions of literacy. And emanating from the UK were major curriculum initiatives and understandings of language learning under the guidance of James Britton and Michael Halliday—from both a sociolinguistic and sociological perspective (e.g., Basil Bernstein). A number of UK

educators were also pioneers in advancing drama education (e.g., Dorothy Heathcote, Cecily O'Neill, and Gavin Bolton).

Cross-National Studies

This same trend to Westernization befits the interests being served by cross-national studies, at least until recently. Indeed, the study of global developments has a history of capturing the imagination of Western educators. In part, such studies were spurred by the recognition that the world offered a “natural” global laboratory that afforded explorations of differences and possibilities beyond those reflected within one country or region alone. From 1950 to the early 1970s, a number of researchers embraced these cross-national studies, viewing literacy as having enormous potential to explore global issues.

For example, Scribner and Cole (1981) explored the vexing question of the role of reading in terms of whether differences in literacy yielded reasoning differences. To do so, they delved into cultures with distinct differences in terms of the nature and role of print in their communities. Similarly, in the context of exploring reading achievement and learning to read and write, other studies delved into areas such as the roles of print in different cultures, language differences, and cultural norms. In his book, *The Teaching of Reading and Writing* published for UNESCO, William S. Gray (1956) explored the nature and role of languages in learning to read, including examining eye movements across various written languages. Others examined gender differences and achievement; still others explored variations in practice such as differences in achievement arising from differences in the starting age of schooling (e.g., Preston, 1962).

A number of scholars also pursued cross-national comparisons of reading achievement differences in which they attempted to correlate reading achievement differences to various factors in each country or post-hoc considerations of emphases (See Side Comment III.9b.2). In a similar fashion, studies of written composition and literature teaching were conducted and likewise related to practices and values of various countries (e.g., Purves, 1973). Further, the interest in cross-national studies remains today. For example, capitalizing on the differences in language, contemporary scholars explore some of the cross-national differences in reading due to language differences (e.g., orthographic, phonological, and morphological) and cultural norms (Chen, Anderson, Li, & Shu, 2014; Shu, Anderson, Zhang, 1995; Zhang, Lin, Wei, & Anderson, 2014).

Side Comment III.9b.2.

For example, in 1962, Foshay, Thorndike, Hotyat, Pidgeon and Walker published a large-scale international study comparing the performance of thirteen-year-old students across 12 countries. Then, in 1973, Robert Thorndyke conducted a comparison of 15 countries, relating differences in reading achievement to a range of factors that varied across the countries.

During this same period, John Downing argued for the creation of Comparative Reading as a field of study (in conjunction with the publication of his 1973 book, Comparative Reading, in which he had scholars from different countries portray their reading practices).

Development Pursuits

Across the globe there are countless educators involved in on the ground literacy efforts. Although their work may not be fully evidenced in terms of the major scholarly outlets, its impact on others in their regions has been substantial—in terms of mobilizing and networking and moving the literacy field forward with a more planetary orientation informed by a post-colonial perspective. In particular, a number of Western literacy educators have been major advocates and allies in the advancement of literacy. They work in collaboration with international groups such as UNESCO, CODE, the Global Alliance on Books, the Soros Foundation, USAID, World Bank and others, along with selected local communities (e.g., Indigenous groups in Southern countries).

In the West, for instance, the leadership of scholars such as Daniel Wagner and his International Literacy Institute at the University of Pennsylvania has been substantial with UNESCO and other groups. Likewise, the efforts of Irwin Kirsch have had tremendous influence. Kirsch is the Director of the Center for Global Assessment at Educational Testing Service and manages the Literacy Assessment and Monitoring Program with the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, the Reading Expert Group for the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). In terms of adult literacy in particular, Tom Stitch has been involved in adult literacy efforts globally. And, in his past capacity as Director of International Relations for the International Reading Association (1995-2003) and now as CEO for CODE, Scott Walters has supported major literacy development in Eurasia and especially in Africa.

Other literacy scholars have been involved in a range of global development initiatives involving professional development with some help from NGOs. For example,

Misty Sailors and James Hoffman have been engaged in major development efforts in Malawi, Liberia and Mozambique (e.g., Sailors et al., 2019; Sailors & Hoffman, 2018). Bonnie Norton, Margaret Early, Maureen Kendrick together with African colleagues have been involved in a major Storybook digital initiative in Africa with primary school teachers to promote multilingual literacy in their classrooms (i.e., using the mother tongue as a resource; see Norton & Tembe, 2020). Marlene Asselin has been engaged in Ethiopia, linking schools with libraries (Asselin, & Doiron, 2013). Victoria Purcell Gates, Rebecca Rogers, and others have been engaged in Latin America (Purcell-Gates, 2007; Rogers, 2017; Trigos-Carillo & Rogers, 2018). And a number of scholars have been involved with the George Soros Foundation in some 50 countries in an effort to advance the critical reading skills of persons living in authoritarian societies.

Rise of Global Studies: Cosmopolitanism and Global Citizenship

Development is never one-way; it always involves negotiations between the parties involved and the interests that are being served. It is especially so when different norms apply and the goals and project activities encounter resistance to efforts of change and the manner in which such change might proceed. In *The Teaching of Reading and Writing* Gray (1956) recounts the resistance encountered by rural communities to literacy programs—until programs shifted to address the direct needs of the community. George Soros encounters resistance to his efforts to advance the critical reading skills in different countries based upon questions about his political motives. Such negotiations and the issues that are brought to the fore represent matters salient to the implementation of development initiatives and the interests served. They also offer areas of considerable importance to study.

Some of the most significant and complex global studies may be those seeking to understand the interfaces between local and global across time and space that occur as globalization is spurred. Take if you will the work drawing upon cosmopolitanism that has surfaced as ways of characterizing the nature of our global experiences. The evolution of the notion of cosmopolitanism can be traced to views expressed by ancient Greek and Chinese philosophers as well as to Emmanuel Kant and discussions of global scholars from anthropology, sociology, philosophy and education (see Nussbaum, 1997). Most recently, it has also been implemented by postcolonial theory analyses, the growing interest in digital connectivity, and the surge of interest in matters of mobility and definitions of global citizenship. Despite some detractors, cosmopolitanism is a term that has come to benefit the

aspiration of worldliness for people pursuing a morality aligned with global development projects.

So, what is cosmopolitanism? Its definition is complicated by being “in between” Western critical theoretical considerations and post-colonial theory. As Fazal Rizvi (2009) remarked, cosmopolitanism is “a political philosophy, a moral theory and a cultural disposition” (p. 253); or, as Martha Nussbaum (1997) has suggested, cosmopolitanism is critical reflection and reflexivity, paired with an identification with the global human community and the ability to imagine across cultural differences (See Side Comment III.9b.3). The chameleon nature of cosmopolitanism befits a disposition to cultures that is respectful, relative and best when self-directed (rather than universal or imposed or portrayed by outsiders). The dilemma for literacy scholars is that aspirations that might hope to engage in the development of cosmopolitanism or propose a cosmopolitan politic find themselves on the tricky ground of cultural crossover by cultural interlopers.

Side Comment III.9b.3.

Nussbaum’s (1997) approach to cosmopolitanism is critical and tied to an orientation that is aligned with a politic of a common humanity that is committed to diversity—as she notes, “recognizing the equal humanity of the alien and the other” (p. 24). But some would suggest that her approach has the potential to be culturally bound in ways that are prescribed rather than relative to different cultural ways of knowing—that is, counter to a cosmopolitanism that embraces postcolonial theory or other viewpoints that position time, space and materiality quite differently.

The cross-national study by Glynda Hull, Amy Stornaiuolo and Urvashi Sahni (2010) as described in their article, “Cultural Citizenship and Cosmopolitan Practice: Global Youth Communicate Online,” further explored these matters as part of a project directed at empowering young women via the internet in ways that reflect a mix of global ambitions and local considerations. Undergirding the study is the notion of cosmopolitanism (borrowing from Appiah, 2006) as affording “...compass in a world that is at once radically interconnected and increasingly divided...[that] can both uphold local commitments and take into consideration larger arenas of concern” (Hull, Stornaiuolo, & Sahni, 2010, p. 331). Moreover, they argue, “social networking sites, along with the online and off line experiences that accompany them, can be a digital proving ground for understanding and respecting difference and diversity in a global world as well as fostering the literacies and communication practices through which such habits of mind develop” (p. 332). The project

itself argues for a form of global citizenship as the aspiration and vehicle by which young people are invited to examine, interrogate and share their pasts with peers in other countries, enlisting digital images and texts. Specifically, they attempted to examine the following questions: “How do young people develop cosmopolitan habits of mind and attitudes toward others? What are the social and cultural processes that characterize the development of cultural citizenship? What kinds of educative spaces, especially those online, might facilitate such processes? And what forms and designs do communicative practices take in such spaces?” (p. 337).

As they recounted, there were tensions that arose when individual empowerment and community considerations or consultations were not aligned—especially if consulting with the community might conflict with or undermine the “critical” aims of the project. As Glynda Hull and Amy Stornaoulo brought to the fore in this in other studies, when one crosses borders, issues of influence, respect, reciprocity and diversity are difficult to navigate. The multilayered engagements of people and goods are complex and at times involve paradoxical circumstances. They may demand situation specific, interpersonal, respectful, and responsive approaches that are iterative, collaborative, formative, inclusive and critically reflexive. In terms of definitions of cosmopolitanism, then, Hull and her colleagues establish it as fluid and culturally relevant—with a consideration of a world as entailing frequent and ongoing border crossings.

That said, as one moves across nations or cultures, navigating one’s place is tricky and needs an orientation to the other that involves a fuller consideration of ethics. For example, an Indigenous ethical lens would suggest the need for trustworthiness, respect for individuals and community, and informed engagement and agreement throughout any research enterprise (See Side Comment III.9b.4). As Maori scholar Linda Smith (2005) commented:

For indigenous and other marginalized communities, research ethics is at a very basic level about establishing, maintaining, and nurturing reciprocal and respectful relations, not just among people as individuals but also with people as individuals, as collectives and as members of communities, and with humans who live in and with other entities in the environment. The abilities to enter pre-existing relationships; to build, build, maintain, and nurture relationships; and to strengthen connectivity are important research skills in the indigenous arena. They require critical sensitivity and reciprocity of spirit by a researcher. (p. 97)

Side Comment III.9b.4.

Interestingly, in Canada, pertinent and relevant ethical guidelines for international work are oftentimes connected with Indigenous ethics. For example, the Canadian government's research guidelines clearly identify the guidelines for international work as being tied to the principles governing research with First Nations communities in Canada (see: <https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/home.html>).

From a postcolonial perspective, this requires for many of us who are Westerners a step back—befitting the kind of critique that Ali Abdi offered on the work in global citizenship. Abdi (2015) warns against a predisposition dominated by Western values:

As much as anything else, the Western-constructed new global citizenship education scholarship reflects a neocolonial or perhaps more accurately, a decolonial character that should not be totally detached from the old tragedies of the mission civilisatrice (Said, 1993) that presumed, without much evidence, a European predestination to save non-cultured natives from themselves What we should not discount though, is the need to see beyond the fog of the still problematically benevolent political correctness as the creators of the new scholarship are somehow oblivious in turning the gaze upon themselves and societies. (p.16)

Similarly, as Vickers (2018) recently argued, we need an orientation which does not advance a marginalization and colonization of other. There is need for a form of shuttle diplomacy, wherein a culture of research might develop that has local relevance while being both locally and globally situated and connected. It befits the kind of horizontal negotiations across persons suggested by Campano and his colleagues (Campano, Honeyford, Sánchez, & Zanden, 2010). At the same time it suggests a fuller consideration of appropriate engagements with others that possibly extends to a fuller range of stakeholders with a variety of expectations of the norms for and integrity of transactions. Moreover, as Hull and Stornaiuolo (2014) have shown in an extension of their aforementioned work, exchanges across cultures involve complex responses, especially given the meanings and their semiotic possibilities. Interpretations may not align even if occurring in good faith or pursued with considerations of proper distance and hospitality (discussions of which extend beyond the considerations of proper distance and hospitality in conjunction with cosmopolitanism presented here).

Moving Forward

The nature and scope of globalization and literacy is gaining ground as a planetary orientation with a critical theoretical lens (especially post-colonial). There is a sense of a growing global shared mission—one that challenges circumstances that detract from global support for diverse ideas, ways of knowing, and languages. There appears to be a coming together across communities to stem the extinction of languages and ways of knowing, and to eradicate those systemic and pervasive structures of racism, inequity and diminished human rights (See Side Comment III.9b.5). Such is apparent in the admonishment that “context counts,” the call for research and development by and for locals, the global reach of Black Lives Matter and other movements, and the considerations of Indigenous concerns and ways of knowing.

Side Comment III.9b.5.

For example, John Willinsky (1998) presented a history of the impact of the British Empire upon its colonies revealing the widespread pervasive and sustained influence upon the teaching of reading.

In a similar vein, more recently scholars have critiqued the imperial forces at play in the global knowledge economy—including the domination of Western theories and approaches to literacy scholarship to the exclusion and elimination of Southern and Eastern ways of knowing (Rogers, 2017; Tierney, 2016).

There seems to be a mobilized global advocacy that is more respectful than patronizing, more planful and self-determined, and potentially more long-term than incidental. Such a global mission can bridge to, between, from and across local communities in ways that position literacy development devotees more organically; it can be less prone to perpetuating forms of colonialism, objectification, commodification and patrimony. This is an orientation that befits a more transactional approach, befitting Giddens (1999) notion of a global dialectic between “global/local, integration/fragmentation and structure/agency” (Sing, Kenway, & Apple, 2005, p. 4). But is it a place where diversity is supported or is it a space where global has been redefined in a fashion that is colonizing?

Consistent with a planetary disposition and aligned with a post-colonial orientation, a shift to global meaning making has been suggested. This orientation resonates with the notion that all reading is foreign—involving a transaction of one’s world with others. It redefines

reading as global in nature, highlighting the need to interrogate the cultural positioning represented in texts, whether they be narratives or expositions or news releases or academic research (Perry, 2018; Tierney, 2018; 2019; 2020). As I have previously stated:

Global meaning making involves transactions that are situated and not standardized anchored in ethics aligned with respect, reciprocity and ecological global eclecticism..... Global meaning making entails cultural protagonism. For those engaged in international pursuits, it entails straddling multiple locals in different countries, including spaces where racism, classism, and ethnic and various other forms of discrimination may be deep-seated, almost intractable and perhaps perpetuated unless challenged....address(ing) the tug of war between homogeneity and heterogeneity, privilege and responsibility, global and local. (Tierney, 2018)

Global meaning also extends to being an activist, advocate and ally confronting and disrupting the hegemonies that privilege some but limit others (See Side Comment III.9b.6). It fits with helping learners explore their voice—challenging or disrupting hegemonies (as has been occurring in accordance with the activist pursuits emanating on the critical and digital research fronts, challenging racism and other systemic forms of violence, prejudice and bias (See Curwood & Gibbons, 2010; Rogers, Winters, Perry, & LaMonde, 2015; Stornaiuolo & Thomas, 2018). Global meaning making relates to those efforts occurring globally and within various nations, such as the reconciliation efforts with First Nations communities in Canada (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015), anti-racist pursuits in the United States, and the challenges to systemic institutional biases against Indigenous persons occurring within universities in various countries (e.g., Parata and Gardiner, 2020).

Side Comment III.9b.6.

Andreotti and de Souza (2011), building upon Spivak (1990, 1999) and Stein (2018), have argued for a global orientation that entails disrupting the normative—to interrogate ideas, especially in terms of the systems colonizing the world (e.g., hegemonic, ethnocentric, ahistorical, paternalistic) and our complicities with their systemic continuation.

Accordingly, one of the foundations of such global meaning making research engagements befits Freirean notions of the empowerment or conscientization of the

community participants involved. As Patti Lather (1986) stated in her arguments for what she termed catalytic validity. As she stated:

My concern is that efforts to produce social knowledge that is helpful in the struggle for a more equitable world pursue rigor as well as relevance. Otherwise, just as my concern is that efforts to produce social knowledge that is helpful in the struggle for a more equitable world pursue rigor as well as relevance “pointless precision” (Kaplan, 1964) has proven to be the bane of the conventional paradigm, the rampant subjectivity inherent in the more phenomenologically based paradigms will prove to be the nemesis of new paradigm research. (pp. 67-68)

With the advent of globalization and critical reflexivity and ecology, notions of integrity, respect and reciprocity need to be advanced in ways that move across time and space and people. As we engage with one another in the interest of providing support that has integrity, the complexities and multilayered nature of the clashes between the local and global arise, as evident when some of the paradoxes and dilemmas are confronted as scholarly pursuits rub shoulders with local interests. Researchers are not innocent but shape how people and ideas are positioned and might be codified and commodified. Research fields are at risk of becoming agents that can dispossess some and privilege others. Consideration of global ethics will bring to the fore the consideration that when we cross borders, we need to interrogate our processes and positionings. Matters of influence, respect, reciprocity and diversity are essential if credibility is to be maintained.

The multilayered engagements of people and goods are complex and at times involve paradoxical circumstances. They may demand situation specific, interpersonal, respectful, and responsive approaches that are iterative, collaborative, formative, inclusive and critically reflexive. Certainly, these complexities should not be avoided, denied or hidden. They suggest notions of responsibility and responsiveness and the democratization of research—a shift from objectification and “study of” to a personalization, embodiment, enlivenment, and “study with” approach.

Unfortunately, our maps to date do not seem to fully address the transactional nature of or a full list of the elements involved in doing this kind of cross-cultural work. We do know that we should avoid disguising ourselves as allies or third-party reporters as we appropriate and commodify and assume the role of a global trader in the knowledge economy. Such work is done without a genuine license to do so by the individual or the community involved and without a fuller appreciation and reckoning with the sociological

and epistemological dynamics and influences across time, place, individuals and communities.

Global Citizenship, Ecopedagogy, Ways of Knowing, Pluraversality and Language Revitalization

Global initiatives on a number of fronts are grappling with how to pursue a world anchored in respect for diversity. These initiatives include: Deliberations on the notion of global citizenship; The pursuit of what has been termed ecopedagogy; Delving into diverse ways of knowing and the revitalization of languages.

Global Citizenship. Concurrent with discussions of cosmopolitanism, global mobility, nationalism, and internationalism, a number of individuals and groups have contemplated forms of global citizenship (e.g., Oxley & Morris, 2013; Schattle, 2008; Stein, 2015; UNESCO, 2015). These discussions have been attempting to break new ground by unpacking aspirations that acknowledge our global nature and engagements with different groups in a fashion that is ecumenical. These formulations are far-ranging, reflecting deliberations that attempt to draw together liberal humanistic perspectives and post-colonial critiques—even neo-liberal considerations. They represent a fusion of historical consciousness with critical reflexivity, especially with regard to anti-colonial, anti-imperialist, and anti-racism objectives, as well as efforts to resist practices and modes of objectification, commodification, universalism, individualism and neoliberalism. They aspire to appreciate the complexities and differences in the realities, interests, histories and epistemologies of diverse cultures, and advocate for the voices and sovereignty of others (Said, 1993; Santos, 2013). Global citizenship wrestles with and seeks to uncover false statements, bias, witnessing, and pursuits that result in objectification rather than respectfulness (Smith, 1999; 2005). It deviates from universalism and nationalism, as it vies for approaches to studying the “other” that are multiple rather than singular (and allied with while still distanced from)—rather than those that are presumptuously intimate or subordinating.

Nevertheless, approaches to this issue still struggle with the paradoxes entailed in a model of global citizenship that is fixed rather than fluid. As noted by Pashby, da Costa, Stein, and Andreotti (2020) in their analyses of the typologies of approaches to Global Citizenship, the questions being addressed have shifted from:

How can we teach students the values that will support democracy, fairness and progress for all humanity? How can we encourage students to take responsibility for people beyond their own nation's borders? What kinds of activities can enable students to connect with and understand global issues so that they can be helpful in solving them (e.g., climate change, migration, economic globalization)? How can learning about other cultures prepare people to work and collaborate more effectively and efficiently across cultural difference? How can global learning be more systemically incorporated into curriculum and assessed through evaluation? (p. 158)

To questions such as:

How can we imagine a responsibility *towards* others (both human and other-than-human beings), rather than a responsibility *for* others? What kinds of analyses can enable students to understand how they are a part of global problems, and how they can work to mitigate or eradicate these problems at a structural level (e.g., the impact of consumption levels on climate change, the role of Western military interventions in prompting migration, the racialized and gendered international division of labour, etc.)? Whose definitions of citizenship tend to dominate in GCE discourses, and why? How might we redefine and repurpose the concept of global citizenship to advocate for more inclusive forms of representation, and the redistribution of resources? How can our ideas of global citizenship be informed not just by the national citizenship formations of Western nation-states, but also of other countries and other kinds of political communities (e.g., Indigenous nations)? How can we learn to learn from different ways of knowing in order to imagine the world differently? (p. 158-159)

And, finally, to questions that address the paradoxes of this framework, such as:

How has the modern/colonial ontology restricted our horizons and what we consider to be possible, desirable, intelligible and imaginable? What kinds of denials and entitlements keep us not only intellectually but also affectively invested in this ontology? What can engender a stream of connections and a sense of care and commitment towards everything that overrides self-interest and insecurities and is not dependent on convictions, knowledge, identity or understanding? What would it look and feel like if our responsibility to all living beings on the planet was not a willed choice, but rather something 'before will'? What kinds of experiences can enable students to see and sense how they can be simultaneously part of global problems, and

part of global solutions? Is it even possible to imagine a definition of global citizenship not premised on conditional forms of inclusion, or shared values? If citizenship is not a universalizable concept, then how might we nonetheless use it in strategic ways, while remaining conscious of its significant limitations, potential harms, and the partiality of any particular approach? How can we open ourselves up to being taught by different ways of being in order to experience and sense the world differently, being aware of misinterpretations, idealizations and appropriations that are likely to happen in this process? (Pashby, da Costa, Stein, & Andreotti, 2020, p. 159-160)

Ecopedagogy. Simultaneously with these developments in global citizenship, an ecological disposition that embraces diversity is also being advanced, through advocacy for what has been termed ecopedagogy (e.g., Grigorov, & Fleuri, 2012; Kahn, 2009; Misiaszek, 2015; 2018). The notion of ecopedagogy has its roots in Brazil among critical pedagogy activists, especially Paulo Freire (Freire, 2004; Gadotti, 2000), whose views explored the possibilities of a collective humanity and opposition to the neo-liberal tendencies that override considerations of others and the planet. As Angela Antunes and Moacir Gadotti (2005) observe:

Ecopedagogy is not just another pedagogy among many other pedagogies. It not only has meaning as an alternative project concerned with nature preservation (Natural Ecology) and the impact made by human societies on the natural environment (Social Ecology), but also as a new model for sustainable civilization from the ecological point of view (Integral Ecology), which implies making changes on economic, social, and cultural structures. (p.13)

Coupled with concerns about the disintegration of the planet and our cultures, ecopedagogy brings to the fore a range of issues, from dealing with problems of inequity in society to climate change. It entails advocacy for human rights as well as the rights of nature. As Freire (2004) highlighted, ecopedagogy places “reading the world” ahead of “reading the word.” Moreover, it highlights our planetary roles and responsibilities to one another and to place as we adopt multiple perspectives attuned to supporting and respecting (rather than diminishing or extinguishing) our diversity. It aligns with notions of pluriversality discussed next.

Cultural Ways of Knowing, pluriversality and language revitalization.

Increasingly, colonized communities are mobilizing goals of re-establishing the currency of their cultural ways of knowing—befitting postcolonial critiques and in alignment with United Nations Declarations such as those pertaining to Education and, more recently, Indigenous Rights (UN et al., 2013; World Conference, 1990). These pursuits are not straightforward, as prevailing forces perpetuate a privileging of colonizing forces over Indigenous rights and knowledges. As Assié-Lumumba (2017) noted in her discussions of African ways of knowing (focusing on Nigeria), the repositioning of Nigeria's Indigenous ways of knowing is immensely complex, given the ongoing reverence for colonizing forces. As she stated:

Contemporary African education has suffered from several fundamental problems. One of them is the forced juxtaposition of the European and the African systems of education on a hierarchical basis, with the European system on the top and the only one considered legitimate. While it was denied agency, the African system was not successfully eradicated by colonial policy. Individuals and groups are forced to resolve the tension between the two without the benefit of consistent, systemic, and sustained policy that attempts to create a constructive dialogue between them. Another major problem is the lack of systematized and appropriated mechanisms to permanently invigorate the Indigenous system as the foundation and using it with confidence, thereby unfreezing Africa's empowering and positive cultural reference, which was denied free agency for the purpose of justifying transatlantic enslavement and colonial domination. (p. 11)

The reality is that non-Western ways of knowing are disappearing—becoming extinct faster than the diversity of species as the broken links between individuals, communities, cultures, and places increase. Efforts to decolonize—along with those to revitalize cultural ways of knowing—struggle to mount campaigns to challenge the domination of Western ways of knowing. At the same time, burgeoning studies of Indigenous ways of knowing have made the differences between Indigenous methodologies and Western traditions clearer (see Side Comment III.9b.7; see also Battiste, 1998; Battiste & Henderson, 2000; Bishop, 1994; Nakata, 2001, 2004; Ocholla, 2007; Pashby, Rigney & Hattam, 2018; Rigney et al., 2018; Smith, 1999; Smith, 2000, 2015).

Side Comment III.9b.7.

As Martin Nakata (2007) has detailed, Indigenous knowledge is different in the following ways:

- *The range and role of different sources of knowledge—experience, observation, history, language, stories, dreams, nature, and animals;*
- *The nature of the state of knowledge—its animations, permanency, or changeability; its state of flux; and its relationship to the past, present, and future;*
- *The position of knowing within the community collective; and*
- *The basis for how knowledge and knowing are validated and used.*

Indigenous knowing represents a significant shift from Western reductionism and objectification. It instead embraces holistic reflections that involve spiritual connections and a high degree of interrelatedness of people and their worlds. As Indigenous scholars indicate, this positions knowledge as less fixed, befitting an orientation to the world that is ecological, involving an intimacy between people and their natural worlds (Battiste & Henderson, 2000).

Even in countries that have succeeded in making progress, the promotion of cultural ways of knowing requires ongoing concerted efforts to develop understandings of how to advocate for and support them. New Zealand Maori have held the view that advocating for cultural ways of knowing is not to displace one epistemology with another, but rather a matter of positioning Indigenous knowledge as significant or primary—with the possibility of it being separate, fused, or integrated with Western ways of knowing. In discussing New Zealand's success in terms of establishing a Maori-based educational focus, Maori scholar Graham Hingangaroa Smith (2000) has argued, "We ought to be open to using any theory and practice with emancipatory relevance to our Indigenous struggle" (p. 214). As Ghiso, Campano, Player, and Rusoja (2016) further suggest, it should involve:

...the robust multilingual counterpublics of their students' home and neighbourhood communities into the curriculum. This may initially be done through developing partnerships with local organizations and viewing parents and community leaders as partners who have critical knowledge about the potential role of education in a participatory democracy. (p. 24)

Drawing from work based in Argentina, it might also involve a democratization of education via horizontalidad (Campano et al., 2010)—to "reorganize the hierarchical template of politics and construct new forms of participatory democracy. This process of horizontalidad is both the 'end' and the 'means to an end'" (p. 278). In African countries, given their

different histories with colonization and their own regional diversities, repositioning epistemologies would require similar but distinct and complex considerations that are respectful of regional differences, varying tribal interests, disparate religious affiliations, and the ways in which local versus colonial knowledges are positioned and viewed (Onukaogu, 2011). In Australia, promoting cultural ways of knowing seems to demand a combination of activism, education, and positioning—such as making Aboriginal ways of knowing visible, fomenting activism that seeks formal recognition of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and their ways of knowing (Sovereign Union, 2019), or engaging in other forms of leveraging to re-secure Aboriginal peoples' roles. Similarly, a horizontal orientational is consistent with a shift in literacies away from being exclusionary, marginalizing and perpetuating deficit models of others (e.g., Bloome, Averill, Hill, & Ryu, 2014). By drawing upon vertical and horizontal knowledges, Kris Gutiérrez and Barbara Rogoff argue for a syncretic orientation and in so doing being able to “rupture the gap between in school and out-of-school learning” (Gutiérrez, 2014, p.49;) ” crossing into the everyday to leverage repertoires of learning practices befitting the movement across borders (Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003).

As the word “pluriversality” implies, threats to our future emanating from colonizing forces that advance some literacies over others have been challenged as our literacies are examined enlisting a combination of lens from postcolonial critique to affect theory and other lens.¹ For example, Mia Perry (Perry, 2020; Perry & Pullanikkatil, 2019; Escobar, 2018) draws upon various lens: affect theory (Leander & Ehret, 2019) humanism and critical theory (Campano, 2007; Campano, & Damico, 2007; Campano, Ghiso, & Sanchez, 2013; Janks, 2020); ecology and ubuntu (e.g., Dillard, La Grange, 2015); the role of arts, music and performance (e.g., Medina & Wiohlwend, 2014); a form of ethico-onto-epistemology (Song, 2020) as well as transliteracies (Stornaiuolo, Smith, Phillips, 2017) to interrogate the nature and place of literacies in terms issues of place and time. Perry challenges the colonizing forces that contribute to the domination of western forms of literacy especially the positioning of peoples and places and questions the disruption of socio-cultural linkages (between people and place and with one another) that western literacy imposes on all people

¹ The terms pluraliversity was traced to a meeting in Chiapas when indigenous persons decrying their displacement rallied behind a plea for a world that embraces diverse lands and their peoples or as they stated “*un mundo donde quepan muchos mundos*,” or a world in which many worlds fit.

to the advantage of those persons and communities invested in these western ways versus others with a different view and orientation to the world Perry argues:

The project of pluriversal literacies is not to eliminate print text but rather to find ways to incorporate a much broader understanding of relational human experience... this development in literacies theory requires an acceptance of contradictions and of new types of alliances and relations across peoples, traditions, and onto-ethico-epistemologies. Beyond ways of being, this call infers rethinking relations and affects across types of being . . . After all, we share one globe, and to acknowledge multiple ways and types of being in this world compels the field of global literacy education to support multiple ways of making meaning and engaging in that shared world (Perry, 2020).

As concerns have grown about planetary disregard for diversity and the impact of global colonizing influences upon cultures, we have seen the rise of developmental efforts, especially among Indigenous groups, to re-establish their languages and ways of knowing in hopes of avoiding the loss of identity and cultural links that join people across generations with place. In some places these efforts have made significant progress and have helped retain at least a foothold against the overwhelming domination of languages such as English, Spanish, and Mandarin, and Arabic, as well as a counter to projects and ongoing efforts to maintain or expand upon the dominance of a particular language (e.g., as can be seen with exporting Mandarin on a global scale by Hanban and the Confucius Institutes). Projects to revitalize languages and ways of knowing have emerged in various countries with at least some success. By establishing legal mandates, these attempts have re-established ancestral languages as integral to cultural identity and educational programs—ensuring their place in society through teaching. In terms of literacy, these efforts have spurred a range of research pursuits focused on language revitalization as well as knowledge projects exploring multilingualism in a world involving migrations, border-crossing and various forms of transliteracies (Rizvi, 2009; Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Tejeda, 1999; Nelson, Barrera, Skinner, & Fuentes, 2016).

A key element in this effort to stem the tide of loss involves support for cultural practices from tales presented through dance, music or art to language revitalization. In a conversation with Lester-Irabinna Rigney, a Nurungga man who grew up on Point Pearce Mission on the Yorke Peninsula in South Australia, Lester discussed the language revitalization efforts that occurred in his own community. When asked the question, what did

the restoration of your ancestral language afford?, his response pointed to cultural affirmation and cultural ways of knowing. He suggested that he now had words that fit with his worlds (across physical, social, political, spiritual and economic spheres). Words in English defined the world in ways that were familiar but seemed foreign or ill-fitting. Further, his experience with the notion of country entailed an animated, living country—rather than one that is separate and objectified. It is one explored in tandem with ancestral practices passed on via elders, such as song and shared meaning making.

Final Comments

Our lives personally interface with globalization on a daily basis—socially, culturally, economically, physically, intellectually, and historically. In some ways, the global and local are fused. Increasingly, our lives are shaped by border crossings (many of us are or are from immigrants) as well as through engagements with ourselves in the context of others. This fusing fits with descriptions of various form of criss-crossing, hip-hop, and translanguaging by meaning makers across their communities. That is, as people brush against other cultures, their engagements reflect recent descriptions of cross-border meaning making and the boundary negotiations that exist through translanguaging (e.g., Horowitz, 2012; Nelson, Barrera, Skinner, & Fuentes, 2016) and line stepping. As Gutiérrez et al. (2017) note, these crossings occur when:

...an individual deliberately and consciously pushes against society's ideological constraints. Rather than seeing boundaries as static, we recognize their dynamism . . . identifying and testing a line, the line-stepper learns how and where lines are permeable and the available latitude in their enforcement.

(p. 53)

Global research is essentially a study of ourselves, this planet and the societies with whom we exchange. As Appadurai (2001) has commented, this is not just a matter of ecumenicalism and generosity. It requires suspending certainty and opening oneself up to debate and differences and grassroots internationalism as a crucible for emergent new forms of global engagements.

References

- Asselin, M., & Doiron, R. (2013). *Linking literacy and libraries in global communities*. Farnham, Surrey, England: Ashgate Publishing. doi: 10.4324/9781315592480
- Abdi, A. A. (2015). Decolonizing global citizenship education. In A. A. Abdi, L. Shultz, & T. Pillay (Eds.), *Decolonizing global citizenship education* (pp. 11–26). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers. doi: 10.1007/978-94-6300-277-6.
- Andreotti, V., & de Souza, L. M. T. M. (2011). *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Antunes, A. and Gadotti, M. (2005). Eco-pedagogy as the appropriate pedagogy to the earth charter process. *Earth Charter in Action, Part IV: Democracy, Nonviolence, and Peace*, 135–137. Retrieved from <https://earthcharter.org/wp-content/assets/virtual-library2/images/uploads/ENG-Antunes.pdf>
- *Appadurai, A. (2001). Grassroots globalization and the research imagination. In A. Appadurai, B.T. Mandémory, P. Rekacewicz, A. Huyssen, & A. Mbembe (Eds.), *Globalization* (1–21). Durham: Duke University Press.
- *Appadurai, A., Mandémory, B. T., Rekacewicz, P., Huyssen, A., & Mbembe, A., (2001). *Globalization*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Appiah, K.A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- *Asselin, M. & Doiron, R. (2013). *Linking literacy and libraries in global communities*. London, UK: Ashgate.: www.ashgate.com/isbn/9781409452843
- Assié-Lumumba, N. T. (2017). The Ubuntu paradigm and comparative and international education: Epistemological challenges and opportunities in our field. *Comparative Educational Review*, 61, 1-21. doi:10.1086/689922
- Association of Canadian Deans of Education (ACDE). (2014). *Accord on the internationalization of education*. Ottawa: Association of Canadian Deans of Education. Retrieved from <http://csse-scee.ca/acde/publications-2/#internationalization>.
- Australian House of Representatives Standing Committee on Indigenous Affairs. (2017, December). *The power of education: From surviving to thriving: Educational opportunities for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders students*. Retrieved from https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/House/Indigenous_Affairs/EducationalOpportunities/Final_Report

- Battiste, M. (1998). Enabling the autumn seed: Toward a decolonized approach to Aboriginal knowledge, language and education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 22, 16-27.
- Battiste, M., & Henderson, J. Y. (2000). *Protecting Indigenous knowledge and heritage: A global challenge*. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada: Pirich.
- *Bhabha, H. K. (2004). *The location of culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Binkley, Marilyn R., Rust, K. Williams, T. (Eds.) (1996). *Reading literacy in an international perspective collected papers from the IEA Reading Literacy Study*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Bishop, A. (2009). *Becoming an ally: Breaking the cycle of oppression*. Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada: Fernwood.
- Bishop, R. (1994). Initiating empowering research? *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 29, 175-188.
- Bloome, D., Averill, J., Hill, H., & Ryu, S. (2014). Ideologies and their consequences in defining literacies – An essay. In P. J. Dunston, S. K. Fullerton, C. C. Bates, P. M. Stecker, M. Cole, A. Hall, D. Herro, & K. Headley (Eds.) *63rd Yearbook of the Literacy Research Association*. (pp. 61-78). Altamonte Springs, FL: Literacy Research Association.
- Boorstin, D. J. (1989). *Hidden history: Exploring our secret past*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Campano, G. (2007). *Immigrant students and literacy: Reading, writing, and remembering*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Campano, G., & Damico, J.S. (2007). Doing the work of social theorists: Children enacting epistemic privilege as literacy learners and teachers. *Counterpoints*, 310, 219– 233.
- Campano, G., Ghiso, M.P., & Sánchez, L. (2013). “Nobody knows the...amount of a person”: Elementary students critiquing dehumanization through organic critical literacies. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 48(1), 98– 125.
- Campano, G., M. A. Honeyford, L. Sánchez, S. & Zanden, S.V. (2010). “Ends in Themselves: Theorizing the Practice of University–School Partnering through Horizontalidad.” *Language Arts*, 87, 4, 277-286.
- Castells, M. (1996). *The information age: Economy, society and culture* [vol 1]. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Castells, M. (1997). *The information age: The power of identity* [vol. 2]. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

- Castells, M. (1998). *The information age: End of millennium* [vol. 3]. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Certeau, M. de, & Rendall, S. (Trans.) (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chen, X., Anderson, R. C., Li, W., & Shu, H. (2014). Visual, phonological, and orthographic strategies in learning to read Chinese. In X. Chen, Q. Wang, Y. C. Luo (Eds.). *Reading development and difficulties of monolingual and bilingual Chinese children* (pp. 23-47). Dordrecht, NL: Springer
- Chomsky, N. (1989) Propaganda, American-style. In C. Watner (Ed.), *I must speak out: The best of the voluntaryist, 1982–1999* (pp. 223–225). San Francisco: Fox & Wilkes.
- Choudry, A. (2015). *Learning activism: The intellectual life of contemporary social movements*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- *Collins, R. (1998). *The sociology of philosophies: A global theory of intellectual change*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Curwood, Jen Scott, and Gibbons, D. 2010. “Just Like I Have Felt:” Multimodal Counternarratives in Youth-Produced Digital Media. *International Journal of Learning and Media*, 1(4), 59-77.
- Dillard, C.B. (2019). You are because I am: Toward new covenants of equity and diversity in teacher education. *Educational Studies*, 55(2), 121–138
- Downing, J. (Ed.) (1973). *Comparative reading*. New York: Macmillan.
- Drucker, P. F. (1969). *The age of discontinuity: Guidelines to our changing society*. New York: Harper & Row.
- *Duff, P., & Talmy, S. (2011). Language socialization approaches to second language acquisition: Social, cultural, and linguistic development in additional languages. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to SLA*. (pp. 95-116) London: Routledge.
- Escobar, E. (2018). *Designs for the pluriverse: Radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Foshay, A. W., Thorndike, R. L., Hotyat, F., Pidgeon, D. A., & Walker, D. A. (1962). *Educational achievements of thirteen-year-olds in twelve countries: Results of an international research project, 1959–1961*. Hamburg: UNESCO Institute for Education.

Friedman, T. L. (2008). *Hot, flat and crowded: Why we need a green revolution—and how it can renew America*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Freire, P. (2004). *Pedagogy of Indignation*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

doi:10.4324/9781315632902

Gadotti, Moacir. (2000). *Pedagogia da Terra* (5th ed.). São Paulo, Brazil: Peirópolis.

*Galla, C.K. (2017). Materials development for Indigenous language revitalization:

Pedagogy, praxis and possibilities, In McKinley, E. & Smith, L.T. (Eds.), *Handbook of Indigenous Education* (pp. 1-19). Singapore: Springer. doi: 10.1007/978-981-10-1839-8_12-1

Ghiso, M. P., Campano, G., Player, G., & Rusoja, A. (2016). Dialogic teaching and multilingual counterpublics. *International Perspectives on Dialogic Theory and Practice*, 16, 1-26. doi:10.17239/L1ESLL-2016.16.02.05

Giddens, A. (1999). *Runaway world: How globalization is reshaping our lives*. London: Profile.

Goodwin, S. (2012, August 23 to 25). *Conducting action research in an “evidence-based” policy environment*. Australian qualitative research conference, *Embodying Good Research: What Counts and Who Decides?* at Charles Darwin University, Australia.

Gramsci, A. (1982). *Selections from the prison books*. London, England: Lawrence & Wishart.

Gray, W. S. (1956). *The teaching of reading and writing: An international survey*. Paris: UNESCO.

Grigorov, S., & Fleuri, R. (2012). Ecopedagogy: Educating for a new eco-social intercultural perspective. *Visão Global, Joaçaba*, 15(1-2), 433-454. Available from <http://editora.unoesc.edu.br/index.php/visao-global/article/view/3435/1534>

Gutiérrez, K. (2014) Syncretic approaches to literacy learning; Leveraging horizontal knowledge and expertise. In P. J. Dunston, S. K. Fullerton, C. C. Bates, P. M. Stecker, M. Cole, A. Hall, D. Herro, & K. Headley (Eds.) *63rd Yearbook of the Literacy Research Association*. (pp. 48-60). Altamonte Springs, FL: Literacy Research Association.

Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-López, P., & Tejeda, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. *Mind, Culture and Activity*, 6(4), 286-303. doi:10.1080/10749039909524733

- Gutiérrez, K. D., Cortes, K., Cortez, A., DiGiacomo, D., Higgs, J., Johnson, P., Lizárraga, J., Mendoza, E., Tien, J., & Vakil, S. (2017). Replacing representation with imagination: Finding ingenuity in everyday practices. *Review of Research in Education*, 41(1), 30.
- Gutiérrez, K. D & Rogoff, B. (2003) Cultural ways of learning: individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational Researcher*, 32(5), 19-25.
- Hampton, E. (1995). Toward a redefinition of Indian education. In M. Battiste & J. Barman (Eds.), *First Nations education in Canada: The circle unfolds* (pp. 5-42). Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press.
- *Hare, J., & *Davidson, S. F. (2016). Learning from Indigenous knowledge in education. In D. Long & O. P. Dickason, (Eds.), *Visions of the heart: Canadian Aboriginal issues, 4th Edition* (pp. 241-262). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- *Henry, A. (2015). "We especially welcome applications from visible minorities": Reflections on race, gender and life at three universities. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 18(5), 589–610
- Horowitz, R. (2012). Border Crossing: Geographic space and cognitive shifts in adolescent language and literacy practices. In H. Romo, C. Garrido de la Caleja, & O. Lopez (Eds.), *A bilateral perspective on Mexico-United States migration* (pp. 147–164). Xalapa, Veracruz, Mexico: Universidad Veracruzana and The University of Texas at San Antonio, UTSA—Mexico Center..
- Hull, G. A., & Stornaiuolo, A. (2014). Cosmopolitan literacies, social networks, and “proper distance:” Striving to understand in a global world. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 44(1), 15–44. doi: 10.1111/curi.12035.
- Hull, G., Stornaiuolo, A., & Sahni, U. (2010). Cultural Citizenship and Cosmopolitan Practice: Global Youth Communicate Online. *English Education*, 42(4), 331-367.
- Janks, H. (2020). Critical literacy in action: Difference as a force for positive change. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 63(5), 569– 572
- Kahn, R. (2009). *Critical pedagogy, ecoliteracy, & planetary crisis: The ecopedagogy movement*. Peter Lang.
- *Kendrick, M. (2016). *Literacy and multimodality across global sites*. London, UK: Routledge. (Literacies Series). <https://www.routledge.com/products/9780415859790>
- *King, J. E. (2017). 2015 AERA Presidential Address: Morally engaged research/ers dismantling epistemological nihilation in the age of impunity. *Educational Researcher*, 46(5), 211–222. doi: 10.3102/0013189X17719291.

- Kim, G. M. (2016). Transcultural digital literacies: Cross-Border connections and Self-Representations in an online forum. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 51(2), 199–219. doi: 10.1002/rrq.131.
- Kubota, R. (2009). Internationalization of universities: Paradoxes and responsibilities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93, 612-616.
- *Kubota, R., & Lehner, A. (2004). Toward critical contrastive rhetoric. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(1), 7–27. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.003.
- *Lam, W. S. E. (2013). Multilingual practices in transnational digital contexts. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(4), 820–825. doi: 10.1002/tesq.132.
- *Lam, W. S. E. (2014). Literacy and capital in immigrant youths' online networks across countries. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 39(4), 488–506. doi: 10.1080/17439884.2014.942665.
- *Lam, W. S. E., Warriner, D. S., Poveda, D., & Gonzalez, N. (2012). Transnationalism and literacy: Investigating the mobility of people, languages, texts, and practices in contexts of migration. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 47(2), 191–215. doi: 10.1002/RRQ.016.
- Lather, P. (1986). Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. *Interchange*, 17(4), 63–84. doi: 10.1007/BF01807017.
- Leander, K.M., & Ehret, C. (Eds.). (2019). *Affect in literacy learning and teaching: Pedagogies, politics and coming to know*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Le Grange, L. (2015). Ubuntu/botho as ecophilosophy and ecosophy. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 49(3), 301–308.
- *Li, G. (2006). *Culturally contested pedagogy: Battles of literacy and schooling between mainstream teachers and Asian immigrant parents*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Lo, L. N. (1991). State patronage of intellectuals in Chinese higher education. *Comparative Education Review*, 35(4), 690–720. doi: 10.1086/447070.
- Luke, A. (2011). Generalizing across borders: Policy and the limits of educational science. *Educational Researcher*, 40(8), 367–377. doi: 10.3102/0013189X11424314.
- Luke, A., Shield, P., Théroux, P., Tones, M., & Villegas, M. (2011). *Knowing and teaching the Indigenous other: Teachers' engagement with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures* (Research report from Australian Commonwealth Government, Department of Employment, Education and Workplace Relations for the evaluation of the Stronger Smarter Learning Communities Project, 2009-2013). Retrieved from <https://eprints.qut.edu.au/53510/2/53510.pdf>

- Mahuika, R. (2008). Kaupapa Maori theory is critical and anti-colonial. *MAI Review* 3, Article 4. Retrieved from <http://www.review.mai.ac.nz>
- *Manzon, M. (2011). *Comparative education: The construction of a field*. Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre. doi: 10.1007/978-94-007-1930-9.
- Maracle, Lee (1993). *Ravensong*. Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers.
- *Martin, F., & Rizvi, F. (2014). Making Melbourne: Digital connectivity and international students' experience of locality. *Media, Culture & Society*, 36(7), 1016–1031. doi: 10.1177/0163443714541223.
- Medina, C.L., & Wohlwend, K.E. (2014). *Literacy, play and globalization: Converging imaginaries in children's critical and cultural performances*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Misiaszek, G. W. (2015). Ecopedagogy and citizenship in the age of globalisation: Connections between environmental and global citizenship education to save the planet. *European Journal of Education*, 50(3), 280–292. doi: 10.1111/ejed.12138.
- Misiaszek, G. W. (2018). *Educating the global environmental citizen: Understanding ecopedagogy in local and global contexts*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- *Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141. doi: 10.1080/00405849209543534.
- Morgan, B. (2019). Beyond the guest paradigm: Eurocentric education and aboriginal peoples in NSW. In E. A. McKinley & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of Indigenous education* (pp. 111-128). Singapore: Springer Singapore. doi:10.1007/978-981-10-3899-0_60
- Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Foy, P., Hooper, M., International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), & Boston College, TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center. (2017a). *PIRLS 2016 International Results in Reading*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Foy, P., Hooper, M., International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), & Boston College, TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center. (2017b). *ePIRLS 2016: International Results in Online Informational Reading*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Nakata, M. (2001). Another window on reality. In B. Osborne (Ed.), *Teaching democracy and diversity* (pp. 331-353). Altona, Australia: Common Ground Publishing.

- Nakata, M. (2004). Ongoing conversations about aboriginal and torres strait islander research agendas and directions. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 33(2004), 1-6. doi:10.1017/S1326011100600807
- Nakata, M. (2007). *Disciplining the savages: Savaging the disciplines*. Canberra, Australia: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- *Nederveen Pieterse, J. (2009). *Globalization and culture: Global mélange* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Nelson, N. E., Barrera, S., Skinner, K., & Fuentes, A. M. (2016). Language, culture and border lives: mestizaje as positionality/Lengua, cultura y vidas de frontera: el mestizaje como posicionalidad. *Cultura y Educación*, 28(1), 1–41. doi:10.1080/11356405.2014.980121 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/11356405.2014.980121>.
- *Nederveen Pieterse, J. (2009). *Globalization and culture: Global mélange* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Nelson, N., Barrera, E. S., Skinner, K., & Fuentes, A. M. (2016). Language, culture and border lives: mestizaje as positionality/Lengua, cultura y vidas de frontera: el mestizaje como posicionalidad. *Cultura y Educación*, 28, 1-41. doi:10.1080/11356405.2014.980121
- *Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow, England: Longman/Pearson Education.
- *Norton, B. & Early, M. (2011). Researcher identity, narrative inquiry, and language teaching research. *TESOL Quarterly*, Special Issue- Narrative Research in TESOL
- Norton, B., & Tembe, J. (2020). Teaching multilingual literacy in Ugandan classrooms: The promise of the African Storybook. *Applied Linguistics Review*. doi: 10.1515/applirev-2020-2006.
- *Nozaki, Y. (2009). Orientalism, the West and non-West binary, and postcolonial perspectives in cross-cultural research and education. In M. Apple, W. Au, & L. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge International Handbook of Critical Education* (pp. 382–390). New York: Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9780203882993.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1994). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. *Boston Review*, XIX(5), 3-16
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: a classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- *Ocholla, D. (2007). Marginalized knowledge: An agenda for Indigenous knowledge development and integration with other forms of knowledge. *International Review of Information Ethics*, 7, 236–245. Retrieved from <http://www.i-r-i-e.net/inhalt/007/26-ocholla.pdf>.
- Onukaogu, C. (August, 2011). *Literacy and transparent elections in Africa: Lessons, issues and challenges of the Nigerian experience*. Paper presented at the 9th Pan African Literacy Conference, Gaborone, Botswana.
- Oxley, L., & Morris, P. (2013). Global citizenship: A typology for distinguishing its multiple conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 61(3), 301-325.
doi:10.1080/00071005.2013.798393
- Parata H., & Gardiner, H. (2020, Sept 19). Letter to Rt Hon Sir Anand Satyanand Chancellor Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato investigating racism. https://squiz-matrix.its.waikato.ac.nz/_matrix-data/assets/pdf_file/0024/183426/Parata-Gardiner-Report.pdf
- Pashby, Rigney, L., & Hattam, R. J. (2018, April). *Toward a decolonizing culturally responsive pedagogy?* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, New York, NY.
- Pashby, K., da Costa, M., Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. (2020). A meta-review of typologies of global citizenship education. *Comparative Education*, 56(2), 144-164.
doi:10.1080/03050068.2020.1723352
- Perry, M. (2020) Pluriversal literacies: affect and relationality in vulnerable times. *Reading Research Quarterly*, <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.312>
- Perry, M. (2018). Unpacking the imaginary in literacies of globality. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 41(4), 574-586. DOI: 10.1080/01596306.2018.1515064
- Perry, M., & Pullanikkatil, D. (2019). Transforming international development. *Impact*, 2019(9), 30–32.
- *Popkewitz, T. S., & Rizvi, F. (2009). Globalization and the study of education. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 108(2), 1–3. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-7984.2009.01157.x.
- Preston, R. G. (1962). The reading achievement of German and American students. *School and Society*, 90, 350-354.
- Purcell-Gates, V. (2007). *Cultural practices of literacy: Case studies of language, literacy, social practice, and power*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Purves, A. (1973). *Literature Education in Ten Countries: An Empirical Study. International Studies in Evaluation*. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Postlethwaite, T. Neville, & Ross, K. N. (1992). *Effective Schools in Reading: Implications for Educational Planners: An Exploratory Study*. November. The Hague, The Netherlands: The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Rizvi, F. (2009). Toward cosmopolitan learning. *Discourse Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 30(3), 253-268.
- Rizvi, F. (2009). Global mobility and the challenges of educational research and policy. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 108(2), 268–289. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-7984.2009.01172.x.
- *Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. London: Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9780203867396.
- *Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture*. New York: Sage.
- *Robertson, S. L. & Dale, R. (2009). The World Bank, the IMF, and the possibilities of critical education. In M. Apple, W. Au, & L. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge International Handbook of Critical Education* (pp. 23–35). New York: Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9780203882993.
- Rogers, R. (2017, November 29). *Literacy research, racial consciousness, and equitable flows of knowledge*. Presidential address at the Literacy Research Association, Tampa, FL. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1oyZ2altlqk>
- Rogers, T., Winters, K. L., Perry, M., & LaMonde, A.M. (2015). *Youth, critical literacies, and civic engagement*. New York: Routledge.
- *Rueda, R., & Yaden, D. B., Jr. (2013). The education of young dual-language learners: An overview. In O. Saracho & B. Spodek & (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on the Education of Young Children*, 3rd ed. (pp. 157-168). New York: Routledge.
- *Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- *Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Knopf.
- Sailors, M., Hoffman, J. V., & International Literacy Association. (2018). *Literacy coaching for change: Choices matter*. Newark, NJ: International Literacy Association.
- Sailors, M., & Hoffman, J. V., Goia, E., Ngomane, J., Siteo, A., & Modesto, H. (2019). Affordances of mentoring on preservice teacher language and literacy learning in Mozambique. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 63(2), 127-133.
- Santos, B. de Sousa. (2007). Beyond abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of

knowledges. *Review-Fernand Braudel Center for the Study of Economies, Historical Systems, and Civilizations*, 30(1), 45-89.

Santos, B. de Sousa. (Ed.). (2008). *Another knowledge is possible: Beyond Northern epistemologies*. London: Verso.

Santos, B. de Sousa. (2013). *Epistemologies of the south: Justice against epistemicide*. London, England: Paradigm. doi:10.4324/9781315634876

*Schriewer, J. (2004). Multiple internationalities: The emergence of a word-level ideology and the persistence of idiosyncratic world-views. In C. Charle, J. Schriewer, & P. Wagner (Eds.), *Transnational intellectual networks: Forms of academic knowledge and the search for cultural identities* (pp. 473–533). New York: Campus Verlag.

*Schriewer, J., & Martinez, C. (2004). Constructions of internationality in education. In G. Steiner-Khamsi (Ed.), *The global politics of educational borrowing and lending* (pp. 29–53). New York: Teachers College.

*Schulte, B. (2004). East is east and West is west? Chinese academia goes global. In C. Charle, J. Schriewer, P. Wagner (Eds.), *Transnational intellectual networks: Forms of academic knowledge and the search for cultural identities* (pp. 307–322). New York: Campus Verlag.

Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981). *The psychology of literacy*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

Schattle, H. (2008). Education for global citizenship: Illustrations of ideological pluralism and adaptation. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 13(1), 73–94.
doi:10.1080/13569310701822263

* Seda Santana, I. (2000). Literacy research in Latin America. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in reading* (pp. 41–52). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

*Shi, L. (2012). Rewriting and paraphrasing source texts in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 134-148.

Singh, M., Fenway, J., & Apple, M. (2005). Globalizing education; perspectives from above and below. In M. Apple, J. Fenway & M. Singh (Eds.), *Globalizing education: Policies, pedagogies and politics* (pp. 1–30). New York: Peter Lang.

Smith, G. H. (1990). Research Issues Related to Maori Education, paper presented to NZARE Special Interest Conference, Massey University, reprinted in 1992, The Issue

- of Research and Maori, Research Unit for Maori Education, The University of Auckland. <http://www.rangahau.co.nz/research-idea/27/>
- Smith, G. H. (2000). Protecting and respecting Indigenous knowledge. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision* (pp. 209-224). Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press.
- Smith, G. H. (2015, April). Transforming research: The Indigenous struggle for social, cultural, and economic justice within and through education. Presented at The American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL. <http://www.aera.net/Events-Meetings/Annual-Meeting/Previous-Annual-Meetings/2015-Annual-Meeting/2015-Annual-Meeting-Webcasts/Transforming-Research-The-Indigenous-Struggle-for-Social-Cultural-and-Economic-Justice-Within-and-Through-Education>.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonising methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.
- Smith, L. T. (2005). On tricky ground: Researching the Native in the age of uncertainty. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3rd ed. (pp. 85-108). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Song, Ah-Young (2020) An ethico-onto-epistemological approach to literacy research. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 52,2, 231-237.
- Sovereign Union. (2019). 'Uluru Statement from the heart'—Wording and video reading [from the Referendum Council at Uluru, May 26, 2017], Sovereign Union: First Nations Asserting Sovereignty [website]. Sovereign Union of First Nations and Peoples in 'Australia.' <http://nationalunitygovernment.org/content/uluru-statement-heart>
- Spivak, G. C. (1990). *The post-colonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogues*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Spivak, G. C. (1999). *A critique of postcolonial reason: Toward a critique of the vanishing present*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stein, S. (2015). Mapping global citizenship. *Journal of College and Character*, 16(4), 242-252. doi:10.1080/2194587x.2015.1091361
- Stein, S. (2017). The persistent challenges of addressing epistemic dominance in higher education: Considering the case of curriculum internationalization. *Comparative Education Review*, 61(Suppl. 1), S25-S50.
- Stornaiuolo, A., A. Nichols, P. C., 2019. Cosmopolitanism and Education. *Oxford Encyclopedia of Education, on-line*.

https://www.academia.edu/39153381/Cosmopolitanism_and_Education?email_work_card=view-paper

Stornaiuolo, A., A. Smith, N. C. Phillips, N. C. 2017. Developing a transliteracies framework for a connected world. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 49 (10) 68-91

Stornaiuolo, A. & Thomas, E. E. (2018) Restorying as political action: authoring resistance through youth media arts, *Learning, Media and Technology*, 43:4,345-358, DOI: 10.1080/17439884.2018.1498354

*Talmy, S. (2015). A language socialization perspective on identity work of ESL youth in a superdiverse high school classroom. In N. Markee (Ed.), *Handbook of classroom discourse and interaction* (pp. 353-368). New York: Wiley Blackwell
Shu, H., Anderson, R. C., & Zhang, H. (1995). Incidental learning of word meanings while reading: A Chinese and American cross-cultural study. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, 76-95

*Takayama, K. (2009). Progressive education and critical education scholarship in Japan: Toward the democratization of critical educational studies. In M. Apple, W. Au, & L. Gandin (Eds.), *The Routledge International Handbook of Critical Education* (pp. 354–367). New York: Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9780203882993.

Takayama, K., Sriprakash, A., & Connell, R. (2017). Toward a postcolonial comparative and international education. *Comparative Education Review*, 61(S1), S1–S24. doi: 10.1086/690455.

*The World Bank. (2012). Knowledge assessment methodology. Retrieved from: <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/WBI/WBIPROGRAMS/KFDLP/EXTUNIKAM/0,,contentMDK:20584250~pagePK:64168427~piPK:64168435~theSitePK:1414721,00.html?>

Thorndike, R. L. (1973) *Reading comprehension education in fifteen countries. International Studies in Evaluation*, New York: Halstead Press.

Tierney, R. J. (2020) Notes on global reading: critical cultural traversals, transactions and transformations. In Lauren Ila Misiaszek (Ed.) *Exploring the Complexities in Global Citizenship Education: Hard Spaces, Methodologies, and Ethics*. [Pp. 36-68]. New York: Routledge.

https://www.academia.edu/40450420/Notes_on_global_reading_critical_cultural_traversals_transactions_and_transformations

- Tierney, R. J. (2018). Toward a model of global meaning making. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 50, 4 . 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X18803134>. Available from <https://independent.academia.edu/RobTierney/Papers>
- Tierney, R. J. (2018) Global educational research in Western times: the rise and plight of China. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 13(2),163-192. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11516-018-0010-4>. Available from [https://www.academia.edu/37171936/Global Educational Research in Western Times The Rise and Plight of Chinese Educational Research](https://www.academia.edu/37171936/Global_Educational_Research_in_Western_Times_The_Rise_and_Plight_of_Chinese_Educational_Research)
- Tierney, R. J., & Kan, W. (2016). Knowledge mobilization within and across the People's Republic of China and the United States: A cross-national study of internationalization of educational research in the early 21st century. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(6), 1759–1791. doi: 10.3102/0002831216678320.
- Torres, C. A. (2015). Global citizenship and global universities. the age of global interdependence and cosmopolitanism. *European Journal of Education*, 50(3), 262-279. doi:10.1111/ejed.12129
- Trigos-Carillo, L. & Rogers, R. (2018). Latin American Influences on Multiliteracies: From Epistemological Diversity to Cognitive. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, 66(1), 373-388.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015). *Honouring the truth, reconciling for the future: Summary of the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. www.trc.ca
- United Nations, Australian Human Rights Commission, & National Congress of Australia's First Peoples. (2013). *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*: Adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 13 September 2007. Available from https://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf
- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2006). *Information economy report: 2006*. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2015). *Global citizenship education: Topics and learning objectives*. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002329/232993e.pdf>
- Vickers, E. (2018) 'Book review: The Strong State and Curriculum Reform, Leonel Lim and Michael W. Apple (eds), with response from the book's contributors. *London Review of Education*, 16 (2): 336–344. DOI <https://doi.org/10.18546/LRE.16.2.12>

- Wagner, D. A. (2018). Technology for education in low-income countries: Supporting the UN Sustainable Development Goals. In I. Lubin (Ed.), *ICT-Supported Innovations in Small Countries and Developing Regions: Perspectives and Recommendations for International Education* (pp. 51–74). NY: Springer.
- Wagner, D. A. (2018). *Learning as development: Rethinking international education in a changing world*. NY: Routledge.
- Wagner, D. A. (2017). Children's Reading in Low-Income Countries. *The Reading Teacher*, 71(2), 127-133.
- Wagner, D. A. (2011). What happened to literacy? Historical and conceptual perspectives on literacy in UNESCO. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 31, 319–323.
- Wagemaker, H., Polydorides, G., and Martin, M. (Eds.). (1994). *Gender Differences in Reading*. IEA, The Hague, The Netherlands.
- Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at Empires End*. University of Minnesota Press.
- World Conference on Education for All: Meeting Basic Learning Needs. (1990). *World declaration on education for all and framework for action to meet basic learning needs*. Adopted by the World Conference on Education for All: Meeting Basic Learning Needs, Jomtien, Thailand, 5-9 March 1990. New York, N.Y: Inter-Agency Commission (UNDP, UNESCO, UNICEF, World Bank) for the World Conference on Education for All.
- World Summit on the Information Society, Stauffacher, D., Kleinwächter, W., & United Nations ICT Task Force. (2005). *The World Summit on the Information Society: Moving from the past into the future*. New York, NY: UN.
- *Yaden, D. B., Jr. (1999). Reading disability and dynamical systems: When predictability implies pathology. In P. B. Mosenthal and D. Evensen (Eds.), *Reconsidering the role of the reading clinic in a new age of literacy* (pp. 293-323). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Zhang, J., Lin, T.-J., Wei, J., & Anderson, R. C. (2014). Morphological awareness and learning to read Chinese and English. In X. Chen, Q. Wang, Y. C. Luo (Eds.), *Reading development and difficulties of monolingual and bilingual Chinese children* (pp. 3-22). Dordrecht, NL: Springer.

Other internet resources

Active mobile broadband subscriptions per 100 inhabitants [Graph illustrating growth of mobile devices, smart phones]. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mobile_phone#/media/File:Active_mobile_broadband_subscriptions_2007-2014.svg.

DeCarlo, S. (Ed.). The *Fortune* global 500. *Fortune*. Retrieved from <http://fortune.com/global500/>.

Global internet usage [Wikipedia page entry]. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_Internet_usage.

Knowledge economic index [Wikipedia page entry]. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Knowledge_Economic_Index.

List of social networking websites [Wikipedia page entry]. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_social_networking_websites.

Matthews, C. (2014, October 5). Fortune 5: The most powerful economic empires of all time. *Fortune*. Retrieved from <http://fortune.com/2014/10/05/most-powerful-economic-empires-of-all-time/>.

A history of literacy education: waves of research and practice