3 Notes on Global Reading

Critical Cultural Traversals, Transactions and Transformations

Robert J. Tierney

The proposal for global reading emanates from discussions of cosmopolitanism grounded in critical theory as well as global citizenship informed by Indigenous, eco-pedagogical, socio-cultural considerations and ethical consciousness across reconfigured borders in our mangled media world (Abdi, 2015; Andreotti & De Souza, 2011; Beach & Tierney, 2016; Butler, 2011; Freire, 1973, 2006; Grigorov & Fleuri, 2012; Hepp & Krotz, 2014; Kakutani, 2018; Kamberelis, McGinley & Welker, 2015; Lankshear & McLaren, 1993; Laverty & Gregory, 2017; Misiaszek, 2015; Morgan & Tierney, 2018; San Pedro, 2018; Santos, 2007a, 2007b, Santos, 2013: Stein, 2017a, 2007b; Torres, 1998, 2015). Aspirational global meaning making is imagined as operating in ways that are multi-layered but dialectically oriented across space and time in ways that respect diverse interests, different materialities including the fusions of meanings occurring globally, locally and across communities (Leander & Sheehy, 2004; Massey, 2005). It involves a mix of materiality and mobility, advancing community, building networks and fostering cooperation, understandings and relationships at the same time as readings heed local centripetal forces including sovereignty and security and centrifugal global influences (de Freitas & Curinga, 2015; Lam & Warriner, 2012; Levinas, 1981, 1993, 1995; Luke, 2011, 2018; Robertson, 1985; Rizvi, 2009; Singh, Fenway, & Apple, 2005; Stornaiuolo, Smith, & Phillips, 2017).[1]

For the global cosmopolitan and those who live on the border or are dealing with forms of global interoperationability, reading and writing might already involve a form of stepping across the line, shuttle diplomacy and border-crossings at the hands of creative and critical dispositions and craft sometimes spurred by cultural commentators, fellow readers, societal critics and artists (Gutiérrez, et al., 2017; Horowitz, 2012; Hull, Stornaiuolo, & Sahni, 2010; Luke, 2004, 2018; Nelson, Barrera IV, Skinner, & Fuentes, 2016; Tierney, 2006, 2018b). It represents a shift from positivism, commodification and standardization to critical humanism and cultural disruption in the interests of the cultural eclecticism (e.g., Enciso, 2019; González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005: Ladson-Billings, 2014; Marshall & Toohey, 2010; Paris, 2012; San Pedro, 2018; Rogers & Soter, 1996).

It is hoped that global meaning making can have an extended reach—beyond oneself or one's communities to cross-border engagements that may have a regional or planetary relevance. The reach may bridge to others allowing for cross-border trade. Or, the cross-border extensions could lead to the development of multilateral spaces and agreements that are mutually beneficial. They might verge on supporting spaces that befit the notion of a public sphere suggested by Habermas (1989)—that is a space or spaces for the exploring of topics or issues (with the appropriate representatives and stakeholders). The deliberations might be guided by cultural practices and tenets grounded in respectful reciprocity and, as Martha Nussbaum (2018) suggests, not distracted by the "tit for tat" oppositionalism, narcissism and attacks between parties.

In the interests of an ethic of cross-cultural respect and responsiveness, global meaning makers should be divested of the conceit of universalism and heed diversity and situatedness enlisting a form of decolonization. Rather than egocentricism, global readers interrogate their predispositions and approach—especially, being vigilant of pre-existing assumptions, the cultural boundedness of their approach and the potential influences of their own insularity and attitudes of impunity. Arrogance may perpetuate faulty presumptive reading and may mask ignorance and the possibility of complicity with cultural appropriation. Certainly, for global meaning making to have integrity, readers should operate with an ethic of respect of cultural norms including expectations of community relative to consultation and engagement (King, 2015).

Our worldly readings and writings represent expressions filtered by reflexivity are critical consciousness embedded within socio-cultural systems that embrace diversity and empowerment, not subversion or subordination. It is as if the reading of the world involves a form of fused concentric circles that move back and forth from self to others (e.g., Gutiérrez, Baquedano-López, & Tejeda, 1999; Purcell-Gates, 2006). A reader's global meaning making is dependent upon the reader's discernments as they read the systems at play from observations and prospecting primary sources, enlisting various perspectives, pondering, seeking patterns and predictability via linkages, bridges, networks and affiliations.

As New Zealand Maori scholar Linda Smith (1999, 2005) has discussed with respect to Indigenous research ethics, cross-cultural readings may be better negotiated bottom up with ongoing respect for participation, self-determination and community concerns. Such befits Howe's (1999) discussion and proposition of tribography where the focus begins with the local or Indigenous rather than embedded or subordinated by the mainstream's ways of knowing and decision-making. As Davis (2018) foregrounded, in researching and advocating for aboriginal water rights in Australia, key to understanding the dynamics of communities is appreciating and respecting the democratic practices of negotiation within

and across communities. In the case of aboriginal communities, as it has for thousands of years, decision-making is done in ways tied to an egalitarian diffusion and interconnectedness within and across communities that can be quite invisible to the culturally uninformed eye.[2]

Indeed, the attitudes and actions of global readers may be misguided if these pursuits are seen as equivocations or paternalistic or pursued without adequate and appropriate reverence or consultation. Readings are apt to lack integrity if the readers act upon pre-set formulations without deconstructing one's own positionality and without the guidance of cultural insiders. Indeed, culturally responsible meaning making may be beyond a reader's grasp or lead to assimilative distortions if the reader is uninformed or their approach is prone to a form of detached objective meaning-making.

Unfortunately, cross-global readings have a mixed history. For example, comparative educational research has a history of paternalistic approaches befitting a Eurocentric colonial orientation. As Keita Takayama, Arathi Sriprakash and Raewyn Connell, in *Toward a Postcolonial Comparative and International Education* (2017), suggested, the founding fathers of comparative education have approached "the other" in a Eurocentric fashion—examining "the other" from a western perspective. Likewise, studies of Indigenous populations regardless of epistemologies (positivist to constructivist to critical or Indigenous) have been shown to be research conducted from the outside in—rather than research that is participatory or supportive in nature (Phillips, Phillips, Whatman & McLaughlin, 2007; Rios, Deion & Leonard, 2018; Dion, Gabel, Rios, & Leonard, 2017). Often studies that tout empowerment involve approaches that excludes a full embrace of community consultation and pursue forms of commodification divorced from the interests or cultural property considerations of communities.

The lack of alignment of scholarly tenets with diversity extends to the knowledge economy that retains systems that perpetuate a form of western exclusivity and egocentrism. As bibliometric analyses of the leading scholarly journals have exposed, the preponderance of scholarly journals is quite exclusionary, rarely including studies, theories or even citations from southern or eastern scholars (Rogers, 2017; Trigos-Carillo & Rogers, 2017; Tierney & Kan, 2016: Tierney, 2018a).

Global meaning makers will need to check their own cultural moorings as they navigate the morass of cultural forces in play. Befitting a tendency to be cocooned or remain in one's own cultural bubble, global readers must wrestle with moving beyond themselves. Their socio-political condition might be perceived as independent, but global meaning makers would be naïve to imagine that they are not involved consciously or unconsciously with affinity groups (even scholarly organizations) undergirded by a global infrastructure (corporate and governmental) that both filter and fashion what they read and how they think and act. Universities are not without guilt as they appear to endorse western

imperialism as their approach to internationalization. Regardless of the increased diversity and internationalization of students, there often seems to be a penchant for standardization including a fixed model for learners and global citizenship that may be complicit with an agenda that is tied to universalism and the reproduction of forms of cultural assimilation or socialization that is inherently aligned with privileging certain cultures (usually western) over others.[3] As Tuck and Yang (2014) point out a master narrative persists. As they state: "the academy as an apparatus of settler colonial knowledge already domesticates, denies, and dominates other forms of knowledge. . . . It sets limits, but disguises itself as limitless" (p. 235). As Tuck and Yang argue it "hurts people who find themselves on the outside or the underside of that narrative. History as a master narrative appropriates the voices, stories, histories of all Others . . . yet disguises itself as universal and common" (p. 235)

While the nature of the empires may have changed our modern-day wired and digital global state has many of the same features and influences of the landgrab that occurred when the British, Spanish, French, Dutch and Portuguese explorers claimed possession of much of the world displacing or making subservient Indigenous peoples as they shaped their colonies in their image. Certainly, nowadays the global knowledge economy represents a non-eclectic world reflecting a mix of neo-liberal ambitions, westernization and global structures that can run "rough shod" over non-western and Indigenous interests. In the age of digital marketing, our political, economic, religious and consumer profiles may be set up with an even more expansive colonizing approach. Our internet behavior as well as background data may contribute to a funneling of "political" information befitting our discerned profiles. Despite the free reigning appearance of the digital world, its use has been political in ways that may advance slanted readings and advance forms of cultural egocentricism (Beach & Tierney, 2016; Deuze, Blank, & Speers, 2012; Kim, 2016; San Pedro, 2018; Stornaiuolo et al., 2017).

A global reader's meaning making is never untethered from the reader's and writer's own history, predisposition and positioning despite the influence of mainstream imperial forces of colonization and nowadays the marketing ideas crafted to fit one's emerging internet profiles. The fusing fits with descriptions of various forms of criss-crossing, translanguaging and other means of hip hopping by meaning makers across their communities. That is as persons brush against one another's cultures, their engagements befit the recent descriptions of cross-border meaning making and the boundary negotiations that exist through translanguaging (e.g., Nelson, Barrera IV, Skinner, & Fuentes, 2016) and line stepping. As Gutiérrez et al. noted:

> an instantiation of boundary crossing where 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.
>
> (2007, p. 53)

Making the Shift to Global Reading

The shift to global reading entails support for readers and writers to navigate cross-cultural concerns—that is supporting meaning makers moving beyond their own cultural bubbles and self-interests to weighing information from multiple informants and multiple sources: various exchanges with friends, colleagues and others—being sure to do so reservedly and respectfully. It entails support for forms of shuttle diplomacy shifting from passive readings to pro-active engagements for, with and behind others—being an ally and advocating interrupting the systems, practices and dispositions that might objectify, commodify, exploit or nullify diversity. It extends to being an activist with but respectful of the cultural ways of knowing and doing of others. If global meaning makers are to expand their understandings and support of others, they will need to move outside beyond their own shadows. Global meaning makers should confront the hegemonies that privilege some but limit others. In some cases, global meaning makers may need to deconstruct their roles and own complicity, complacency or compliance with restrictions that serve to enculturate, assimilate and marginalize. For academics, this might include confronting or challenging the Eurocentric tendencies or the marginalization of "other" occurring within universities and perpetuated by institutional alignments with the global knowledge economy. For educators, it might entail scrutinizing our pedagogies that position cultures as objects of study and not ways of being. Educators should examine whether educational practices are more monocultural or monolingual than multicultural or multilingual and whether the systems advance socio-political practices that discount diversity in the interest of reproducing historic privilege. Global readings should look to disrupt rather than to perpetuate forms of governance and practice that exclude "others" and preclude participatory forms of deliberate democratic decision-making, and cooperation among peoples.

The proposal for global reading being espoused is premised upon aspiring to forms of globalism that entails multiple readings across spaces, people and times and beyond oneself. These readings would occur across multiple levels that are more extensive and mangled than nationalistic or protectionist. The global readings that are proposed embrace multiple epistemologies including alignments to planetary, Indigenous and other ways of thinking. The espoused approach to global readings strives for a parsimony between local and global that is interoperative and cooperative—flowing, hybridized, fused, multilateral,

border-crossing, multicultural and respectful—that is, not tribal, divisive, bourgeois, state-mandated, uniform nor subordinating. The aspired global readings involve forms of participation involving multiple public spheres befitting the communities' approaches to decision-making and development. The negotiations might occur with communities among reader participants around societal issues (health and welfare, services, cultural practices, communication, education, spirituality, food supply, governance, law and order) or might entail opportunities for critical and creative expression of one's identity. Integral to their development will be the meaning makers' relationships to social transformation as activists or allies or cultural development workers (Bishop, 2009, 1994; Butler, 2011; Campano, Honeyford, Sánchez, & Vander Zanden, 2010; San Pedro, 2018; Simon, & Campano, 2013).

Some Keys to Global Meaning Making

Global reading is not an approach that cannot be scripted, rather it flows from key elements. As espoused in an earlier paper, global reading:

> is not a scripted reading of the world following a strict protocol applied in a singular or monolithic fashion. The dynamic processes are by their very nature diversified, multilayered and multifaceted involving fusions and adaptations of ideas and styles. Global meaning making involves transactions that are situated and not standardised 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. It involves what Hymes (1990) described as a kind of dialectic between insider-outsider perspectives. Global meaning making is rarely solitary; engagements are participatory. It involves multiple dependency—colleagues and collaborators with local knowledge, Indigenous histories, migrant pasts and cultural moorings in other places—Oceania, Asia, the Americas and Africa.
> (Tierney, 2018, pp. 11, 15)

Global readers need an array of resources (access to sources, strategies, skills and attitudes) if they are to bridge, traverse and accommodate for multiple languages, different epistemologies, varying cultural practices, jurisdictional variations and a consciousness of self as they read and pursue actions in the interest of others. Lest certain signifiers are missed,

it is suggested that it should involve approaches to meaning making informed by cultural studies including histography but also guided by approaches that are formative and empowering—participatory engagements with the aid of cultural intermediaries.

At one level, a reader's sophistication in terms of engaging with these worlds is relative—anchored in pre-existing knowledge about the world across people, places and times along with a reader's adroitness at moving across space and time within and across borders in the company of others and adjusting oneself to the norms and expectations of others. At another level, to engage globally meaning makers need to read and write their worlds as they seek to know themselves in the company of others. Reading and writing involve stepping inside and outside of or to the side of one's world to observe, engage with and respect the world of others. These engagements involve criss-crossing global times and spaces with stealth, flexibility, visas or other forms of worldly skills and attitudes. As suggested in other papers (e.g., Tierney, 2018), meaning makers might pursue:

- Interrupting existing frames especially cultural hegemony;
- Decolonizing and opening spaces for the sovereignty of and respect for diverse cultures and their self-determination;
- Accommodating cultural dynamics within and across communities: via adaptation, translanguaging, fusion, border-crossing;
- Reading self; deconstructing identity as one engages with diversity, indigeneity, decolonization;
- Being mindful: finding a higher moral plane;
- Interrogating truth/post-truth;
- Being activist or actionist.

Implicit in these notions there were also features such as the following:

- Developing channels of communication, bridges for traversing spaces, collaborations, responsiveness and support; and
- Pursuing transformative change.

If these goals are unpacked further, there appears to be at least eight keys that offer overlapping synergies important to global meaning making.

1. Contemplating Global Presence, Positionality and Purview

Global reading involves contemplating the state of the world, the cacophony at the global intersections of worldly trafficking of ideas or forms of personal diplomacy as one engages with the world and an interrogation of existing and possible alliances that cross borders geographically or ethnically or in other ways. Many of us are engaged in

global or cross-cultural events daily (face to face or virtual, synchronized or asynchronized) from relationship building to trade in ideas and alliance building to global disputes and wars. It is as if our lives involve a fusion of global and cultural matters involving cross-border considerations of time, space and peoples. They involve our interactions with our neighbors, with family or colleagues locally and abroad. For some of us, international engagements are particular—they involve international projects overseas or with a global network of collaborators. For all of us, however, global affairs such as migration, climate change, Indigenous matters, populism are difficult to disregard as they are not just newsworthy, but influence our material lives.[4] These are matters not outside of our realm of experience; they are within all of our purview. Essentially, they represent an ongoing reckoning of ourselves as planetary beings locally and globally.

2. *Exploring Resources and Multiple Viewpoints*

To make discerning judgements,[5] global meaning making demands readers to engage with multiple and diverse stakeholders along with a wide range of texts. To engage globally nowadays entails various matters: travel and trade, housing and health, food and water supplies, economic development, governance, but also matters of unity and division around religion and ethnicity including hate crimes, terrorism, the criminal code, security issues especially as they intersect with matters of race, economic circumstances, gender and sexuality.

To explore such matters, there is a plethora of material: news releases, briefings, policy documents, judicial considerations and essays on documents from legislation to scientific evidence (quantitative and qualitative), court decisions to first-hand accounts and daily encounters with events and people that have a global currency. They might also include tweets, Instagram, blog commentaries and solicitations crafted for micromanaging one's views.[6] Undoubtedly, the trade in ideas occurs increasingly across digital corridors that support rapid-fire exchanges across various networks including some prone to be marketing their representation of ideas and interests (Kress, 2003; Beach & Tierney, 2016; Frazer & Carlson, 2017). As global exchanges swell especially via the internet and social media, it is not without experiencing growing pains. Any global exchange can be influenced by fear, prejudices, slanted characterizations and past histories, in an age of global exchanges via the internet, they can be enhanced or tinged by forms of microtargeting of perspectives. Indeed, our text worlds have been shown to be susceptible to misrepresentation and prone to forms of microtargeting for nefarious reasons—political and economic. Further, the approach of meaning makers using the internet may lack criticality and be neither ardent nor dialectic nor reflexive. For example, a study by the Stanford History

Group suggests most internet users' approach to searching and judging information to be severely limited (McGrew, Breakstone, Ortega, Smith, & Wineburg, 2018; Wineburg, & McGrew, 2016).[7]

Communications can be positive and generative if discerning and respectful, but negative and reckless if approached with pre-set views and without criticality. Indeed, global developments may herald an expansion of global exchanges, but mask the extent to which global engagements beget indoctrination or are prone to purposeful shaping of certain perspectives over others.

3. Exploring Multiple Viewpoints and Approaches: Reading Across Time and Space Into, Beneath and Beyond

Global meaning-making entails readers exploring multiple sources, engaging in frequent consultations, adjusting points of view and reconsiderations tied to a consciousness of the times, places and the people involved. It may be that multiple global readings are needed with various readers in partnership or in support of one another. Essentially global readers crossing borders should operate recursively, seeking various perspectives remaining conscious or, if possible, suspending their own biases as they explore read, listen and learn with refrain.

In terms of resources, the global reading assumes that the reader will access a range of texts that have credibility. Reading across time and space involves seeking and acting upon understandings of the place of text materials and the standpoints that preclude and guide their orchestration and layers of provocations whether global meaning making relates to political events (such as the assortment of texts around government pronouncements, legislation, commentaries etc.) or literary works (e.g. poems, novels, films) or everyday exchanges (e.g. Skype, Instagram, e-mail) between parties strewn across people separated geographically, politically and temporally.

Such readings might involve various probes as ideas are questioned, cross-checked with one's own experience or explored by various other forms of investigative procedures such as post-holing or other corroborating practices. Reading might entail a study of ideas and ideologies, the veracity of accounts of events, the credibility of claims or other forms of rhetorical analysis such as analyses of persona or argumentative elements tied to evidence, warrants and claims (e.g., Sheehy, Scanlon, & Roesch, 2016; Toulmin, 1958). At the same time, they might explore the saliency of matters through the lens of others.

4. Probing Socio-Political Currents

Global readers need to probe the socio-political undercurrents. In the political realm, they need to consider the systemic forces at play

(Connell, 2007; Connell, Collyer, Maia, & Morrell, 2017; Spivak, 1988, 1990, 1999; Stein, 2017b). In a fashion consistent with analyzing speech acts, persona and identity, they should be examining texts in terms of how authors are positioning themselves, the subject of their texts and audience using a lens that illuminates the power dynamics and hierarchies in play (e.g., Austin, 1962; Crumpler & Tierney, 1995; Gibson, 1969; Lakoff, 2016/2017; Lemke, 1995; Moje & Luke, 2009; Searle, 1969). They should consider the racial, ethnic and gender positioning being employed as well as the methods for doing so (including assessing factualness and claims) and that readers are likely to be faced with a degree of indeterminacy as they weigh what they read against the political motives of different texts. They will need to check for slants, vested interests, a range of rhetorical ploys along with the changing status of truth in those post-truth times (Bump, 2018; Kakutani, 2018). A reader may need trustworthy resources—commentators, experts and cultural informants—to serve as a help line to make well-reasoned and credible decisions. Such should not be assumed as straightforward, as it may entail readers avoiding egocentrism and divesting themselves of self-righteousness as they enlist their past and self-consciousness to explore and seek to understand the interests, ways of knowing and discernments of others.

Oftentimes, cultural understanding requires a paradigm shift. For example, as Takayama (2009) and Shi and Li (2018) have explored, a lock step application of western critical thought can involve a form of overreach if applied in the non-western world. Or, as Park (2018) suggests, drawing upon Chen's (2010) discussion of *Asia as Method*, if one were to look at Asia one should engage in "a paradigm shift to look at Asia with a de-imperialized, de-colonized, and de–Cold War mentality" (p. 760)[8]. Or, as N'Dri Thérèse Assié-Lumumba (2016) argues in her paper "The Ubuntu Paradigm and Comparative and International Education: Epistemological Challenges and Opportunities in Our Field," African readings should not be supplanted or displaced by European texts denying agency to African voices within or from Africa. She argues that readers should be aware of this neglect and explore meanings that are informed by texts from southern sources rather than fall prey to perpetuating western exclusivity. They should take care to check on their assumptions and understanding of the worlds of others including the mainstream forces at work that indoctrinate or afford certain licenses and views over others.[9]

5. Contemplating Self and Positionalities

Global reading entails finding ways to learn with and from others and to do so reflexively—unpacking one's position as one engages with others by invitation and permission versus intervention and imposition. Oftentimes global approaches are confounded by ignorance, arrogance,

equivocation and egocentrism that is more akin to narcissism than acknowledgment, collaboration, partnerships or respectful exchanges. It is as if global meaning makers need to be aware of their own signature and their position and investment in terms of the issues presented. As they form and posit views they should do so reservedly and respectfully—in a fashion that acknowledges themselves, their sources and evidential bases including their collaborators.

Again, global readers may need to move beyond the bubble of their own views of the world. As Laverty and Gregory (2017) have argued it befits the pragmatism of Charles Peirce, Dewey, Richard Rorty and others that view meaning making as confronting egocentrism "as a site for radical inter-subjective, inter-generational address and response, and for the radical questioning and subversion of personal, societal and cultural ways of life" (p. 521). As they stated, it:

> promotes inquiry as a socially embedded, experimental, and indeterminate process of self/world reconstruction . . . a site for radical inter-subjective, inter-generational address and response, and for the radical questioning and subversion of personal, societal and cultural ways of life.
>
> (Laverty & Gregory, 2017, p. 521)

Global readers should approach their meaning making in ways that are not patronizing, colonizing, informed but not defined by self-interests.

Cross-cultural readings might be informed by "on the ground" engagements with people and their communities in conjunction with shared experiences Sometimes events or personal encounters can lead to some of the most transformative enlightenments and engagements that interrupt complacency and parochialism quite directly. For example, the news of natural disasters or the terrorism and violence that has impacted schools, religious gatherings and communities. Such events can bring to the surface a range of issues existing in our lives: concern over global terrorism and the rising white supremacist movement, the consequences of interconnectedness with global media, the debates around the precipitousness of hate speech from tweets to blogs or tied to political policies.

Sometimes, readers might engage vicariously through texts, film or poetry or other means. For example, James Baldwin's *If Beale Street Could Talk* (Baldwin, 1978) offers a journey that is vivid with reverberations that reach within and across lives, races, times of African Americans in the US. Coupled with timeless classics such as "*To Kill a Mocking Bird*", "*The Color Purple*" or the poems of Maya Angelou, or speeches such as those by Martin Luther King or songs such as *"Glory"* by John Legend and Common, meaning making have platforms that build cultural awareness, transform cultural interactions and spur social actions. In Australia, where racism toward its indigenous population abounds, various events, books

and court deliberations can help illuminate the systemic socio-political forces at play and exposed the rampant discriminatory practices. A video production, *Babakiueria (Barbecue Area)*[10] offered a satire to engage white Australians with their own racism in Australia by reversing the role of the colonizers from the Europeans to Australian aboriginals. In so doing, the film serves as a vehicle by which a non-Indigenous audience is confronted with their own racism and subordinating as well as enculturation practices (Australian Broadcasting Corporation, 1986, 2006). Such satire, coupled with various other scholarly books, can and have exposed the systemic forces that undergird the racism that has shaped Australia culturally and help expose what had remained hidden—Australia's hidden Aboriginal history, including genocidal practices (e.g. Pasco, 2014; Willmott, 1987). For North American readers, *The Inconvenient Indian: A Curious Account of Native People in North America* (King, 2012) may provide a similar platform especially coupled with other native American novels.

6. Transforming: From Connoisseur to Activist

As with activism, global readings involve "thinking, talking about, researching and theorizing about what is going on, what they are going to do next and how to analyse the situations they face, whether in relation to attending a demonstration, a meeting, a confrontation with institutional forces or planning the next action or campaign" (Kinsman, 2006, p. 134). Budd Hall (1978) and Choudry (2015) describe engagements in activism as a form of continuously testing, acting on, trying out and repeating the cycle as one moves forward. Haluza-Delay (2003) suggested there was often an assumption "that knowledge uncovers the oppressive structures and confronts power. However, it is not the 'knowledge' alone that does this, but the process by which the knowledge is taken up and used in the community, altering 'common-sense'" (p. 86). It occurs as the reader's explorations, expressions, exchanges and enactments find the light of day especially if they involve the politics of equity, including race, gender, ethnicities, class and sexuality. Such befits Gramsci's (1982 discussion of the intelligentsia as being involved not traditionally, but organically in the interests of the subaltern. It is consistent with a model of reading and research that some characterize as formative and that aspires to be transformative. As Goodwin (2012) suggests: "an orientation to inquiry with an obligation to action" (p. 3) involving participation tied to local interests and pursued cyclically. The goal are forms of engagement that are transforming in the interests of the pursuit or movement. It shifts their role to that of a supporter and ally (Bishop, 2009) rather than distant observer, critic or director.

Essentially, the espoused global reading is pursued with an eye to making change not just critique; it fits with interrogating the systems

of power in play, but also pursuing ways to change them in the interests of emancipation or Gramsci's view of and the need for organic intellectuals engaged with the public rather than remaining cocooned in their academic theorizing and studies.[11] In other words, the activism and transformative change that is imagined moves beyond examinations, self-study, respectful collaborations to exploring transformative change. In some ways it befits some of the tenets espoused already but it moves beyond a consideration of the present and its critique on a number of fronts to planning change and development. It may entail contemplating and working toward paradigm shifts that support cultural developments in community. For the educator, it might involve helping students exploring ways that breathe life from communities into schools and vice versa. For the researcher, it may entail contemplating participatory forms of research exploring issues such as water use, needs and practices in communities. Or it might entail exploring the transformative pursuits in various community sites. To date, even our research with cultural others such as Indigenous groups has been quite anemic in terms of empowerment as researchers have tended to acknowledge and collaborate but to the researchers' ends rather than communities' sustainable future.

The activism of global meaning makers is one that fits with tenets of respect, trust-building, responsibility and self-determination. Readings and actions might be fashioned not unlike what Patti Lather (1986) pursued in exploring what she deemed as validity essential for "rigor" and "vigor" and, at a level, befitting Freire (1973) "conscientization" or transformative change or what Lather termed as "catalytic validity." To this end, she explored the work of Carol Gilligan (1982) examining the moral development of women distinct from men and the work of Paul Willis (1981) exploring the working lives of youth disaffected from schools. Patti Lather's explorations of their work applauded the pursuit of the world views of others, but lamented their failure to triangulate, the failure to engage the respondents or participants with the information that was gathered and the claims that were offered in ways that might be transformative.

Media can serve as a vehicle for such activism—especially given the digital capabilities within reach. For example, digital handheld tools afford individuals and groups access to video making and other forms of media production as a means of exploring one's worlds or engaging in forms of civic activism. As Greene, Burke, and McKenna (2018) recently uncovered we have seen a rise in participatory research initiatives where educators and youth pursued various uses of digital media to address social issues relevant to the youth, involving expressions by the youth and if there was a traction with the community. For example, Rogers, Winters, Perry, and LaMonde (2015) demonstrated various digital media can be used as a means for youth who might be disenfranchised

to speak out about societal issues including matters of their identity. As Rogers et al. described the enlistment of digital resources supported "as expressions of resistance to the inheritance of the broken promises of democratic citizenship and their ability to imagine new possibilities of public engagement" (p. 2). The youth that they observed were involved in "juxtaposing . . . hybridizing . . . remixing" (p. 102) as forms of counter-narratives and speaking for themselves and being heard by others. As Frazer and Carlson (2017) found in the use of memes with images to challenge constructions of Australian aboriginal understandings, memes functioned:

> not necessarily to formalize some clearly articulable political position but to challenge the colonial arrangement and produce something new (which is essentially anti-colonial). But this is a politics without unity, in the traditional sense. It is closer to . . . "fluidarity" rather than solidarity—"a plurality of disparate groups com[ing] together in a kind of unified disunity."
>
> (in Guattari, 2000, p. 11)

7. Bridging and Leveraging

Transformative change is rarely straightforward, and endeavors to do so require careful contemplation and meaningful engagements with stakeholders, including participatory forms of decision-making and approaches to moving forward that are respectful of the communities involved. Transformative change is political at various levels—within and across communities and various subgroups and individuals with the communities, various agencies that serve the communities as well as the institutions that govern the agencies.

Take, if you will, efforts at transformative change for indigenous communities. In various communities there have been countless efforts to remove the yolk of colonialization and instead breathe life into schools by moving away from standardized and culturally estranged education to culturally responsive and sustainable education. In some Indigenous communities, we have seen the development of Indigenous ways of knowing as core educational developments (e.g., New Zealand Kaupapa Māori theory; see Smith, 1990; www.rangahau.co.nz/research-idea/27/).

In Australia, however, it remains a struggle. Most recently, it has manifested itself in various forms of activism to recent efforts around the "Uluru Declaration of the Heart" that seeks formal recognition of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and their ways of knowing (see: http://nationalunitygovernment.org/content/uluru-statement-heart). And, it is apparent in communities striving for a political foothold as they represent the community interests including the land in ongoing economic and educational matters. Australia's Indigenous communities

struggle to be heard and to have their rights respected by the coloniz-
ing government. They have sought reconciliation but also leverage
through constitutional change, through court cases challenging errone-
ous constructions of others (e.g., Mabo). Because aboriginal sovereignty
over their own affairs is rare, other forms of leverage have become a
focus. Adroitly, a reading of these circumstances has some aboriginal
community seeking other forms of positioning to the same ends such as
cooperation and contractual agreements that elevate the possibility of
community development by and for communities. For example, Daryle
Rigney and his Aboriginal community (Ngarrindjeri), in hopes of attain-
ing a degree of sovereignty and self-governance, have engaged in forms
of contractual relationships with the federal and state governments
around their water problems. The Ngarrindjeri community (located
at the mouth of the Murray River—Australia's longest and perhaps the
river that is considered among the most vital to its sustenance) has been
involved in an effort to re-balance the power dynamic between them-
selves and the settler government. As Daryle Rigney and his colleagues
detail, the community with agility positioned themselves enlisting settler
law to have agency. As Rigney and his colleagues stated:

> In 2007, they consolidated their governing authority in a peak politi-
> cal body, the Ngarrindjeri Regional Authority (NRA) . . . . built
> upon an existing Indigenous political culture. By providing a central
> point of political administration the NRA both enabled the coordi-
> nation of activities carried out by the various Ngarrindjeri govern-
> ance organizations and established a unified point of contact for
> communication and negotiation with the state.
>
>   Employing principles of contract law, the negotiation regime initi-
> ated by Ngarrindjeri is geared towards the creation of legally bind-
> ing accords known as Kungun Ngarrindjeri Yunnan Agreements
> (KNYA). The KNY process does not designate fixed outcomes,
> but rather clarifies a starting point for respectful communication
> between interested parties. Every KNYA requires parties to commit
> to listening, discussion and negotiation over any and all manage-
> ment matters concerning Ngarrindjeri jurisdiction over their peo-
> ples and their Country. Importantly, in accordance with contract law,
> the negotiation can only proceed when there is a formal procedural
> recognition of the capacity of each partner to enter into the nego-
> tiation and agreement process. This necessarily includes an a priori
> recognition of the NRA as a peak political body that registers the fact
> of Ngarrindjeri sovereignty over their (unceded) territories.
>   (Rigney, Bignall, & Hemming, 2015, pp. 339–341)

For Daryle Rigney, this is a tricky place even as a member of the Ngar-
rindjeri community. For outsiders, this is space that would be even more

tricky to negotiate and indeed, an outsider's knowledge, commitment and vested interests might be considered suspect. Outsiders may view themselves as emancipists, but be seen as having the vestiges of colonization, imperialism, racism, objectification, commodification, universalism, individualism and simplification which fail to address the complexities and differences in the realities, interests, histories and epistemologies of diverse cultures. Global reader/activists may need to search for an ethical compass to address what seems paradoxical and a form of activism that befits the circumstances and communities being supported or partnered. Global readers and researchers can find themselves slipping from advocate and ally to cultural interloper engaged in a form of colonization and appropriation. Global readers might be ardent,[12] but their meaning making should be pursued in a fashion befitting the kind of contrapuntal reading espoused by (Said, 1979)[13] and more recently Takayama (2018) as he examined how our global perspectives need to confront how modernism and colonialism perpetuated forms of racism.

From the perspective of Indigenous scholars, it could entail what Maori scholar Linda Smith (2005) suggested in the context of discussing ethics for Indigenous research:

> 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 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. (p. 97)

As Ali Abdi has warned, activism should advance cautiously, lest it unwittingly advances an agenda which is assimilationist (Abdi, 2015). As Aman (2017) illustrated in his discussion of Bolivia, there is a constant as westerners control the words to describe and indeed appropriate or control even the manner of change. For example, as Aman noted in Bolivia, they began to enlist the language of the Indigenous such as interculteridad in ways that detracted from its use by the Indigenous groups.

Respectful global meaning making requires practices that avoid outside imposition or the appropriation of others in the outsider's image or in ways that displace the societies, communities and individuals they might be seeking to read, study or support. Accordingly, global meaning making may need to thwart what has been the dominant research norms that have deferred to forms of standardizing rather than differentiating others, objectivity and detachment over participation, cooperation and consultation.

Unfortunately, as recent reviews of Indigenous research have revealed, in the majority of cases, regardless of epistemologies, most studies have

been anemic in terms of commitments to empowering communities and the ethics of engagement. For example, as Dion et al. (2017) note, a limited number of the hundreds of Indigenous research studies have focused on empowerment including even those conducted from a critical perspective or constructivist orientation or touting Indigenous methodology.

Systemic changes on other fronts are instructive in terms of leveraging change. The recognition of LGBTQ rights in a number of countries has involved demonstration, "allyship" but on a number of occasions the support of politicians and the judiciary. In his essay, "Stonewall and the myth of self-deliverance," Kwame Anthony Appiah (2019) discussed how LGBTQ rights moved forward in the United Kingdom and the United States. As he noted in New York at the time of the memorialization of the historic Stonewall demonstration:

> It mattered enormously, then, that the old-guard gay advocacy groups organized an annual Stonewall demonstration. It also mattered enormously that after the 1971 demonstration, the reporter Joseph Lelyveld published an account in *The New York Times* that was long, detailed and, read in its historical context, deeply sympathetic. Unblinkered journalists in the mainstream media were indispensable to the cause.
>
> The story of gay rights is the story of gay activism—but it is not only that story. It's the story, too, of black-robed heterosexuals like Margaret Marshall, who as the chief justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court wrote a 2003 decision declaring that same-sex marriage was entitled to legal recognition. It's the story of mainstream politicians like Gov. Andrew Cuomo, who decided about a decade ago that he wanted New York to become the first large state to legislate marriage equality. Mr. Cuomo blamed the failure of a previous effort on infighting among the advocacy groups, and he called them to heel. Then—with the assistance of rich Wall Street donors—he engaged in the usual wheeling and dealing and arm-twisting to wrangle the bill through the Legislature. He signed it in 2011.

In the UK, he noted a similar story, where a largely unheralded Welsh politician steered various social reform acts of the UK parliament ensuring LGTBQ rights not by "allyship" or as a result of lobbying, but by this social reformer's grit, commitment and "finely honed" political skills.

8. *Reading Global Reading or Making Meaning of Global Meaning Making*

One of the essential premises of the proposal for global reading is tied to pursuit of a global multitopian planetary commitment that is eclectic

(Tierney, 2017). It is an approach to meaning making that does not use a fixed model but takes shape with one another across circumstances and efforts to read and transact with one another and self in ways that involve a reflexive consciousness that is multilayered, multidimensional, multifaceted multidirectional and mobile. Global reading requires the active engagement of self in the world of others. It involves engagement with self in ways that are active, critical and ongoing.

Indeed, global reading is viewed as a form of active conversation with self as one engages with others and their lives in a manner that is transactional and dynamic. Listening with an understanding of the situatedness, norms, conventions and language of others may be a step but it is also important to find one's own voice in global life engagements. In some ways, the proposal for global reading has parallels to the critical pedagogical orientation suggested to reading and writing life stories (one's own and those of others) as antecedents for examining cross-cultural differences (Marshall, 2019). As Appadurai (2005) commented this is not just a matter of ecumenicalism and generosity, but requires suspending certainty and opening oneself up to debate, to differences and consider grassroots internationalism as a crucible for emergent new forms of global ethics.

Reading global reading could be viewed as akin to the ongoing foreign policy tied to shared and changing planetary interests. It would be anchored in accommodation of and respect for differences but aligned with humanism without suppression or violence to others.

Closing Remarks

The importance and complexity of reading or writing in our worlds should not be underestimated; they are integral to our local and planetary participations and citizenry responsibilities. Our exchanges support mundane and complex engagements in ways that may be instrumental or requiring contemplation. In socio-political terms, reading and writing are spaces where communications across people and places occur tied to local and global concerns; they are the sites for grand conversations and vehicles to interrogate experiences, ideas, feelings, attitudes, actions and law as well unify, rally, challenge and change.

The proposal for meaning making tries to overcome some of the systemic forces that may hamper global meaning making and democratic reckoning with self and societies in these post-truth times that seem more exclusionary than eclectic. The framework for global meaning making and the keys posited for global reading represent a patchwork of suggestions befitting a partial map for moving forward. At times, it befits a conversation with self that seems fallible, at time wrong-handed, but mostly incomplete and unsafe but fortunate to occur with the support of colleagues willing to steady the hand.

In his book *Learning to Divide the World: Education at Empire's End* (1998), John Willinsky ended his unmasking of the imperialistic underpinnings of educational developments worldwide with retorts to examine our identity in the context of this legacy with a view to ourselves as foreigners. At the same time, he warned us not to become cathartic about identity and not to shy away from operating across cultures or globally. Willinsky (1998) suggested that our engagements should have less the appearance of imperialist and more the form of critical culturalists working across borders with a view of themselves as foreigners in support of others (see Kristeva, 1991; West, 1990).

Tensions may arise as international developments collide with local issues, such as native languages, cultural practices and so on. Within the larger context of global forces, there may cultural, social, economic and linguistic oppression. As Leslie Roman (2004) argued, some of the developments that have arisen to serve diverse populations have been liberating and profitable for some but inhumane and inequitable for many. She maintains that global pursuits need to be linked to human rights issues. As she stated, the pursuit of education should be viewed as "an opportunity to claim democratic praxis through a decolonized curricular, pedagogy and educational policy" (p. 231), and to do so requires educators who can read cultures with various lenses and engagements that "focus on human rights that is not abstract and universalizing" (p. 252). It requires global meaning makers who are not paralyzed, but peel back the layers as they negotiate the various terrains and peoples involved, implicated and influenced by a form of critical reflexology which is dialectical toward ethical considerations which may be more complex, nuanced and situation-specific. As Ali Abdi (2015, p. 16) warns, we should be alert to those tendencies that give the appearance of eclecticism, but operate as

> a European predestination to save non-cultured natives from themselves . . . we should not discount . . . 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.

At the same time, global reading can be looked at through an ecological lens that questions the influence that the research has on the ecology of our diverse cultures especially the impact on our epistemologies over time—the extent to which our research builds upon and complements the local or traditional ways of knowing or displaces or contributes to their extinction, as de Sousa suggests their epistimecide. I concur with Kohlberg, there may be need for a seventh level of moral principle to which global reading and research should aspire—a level which looks more broadly at the ethics of decision-making aligned with a fuller and

ongoing consideration of the future of a society (Kohlberg, 1981). As Appadurai (2005) commented this is not just a matter of ecumenicalism and generosity but requires suspending certainty and opening oneself up to debate, to differences and consider grassroots internationalism as a crucible for emergent new forms of global ethics. It is consistent with Santos's suggestion of the need for a shift from science as the gatekeeper or metonym for knowledge to being positioned as one of its constituent's knowledge along with other knowledges. As he suggests, it warrants a shift from knowledge as regulation to knowledge as emancipation (de Sousa Santos, 2007, p. li).

Global meaning making is a proposal that is intended to challenge the tendency to equivocate about matters of diversity and cultural spaces that supports a dynamic form of cultural humanism and ecological togetherness that unmasks our identities when self-righteousness, privilege, whiteness and other dominating tendencies remain unchallenged or invisible. It is not something that is imagined as being able to be done alone or in a fashion that is singular in terms of time, space, cultures and ways of knowing. It befits approaches to meaning making that involve self and others accepting eclecticism in consultation with readings, interests, perspectives and the fusions arising from cross-border journeys done outside of but not blind to and challenging mainstream cultural hegemonies.

As global readers engage in these matters and perhaps engage in advocacy and change, they should not assume infallibility or certainty. The global reader should remain self-conscious of their limitations at the same time it is hoped that they would make visible their beliefs, their reasoning and how they checked on the meanings that they discerned including their missteps, uncertainties or perhaps their sense of being lost or out of place, unable to discern the cultural signifiers and lacking in the dexterity to position themselves to understand their own cultural imprint on their readings. Global readers should realize that their vision combined with craft involves negotiations with the material world and other views that might be more fluid than fixed and more momentary than sustained. Meaning making may involve a mix of romance and eroticism, risk and discovery that can be frustrated by one's self—the lack of a "steady hand"—and uncertain predispositions. Advocates for global meaning making should recognize that they are engaged in a journey that may be tricky and for which there may not be a map or fixed destination.

Notes

1. For the constructivist, meaning making is recognized as situated and as such governed by local and global transactions that reckon with one another in a fashion that befits the tenets of responsive evaluation (Guba & Lincoln,

1989). From a postmodernist framework, the meaning making needs to be examined in terms of if it is governed by relativism (e.g., Peters, 2017, 2019). For the sociolinguists, the meaning making might be viewed as forms of planned based speech acts involving transactions between parties tied to a consideration of each other's goals and interests (e.g., Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). From a sociological perspective, culture is viewed as ongoing, situated and in motion rather than anchored in its past; consideration is given to the systemic forces that are at play especially the hierarchies within which power and privilege are afforded within and across societies (e.g., Bourdieu, 1991; Misiaszek, 2019). For the postcolonialist, they might be examined in terms of cultural accommodation and self-determination (e.g., Andreotti & De Souza, 2011).

2. As Davis (2018) stated:

within traditional Aboriginal societies, notions of collective agreement-making that resonate with democracy were pervasive largely because there was an egalitarian diffusion of power rather than concentration of power in one leader. Power and authority in tribal groups was vested in Elders with no concept of hereditary chiefs that exists in other Indigenous cultures so there was no assumption of leadership simply on the basis of genealogy. Elevation to a leadership position was determined by a fusion of the merit of the individual and the consensus of the group and were restricted to the most intelligent and diligent and those who had the most knowledge of religious and ceremonial affairs. The closeness of the group and its interdependence also meant that the community could use public opinion to encourage people to meet their obligations. While there was no concept of election within traditional culture, achieving influence or gaining a strong voice in decision-making was effectively granted by the rest of the group. But while certain people were more influential than others, no one had ultimate power. (p. 9)

3. This befits Australian aboriginal educator Robert Morgan's notion of relegating Indigenous learners as "guests" (Morgan, 2018).

4. The number of international students is in excess of 200 million per year, the number of international scholars (short and long term) to the US alone over 45,000—specifically, the Institute of International Education reported in 2011 that there were 1,369 professors, 26,370 researchers and 18,106 short-term scholars on a J-1 visa in 2009 in the United States.

The number of international travellers is in excess of 1.25 billion annually and the size of cross-border migration globally in excess of 250 million per year.

5. This fits with what Maori scholar Graham Smith (2015) refers to as pursuing a 360-degree view of their reading including a reading of their reading.

6. It is estimated that on average 450 minutes per day are spent consuming or posting media across the globe, more so in more developed countries (e.g., Americans report spending over 600 minutes per day). The exchange via the global internet is in excess of 100 billion exchanges by the over 4 billion internet users across various platforms including nearly 2 billion websites that they access. If we use academic publishing as a proxy, the magnitude has risen at least 3.5% annually for two centuries [?] and is now rising even more substantially. It is estimated that there are some 5,000–10,000 publishers and 8–9 million scholars in 17,000 universities worldwide (e.g., Ware & Mabe, 2015). In terms of journals, there were at least 28,606 academic journals across all fields in 2016, growing from 15,896 in 2000. For education there were at least 1,067 scholarly journals in 2016 growing from 356 in 2000. In terms of documents or articles in these journals and other sources (across all fields of science), there were at least 1.9 million peer-reviewed articles

published in 2010 and 1.8 billion full-text articles downloaded and further increases estimated to be 20% by 2016 [update?] (Research Information Network, 2010; Potter, 2017). In terms of readership, estimates based upon survey data indicate academics on average read (peruse, explore, etc.) over 250 articles per year and for around 90 minutes to 120 minutes per day, non-university scientists read on average maybe 50% as much. (King & Tenopir, 2004; King, Tenopir, & Clarke, 2006). Various websites can be accessed for these details. They include:

https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SM.POP.TOTL
https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/ST.INT.ARVL
www.internetlivestats.com
www.zenithmedia.com/26-of-media-consumption-will-be-mobile-in-2019/

7. Based upon over 7,000 US middle school through college-aged students' responses in 12 states, there were major shortcomings in meaning makers' ability to engage in reasonable discernments of the merits of information or their validity. They encountered numerous failures to check on veracity of the ideas presented on the internet for example, against the identified "authorship" or article "sponsorship" or other identified factors that should trigger uncertainty about the newsworthiness of information presented in news releases, on Facebook, Twitter or other outlets. As one of the researchers suggested: many of students appeared to "focus more on the content of social media posts than on their sources." The researcher suggested: "Despite their fluency with social media, many students are unaware of basic conventions for indicating verified digital information." Likewise, when students were asked to evaluate information downloaded from internet searches, they had difficulty sorting facts from falsehoods especially when the issue was politically charged. And, as they found the strategies employed by the user tended to be non-critical. For example, the users did not analyze the website in terms of the communication ploys enlisted or the arguments made nor did they engage in a public sphere where ideas would be challenged. Instead, they reported that they found: "high production values, links to reputable news organizations and polished 'About' pages had the ability to sway students into believing without very much scepticism the contents of the site" (Donald, 2016).

8. See also Nozaki, 2009.

9. See also Ocholla, 2007

10. The film won the United Nations Media Peace Prize.

11. The recommendations for global reading align with the kind of emancipatory practices espoused by Augusto Boal in "Theater of the Oppressed" (Boal, 1993).

12. It may be that exposure to these ideas is not enough. To achieve traction, there may be a need to follow up. For example, a global reader should consider entering what would be tantamount to spaces equivalent with a form of the public sphere proposed by Habermas (1989) and extended by critical theorists to encompass multiple voices. They could do so in the context of meaning making involving potentially volatile global affairs such as the current discussions around climate change to racial division and immigration and free trade (Suárez-Orozco, 2005). At the same time, they could access commentaries on global issues. As global readers contend with these ideas and debate ideas as they examine the discourse especially in terms of relevance and credibility, a degree of connoisseurship might be attained. At times such requires wading through a quagmire that may include false denials and allegations of partisanships and views that appear to be embedded within or flowing from efforts by positioning what were purported as facts as

"alternative facts" or to pivot as a means of shifting foci. But is it enough to be cognizant of these matters or simply be questioning?

13. As Said espoused readings that "take(s) account of both processes, that of imperialism and that of resistance to it, which can be done by extending our reading of the texts to include what was once forcibly excluded" (Said, 1993, pp. 66–67).

References

Abdi, A. A. (2015). Decolonizing global citizenship education: Critical reflections on the epistemic intersections of location, knowledge, and learning. In A. A. Abdi, L. Shultz, & T. Pillay (Eds.), *Decolonizing global citizenship education* (pp. 11–26). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.

Aman, R. (2017). Colonial differences in intercultural education: On interculturality in the Andes and the decolonization of intercultural dialogue. *Comparative Education Review, 61*(S1), S103–S120.

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

Appadurai, A. (2005). Grassroots globalization and the research imagination. In A. Appadurai (Ed.), *Globalization* (pp. 2–21). Durham, Duke University Press.

Appia, K. A. (2019, June 23). Stonewall and the myth of self-deliverance. *New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/22/opinion/sunday/stonewall-myth.html#commentsContainer

Assié-Lumumba, N. T. (2016). The Ubuntu paradigm and comparative and international education: Epistemological challenges and opportunities in our field. *Comparative Educational Review, 61*, 1, Retrieved June 2018 https://doi.org/10.1086/689922.

Austin, J. L. (1962, 2005). *How to do things with words* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Australian Broadcasting Corporation. (1986, 2006) *Babakiueria (Barbecue Area)*. ABC DVD.

Baldwin, J. (1974). *If Beale street could talk*. New York: Dial Press.

Beach, R., & Tierney, R. J. (2016). Toward a theory of literacy meaning making within virtual worlds. In S. Israel (Ed.), *Handbook of research on reading comprehension* (Vol. 2, pp. 135–164). New York: Guilford.

Bishop, R. (1994). Initiating empowering research? *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 29*(1), 175–188.

Bishop, A. (2009). *Becoming an Ally: Breaking the cycle of oppression*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Boal, A. (1993). *Theater of the oppressed*. New York: Theatre Communications Group.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language & symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bump, B. (2018, July). With the release of new documents: Devin Nunes's memo on Carter Page has gotten even less credible. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from www.washingtonpost.com/news/politics/wp/2018/07/22/with-the-release-of-new-documents-devin-nunes-memo-on-carter-page-has-gotten-even-less-credible/?utm_term=.d24213202261&wpisrc=nl_most&wpmm=1.

Butler, J. (2011, May 27). Precarious life and the obligations of cohabitation. *Address given at the Nobel Museum*, Stockholm. Retrieved June 2018 from www.youtube.com/watch?v=KJT69AQtDtg

Campano, G., Honeyford, M. A., Sánchez, L., & Vander Zanden, S. (2010). Ends in themselves: Theorizing the practice of University—School partnering through horizontalidad. *Language Arts*, *87*(4), 277–286.

Chen, K. H. (2010). *Asia as method: Toward deimperialization.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

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

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

Connell, R., Collyer, F., Maia, J., & Morrell, R. (2017). Toward a global sociology of knowledge: Post-colonial realities and intellectual practices. *International Sociology*, *32*(1), 21–37. Retrieved June 2018 from https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580916676913.

Crumpler, T., & Tierney, R. J. (1995). Literacy research and rhetorical space: Reflections and interpretive possibilities. *Research Monograph.* Retrieved from www.academia.edu/9699516/Literacy_Research_and_Rhetorical_Space_Reflections_and_Interpretive_Possibilities.

Davis, R. B. (2018). Aboriginal water governance as a deliberative system in the Murray-Darling Basin. *Paper Presented at the 25th World Congress of Political Science July 21–25, 2018.*

de Freitas, E., & Curinga, M. X. (2015). New materialist approaches to the study of language and identity: Assembling the posthuman subject. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *45*, 249–265.

Deuze, M., Blank, P., & Speers, L. (2012). A life lived in media. *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, *6*(1). Retrieved June 2018 from http://tinyw.in/IKTm.

Dion, M., Gabel, C., Rios, C. D. M., & Leonard, K. (2017, September). Indigenous futures; research sovereignty in a changing social science landscape. SHRCC Knowledge Synthesis Grant Final Report. Retrieved from https://Indigenousfutures.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/20170926_Indigenous-Futures_small.pdf.

Donald, B. (2016). Stanford researchers find students have trouble judging the credibility of information online. *Stanford News.* Retrieved from https://ed.stanford.edu/news/stanford-researchers-find-students-have-trouble-judging-credibility-information-online.

Enciso, P. (2019). Stories of becoming: Implications of future-oriented theories for a vital literacy education. *Literacy*, *53*(1), 46–55.

Frazer, R., & Carlson, B. (2017, October–December). Indigenous memes and the invention of a people. *Social Media and Society*, 1–12.

Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness.* New York: Seabury Press.

Freire, P. (2006). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (30th anniversary ed.), New York: Continuum.

Gibson, W. (1969). *Persona: A style study for readers and writers.* New York: Random House. Retrieved from www.todroberts.com/USF/persona.pdf.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and of morality. *Harvard Educational Review*, *47*(4), 481–517. doi:10.17763/haer.47.4.g6167429416hg5l0

González, N., Moll, L., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities and classrooms.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Goodwin, S. (2012). Conducting action research in an "evidence-based" policy environment. *Australian Qualitative Research Conference "Embodying Good*

Research—What counts and Who decides?" August 23, 24 and 25, 2012, Charles Darwin University, Darwin, NT, Australia.

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

Greene, S., Burke, K. J., & McKenna, M. K. (2018). A review of research connecting digital storytelling, photovoice, and civic engagement. *Review of Educational Research, 88*(6), 844–878.

Grigorov, S., & Fleuri, R. (2012). *Ecopedagogy: Educating for a new eco-social intercultural perspective.* Florianopolis: Visão Global, UNOESC. Retrieved from http://editora.unoesc.edu.br/index.php/visaoglobal/article/view/3435/1534 and www.academia.edu/4111655/Grigorov_S_and_Fleuri_R._2012._Ecopedagogy_educating_for_a_new_eco-social_intercultural_perspective._Visao_Global_UNOESC_Florianopolis.

Guattari, F. (2000). *The three ecologies.* London: Bloomsbury.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

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,* 286–303.

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.

Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of Bourgeois society.* Cambridge: Thomas Burger.

Hall, B. (1978). Continuity in adult education and political struggle. *Convergence: An International Journal of Adult Education, 11*(1), 8–15.

Haluza-Delay, R. (2003). When the topic is racism: Research and advocacy with a community coalition, *Social Justice, 30*(4), 77–90.

Hepp, A., & Krotz, F. (Eds.) (2014). *Mediatized worlds: Culture and society in a media age.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Horowitz, R. (2012). Border Crossing: Geographic space and cognitive shifts in adolescent language and literacy practices. In H. Romo, C. Garrido de la Caleja, & O. Lopez (Eds.), *A bilateral perspective on Mexico-United States migration* (pp. 147–164). XaLapa, Veracruz, Mexico: Universidad Veracruzana and The University of Texas at San Antonio, UTSA—Mexico Center.

Howe, L. (1999). Tribalography: The power of native stories. *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism, 14*(1), 117–126.

Hull, G. A., Stornaiuolo, A., & Sahni, U. (2010). Cosmopolitan imaginings of self and other: Girls in India go online. *English Education, 42*(4), 331–367. Retrieved June 2018 from www.hullresearchgroup.info/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Cultural-Citizenship-and-Cosmopolitan-Practice-Global-Youth-Communicate-Online.pdf.

Hymes, D. (1990). Emics, etics and openness: An ecumenical approach. In Y. Headland, K. Pike, & M. Harris (Eds.), *Emics and etics: The insider/outsider debate* (pp. 120–126). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Kamberelis, G., McGinley, W., & Welker, A. (2015). Literature discussions as mangles of practice: Sociological theories of emergence and/in dialogic learning events. *Journal of Dialogic Pedagogy, 3.* Retrieved from http://tinyw.in/fV4k.

Kakutani, M. (2018). *The death of truth: Notes on falsehood in the age of Trump.* New York: Tim Duggan/Penguin-Random.

Kim, G. M. (2016). Transcultural digital literacies: Cross-border connections and self-representations in an online forum. *Reading Research Quarterly, 51*(2), 199–219. Retrieved from June 2018 http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/rrq.131/epdf.

King, D. W., & Tenopir, C. (2004). An evidence based assessment of author pays. *Nature web focus on access to the literature.* Retrieved from www.nature.com/nature/focus/accessdebate/26.htm.

King, D. W., Tenopir, C., & Clarke, M. (2006). Measuring total reading of journal articles. *D- Lib Magazine, 12*(10). doi:10.1045/october2006-king.

King, J. (2015). Morally engaged research/ers dismantling epistemological nihilation in the age of impunity. *Presidential address at the American Educational Research Association annual conference.* Retrieved from www.aera.net/tabid/15954/mid/38465/default.aspx?dnnprintmode=true&SkinSrc=%5bG%5dSkins%2f_default%2fNo+Skin&ContainerSrc=%5bG%5dContainers%2f_default%2fNo+Container&TabId=15954.

Kinsman, G. (2006). Mapping social relations of struggle: Activism, ethnography, social organization. In C. Frampton, G. Kinsman, A. K. Thompson, & K. Tilleczek (Eds.), *Sociology for changing the world: Social movements/Social research* (pp. 133–156). Black Point, NS: Fernwood.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays on moral development, Vol. 1: Philosophy of moral development.* San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.

Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age.* London: Routledge.

Kristeva, J. (1991). *Strangers to ourselves.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0: Aka the remix. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(1), 74–84.

Lakoff, G. (2016/2017). Retrieved from Lam, W. S. E., & Warriner, D. (2012). Transnationalism and literacy: Investigating the mobility of people, languages, texts, and practices in contexts of migration. *Reading Research Quarterly, 47*(2), 191–215.

Lankshear, C., & Mclaren, P. L. (Eds). (1993). *Critical literacy.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Lather, P. (1986, Winter). Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. *Interchange, 17*(4), 63–84.

Laverty, M. J., & Gregory, M. R. (2017). Pragmatism and the unlearning of learnification. *Childhood and Philosophy, 15*(8), 521–536. Retrieved from www.e-publicacoes.uerj.br/ojs/index.php/childhood/article/view/29925/21450.

Leander, K. M., & Sheehy, M. (2004). *Spatializing literacy research and practice.* New York: Peter Lang.

Lemke, J. L. (1995). *Textual politics.* London: Taylor.

Levinas, E. (1981). *Otherwise than being or beyond essence* (A. Lingis, Trans.). The Hague, NL: Martinus Nijhoff. (Original work published 1974).

Levinas, E. (1993). *Outside the subject* (M. B. Smith, Trans.). London: Athlone Press.

Levinas, E. (1995). *Ethics and infinity* (R. Cohen, Trans.). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne.

Luke, A. (2004). Teaching after the market: From commodity to cosmopolitan. *Teachers College Record, 106*(7), 1422–1443.

Luke, A. (2011). Generalizing across borders: Policy and the limits of educational science. *Educational Researcher, 40*, 367–377.

Luke, A. (2018). Digital ethics now. *Language and Literacy, 20*(3), 185–198.

Marshall, E. (2019). Life writing and the language arts. *Language Arts, Research and Policy Column, 96*(3), 167–178.

Marshall, E., & Toohey, K. (2010). Representing family: Community funds of knowledge, bilingualism, and multimodality. *Harvard Educational Review, 80*(2), 221–242.

Massey, D. (2005). *For space.* London: Sage Publications.

McGrew, S., Breakstone, J., Ortega, T., Smith, M., & Wineburg, S. (2018). Can students evaluate online sources? Learning from assessments of civic online reasoning. *Theory & Research in Social Education, 46*(2), 165–193. doi:10.1080/00933104.2017.1416320.

Misiaszek, G. (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). Retrieved June 2018 from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/ejed.12138/epdf.

Misiaszek, L. I. (2019). Council circles on sensitive topics as a feminist praxis of resistance in "post-truth" times. *Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual meeting, Toronto.*

Moje, E. B., & Luke, A. (2009). Literacy and identity: Examining the metaphors in history and contemporary research. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*(4), 415–437.

Morgan, R. V. (2018). Beyond the guest paradigm: Eurocentric education and aboriginal peoples in NSW. In E. McKinley & L. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of Indigenous education.* Singapore: Springer.

Morgan, R. V., & Tierney, R. J. (2018). Finding our way cross-culturally: Educators walking with and working with and for Indigenous communities. *Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York, April 14, 2018.*

Nelson, N. E., Barrera, S., Skinner, K., & Fuentes, A. M. (2016). Language, culture and border lives: mestizaje as positionality/Lengua, cultura y vidas de frontera: el mestizaje como posicionalidad. *Cultura y Educación, 28*(1), 1–41. doi:10.1080/11356405.2014.980121 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/11356405.2014.980121.

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.), *International handbook of critical education* (pp. 382–390). New York: Routledge.

Nussbaum, M. C. (2018). *The monarchy of fear: A philosopher looks at our political crisis.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Ocholla, D. (2007). Marginalized knowledge: An agenda for Indigenous knowledge development and integration with other forms of knowledge. *Proceedings of the 1st African Information Ethics. International Review of Information Ethics, 7,* 236–245.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher, 41*(3), 93–97.

Park, J. (2018). Knowledge production with Asia-Centric research methodology. *Comparative Education Review.* https://doi.org/10.1086/693980. Retrieved from www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdfplus/10.1086/693980.

Pasco, B. (2014). *Dark Emu.* Broom: Magabala Books.

Peters, M. A. (2017). Education in a post-truth world. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 49*(6), 563–566. doi:10.1080/00131857.2016.1264114.

Peters, M. A. (2019). Viral modernity in education: From postmodernism to post-truth? *Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual meeting, Toronto.*

Phillips, S., Phillips, J., Whatman, S., & McLaughlin, J. (2007). Introduction: Issues in (re)contesting Indigenous knowledges and Indigenous studies. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 36*(Supplement), 1–6.

Potter, I. (2017, October). *Connecting the dots from submission to decision, the fate of scholarly papers.* Frankfurt Book Fair. Retrieved from http://images.mail info.clarivate.com/Web/ThomsonReutersScience/%7B69272fbc-53e2-44bd-9159fffac85eb662%7D_Clarivate_2017-FBF-Hotspot-Connecting-the-dots.pdf

Purcell-Gates, V. (2006). What does culture have to do with it? In B. Maloch, J. V. Hoffman, C. M. Fairbanks, & J. Worthy (Eds.), *National reading conference 55th yearbook* (pp. 43–59). Oak Creek, WI: National Reading Conference.

Research Information Network. (2010) *If you build it, they will come? How researchers perceive and use the web 2.0.* London: Research Information Network. Retrieved from http://rinarchive.jisc-collections.ac.uk/our-work/communicating-and-disseminatingresearch/use-and-relevance-web-20-researchers

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

Ríos, C. D., Dion, M. L., & Leonard, L. (2018). Institutional logics and Indigenous research sovereignty in Canada, the United States, Australia, and New Zealand. *Studies in Higher Education.* doi:10.1080/03075079.2018.1534228.

Rizvi, F. (2009). Global mobility and the challenges of educational research and policy. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 108*(2), 268–289.

Robertson, R. (1985). Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash, & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities* (pp. 25–44). London: Sage Publications.

Rogers, R. (2017, November 29). Literacy research, racial consciousness, and equitable flows of knowledge. *Presidential Address, Literacy Research Association.* Retrieved from www.youtube.com/watch?v=1oyZ2altlqk.

Rogers, T., & Soter, A. (1996). *Reading across cultures: Teaching literature in a diverse society.* New York: Teachers College Press.

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

Roman, L. (2004). States of insecurity: Cold War memory, "global citizenship" and its discontents. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 25*(2), 231–259.

Said, E. W. (1993). *Culture and imperialism.* New York: Vintage.

San Pedro, T. S. (2018). Abby as Ally: An argument for culturally disruptive pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 55*(6), 1193–1232. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831218773488.

Santos, B. S. (Ed.) (2007a). *Another knowledge is possible.* London: Verso.

Santos, B. S. (2007b). Beyond abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of knowledge. *Eurozine, 33*, 45–89.

Santos, B. S. (2013). *Epistemologies of the south: Justice against epistemicide.* London: Paradigm.

Santos, B. S., Nunes, J. A., & Meneses, M. P. (2007). Opening up the canon of knowledge and recognition of difference. In B. Sousa Santos (Ed.), *Another knowledge is possible* (pp. xix–lxii) London: Verso.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sheehy, M., Scanlon, D. M., & Roesch, C. (2016). Assessing argument as communities' content and rhetorical knowledge building. *Paper presented at the Literacy Research Association annual meeting, Nashville, Tennessee.*

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

Simon, R., & Campano, G. (2013). Activist literacies: Teacher research as resistance to the "normal curve". *Journal of Language and Literacy Education, 9*(1), 21–39.

Singh, M., Fenway, J., & Apple, M. W. (2005). Globalizing education: Perspectives from above and below. In M. W. Apple, J. Fenway, & M. Singh (Eds.), *Globalizing education: Policies, pedagogies and politics* (pp. 1–31). New York: Peter Lang.

Smith, G. H. (1990). Research issues related to Maori Education. *Paper presented to NZARE Special Interest Conference, Massey University.*

Smith, G. H. (2015). Transforming research: The Indigenous struggle for social, cultural, and economic justice within and through education. *Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 2015.* Retrieved June 2015 from www.aera.net/EventsMeetings/Annual Meeting/PreviousAnnualMeetings/2015AnnualMeeting/2015AnnualMeet ingWebcasts/TransformingResearchTheIndigenousStruggleforSocial,Cul tural,andEconomicJusticeWithinandThroughEducation/tabid/15952/ Default.aspx.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies.* Dunedin, New Zealand: Otago University 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* (pp. 85–108). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). *Can the subalterns speak?* Basingstoke: Macmillan.

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

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

Stein, S. (2017a). *Contested imaginaries of global justice in the internationalization of higher education* (Unpublished dissertation). The University of British Columbia.

Stein, S. (2017b). The persistent challenges of addressing epistemic dominance in higher education: Considering the case of curriculum internationalization. *Comparative Education Review, 61*(S1), S25–S50.

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

Suárez-Orozco, M. (2005). Right moves? Immigration, globalization, utopia, and dystopia. In M. Suárez-Orozco, C. Suárez-Orozco, & D. Qin-Hilliard (Eds.), *The new immigration: An interdisciplinary reader* (pp. 3–20). New York: Routledge.

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.), *International handbook of critical education* (pp. 354–367). New York: Routledge.

Takayama, K. (2018). Beyond comforting histories: The colonial/imperial entanglements of the International Institute, Paul Monroe, and Isaac L. Kandel at Teachers College, Columbia University. *Comparative Education Review, 62*(4), 459–481. https://doi.org/10.1086/699924.

Takayama, K., Sriprakash, A., & Connell, R. (2017). Toward a postcolonial comparative and international education. *Comparative Education Review, 61*(S1), S1–S24. Retrieved June 2018 from https://doi.org/10.1086/690455.

Tierney, R. J. (2006). Global/cultural teachers creating possibilities: Reading worlds, reading selves and learning to teach. *Pedagogies*, 77–87. Retrieved from https://independent.academia.edu/RobTierney/Papers.

Tierney, R. J. (2017). Multitopia: Global citizenship across diverse spaces. *Global Commons Review, I*, 75–81. Retrieved from https://independent.academia.edu/RobTierney/Papers.

Tierney, R. J. (2018a). Global educational research in Western times: The rise and plight of Chinese educational research. *Frontiers of Education in China, 13*(2), 163–192. Retrieved June 2018 from https://doi.org/10.1007/s11516-018-0010-4.

Tierney, R. J. (2018b). Toward a model of global meaning making. *Journal of Literacy Research, 50*(4), 1–26. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X18803134. Retrieved from https://independent.academia.edu/RobTierney/Papers.

Tierney, R. J., & Kan, W. (2016). Knowledge mobilization within and across the People's Republic of China and the United States: A cross-national study of internationalization of educational research. *American Educational Research Journal, 53*(6), 1759–1791. doi:10.3102/0002831216678320. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.3102/0002831216678320.

Torres, C. A. (1998). Democracy, education and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world. *Comparative Education Review, 42*, 421–447.

Torres, C. A. (2015). Global citizenship and global universities. The age of global interdependence and cosmopolitanism. *European Journal of Education, 50*(3), 262–279.

Toulmin, S. (1958). *The uses of argument.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trigos-Carillo, L., & Rogers, R. (2017). Latin American influences on multiliteracies: From epistemological diversity to cognitive. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice, 66*(1), 373–388.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2014). R-words: Refusing research. In D. Paris & M. Winn (Eds.), *Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities* (pp. 223–248). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ware, M., & Mabe, M. (2015). *The STM report an overview of scientific and scholarly journal publishing* (5th ed.). The Hague: International Association of Scientific, Technical and Medical Publishers.

West, C. (1990). The new cultural politics of difference. In R. Ferguson, M. Gever, Trinh, T. M.-H, & C. West (Eds.), *Out there: Marginalization and contemporary culture* (pp. 19–38). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

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

Willis, P. (1981). *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Willmott, E. (1987). *Pemulwuy: The rainbow warrior.* McMahon's Point: Weldon Press.

Wineburg, S., & McGrew, S. (2016). Why students can't Google their way to the truth. *Education Week, 36*(11), 22, 28.