11 The Global Wave

11.1 THE GLOBAL READER

How do you view yourself as global? You may not be aware of doing so every day, but in multiple ways we engage with the world—through the lens of both a telescope and a microscope as we examine our surroundings, look out the windows at the landscape, check the weather, or indulge in the outdoors or intermingle with others. Many of us are global news junkies, continental and intercontinental travelers as well as planetary consumers—attending to world affairs and ever conscious of our footprint. Even as we open our computers, we are apt to have emails or other forms of exchange that have global trajectories. For those of us who are deemed foreigners, we may find ourselves interacting with family, friends, and colleagues about both worldly and local issues as we contemplate planetary, national, and local circumstances, including our engagements and how we are coping with our realities. These are family, friends, and colleagues located thousands of miles apart, sometimes in transit. Yet, nowadays, it is as if we are in the same neighborhood or near to one another as we share a focus on issues that are both local and planetary in scope.

Along with our histories—including events and new technologies, the media, our countries' global ambitions and behaviours—we change as individuals as we travel across and adjust to global and local terrains and respond to the various forces that we experience. Some of these global forces are economic; others occur at the intersection of local and global as well as via personal connectivity with colleagues, family, and friends across cultures and locations. As we engage with our worlds and the world moves forward, we are learning to read ourselves and our worlds more discerningly—perhaps as an ally, advocate, activist, or reactionary as we recalibrate our views of the planet and its diversities. As a literacy educator, then, what does it mean to be a global reader?

In his "Critical Global Literacies" column for NCTE's *English Journal*, Bogum Yoon (2018) highlighted the importance of the global:

> We no longer live in an isolated world; we live in a global era. Understanding dynamic human practices around the world is a necessity, not an option. Given that there is no "official" curriculum standard on global literacy, English teachers' agency to provide

opportunities for students to expand their understanding of the world in their ELA classes becomes quite important. By linking local and global issues and adding global perspectives to traditional and multicultural texts, teachers can offer students more opportunities to envision "alternative ways of thinking and living" and to challenge global issues (Short, 2011, p. 145). When teachers invite students to become critical members of the global community with the lens of critical global literacies, possibilities open. (p. 94)

We would offer what might be a bolder proposal: Global meaning making should be integral to all of our reading. Our engagement with global matters goes beyond comparative analyses or a reading to learn about others; it involves reading ourselves and our worlds in the company of other readers and other cultures—thereby recognizing "the others of our selves" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 560). Moreover, it involves reading the systems at play that limit or liberate, nurture or destroy. Critically oriented global meaning making is not passive but action oriented, requiring us to act responsibly on our readings.

Defining our reading as global may seem foreign, but it is not. Our reading of worlds is lifelong and life-wide. We are constantly crossing borders; as we do so, we read events either vicariously or as a participant, consumer, or connoisseur—with an eye to understanding the systems at play and the relationships among people, places, and events. Reading is not a simple act of retrieval but a form of cultural study and engagement. Readers, students as well as adults, are akin to researchers—conscious of the perspectives, positionalities, gaps, slants, and biases that inform their ongoing meaning making. Their contemplations may involve an aversion and opposition to or, alternatively, a resonance with calls for engaged support, action, or even activism. Approaching engagements globally, from multiple perspectives, affords meaning makers opportunities to observe and participate aesthetically or vicariously, efferently and critically, with events, settings, characters, and issues.

Further, reading globally compels meaning makers to grapple with their own positionalities and identities, and to reach out for other perspectives to scrutinize the cauldron of sociopolitical forces involved in different circumstances. While it requires a consideration of how others see the world—hearing their voices and examining their ways of thinking—it also helps us to see ourselves, uncovering what may have gone unnoticed, misunderstood, or ignored. This may occur with as little effort as inviting others to bring their different knowledge sources to the reading; alternatively, it may necessitate a more strategic invitation to outsiders with different interests and histories to inform one's reading. Such transformative readings can shape one's own life or reading of others. It can occur as one participates in everyday events, engaging with different persuasions or attitudes or history. It might entail being faced with confrontations or circumstances that are racist, sexist, gendered, or in other ways discriminatory.

Being global involves the everyday, requiring forms of multicultural cosmopolitanism including nuanced knowledge of others (e.g., norms, conventions,

language) to connect. It may involve forms of border crossing or cross-boundary negotiations through translanguaging (e.g., Horowitz, 2012; Nelson et al., 2016) and language fusions or playful line stepping (Gutiérrez et al., 2017) that capitalize on readers' plural identities and abilities to move across or interweave communities.

Texts and media can contribute to global considerations—from the simplest of picture books to graphic novels; from realistic to historical, fantasy, and science fiction to nonfiction, self-help guides, and naturalist writing; and from print media to films to online and social media productions—even Twitter feeds. Arguably, in these political times, global meaning making is integral to one's reading of news releases, opinion pieces, and the writings of politicians. But it is also how we support, dismiss, or position ourselves as an ally, adversary, or passive observer of forms of discrimination or advantage for one group over another.

Take, if you will, James Baldwin's (1974) novel *If Beale Street Could Talk.* Baldwin's story moves readers across multiple perspectives, cultures, and worlds. It is not just a story of love between an African American couple, as told by a wife, or that of love within a family, as told by a daughter. It is a story of families; of the broader society of humanity; of intolerance, and unconscionable racism. It is a story that engages readers in complex social dynamics within and across individuals, families, communities, and cultures. As readers encounter these various dynamics, they are transacting with and across cultures, bringing their own selves and their societal experiences to the text—especially as they contemplate the events and the cultural forces in play. In this way, as Baldwin seems to suggest, Beale Street is not just one place, within one story.

Similarly, consider some of the powerful Indigenous historical novels, such as Australian Aboriginal educator Eric Willmott's (1988) book *Pemulwuy: The Rainbow Warrior.* The novel recounts the story of Australian Aboriginal resistance to British occupation—a story kept invisible both to outsiders and across generations of Australian immigrants. Or take scholar and author Larissa Y. Behrendt's (2004) work *Home*—a modern-day account of her experiences, as an urban Aboriginal, in visiting her place of heritage in a remote rural area where her community experienced horrific treatment. These stories reveal the current circumstances and dynamics of cultural experiences across time and place; they are educative, provocative, and may be transformative. For Australian readers, these texts might serve as antecedents to a reconsiderations of the systemic forces that have shaped the population culturally, including the unacceptable racism that persists. For North American readers, Thomas King's (2012) work *The Inconvenient Indian: A Curious Account of Native People in North America*, may provide a similar platform. His account introduces readers to a world that that they might claim to know, but likely narrowly or monoculturally.

Many of us who read these stories are reading them not just as powerful narratives, but as accounts of societies that may be invisible or that may have been (and may remain) violent. Moreover, our readings reveal how the worlds of others are also part of "our worlds" and "our selves" (Bhabha, 1994). They afford forms of transformative engagements in terms of understanding and situating our social

and cultural time and place, including recognizing and, I would hope, interrogating and challenging the systems that may still contribute to persisting cultural and planetary affronts.

Cultural considerations, on a global scale or those that involve border crossings, are pervasive in our lives as a result of our associations, links, and interests—to the point that they verge on planetary considerations. Our lives involve forms of trafficking as we attend to time zones, climate flows, migration, languages, health, trade, and politics. At times—such as with many of the events over the past few years—historical developments occur that reverberate throughout our lives, challenge the status quo, and make forms of global meaning making more overt. For example, consider the news in the spring of 2019 of the murder of some 50 New Zealanders of Muslim faith by an Australian white supremacist. The event brought to the surface a range of issues existing in our lives, including concerns over global terrorism and the rising white supremacist movement; the consequences of our interconnectedness with global media; and debates around the precipitousness of hate speech, from tweets to blogs (e.g., of individuals, such as PewDiePie, or those tied to political policy speeches, such as Trump). Yet in the midst of these concerns, New Zealand prime minister Jacinda Ardern reminded us of the need for a moral compass—that is, the need to embrace one another as one, with all our differences. One of the most poignant moments occurred when, immediately following the tragic event, she stated:

> Clearly what has happened here is an extraordinary and unprecedented act of violence. . . . Many of those who would have been directly affected by this shooting may be migrants to New Zealand. They may even be refugees here. They have chosen to make New Zealand their home, and it is their home. . . . They are us. . . . The people who were the subject of this attack today, New Zealand is their home, they should be safe here. The person who has perpetuated this violence against us is not. They have no place in New Zealand. ("Christchurch mosque," 2019)

As with other global affairs, this horrid event triggered discussions of xenophobic developments in various venues around the world, from classrooms to media to town meetings to informal conversations with friends. For some, it entailed interrogating the white supremacy movement, the growth of anti-Muslim sentiment, and the spread of nationalism—scrutinizing how these developments are fueled by certain political factions and policies. For others, it spurred contemplating the role of media conglomerates, including Facebook and YouTube, as vehicles for trafficking hate speech—specifically through their failure to balance profitability with social responsibility, free access with censorship, and cultural diversity with respect. Some New Zealanders in particular questioned whether or not the country was as inclusive as it had been purported to be. Issues of firearms also resurfaced, and Prime Minister Ardern introduced legislation to revamp the country's gun laws. Australia interrogated its current role in advancing racism and the conditions for white supremacy. Adolescents reckoned with the role of social media, including

the norms with regard to language used on certain sites. The United States examined the president's role and use of social media in inciting the event. Globally, xenophobic attitudes, especially Islamophobic prejudices, were interrogated, and matters of responsiveness and responsibilities (especially moral and humanistic) to one another remotely or in our immediate worlds were brought to the fore.

A reader might view the event as creating a new site for engagement—a space that might include:

- Exploring the event through a range of social frames, including religious freedom and coexistence; immigration; individual expression, social responsibility, and censorship; and liberty and violence against humanity and community.
- Contemplating cultural developments and the flow of people and ideas along with global fusion, adaptation, translanguaging, border crossing, and various forms of displacement.
- Unpacking the sociopolitical conditions that undergird these developments.
- Being responsive; reading oneself and one's positioning as detached or complicit; as an ally, activist, or actionist.

Engaging in global reading therefore involves contemplating ourselves in the company of others, deliberating on the sociopolitical and physical conditions that exist within and across the precincts of a community, country, and the planet itself. Such dynamics may play out in our everyday exchanges locally or may manifest themselves globally. Influences that shape readers and the objects of readings and writings may exist separately or be woven together in a tapestry of events, patterned by sociopolitical circumstances or affordances. Though our specific circumstances differ, we all live across societies—from the local to the planetary—exploring and contemplating ourselves and others, deliberating on the social, political, cultural, and physical conditions of our worlds, and, at times, crossing borders as we engage with global affairs patterned by those conditions. Our readings involve multilayered, critical self-examinations—forms of reflexivity as well as activism as we contemplate our positionality and roles as well as our responsibilities and responsive possibilities. If examined systematically, matters of complicities, responsibility, and possible responses will arise.

Arguably, global readers/meaning makers transact with themselves and others as they contemplating the road ahead—with an eye to the systems at play across the spaces and times available to them and their collaborators. They engage with both a global telescope and a microscope, attending to media coverage of worldly matters while scrutinizing their own affairs and those of their communities. Such scrutiny should be as sensitive to local circumstances as it is to the broader systems at play—whether they be the Internet architecture that undergirds the traffic of communications, or the norms that relate to the incidental exchanges or updates on events among colleagues, family members, and friends.

These layered interfaces could be viewed as the local and global existing in combination, transacting, or trafficking within or across borders. They could include a number of topics anchored in the local but with an obvious global reach—including questions of Western interference in the affairs of other countries; nationalism, populism, sovereignty, and trade within and across regions; intellectual property and extraditions; and matters of internationalizing and indigenizing. These topics, though local in origin, may also be tied to a network of global interests and matters of alignment with regard to one's position and role—befitting cultural considerations of self in the company of others and a moral reckoning of interests.

Thus, global reading involves our mobilization and search for traction as we address local concerns that also may extend to regions, nations, and the planet. It is not uncommon nowadays to witness different publics taking the initiative to be engaged in local and global activism on social, political, and environmental issues. In the past years, for example, we have witnessed a range of movements—including the advent of global student reading, networking, and activism on issues such as gun control and climate change.

For these reasons, global explorations should be pursued carefully; they should be well researched, consultative, and informed by an interrogation of one's position, interests, and potential roles. The contemplations of global readers should be reflexive and scrutinized, and any resulting actions should be pursued in ways that are supportive, not narcissistic or presumptuous. Actions should respect situatedness, befitting the indigenous nature of communities and the particular circumstances at play. Global reading should extend to activism that is grounded in and consistent with ecological considerations and cultural respectfulness of local circumstances. It should involve critical analyses that stem from thoughtful explorations of multiple resources, viewpoints, and approaches; it should aim to understand sociopolitical circumstances; and it should demonstrate a reflexivity and recognition of oneself and one's position as insider-outsider, ally, or partner—especially as one strives to leverage and support the needs and interests of others in a manner reverent of cultural practices.

Essentially, global meaning making involves leveraging an ecology anchored in the recognition of multiple voices—the pursuit of a multitopia that advances unity, but not at the cost of uniformity or suppression. It engages readers in a form of shared and transformative decisionmaking that involves a critical reflexivity of one's world as experienced through events and writings and encounters with media (Tierney, 2017). Global meaning making goes beyond being able to recant, connect, or even compare and contrast. As Rob has discussed in other papers (Tierney, 2018, 2020), global reading is not scripted; however, there are some dimensions that are commonplace. It entails methods and strategies of critical analysis, including the following:

- Contemplating one's self and one's global presence, positionality, and purview

- Exploring multiple resources, viewpoints, and approaches
- Reading across time and space, including into, beneath, and beyond
- Probing sociopolitical currents
- Moving from connoisseur to activist
- Bridging and leveraging information and knowledge

Moreover, for each of us it involves dealing with and traversing cultures—whether within or across places, with various peoples, across our planet.

Global readings and consultations also entail a form of shuttle diplomacy tied to nuanced meaning making. They require inferencing, translating, situating, discerning, questioning, discussing, linking with, reconsidering, rereading, rethinking, composing, and acting on. They involve accessing and weighing information that might be gleaned from multiple readings, multiple informants, and multiple sources, such as selected websites, tweets, and listservs; blogs, news bulletins, and papers (including developing drafts) related to ongoing projects; and various exchanges with friends and colleagues. Moreover, befitting forms of activism and advocacy, global reading involves navigating "tricky" spaces in support of others, including challenging the hegemonies and perhaps one's own complicity with systemic biases whether they be tied to racism, ethnocentrism, gender, colonialism, or economic privilege (Andreotti & de Souza, 2011; Smith, 2005; Spivak, 1990, 1999; Stein 2018; Tierney, 2018, 2020). At times when societal unrest or anxieties arise from events in their worlds, thoughtful and nonjudgmental spaces might be considered (Kay, 2018) or what Arao & Clements (2013) and Ali (2017) refer to as the necessary "brave" spaces—engagements that build understandings of ourselves (individually and collectively) in the interests of our local and planetary diversities.

References

Ali, D. (2017). Safe spaces and brave spaces: Historical context and recommendations for student affairs professionals. NASPA Policy and Practice Series. NASPA. https://www.naspa.org/images/uploads/main/Policy_and_Practice_No_2_Safe_Brave_Spaces_DOWNLOAD.pdf

Andreotti, V., & de Souza, L. M. T. M. (2011). *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education*. Routledge.

Arao, B., & Clemens, K. (2013). From safe spaces to brave spaces: A new way to frame dialogue around diversity and social justice. In L. Landreman (Ed.), *The art of effective facilitation: Reflections from social justice educators* (pp. 135–150). Stylus.

Baldwin, J. (1974). *If Beale Street could talk*. Dial Press.

Behrendt, L. (2004). *Home*. University of Queensland Press.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Routledge.

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), 30–60.

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-U.S. migration* (pp. 147–164). Universidad Veracruzana and The University of Texas at San Antonio, UTSA—Mexico Center.

Kay, M. R. (2018). *Not light, but fire: How to lead race conversations in the classroom.* Stenhouse.

King, T. (2012). *The inconvenient Indian: A curious account of native people in North America.* University of Minnesota Press.

Nelson, N. E., 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), 1–41. doi: 10.1080/11356405.2014.980121

New Zealand Herald. (2019, March 15). Christchurch mosque shootings: New Zealand prime minister Jacinda Ardern describes one of "darkest days." www.nzherald.co.nz /nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=12213100

Short, K. G. (2011). Building bridges of understanding through international literature. In A. W. Bedford & L. K. Albright (Eds.), *A master class in children's literature: Trends and issues in an evolving field* (pp. 130–148). National Council of Teachers of English.

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). SAGE.

Spivak, G. C. (1990). *The post-colonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogues.* Routledge.

Spivak, G. C. (1999). *A critique of postcolonial reason: Toward a critique of the vanishing present.* Harvard University Press.

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.

Tierney, R. J. (2017). Multitopia: Global citizenship across diverse spaces. *Global Commons Review, Fall 1*, Paulo Freire Institute-UCLA, 75–81. www.globalcommonsreview.org /download/b972f6ad34fcd2e33307646455838a6a189728.pdf

Tierney, R. J. (2018). Toward a model of global meaning making. *Journal of Literacy Research, 50*(4), 397–422. doi: 10.1177/1086296X18803134

Tierney, R. J. (2020). Notes on global reading: Critical cultural traversals, transactions and transformations. In L. I. Misiaszek (Ed.) *Exploring the complexities in global citizenship education: Hard spaces, methodologies, and ethics* (pp. 36–68). Routledge. www .academia.edu/40450420/Notes_on_global_reading_critical_cultural_traversals _transactions_and_transformations

Willmott, E. (1988). *Pemulwuy: The rainbow warrior.* Bantam Press.

Yoon, B. (2018, September). Critical global literacies: Critical global perspectives in the English curriculum. *English Journal, 108*(1), 92–94.

11.2 **THE GLOBAL WAVE**

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 ever changing;
- Acknowledgment 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., 2017; Stornaiuolo & Nichols, 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 been tied

to conquest and cooperation—where literacy has been critical 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 ever-changing, 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, and 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 nonprofit organizations, has been responsible for major developments in literacy in different parts of the world—especially through ILA's seven international affiliates (Africa, Europe, Asia, Latin America, the 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. For example, the Africa network has affiliates in over 50 African countries that come together for a biannual Pan-African Conference and most recently in an initiative, "Context Matters," jointly sponsored by CODE (a Canadian NGO supporting global literacy) and ILA in an effort to advance literacy research for Africans by Africans (code.ngo/approach/research-initiatives/). In addition, many of the African affiliates are pursuing a range of initiatives under the umbrella of their national reading associations. In Nigeria, under the leadership of Chukwuemeka Eze Onukaogu and his colleagues (such as Gabriel Egbe, Chinwe Muodumogu), teacher leadership as well as literacy for social change have been foci. In Uganda, various book projects supported by CODE and Room to Read (a U.S. organization) and other initiatives have been launched under the leadership of Annette K. Mpuga, Loy Tumusiime, Harrison Kiggundu, and Sam Andema. In Kenya, under the leadership of Hellen Inyega and Margaret Muthiga, the Association of Reading of Kenya was a partner in a Reading Kenya project. In South Africa, the Literacy Association of South African Reading Association has been under the leadership of Janet Condy and Carol Bloch. In Botswana, the Reading Association of Botswana has been led by Penny Moanakwene and Arua E. Arua.

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 have 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 as well as who read, what, why, and how.

Nowadays, although colonial forces can be difficult to dislodge as a result of their deep roots, a number of countries are divesting themselves of their colonial past. At the same time, other interests are taking hold. For example, foreign aid has

become a new tool of countries such as China and the United States seeking influence in different regions. Multinational corporations including groups such as Internet providers (e.g., Amazon, Alibaba, Google, Mozilla, Apple, and Samsung) or industries such as those in petroleum or automobile manufacturing (e.g., BP, Exxon, Royal Dutch, Volkswagen, and Toyota) use investments to leverage access and advantage. Global powers including the United States, Britain, Europe, and, increasingly, China have enormous clout in part achieved by 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) traveled to work with Wilhelm Wundt in Germany as psychological studies of reading were being pursued in the 1850s. This seeding of psychology across countries accounts 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 among British, German, and French sociologists. These account for many of the developmental and sociological 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 (also discussed in Chapter 1: "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 what Santos (2013) has suggested as epistemicide or the extinction of non-Western ways of knowing or an approach to engagement that involves forms of epistemological imposition or reeducation (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 appear 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 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* and discussed in conjunction with an essay she cowrote entitled "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 et al., 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 predominantly 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 stemming from Michael Halliday and James Martin. 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 the theories and projects of 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 sociopolitical 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).

For example, in 1962, Foshay et al. published a large-scale international study comparing the performance of 13-year-old students across 12 countries. Then, in 1973, Robert Thorndike 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).

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. 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 (e.g., Chen et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2014).

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 postcolonial 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 (Wagner, 2011, 2017: 2018a & b). 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 efforts in this area 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 Walter 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 non-governmental organizations (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, and 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 on 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 on 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).[1] 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, the term cosmopolitanism has come to befit the aspiration of worldliness for people pursing a morality aligned with global development projects.

So, what is cosmopolitanism? Its definition is complicated by being "in between" Western critical theoretical considerations and postcolonial theory. As Fazal Rizvi (2009a) 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. 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 to engage in the development of cosmopolitanism or propose a cosmopolitan politic find themselves on the tricky ground of cultural crossover by cultural interlopers.

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 et al., 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 Hull et al. (2010) 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 they brought to the fore in this and

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.[2] 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. 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, 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)

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 civilsatrice (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 that 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 (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 are gaining ground as a planetary orientation with a critical theoretical lens (especially postcolonial). 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. 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.

There seems to be a mobilized global advocacy that is more respectful than patronizing, more planful and committed to ensuring the self-determination of stakeholders, 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 entails a more transactional approach, befitting Giddens's (1999) notion of a global dialectic between "global/local, integration/fragmentation and structure/agency" (Singh et al., 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 postcolonial 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, 2018a, 2018b, 2020). As 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, 2018a)

Global meaning making also extends to being an activist, advocate, and ally, confronting and disrupting the hegemonies that privilege some but limit others (see box). 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 et al., 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), antiracist pursuits in the United States, and the challenges to systemic institutional biases against Indigenous persons occurring within universities in various countries (e.g., Parata & Gardiner, 2020). It is aligned with Andreotti and de Souza (2011), building on Spivak (1990, 1999) and Stein (2017), who 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:

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 reflexology 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, Pluriversality, Language Revitalization, and Open Access Publishing

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; the revitalization of languages; and "open access" publishing.

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; Pashby et al., 2020; 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 postcolonial critiques—even neoliberal considerations. They represent a fusion of historical consciousness with critical reflexivity, especially with regard to anti-colonial, anti-imperialist, and antiracism 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 et al. (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 *toward* 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 labor, etc.)? Whose definitions of citizenship tend to dominate in GCE (Global Citizenship Education) 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 et al., 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 neoliberal 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

Increasingly, colonized communities are mobilizing goals of reestablishing 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 among 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 box; see also Battiste, 1998; Battiste & Henderson, 2000; Bishop, 1994; Nakata, 2001, 2004; Ocholla, 2007; Rigney et al., 2015; Rigney & Hattam, 2018; Smith, 1999; Smith, 2000, 2015).

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 et al. (2016) further suggest, it should involve:

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).

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 orientation is consistent with a shift in literacies away from being exclusionary, marginalizing and perpetuating deficit models of others (e.g., Bloome et al., 2014). By drawing upon vertical and horizontal knowledges,

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 lenses from postcolonial critique to affect theory and other lenses.[3] For example, Mia Perry (Perry, 2020; Perry & Pullanikkatil, 2019; Escobar, 2018) draws on various lenses: affect theory (Leander & Ehret, 2019), humanism and critical theory (Campano, 2007; Campano, & Damico, 2007; Campano et al., 2013; Janks, 2020); ecology and ubuntu (e.g., Dillard, 2019; Le Grange, 2015); the role of arts, music, and performance (e.g., Medina & Wohlwend, 2014); a form of ethico-onto-epistemology (Song, 2020), as well as transliteracies (Stornaiuolo et al., 2017) to interrogate the nature and place of literacies in terms of 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 sociocultural linkages (between people and place and with one another) that Western literacy imposes on all people 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).

Language Revitalization

As concerns have grown about planetary disregard for diversity and the impact of global colonizing influences on cultures, we have seen the rise of developmental efforts, especially among Indigenous groups, to reestablish 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, Mandarin, and Arabic, as well as a counter to projects and ongoing efforts to maintain or expand on 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 reestablished 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 (Gutiérrez et al., 1999; Nelson et al., 2016; Rizvi, 2009b).

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 through song and shared meaning making.

Open access

All of these aforementioned global developments are intertwined and will be propelled by what may be emerging as a major global force—the advent of open access publishing. The adoption of open access in different countries and by various consortia and institutions represents a major shift in the flow of ideas. Indeed, depending on where one is standing, the barriers that inhibit who reads what, when, and how seem to be crumbling. Open access represents a shift from limited access to reading material (especially scholarly material) to free access to those materials without the restrictions of a financial market that controls which countries or populations can obtain access to information.

Open access may be a breakthrough comparable to movable print in 11th-century China, Gutenberg's printing press in 15th-century Europe, or worldwide digital modes of representation at the cusp of the 21st century. Global access means that the proprietorship of ideas enforced by copyright laws in a publisher-controlled monopoly is giving way to an article economy privileging author rights. Moreover, we are seeing a shift to a form of global readership that advances literacy as anchored in a broad view of public readership, a stronger commitment to academic freedom, and diversity.

As pressure has increased to meet the needs of all, especially those parts of the world that have been locked out of the publisher-controlled global economy of knowledge, challenges to the Western domination of that global knowledge

economy have arisen. In our own world of literacy research publications, research has been dominated by North America and Europe, at least in terms of acceptance rates, publications, citations, and representation on editorial boards. Even closer to home in the literacy field, within the International Literacy Association, this domination of the production of knowledge has occurred despite the fact that the majority of the subscribers to ILA's three journals—*Reading Research Quarterly*, *The Reading Teacher*, and *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*—are from outside the United States and Europe.

Open access is not just a dream for the future, but a development that is under way and gathering momentum. One example: The University of California system of 11 campuses challenged the dominant hold of Netherlands-based Elsevier Publishing on journals in the natural and medical sciences by severing subscriptions to Elsevier journals. In March 2021, the dispute was settled with the university and its faculties agreeing to pay publication costs in return for Elsevier granting free public access to all articles authored by UC faculty. The fundamental principle is that since the scholarship was made possible by public funds, the general public should have free access to the information generated by those funds. A small but significant effort on behalf of the Literacy Research Association, when it was still the National Reading Conference, was a resolution passed in 2008 (Beach et al., 2007; NRC, 2008) advocating for open access for all literacy scholarship. A world of ideas once Western and privatized seems to be giving way to a world of ideas both global and freely accessible.

And, as John Willinsky (2005) suggested in his book *The Access Principle: The Case for Open Access to Research and Scholarship*:

> The case for open access is multifaceted. It draws on the spirit of copyright law, the mandate of scholarly associations, the promise of global knowledge exchanges, the right to know, the prospect of enhanced reading and indexing, the improved economic efficiencies of publishing, and the history of the academic journal, which speaks to the courage—and risk—of new ventures at opening this world of learning. . . . How knowledge circulates has always been vital to the life of the mind, which all of us share, just as it is vital, ultimately, to the well-being of humanity. (p. 206)

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 forms 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 et al., 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

Abdi, A. A. (2015). Decolonizing global citizenship education. In A. A. Abdi, L. Shultz, & T. Pillay (Eds.), *Decolonizing global citizenship education* (pp. 11–26). Sense. doi: 10.1007/978–94-6300-277-6

Andreotti, V., & de Souza, L. M. T. M. (2011). *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education*. 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. 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* (pp. 1–21). Duke University Press.

Appadurai, A., Mandémory, B. T., Rekacewicz, P., Huyssen, A., & Mbembe, A. (2001). *Globalization*. Duke University Press.

Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. W. W. Norton.

Asselin, M., & Doiron, R. (2013). *Linking literacy and libraries in global communities*. 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 Education Review, 61*(1), 1–21. doi: 10.1086/689922

Association of Canadian Deans of Education (ACDE). (2014). *Accord on the internationalization of education*. Association of Canadian Deans of Education. 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*. 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*(1), 16–27.

Battiste, M., & Henderson, J. Y. (2000). *Protecting Indigenous knowledge and heritage: A global challenge*. Pirich.

Beach, R., Carter, A., East, D., Johnston, P., Reinking, D., Smith-Burke, T., & Stahl, N. (2007). Resisting commercial influences on accessing scholarship: What literacy researchers need to know and do. In D. W. Rowe, R. T. Jimenez, D. L. Compton, D. K. Dickinson, Y. Kim, K. M. Leander, & V. J. Risko (Eds.), *56th yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 96–110). National Reading Conference.

Bhabha, H. K. (2004). *The location of culture*. Routledge.

Binkley, M. R., Rust, K., & Williams, T. (Eds.). (1996). *Reading literacy in an international perspective: Collected papers from the IEA Reading Literacy Study*. 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 in people*. Fernwood.

Bishop, R. (1994). Initiating empowering research? *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 29*(2), 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). Literacy Research Association.

Boorstin, D. J. (1989). *Hidden history: Exploring our secret past*. Vintage Books.

Campano, G. (2007). *Immigrant students and literacy: Reading, writing, and remembering*. 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., Honeyford, M. A., Sánchez, L. & 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). Blackwell.

Castells, M. (1997). *The information age: The power of identity* (Vol. 2). Blackwell.

Castells, M. (1998). *The information age: End of millennium* (Vol. 3). Blackwell.

Certeau, M. de, & Rendall, S. (Trans.) (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. University of California Press.

Chen, X., Anderson, R. C., Li, H., & 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 in monolingual and bilingual Chinese children* (pp. 23–47). 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). Fox & Wilkes.

Choudry, A. (2015). *Learning activism: The intellectual life of contemporary social movements*. University of Toronto Press.

Collins, R. (1998). *The sociology of philosophies: A global theory of intellectual change.* Harvard University Press.

Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science.* Polity.

Curwood, J. S., & 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.* Macmillan.

Drucker, P. F. (1969). *The age of discontinuity: Guidelines to our changing society.* Harper and 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 Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 95–116). Routledge.

Escobar, E. (2018). *Designs for the pluriverse: Radical interdependence, autonomy, and the making of worlds.* 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.* UNESCO Institute for Education.

Freire, P. (2004). *Pedagogy of indignation.* Paradigm Publishers. doi: 10.4324/9781315632902

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

Gadotti, M. (2000). *Pedagogia da terra* (5th ed.). Peirópolis.

Galla, C. K. (2017). Materials development for Indigenous language revitalization: Pedagogy, praxis and possibilities, In E. McKinley & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of Indigenous education* (pp. 1–19). 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.* 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 notebooks.* Lawrence & Wishart.

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

Grigorov, S., & Fleuri, R. (2012). Ecopedagogy: Educating for a new eco-social intercultural perspective. *Visão Global, Joaçaba, 15*(1–2), 433–454. editora.unoesc.edu.br/index.php/visaoglobal/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). 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). 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 ed., pp. 241–262). 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). 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.* Routledge. (Literacies Series). www.routledge.com/products/9780415859790

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

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

Kubota, R. (2009). Internationalization of universities: Paradoxes and responsibilities. *Modern Language Journal, 93*(4), 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*. 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*. 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. (2012). *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). eprints.qut.edu.au/53510/2/53510.pdf

Mahuika, R. (2008). Kaupapa Maori theory is critical and anti-colonial. *MAI Review 3*, Article 4. 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, L. (1993). *Ravensong*. 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*. 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*. 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). 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*. 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*. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Nakata, M. (2001). Another window on reality. In B. Osborne (Ed.), *Teaching diversity and democracy* (pp. 331–353). Common Ground Publishing.

Nakata, M. (2004). Ongoing conversations about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander research agendas and directions. *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 33*(2004), 1–6. doi: 10.1017/S1326011100600807

Nakata, M. (2007). *Disciplining the savages: Savaging the disciplines.* Aboriginal Studies Press.

National Reading Conference. (2008). *NRC resolutions concerning publication of scholarship in on-line, open- access outlets.* https://www.literacyresearchassociation.org/assets/docs/Websitedocs/nrc_digital%20publication_ad%20hoc%20resolution%20dec%202008.pdf

Nederveen Pieterse, J. (2009). *Globalization and culture: Global mélange* (2nd ed.). 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), 1–41. doi: 10.1080/11356405.2014.980121

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change.* 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). 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.* 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. www.i-r-i-e.net/inhalt/007/26-ocholla.pdf

Onukaogu, C. (2011, August). *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, September 19). Letter to Rt Hon Sir Anand Satyanand Chancellor Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato investigating racism. www.waikato.ac.nz/major-projects/taskforce/Parata-Gardiner-Report.pdf

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. (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. (2020). Pluriversal literacies: Affect and relationality in vulnerable times. *Reading Research Quarterly*. doi: 10.1002/rrq.312

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

Postlethwaite, T. N., & Ross, K. N. (1992, November). *Effective schools in reading: Implications for educational planners: An exploratory study.* The International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

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.* Erlbaum.

Purves, A. (1973). *Literature education in ten countries: An empirical study. International Studies in Evaluation.* National Council of Teachers of English.

Reinking, D. (1996). Reclaiming a scholarly ethic: Deconstructing "intellectual property" in a post-typographic world. In D. J. Leu, C. K. Kinzer, & K. A. Hinchman (Eds.), *Literacies for the 21st Century: Research and practice. 45th yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 461–470). National Reading Conference.

Rigney, D., Bignall, S., & Hemming, S. (2015). Negotiating indigenous modernity. Kungun Ngarrindjeri Yunnan—Listen to Ngarrindjeri speak. *Alternative, 11*(4), 334–349.

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.

Rizvi, F. (2009a). Towards cosmopolitan learning. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 30*(3), 253–268.

Rizvi, F. (2009b). 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.* Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9780 203867396

Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture.* 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). 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. www.youtube.com/watch?v=1oyZ2altlqk

Rogers, T., Winters, K. L., Perry, M., & LaMonde, A. M. (2015). *Youth, critical literacies, and civic engagement.* Routledge.

Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism.* Vintage Books.

Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and imperialism.* Knopf.

Sailors, M., Hoffman, J. V., Goia, E., Ngomane, J., Sitoe, 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.

Sailors, M., Hoffman, J. V., & International Literacy Association. (2018). *Literacy coaching for change: Choices matter.* International Literacy Association.

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.* Verso.

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

Schattle, H. (2008). Education for global citizenship: Illustrations of ideological pluralism and adaptation. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 13*(1), 73–94. doi: 10.1080/13569310701 822263

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). 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). 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). Campus Verlag.

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

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). Erlbaum.

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

Shi, Z., & Li, C. (2018). Bourdieu's sociological thinking and educational research in Mainland China. In Mu, G.M., Dooley, K. & Luke, A. (Eds.), *Bourdieu and Chinese education* (pp. 45–61). Routledge.

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*(1), 76–95.

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). 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. 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). 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. Paper presented at The American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonising methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples.* 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). SAGE.

Song, A. Y. (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). nationalunitygovernment.org/content/uluru-statement-heart

Spivak, G. C. (1990). *The post-colonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogues.* Routledge.

Spivak, G. C. (1999). *A critique of postcolonial reason: Toward a critique of the vanishing present.* 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., & Nichols, T. P. (2019). Cosmopolitanism and education. *Oxford encyclopedia of education, online.* www.academia.edu/39153381/Cosmopolitanism_and_Education?email_work_card=view-paper

Stornaiuolo, A., Smith, A., & 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

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). 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

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). Wiley Blackwell.

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

Tierney, R. J. (2018a). Toward a model of global meaning making. *Journal of Literacy Research, 50*(4), 1–26. independent.academia.edu/RobTierney/Papers

Tierney, R. J. (2018b). Global educational research in Western times: The rise and plight of China. *Frontiers of Education in China, 13*(2),163–192. www.academia.edu/37171936/Global_Educational_Research_in_Western_Times_The_Rise_and_Plight_of_Chinese_Educational_Research

Tierney, R. J. (2020). Notes on global reading: Critical cultural traversals, transactions and transformations. In L. I. Misiaszek (Ed.) *Exploring the complexities in global citizenship education: Hard spaces, methodologies, and ethics* (pp. 36–68). Routledge. www.academia.edu/40450420/Notes_on_global_reading_critical_cultural_traversals_transactions_and_transformations

Tierney, R. J., & Kan, W. (2016). Knowledge globalization 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-Carrillo, 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. www.un.org /esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2006). *Information economy report: 2006.* United Nations.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2015). *Global citizenship education: Topics and learning objectives.* UNESCO. unesdoc.unesco .org/images/0023/002329/232993e.pdf

Vickers, E. (2018). Book review: The strong state and curriculum reform, edited by Leonel Lim and Michael W. Apple, with response from the book's contributors. *London Review of Education, 16*(2): 336–344. doi: doi.org/10.18546/LRE.16.2.12

Wagner, D. A. (2011). What happened to literacy? Historical and conceptual perspectives on literacy in UNESCO. *International Journal of Educational Development, 31*(3), 319–323.

Wagner, D. A. (2017). Children's reading in low-income countries. *The Reading Teacher, 71*(2), 127–133.

Wagner, D. A. (2018a). 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). Springer.

Wagner, D. A. (2018b). *Learning as development: Rethinking international education in a changing world.* Routledge.

Wagemaker, H., Polydorides, G., & Martin, M. (Eds.). (1994). *Gender differences in reading.* IEA, The Hague, The Netherlands.

Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end.* University of Minnesota Press.

Willinsky, J. (2005). *The access principle: The case for open access to research and scholarship.* MIT 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. 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*. UN.

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). Springer.

Other Internet Resources

Active mobile broadband subscriptions per 100 inhabitants (Graph illustrating growth of mobile devices, smartphones). en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mobile_phone#/media/File:Active _mobile_broadband_subscriptions_2007-2014.svg

DeCarlo, S. (Ed.). The *Fortune* global 500. *Fortune*. fortune.com/global500/

Global Internet usage (Wikipedia page entry). en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_Internet_usage

Knowledge economic index (Wikipedia page entry). en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Knowledge _Economic_Index

List of social networking websites (Wikipedia page entry). 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*. fortune.com/2014/10/05/most-powerful-economic-empires-of-all-time/

NOTES

1. 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.

2. 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 ethics.gc.ca/eng/home.html).

3. The term *pluriversal* 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.