



International Journal of Doctoral Studies

An Official Publication
of the Informing Science Institute
InformingScience.org

IJDS.org

Volume 16, 2021

TOWARD ENGAGING DIFFERENCE IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD

Jennifer MacDonald	University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada	jennifer.macdonald2@ucalgary.ca
Jingzhou Liu*	University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada	jingzhou.liu@ucalgary.ca
Sylvie Roy	University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada	syroy@ucalgary.ca
Jody Dennis	University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada	jody.dennis@ucalgary.ca
Stefan Rothschuh	University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada	stefan.rothschuh@ucalgary.ca
Marlon Simmons	University of Calgary, Calgary, Canada	simmonsm@ucalgary.ca

* Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

Aim/Purpose	This paper reflects on participation in an International Doctoral Research Seminar, held in Beijing, China, to consider what it means to locate difference and make meaning in a globalized world in relation to teaching and learning.
Background	The impetus for our inquiry stems from our shared experience at the seminar, which brought together 12 graduate students and six faculty members from three universities. We came with diverse life stories, educational and professional experiences, and research interests. Alongside presentations and school visits, some students questioned how teaching and learning practices <i>differ</i> in China compared to their experiences in Canada.
Methodology	We employ an interpretive approach which allows us to revisit our individual stories and to explore different views of meaning-making in a globalized context. Specifically, two authors, positioned by different backgrounds (Chinese and Canadian), share their life histories and experiences for wider dialogue with other delegation members. We consider their experiences at various levels of education (K-12, leading up to graduate school, and at the doctoral seminar) as a mode of generating dialogue around the different contexts in relation to teaching and learning.
Contribution	Our article contributes to the area of globalizing teaching and learning. We invite students and educators to revisit their lived experiences and advocate for

Accepting Editor Adriana Burlea-Schiopoiu | Received: November 9, 2020 | Revised: March 11, March 30, 2021 | Accepted: April 1, 2021.

Cite as: MacDonald, J., Liu, J., Roy, J., Dennis, J., Rothschuh, S., & Simmons, M. (2021). Toward engaging difference in a globalized world. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 16, 273-290.

<https://doi.org/10.28945/4742>

(CC BY-NC 4.0) This article is licensed to you under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). When you copy and redistribute this paper in full or in part, you need to provide proper attribution to it to ensure that others can later locate this work (and to ensure that others do not accuse you of plagiarism). You may (and we encourage you to) adapt, remix, transform, and build upon the material for any non-commercial purposes. This license does not permit you to use this material for commercial purposes.

	daily practices that might defy sameness caused by the forces of globalization to instead contribute to epistemological diversity and tolerance.
Findings	Through the process of unpacking the lived experiences of the two authors, we encounter the complexities of already being products of a globalized world. We reveal how a singular normative mode of knowing is perpetuated in many educational institutions. Difference, however, was located in the nuances of our stories. Thus, cultivating a practice of paying attention to the dynamic forms of knowing as they emerge can be a process of unlearning sameness toward rich meaning-making.
Recommendations for Practitioners	We challenge educational practitioners to reflect on the ways in which meaning is, and can be, generated to resist uniformity and honor the lived experiences of students. We offer an opening to engage in narrative opportunities to promote dialogue and facilitate collaboration.
Recommendations for Researchers	We open possibilities to consider a different ethic for generating meaning that resists overpowering global powers and honor local knowledge.
Impact on Society	Our article provides an interpretive lens of global meaning-making to discuss critical social, cultural, and ecological dilemmas facing humanity through individuals' narratives and life histories.
Future Research	Future research will inquire into practical and ethical considerations that might play out in local settings (lectures, seminars, assessments, research proposals) and global collaborations, such as future doctoral seminars, to confront western exclusivity.
Keywords	meaning-making, difference, globalization, praxis, stories, ethics

INTRODUCTION

Georgia Warnke (2002) writes:

“as human beings, we are ‘thrown’ into a history or set of stories that we did not start and cannot finish... to determine how to act, we must understand ourselves and the set of stories we find ourselves in” (p. 79).

In this globalized world, an essence of sameness has evolved with the spread of multi-national corporations, the English language, multi-media technology, etc., and it is becoming more difficult to hear the unique stories that make us who we are (B. G. Davis, 2009; Mense et al., 2018). While global infrastructure can open collaborative possibilities across geographical locations, worldviews, and cultural positions, as a group of scholars with diverse backgrounds, we are concerned about the power relationships involved and what might be lost by global processes that colonize cultural stories with less power. In the context of teaching and learning, the erasure of difference can manifest as opportunity gaps and inequitable resources for different groups of students, standardized teaching and assessment practices, under or misrepresentation of cultural identities and practices, and challenges generating or expressing meaning (Gitomer & Bell, 2016; Nguyen, 2011; Rusciano, 2014). To tackle the many critical social, cultural and ecological dilemmas facing humanity, there is importance in coming together, in all our diversity, for understanding and sharing the set of stories we find ourselves in – and to develop the means to do so – however, there is also a need to continuously question the epistemological, political, economic, and ideological underpinnings (Beyer & Apple, 1998) to consider the ethics of proceeding together in ways that honor cultural differences.

The impetus for our inquiry on this topic stems from our shared experience at the 2018 International Doctoral Research Seminar held in Beijing, China. This gathering brought together 12 doctoral students and six faculty members from faculties of education in three universities (Queensland University of Technology, Beijing Normal School, and University of Calgary). The collective engaged in discussion, presented doctoral research projects, and took part in cross-cultural learning opportunities around the theme: *Teacher Education: Theories and Practices from an International Perspective*. As the delegation who travelled from Canada, we already came with diverse life stories, educational and professional experiences, and research interests. Within the student cohort, two of us have international backgrounds (Germany and China) and two of us are Canadian (British and Scottish descent). We were guided by the support of two professors, one who is French-Canadian and one of Trinidadian heritage.

The seminar featured speakers (Dr. Zhongying Shi and Dr. Robert Tierney) who addressed us about education in China and notions of citizenship and school vitality. We also had several outings to visit local schools and cultural sites. While visiting Beijing schools and walking around the university campus, some of us observed the legacy of Confucius visibly present in both statue and picture form. However, over a dinner-time conversation, one of the authors commented that the pedagogical approaches she observed during the school visits looked similar to the classroom environments she knew growing up in Canada. She wondered if she had missed something—are there local ways to teach and learn, for example, inspired by the philosophical orientation of Confucius or other Eastern wisdom insights? While keeping the tension that there are some universal practices, are there ways in which we might interact, in teaching and learning practices, to recognize and honor the nuances of difference? If so, what might these look like?

With others around the table, the dialogue was tempered in attempts to articulate and explain ideological and epistemological questions, understandings, positions, and challenges. Coincidentally, during the later lecture by Dr. Tierney, he shared parts of his recent paper, *Toward a Model of Global Meaning Making* (2018), which further encouraged our discussions. Global meaning making, in this sense, strives for a richer process of bringing cultural understandings together with the intention of fusing difference, but not assimilating, to arrive at something new together. His model calls for a commitment to further research and pedagogy that: “situate[s] diversity on a new ethical plane, aligned with a form of epistemological activism that confronts and moves beyond the systems in place that play a role in the exclusion or filtering of the cultural “other” in our global conversations” (p.2). Within the dynamics of both our dinner conversation and Tierney’s model, we were left in an untidy but generative space.

In this paper, we want to go further in our reflections by using our own stories as openings for inquiry. Our conversations keep circling back to our positions and experience as students and educators, which leads us to consider the wider implications for learning and teaching. Our question is: how might we locate difference to make meaning in a globalized world in relation to teaching and learning experiences? In our context, locating difference refers to experiencing the world in more nuanced, local, and comprehensive ways that acknowledge that universals do exist, but cautiously questions the ideology that undergirds of the universals (i.e., it is all Westernized colonizing the world?). We begin by briefly exploring scholarly literature around education in a globalized context as background to understand what we experienced in China. We will then explicate our process of inquiry, offer two sets of narrative (a Chinese and a Canadian perspective), and reflect on how our theoretical exploration and lived experiences may translate into praxis for global meaning-making.

TEACHING AND LEARNING IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD

Globalization is not a new phenomenon and can be traced in complex ways across fields from political processes and economics to technology and media, to culture, language, and identity studies (Giddens, 1999; Castells, 2009). Alistair Pennycook (2006) offers a concise summary: “[g]lobalization re-

fers to the] compression of time and space, an intensification of social, economic, cultural and political relations, a series of global linkages that render events in one location of potential and immediate importance in other, quite distant locations” (p. 25). He also shares an interpretation that globalized processes are the “Americanization” (p. 24) of the world, leaning to the domination of an American-based economy and political power structures, tied closely to corporatization, privatization, and emphasis of the free market. The intention of this literature review is to acquire more nuanced insight into how the processes of globalization are understood by people working in the field of education, we ask: how are the processes of globalization influencing the ways in which we teach and learn and perceive the world around us? It serves to provide a foundation for reflecting on our own experiences (past, present, future) of being in the world and attending the Doctoral Seminar in Beijing.

In westernized countries, where the ideologies governing globalization are deemed to stem (Pennycook, 2006), education systems tend to be based on accountability and standardized education even if democratic and individualized education is present (B. Davis et al., 2012). This means that access to education is provided with the same conditions for instructions to all students who should leave with the same baggage of knowledge while schools and teachers are being confronted with the need of individualization for students’ engagement. These educational goals can be “mixed and conflicted, owing in large part to widely varied assumptions about knowledge, learning, teaching and the purposes of schooling” (B. Davis et al., 2012, p. 58). Given the historical tensions and ideological differences between America and China (with Canada being closely tied to America), this is an interesting statement for us to consider when reflecting on our journey. On the surface, during our visit in Beijing, there were signs of western influence (fast-food chains, the use of English especially at the university and some service sectors, brand name clothing, automobiles), but also evidence of Chinese resistance of western influence (i.e., the widespread use of the WeChat app for communication and commerce instead of credit cards, no access to Google or other social media) and resilience of cultural rituals. For example, on our evening walks around campus, we witnessed the Liabdao, a ceremonial burning of imitation paper money to honor the deceased. If we had not had a Chinese student interpreting this ritual, the significance of it would have been lost.

In the Chinese education context, the Confucius educational model, which focuses on listening, thinking, reflecting, and applying provides a broad scope of application in the resurgent cultural nationalism and educational hybridity in contemporary China (Wu, 2018). This process has been impacted by globalization in Chinese educational reform over the past three decades. The reform intends to reorient the system from traditional curriculum – a didactic teaching and passive learning pedagogy – to skill orientation as requisite for globalized knowledge and information-saturated economies (Ryan et al., 2009). The shift emphasizes teacher-centered pedagogy over student autonomy and seeks to establish a transformative education system from knowledge transmission to knowledge interpretation (Halstead & Zhu, 2009; Liu & Fang, 2009). Many Chinese learners now live transnationally and navigate social and cultural capitals as they integrate themselves into diverse educational locations. For example, 600,000 Chinese students studied abroad in 2017 (Ministry of Education of the People’s Republic of China, 2018) and in Canada, Chinese students comprises 28% of the total international student population.

Pennycook (2006) further details the complexity of globalization for teaching and learning by describing how new technologies and communications are enabling complex flows of people, signs, sounds, and images across multiple directions. Transnational migration, the social and geographic movement of people with different ethnicities from one country to another, shows how people are not only moving from one space to another but continue to keep contact with their country of origin due to technology and modern transportation. This results in people being in constant and multiple connections across international borders (Guo & Maitra, 2019). In their special issue, these authors argue a need to look at how colonialization shaped migrants’ transnational learning experiences and how Eurocentric assumptions became the norm for knowledge accumulation. Undoubtedly, the time-space compression and flow of goods impact the sharing of knowledge and what happens in

formal educational contexts. Considering these explanations, teaching and learning within a globalized world, might mean identifying with the world as a whole (i.e., Americanized values and market practices) over honoring local practices and identities. Minh Thi Thuy Nguyen (2011), for example, speaks to the difficulties that arise when utilizing commercially produced textbooks in English language learning environments because the range and variety of cultural material is limiting and limited. This can result in language learners having to adapt their identity to fit how the language is presented and resist expression of cultural distinctions. The injustice and controversy remain as we consider questions around what counts as knowledge, what knowledge is of most worth, who controls the knowing, etc. Largely, it is visible that Western views and practices serve to colonize and silence other ways of knowing (Tierney, 2018).

Gitomer and Bell (2016) raise questions regarding what it means to develop expertise in teaching and what precisely teachers are getting better at when they learn to teach. They proposed three core components: process-product, cognitive, and situative and sociocultural perspectives. Respectively, process-product highlights the changes to a teacher's pedagogical actions and their reflection on paradigms and student achievement. The cognitive perspective treats teaching as a way of thinking. It views the knowledge of teachers as a repository that facilitates them to map out the process of thinking. The situative and sociocultural perspective underlines how learning can be developed within a larger system between students, communities, and the teachers themselves. This process can be fluid and nonlinear within broader institutional and social contexts and further supports us in untangling the complexity in how our lived experiences interrelate to meaning making in the globalized world.

While the goal of many cross-cultural experiences, including the seminar discussed here, is to learn from each other in order to widen perspectives, many educational discourses around globalization (for example, Suárez-Orozco & Qin-Hilliard, 2004; Townsend, 2011), emphasize a need to *manage* differences to develop globalized skills. This approach comes at the cost of generating opportunities for more dynamic collaboration across epistemological divides. At stake in managing differences toward skill-based technocratic sameness is the disappearance of many diverse and localized knowledge sources—linguistic, ecological, cultural ways of being and doing (B. G. Davis, 2009). In consideration of how one might meaningfully add global perspectives in the curriculum, Frank Louis Rusciano (2014), speaks to the need of bringing in different beliefs and cultural perspectives, while advocating for the need to challenge assumptions through the principles of non-utopian (promoting tolerance of different perspectives not privileging a singular view), non-unitary (does not need to apply or include everyone), and non-hierarchical (global identities do not supersede national or individual identities) ways. With this guidance in mind, we turn back to Tierney's (2018) model of global meaning-making, he writes: “[the model] befits a commitment to research and pedagogy that situates diversity on a new ethical plane, aligned with a form of epistemological ecological activism that confronts and moves beyond the systems in place that plays a role in the exclusion or filtering of the cultural ‘other’ in our global conversations” (p. 398). As we proceed with our inquiry, we wanted to better understand our own narratives to recognize nuances that might defy sameness toward honoring and preserving difference.

CONCEPTUAL FRAME AND METHODOLOGY: MAKING MEANING THROUGH NARRATIVE INQUIRY

In the time since returning from Beijing, our cohort has met regularly to debrief and engage our learning. Through these discussions, themes of worldviews, global citizenship, globalization, and ethics continuously surface. *What does it even mean to be global? Can we train ourselves to witness and honor another worldview? What might this mean for teaching and learning?* We find ourselves dwelling in the complex and layered questions intricately linked to wider socio-cultural phenomena. According to Tierney (2018), dynamic and interpretive processes of meaning-making are “diversified, multilayered, and

multifaceted, involving fusions and adaptations of ideas and styles. It also involves complex negotiations to the pursuit of reciprocity between local and global and ecological eclecticism” (p. 407). Within this frame, global meaning-making aims to open cultural understandings and ways of knowing in a more dialogic way.

As mentioned earlier, the seminar included a lecture by Dr. Robert Tierney, thus, centering his framework as common point for us to engage and inquire. To pursue a process of global meaning-making, he suggests that we interrupt existing frames, decolonize spaces, read self, Indigenize, shift to an ecology of eclecticism, be mindful, be an activist or actionist, and interrogate truth/post-truth (Tierney, 2018, pp. 403-408). To explore these calls, we understand that the ideologies we carry within our stories will influence how we participate in the world (Gadamer, 1976; 2004) and that other perspectives can expose the taken-for-granted within these stories. As we see it, only when we begin unpacking some of our own stories, can we enter a place of relational ethics to explore global meaning making together (Clandinin et al., 2018). Therefore, to inquire further, we employ tenets of narrative inquiry (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Clandinin, 2013) to juxtapose our lived experiences and to consider emergent possibilities of global meaning-making across cultural difference and for teaching and learning.

Compared to narrative inquiry, interpretive researchers take a very different view of the nature of uniformity in social life. The behavioral uniformity from day to day that can be observed for an individual, and among individuals in groups, is seen not as evidence of underlying, essential uniformity among entities, but as an illusion – a social construction akin to the illusion of assessed ability as an attribute of the person assessed (Erickson, 1985). However, in our understanding, interpretive scholars do not make “social constructs” because being-in-the world is informed by the tradition of our history, our stories, and understanding comes through expanding the horizons of knowledge through processes of revealing and concealing. In narrative inquiry studies, researchers look at understanding individual past experiences as well as present and future, through collecting stories from different sources such as discussions, conversations or interviews. As with all qualitative studies, researchers identify themes provided by the complexity of stories and those themes are usually presented after retelling the story. As a group, our conversations on the topic of international perspectives of teaching and learning started in preparation for our travels to Beijing through discussing academic articles. During the experience, we all kept a journal with fieldnotes of what stood out to us as significant. When we returned from the trip, we continued to meeting to debrief what we learned, and this tension around making meaning in a globalized world continued to surface. To explore our questions further, we decided that two graduate students would write explicitly about their stories and understandings. We would then regroup and provide space for the other team members to share interpretations of the two sets of stories.

Therefore, two authors of this paper, Jingzhou and Jennifer, become the sites of inquiry as they share three narratives: growing up in respective K-12 education systems, their life experience between grade school and graduate school, and their reflections at the International Doctoral Research Seminar in Beijing. Juxtaposed by cultural upbringing and histories—Jennifer growing up in a small city in Ontario, Canada, and Jingzhou in a large city in southeast China—we bring together fragments of their life stories in an effort to collectively make new meaning. Though these sections are presented in three parts, they are intertwined in the themes of teaching and learning, meaning-making, difference, and globalization. To be more specific, aligning our narratives with the work of Tierney (2018), the whole group rejoined for dialogue on the context and discussion on how the narrative content might provide insight for pedagogical considerations that complicate global authority, integration, and inclusivity.

While these narratives share the experiences of just two individuals, we are mindful that we risk making sweeping generalizations about an entire culture. We instead see an invitation to learn from one another for furthering our understanding. Meanwhile, these narratives call on us to unpack the com-

plexity between the individual and the global by providing us the intersection of horizontal and vertical inquiry. For example, this inquiry visualizes how our individual vertical dimensional life stories can be influenced and shaped by the horizontal dimensional development of globalization. As such, the three fragments of life stories facilitated our focus towards the micro-level of our learning and teaching stories to better understand differences or similarities between the west and the east, linking them to the macro level of interpretation of meaning-making, difference, diversity, praxis, and ethics in the age of globalization.

NARRATIVES OF OUR LIFE JOURNEYS IN TEACHING AND LEARNING

K-12 EXPERIENCES

Jingzhou: Collectivism and daily learning

Growing up in the Chinese education system, a memorable experience I had during my K-12 education is the Gaokao (the university and college entrance exam in China). In a process of consistent high-intensity studying, every student could have their own understanding of the Gaokao. For me, it was the collectivist way of learning and bonding us to study together as a group. I remember the first day in junior high the teacher stood on the stage and told us that one day we all needed to face the Gaokao and that we had better start to prepare because early birds get to enjoy better food. Due to this Gaokao “battle,” we started our mornings by reading Chinese or English textbooks loudly altogether at 7:00 am before our first class. At the end of our morning classes, we did eye exercises. These eye exercises were suggested by the Ministry of Education in China to protect our eyes from working too much on studying based on the “Implementation Plan for Comprehensive Prevention and Control of Myopia among Children and Adolescents” (Ministry of Education of the People’s Republic of China, 2019). As students were arranged to do these exercises together, it became a series of vital collective actions, including greeting teachers in every class altogether, wearing school uniforms, doing a national standardized morning exercise all together at a school playground on every school day. These arrange of life activities could possibly shape students’ practices on a daily basis.

The collectivist way of learning, where we all study and live as a group, is rooted in how we understand ourselves and how we construct our own knowledge. For example, we would volunteer to form a mentorship study group to help those who were weak in some subjects. Though our study workload was overwhelming, we were motivated to help as a group to finish all the assignments together. We were very privileged if there were any “excellent students” who joined us to study together since they were viewed as the “stars” or “celebrities” in school and always received compliments. A student’s score was the only way to be famous. Nothing else was considered as official and acceptable. While in class, students were not supposed to stop the teacher or raise their hand to ask questions while the teacher was talking. Even though teachers asked, “do you have any questions?”, that meant “no, we are all good.” This pedagogical approach varies between teachers. Some were open to being challenged while most of them were not. Questions should be discussed after class because one student’s question could not occupy all students’ time in class.

The collective ways of learning provide students not only a way of studying but taking the idea of studying as a group to be a means of ideological molding to produce our thinking and acting in a certain way. In this collective space, individuality is not acceptable since oftentimes students were expected to behave and act as silent and submissive – receiving learning through one direction only. In this process, I gradually became confined in a physical location in school or in class but also “framed in” in such a way that did not allow for interaction with society.

Jennifer: Balancing expectations

From a young age, I enjoyed going to school. During the elementary years (K-8), we had a teacher who taught us all subjects in one classroom (language arts, math, social studies, art) and a rotating physical education and music teacher. There was a 15-minute morning recess and a 15-minute afternoon recess, and 45 minutes at lunch, where all the students would play in the schoolyard. I remember learning around themed units, typically around the seasonal holidays and events, but I also have a distinct memory of a dinosaur unit in grade three.

From grade four to six, I was enrolled in the French Immersion program at the same school. During this time all the core subjects were taught in French. In grade 7, many of my friends carried on with French and switched schools, but my parents and I decided that I would switch back to the English program. Therefore, in grade seven, I had to renegotiate my social circle. Other stand-out memories from these years were the projects – in math, we designed a shopping center storefront; in language arts, holiday books; and my favorite, a research project on skunks). I also remember school plays where I often played a background role and visiting the Frink Centre (an outdoor environmental education center our school board ran, we typically went once a year), and other school trips to Quebec City in grade 6, Upper Canada Village, the Toronto Zoo, and an Ottawa daytrip.

High school began in grade 9. I moved down the road to a big school that I had admired for several years. Instead of being in the same class all day, classes were now fragmented by discipline-focus and we had four classes per day. The school year had two terms. The core subjects were math, English, science, social studies, physical education, and there was some choice between elective subjects. For example, students needed two arts credits to graduate, and two language credits, but could choose their courses from a variety.

I felt pressured to take math and science through all my high-school years even though I never did that well. There was an underlying discourse that these subjects would open doors for a “successful” future and the identity of being smart, with social circles, was closely linked to grades. I often felt discouraged because I could not keep up, but I was always pushed to carry on. I see now that my strengths are in social studies and art streams and regret not following these passions in my formative years. Most of our classes were taught to test; meaning the teacher presented material, we would have homework each night, and a unit test would follow. At the end of the semester, there were exams, often worth a large portion of the grade.

Throughout my schooling, I was always very involved in the school community. I volunteered in and out of school, and in my last year of high school, I was the student council president. Although there was a lot of pressure to do well academically (to apply for university, etc.), there were extracurricular activities and events to get involved in. In grade 9, I participated in the 30-hour famine and in grade 10 was part of a leadership class. I was also on the school cross-country running, swimming, and rowing teams. A particularly unique experience in my high school was the Geoventure program in Grade 11. In this program, we studied four subjects, geography, English, physical education, and cooperative education, through an experiential learning focus. This experience introduced me to outdoor education. Here, I learned to canoe and endured my first long hiking trip. The pinnacle of the semester was a two-week learning experience in Costa Rica where we were hosted by local families and volunteered in communities. My participation in this program changed my life and I can see direct links to the work I do today.

PATH LEADING TO GRADUATE SCHOOL

Jingzhou: Making decision to study in the West

Before coming to Canada, I was working at a national TV station in Beijing. National TV stations in China are considered “the mouthpiece of the central government.” In the Chinese media industry,

political sensitivity is fundamental, and it is deeply rooted in media workers' daily practices. To be employed in the industry, media workers need to maintain a strong sense of political sensitivity at all times. In light of this experience, I was always reflecting on my self-identity and my true will since I was uncertain if they would fit in my future direction. I considered my life as a rechargeable battery while working was a way of burning the battery without recharging it. After five years of close involvement in the media industry, I was trying to find ways to empower my life differently.

In an interview with a professor at Beijing Normal University (BNU), they introduced the forces of innovation in Chinese higher education institutions in the context of internationalization. I was surprised by the richness of divergence in knowledge acquisition and the changing nature of teaching and learning. That was a defining moment for me when I realized that I should go back to school and relearn my goals in life. As I would need to keep my position at the company to pay for my tuition, I applied for a part-time master's program in media and communication studies at BNU. In this program, I had the opportunity to attend lectures that were given by scholars in the area of media and communication as well as in fields of philosophy, anthropology, and psychology. My experiences of learning in BNU led me to consider exploring knowledge not only in the Chinese contexts but also in constructing knowledge from diverse perspectives. This reflection further perked my interest to study in the west.

Growing up in China and now pursuing a doctoral degree in Canada has allowed me to develop important diverse perspectives and learn to think outside of the box in the global environment. The cross-cultural experience has allowed me to cultivate a more critical mindset to better understand what teaching and learning means in the global society (Hofstede, 2001). Several factors account for my transformative cultural competency experiences. First, the construction of knowledge between the east and the west is diverse. In the east, teaching is unidirectional, as education is teacher-centered. Students are expected to listen and take notes. In contrast, education in the west is more learner-centered. Specifically, knowledge in my program in Canada is taught by conversation, interaction, and reflection to help promote student or learner understanding. In Canada, I have been enculturated into the educational system of individualization and the value system of individualism through processes of intellectual engagement and cultural, political, as well as social, constructivism. Second, the power relation between instructors and students is different. As mentioned earlier, in the east, students are not supposed to ask questions during teacher-led instructions. Asking questions in class by students is typically considered an interruption and disrespectful. In Canada, there is always an openness to discuss with instructors during, before and after class on our understandings of concepts and theories and how to apply them into our research. Though power relations exist in a graduate-level Canadian classroom, instructors present these relations differently. They join in our conversation to ensure our discussions are generating important connections with our designed readings.

Jennifer: Recognizing privilege and seeking experience

My desire for experiential learning becomes evident when I look at the path that led me to doctoral studies. I took part in year-long volunteer programs, loved learning about and being mindful of my living body, and was drawn to philosophical conversations connecting the body and the natural environment. My path differed from my peer group who all seemed more focused on clear goals. Following my time in a physical education program, I pursued a teaching degree in New Zealand because of its seemingly progressive education system, outdoor culture, and environmental policies. I spent much of my time outdoors, on the beaches, in the waves, hiking mountain passes, and learning from skilled teachers. I was drawn to the ways these teachers infused humor into their instruction that upheld rigor but also made learning fun and relational. In addition, I was attentive to how Māori teachings were engaged within the education system and was profoundly moved as we learned to teach through these principles.

When I returned to Canada to teach, the erasure of Indigenous cultures became notable to me. Indigenous-Canadian relations were not in the forefront of my experience growing up and, as I started

to travel down the path of learning more, I had to encounter difficult truths about a different story of Canada. My privileges began to stare me in the face. My first years of formal classroom teaching were in marginalized contexts and, with the best intentions. During the summer months, when school was out, I continued to take students on long wilderness excursions. This is where I felt my best and where I could build meaningful connections with students. In these moments, however, deep questions about human-nature relationships began to surface.

I came into graduate school with these experiences circling each other. I was concerned about privilege, learning more about student perceptions within outdoor learning, and human-earth relations more generally. I have had tremendous opportunities to teach undergraduate courses and work on research projects in a variety of communities. Following my experience in New Zealand, I read a lot about the Indigenous understandings of the world, which resonated with how I felt on outdoor learning trips with students. Yet I wanted to learn more about actually teaching in ways that might convey with ecological sensibilities to students (Abram, 1996; Kimmerer, 2013), which led to my doctoral work in Curriculum Studies. My dissertation study involves learning relational teachings from a Cree Elder¹ and I paralleled my learning with students' learning as we travelled to different places in outdoor learning programs. I faced complexity with the processes of my dissertation project. As I negotiated responsibilities journeying with different worldviews, I found myself needing to slow down to thoughtfully and heartfully proceed in good ways. As I am now deeper into the writing phase of my dissertation, I see how limits in language can influence how experiences in the world.

REFLECTING ON THE BEIJING DOCTORAL FORUM

Jingzhou: Revisiting BNU

Participating in the International Doctoral Forum at the BNU was an interesting way for me to connect my K-12 experiences in China with my post-secondary learning in Canada. I see this intersection as an integrated identity because of my unique experiences in both socio-cultural contexts. There were many moments during the seminar that resonated with this integrated identity. One of them was visiting an Experimental Primary School in Beijing. We were invited to observe their Math and English classes. For the Math class, students were learning how to count and encouraged to participate in several hands-on activities. Clearly, the process was designed to enable students to develop cognitive learning skills. During the activities, the teacher acted like a “Socratic” and asked questions about how students counted and why they counted in certain ways. Some of the students were invited to the stage and introduced their methods to others. The “audience” questioned whether this method was the best. Through the process, concepts of counting were established. Students learned distinct counting methods as well as the thinking behind these methods. I reflected on how I learned math. I recall how, in first grade, the teacher demonstrated with an abacus, rather than the collaborative way of learning and knowledge building that we observed. Though While there was a shift from teacher-oriented to student-centered in my math class, our exploration on learning was still confined by teaching pedagogy.

The English class seemed to contain many similarities compared to my childhood memories in the early 1990s. Students were selected to answer questions by the teacher. When teachers instructing an English story in the textbook, students were asked to reflect on the plot of the story. After large amounts of lecture time the teacher would ask a simple question followed by a quick “yes or no” without taking time to hear a response, they continued on. The teacher asked “yes or no” can be deemed as a teaching habit that many Chinese teachers obtain. But for the students, asking “yes or

¹ In an Indigenous paradigm, an Elder refers to an individual holding a central role in the community. These individuals carry ancestral knowledge, cultural values, and traditional teachings that are specific to life and living in their specific ecological locality. Elders impart this knowledge through oral processes and ceremony (see more: Council on Aboriginal Initiatives, 2012; Wilson, 2008).

no” does not mean asking for their level of knowledge comprehension. In my own learning experience during first grade, this teacher-centered instruction seemed typical of beginner’s classes. None of the students challenged teachers’ knowledge by saying no, but all were nodding their heads. This observation strongly linked to how I learned as a child where teachers were considered philosopher kings and discouraged students’ potential to construct learning mutually and reciprocally. From my perspective, this one-directional learning limits the possibility of how language could be taught. It also restricts the understanding of language as a tool to communicate or to go beyond language teaching itself in order to translate the sociocultural meanings that are embedded in the language. However, compared to my childhood experiences, there are many significant changes in China’s language learning classes now. For example, students are provided with opportunities to study abroad by participating in summer programs in many western countries, although this engagement can be budget driven. Language learning can potentially be different since student would have divergent interpretations in learning language if they have studied in the western compared to those who never have been to English speaking countries.

My experience observing the English class took me back to learning English in primary school. My grade one English teacher was a new graduate student from Hong Kong who learned western curriculum and pedagogy. In one class, we learned different names of animals. The teacher invited our parents to make animal masks with us at home and we brought those masks to class. We then role-played the animals, and another group of students would guess what the animals were. In this process, we all communicated in English though we only knew a little of the language. However, this interactive way of learning a language did not last long since this teacher was replaced.

Jennifer: Observing Chinese pedagogy as an outsider

At first, I was hesitant to apply to participate in the doctoral seminar. My first interpretation of the theme of the seminar gravitated to topics of international education, in which I have some experience, but I did not feel that I could contribute much from my research interests. After more thoughtful considerations, however, the theme came alive and multiple connections emerged. I love visiting new places, discussing complex issues, and imagining different approaches. My anticipation going in was that we would consider different pedagogical approaches from the different countries, both to consider how we might prepare student teachers and also to challenge our own teaching practices and hold discussions towards addressing global challenges in teacher education.

It was my first visit to China, and I did not know what to expect. One of my interests was to learn more about Confucian philosophy and traditional pedagogy. I had been introduced to some concepts through my yoga practice and I was curious how they might translate in schools. While walking around and visiting schools, I saw evidence of Confucian influence in many areas, but less so with regards to teaching and learning styles. However, I also did not know what I should be looking for. During our two school visits, both well-resourced, I was drawn into the aesthetics of gateways at the front entrance resembling the Forbidden City, artwork and hanging ornaments, and modern sport facilities. I was taken aback by the sophisticated technology—from teachers remote teaching to rural communities in northern China to microphones and specialized lighting in the primary math and English classes. While some unique moments stood out, for example, a military-style exercise break where hundreds of students formed lines on the sports field and moved in perfect unison, I found that the classroom activities we observed were similar to what I experienced growing up.

As I reflect more on my Beijing experience, it seemed like my whole self, as in my emotional, spiritual, mental, and physical parts of who I am, did not arrive until our last morning in the city. I had to adjust to the time change and then sitting in a university setting, it seemed as though my body was transported thousands of kilometers, but I was having similar conversations that I might have at my home university. On that last morning, I took time to walk around the city on my own. With the various sounds of horns, drilling, talking that I could not comprehend, the smells of exhaust, burning of

intense, street food, and sights like maze streets, bicycles, people, and pets, I came to myself in an unfamiliar place. Not being able to read the street signs to memorize my route required me to pay more attention to my surroundings. As I moved along the sidewalks, it was in the details of the city structure – streets, homes, markets – and watching people in the communities interact that the local curriculum came to life for me.

COMING TOGETHER: WE ALREADY ARE GLOBALIZED CITIZENS

As the group, we came back together and to navigate the stories and quickly we saw evidence consistent with our introductory concerns. There is a shrinking distance between vast local places into a global space. Meaning was being centralized to common goals linked to market logics (Smith, 2013) which flattens some possibilities within different parts of the stories. For example, we saw the promotion of industrial-consumer models of pedagogy in both of our experiences, the prominence of learning the English language with the goals of preparing workers for participation in the economy and undercurrent beliefs that education is linked to *progress*. Both Jennifer and Jingzhou are steeped in this grand story. We also acknowledge the importance of attending to multiple levels of learning to understand that knowledge is interwoven inextricably with the multiple layers of social, cultural, and political pillars. There are indeed subtleties in the grand story based on our interactions are contextualized in macro-context (society, the state, and country), meso-context (educational institutions), and micro-context (families and classrooms) in our daily life events (Gitomer & Bell, 2016).

Looking at the whole of the stories, we notice that both life narratives followed the trajectory of globalization, as in the increases in global markets, technology, and liberalized politics (see Kofman & Youngs, 2008) that trace back to the 1980s when the two authors were born. For example, when Jennifer and Jingzhou were young, globalization trends were beginning to emerge and as they grew older, more “opportunities” – for instance, graduate studies and travelling – opened to them, compared to their parents and grandparents who have different stories of living local. The stories from both authors, indeed, are social artifacts of neoliberal agendas undergirding the rise of global markets, where we are invited to be part of the social competition and to contribute to progress. Prior to the doctoral seminar, both narratives describing Jennifer and Jingzhou exposed privileged backgrounds, meaning that they were not marginalized in our local circumstances and had access to travel and educational opportunities. It is now generally a norm for university students to have exchange opportunities and to access openings beyond their local communities. That said, both already had their eyes open to experiences beyond their home contexts and perhaps, earlier cross-cultural experience made them not question surroundings in Beijing as much as a person travelling for the first time.

We do not see simple responses, or silver-bullet solutions, for defying sameness. Our efforts in response to our inquiry question – how might we locate difference to make meaning in a globalized world in relation to teaching and learning? – were complicated as we found ourselves defaulting to the exact binaries that we were trying to oppose. For example, in our discussions about the K-12 narratives, we quickly turned to label macro themes, such as *east* and *west* understandings, and we found ourselves needing to trouble our understandings of *local* and *global*. Following Rusciano (2014), we noticed that we may have perpetuated a singular lens of what east and west might mean, instead of allowing the stories to disrupt our preconceptions in ways that might help us learn with “the other”. As the group moved to attend to subtleties of local experience, difference was most visible to us in the early years of our school experiences. Jennifer had a degree of individual choice, reflection, and autonomy (project-based learning and choice to change language of instruction), where Jingzhou was part of the strict collective with a fixed objective (ultimately the Gaokao exam). However, we worried that our tendency to see the narratives in this way perpetuated typical stereotypes and confirmed pre-existing political and institutionalized understandings. This inquiry pulls the group into murky water where, in trying to understand deeper meaning, there are massive bodies of knowledge, and wisdom traditions, in which we would need to access and understand. In connection to the seminar, we talked

about the short duration and structure, and questioned whether longer exposure in more rural settings, outside of Beijing, may have led to more authentic interactions with local communities and pedagogical approaches.

Through interpreting the narratives, we group are certain that local knowing still exists at the individual level. As we discussed the differences in our experiences, it was common for anecdotes to surface in reflection to our family upbringings and traditions passed from generation to generation. As evident through narratives, we continue to have local experiences unique to place that we can draw on as both learners and educators and can resist standardized forms of knowledge. Standing out to us was how our different life stories led to a shared experience, and how the shared experience was different based on our histories. This phenomenon of historicity also emerged throughout process of generating the narratives. Jennifer and Jingzhou wrote the narratives separately from the same prompt, and when they shared with the group, we noticed how the description of experience, narrative styles, and language use (pronouns “I” vs. “we”) exposed traces of collectivist vs. individualist upbringings. Along these lines, we also acknowledge that if all the authors in our group would have shared their narratives, our discussions and understandings of the seminar would have differed again. For the group members who did not share, witnessing the narrative process offered the new perceptions and reflections of the Beijing. For example, the other two doctoral students (Stefan and Jody) spoke to expanded considerations of what it might practically mean to be educated in the Chinese system in terms of studying and commitment from the individual, how interactions between students is not necessarily encouraged, and how collectivism is rather enforced in a top-down approach in which the individual is supposed to function in a controlled way. In another way, the narratives provided the group more appreciation and understanding for how the Chinese students at the seminar presented their research – in terms of topic, theoretical approach, methodology, and finding – that seemed rigid and unrelatable at the time.

While we found it difficult to access subtleties of local traditions through witnessing pedagogical practices in Beijing, to allow for more life in this discussion, we turned to Jennifer’s mention of feeling lost while walking the streets the last day. It turns out feeling lost resonated with others as a metaphoric sponge for paying attention to subtleties in inner and outer surroundings. For example, the organic dinner conversation that turned awkward, walking around campus or city streets, and navigating discussions after returning to Canada, surfaced tensions and contradictions, where some of us felt lost, yet moving through that process allowed for more difficult conversations outside the prescribed structure of the seminar. These moments helped us dwell outside our comfort zone and struggle alongside each other. Thus, in order for a different ethic of meaning making, we learned that teaching and learning should involve engaging difficult conversations and expanding our capacity to truly listen to the other, in ways that do not seek simple resolution but to complicate the assumptions of what we think we already know. In our being lost together, we build stronger relationships.

Overall, through this inquiry, we became more critical of global education discourses. We felt the lingering assumption, perhaps by the seminar itself, that bringing groups of people from different universities together might automatically lead to a global experience without any deeper facilitation of more difficult conversations to get under the surface. How then, might we learn or make meaning as circumscribed through the experiences of within complex histories? We agreed that coming together in more ethical ways includes more critical reflection on our educational experiences and sharing more about who we are as individuals. It will involve contextualization of experiences or stories whether at the local or global levels. Our inquiry unravels the grey areas, multiplicity, and emergent possibilities in the existing complex world. We believe that there is need for people across differences to engage in dialogue as a starting place, but it is difficult when the dominant group gets to decide how that dialogue might be structured. Thus, it is important to question things that we take for granted – for example, it is great that we can communicate in one language, but why is it English? How would this exercise differ if we engaged Mandarin? (see Woodend et. al., 2019 for a bigger discussion). We are left with a desire to advocate for small openings to unsettle structured institutional

understandings for more nuanced discussion. Even through our coming together in this way, at times vulnerable, we are left with a deeper understanding of who we are, and who we shared the experience with. The process of sharing enhanced our understanding of the Beijing experience. Pedagogically, even on as a small scale, such as writing and sharing life stories as we did in this article, dialogue may be encouraged, and room created for diverse knowledge generation.

ARE WE TOO LATE? PRAXIS FOR GLOBAL MEANING-MAKING TO SUPPORT DIFFERENCE

As a group, we reflected on our participation at an International Doctoral Research Seminar, in Beijing, China, and had many discussions about what we observed and experienced. As a group, we found it was difficult to locate, notice, and articulate differences in relation to teaching and learning. While we knew there were ideological, geographical, political, and social nuances to where we were, and that delegates from Australia also brought their own stories, on the surface many of the classroom practices and ways of interacting together appeared the same as what we might observe and experience in Canada. These initial observations and discussions were supported and further inspired by Tierney's (2018) presentation around global meaning making that left us questioning how we might locate difference to make richer meaning in a globalized work in teaching and learning practices.

We situated two sets of narratives (one Chinese and one Canadian) in anticipation that this exercise might provide insights into distinct knowledge systems and open questions for contemporary challenges around how difference might be incorporated in teaching and learning. After the two authors shared their stories, we came back together as a group and found ourselves in an ambiguous and complex space as we found ourselves already participating in global events and processes. We had to first recognize how such global forces were already impacting how we see and experience the world, to then consider how we might unlearn and participate in something different. We started to wonder if it was too late or too big of a task to support a new global ethic toward honoring moral values or codes ingrained in everyday conversations about public activities and social events. Interestingly, however, we found solace in this opportunity to come together, which provided an outlet for us to have difficult conversations towards diversity of knowledge. In a sense, we noticed how different conduits of relationality and reciprocity were embedded in particular learning enactments and materialized themselves through one's history, memory, tradition and culture.

Therefore, as exemplified through our process, perhaps, we see that defying sameness and supporting a new praxis for global meaning making can occur on small scales working across difference with, in our case, other doctoral students that you may not otherwise interact with in a deep way (across research interests, backgrounds, departments, and research paradigms). Upon our return to Canada, our interpretative approach, discussions and collaborations in the months following were more impactful than our being at the seminar, but the seminar was the catalyst for our dialogue. Creating conditions for this dialogue took effort requiring both voices to articulate where they were coming from, practicing deeper listening (without judgement and pushing each other to deeper places) and patience to negotiate together. Enduring challenges together – across theoretical understandings and language – allowed us to go beyond surface understandings of our nationalities and get to a place where we shared deeper emotions, life stories, and humor that cracked the typical pedagogy of a university.

It is our hope, by integrating the idea of meaning-making within our future practices transiting out of doctoral studies, that we might move inwards to local stories and holistic understandings of experience that can oppose the overbearing global powers that control what form of knowledge is most worth knowing. These inner and outer forms of dialogue that come as part of a meaning-making process, are asking us to think about how we are making sense of our roles as educators, learners, and researchers, and the role of storied self (as all individuals comes as storied beings), in a non-hierarchical relation to others. Through this approach, we can revisit our lived experiences in reflective

ways to allow us to interact between the local and the global without defaulting to simple binaries (i.e., East vs. West) that do not honor the complexity of our entanglements. We strive to actively determine the direction within research and practice to a more dialectic view – beyond rote learning – where we can get to the heart of the stories that matter and, perhaps, in small ways, contribute to a new global ethic that supports difference in meaningful ways.

REFERENCES

- Abram, D. (1996). *The spell of the sensuous: Perception and language in a more than human world*. Pantheon Books.
- Beyer, L. E., & Apple, M. W. (1998). *The curriculum: Problems, politics, and possibilities*. State University of New York Press.
- Castells, M. (2009). *The rise of the network society (2nd edition)*. Wiley-Blackwell. <https://www.wiley.com/en-us/The+Rise+of+the+Network+Society%2C+2nd+Edition%2C+with+a+New+Preface-p-9781405196864>
- Clandinin, D. J. (2013). *Engaging in narrative inquiry*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315429618>
- Clandinin, D. J., Caine, V., & Lessard, S. (2018). *The relational ethics of narrative inquiry*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315268798>
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. Jossey-Bass.
- Council on Aboriginal Initiatives (2012, February 11). *Elder protocols and guidelines*. University of Alberta. <https://www.ualberta.ca/media-library/ualberta/students/first-peoples-house/documents/elder-protocol.pdf>
- Davis, B., Sumara, D. J., & Luce-Kapler, R. (2012). *Engaging minds: Cultures of education and practices of teaching*. Routledge. <https://www.routledge.com/Engaging-Minds-Cultures-of-Education-and-Practices-of-Teaching/Davis-Sumara-Luce-Kapler/p/book/9781138905412>
- Davis, B. G. (2009). *Tools for teaching*. Jossey-Bass.
- Erickson, F. (1985). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock. (Ed.). *Handbook of research on teaching (3rd edition)* (pp. 119-161). Macmillan Publishers. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED263203.pdf>
- Gadamer, H. G. (1976/2004). *Philosophical hermeneutics* (Trans. D. E. Linge). University of California Press. <http://www4.westminster.edu/staff/nak/courses/documents/Gadamer%20Philosophical%20Hermeneutics.pdf>
- Giddens, A. (1999). *The third way: The renewal of social democracy*. Polity Press & Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Gitomer, D. H., & Bell, C. A. (Eds.) (2016). *Handbook of research on teaching*. American Educational Research Association (AERA). <https://doi.org/10.3102/978-0-935302-48-6>
- Guo, S., & Maitra, S. (2019). Theorizing decolonization in the context of lifelong learning and transnational migration: Anti-colonial and anti-racist perspectives. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 38(1), 5-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02601370.2018.1561533>
- Halstead, J. M., & Zhu, C. (2009). Autonomy as an element in Chinese educational reform: Case study of English lessons in a senior high school in Beijing. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 29(4), 443-456. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188790903308944>
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations (2nd edition)*. Sage Publications. https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/unf_research/53/
- Liu, Y., & Fang, Y. (2009). Basic education reform in China: Globalization with Chinese characteristics. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 29(4), 407-412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188790903312714>
- Kimmerer, R. W. (2013). *Braiding sweetgrass: Indigenous wisdom, scientific knowledge, and the teachings of plants*. Milkweed. <https://milkweed.org/book/braiding-sweetgrass>
- Kofman, E., & Youngs, G. (2008). *Globalization: Theory and practice (3rd edition)*. The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.

- Mense, E. G., Lemoine P. A., Garretson, C. J., & Richardson, M. D. (2018). The development of global higher education in a world of transformation. *Journal of Education and Development*, 2(3), 47-52. <https://doi.org/10.20849/jed.v2i3.529>
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China (2018, April 3). *2017 sees increase in number of Chinese students studying abroad and returning after overseas studies*. http://en.moe.gov.cn/News/Top_News/201804/t20180404_332354.html
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China (2019, August 30). 教育部等八部门关于印发《综合防控儿童青少年近视实施方案》的通知 [Implementation Plan for Comprehensive Prevention and Control of Myopia among Children and Adolescents]. http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A17/moe_943/s3285/201808/t20180830_346672.html
- Nguyen, T. M. T. (2011). Learning to communicate in a globalized world: To what extent do school textbooks facilitate the development of intercultural pragmatic competence? *RELC Journal*, 42(1), 17-30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688210390265>
- Pennycook, A. (2006). *Global English and transcultural flows*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203088807>
- Rusciano, F. L. (2014). Globalizing the curriculum: How to incorporate a global perspective into your courses. *Liberal Education*, 100(3), 14-21. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ11095012>
- Ryan, J., Kang, C., Mitchell, I., & Erickson, G. (2009). China's basic education reform: An account of an international collaborative research and development project. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 29(4), 427-441. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188790903308902>
- Smith, D. G. (2013). Wisdom responses to globalization. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.) *International handbook of curriculum research* (pp. 45-60). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203831694.ch3>
- Suarez-Orozco, M., & Qin-Hilliard, D. B. (Eds.) (2004). *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium*. University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520930964>
- Tierney, R. J. (2018). Toward a model of global meaning making. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 50(4), 397-422. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1086296X18803134>
- Townsend, T. (2011). Teacher education: An international perspective. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 37(4), 373-375. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2011.610986>
- Wu, J. (2018). Confucian revival and the hybrid educational narratives in contemporary China: A critical rethinking of scale globalization and education. *Globalization, Societies and Education*, 17(4), 474-488. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2018.1558048>
- Warnke, G. (2002). Hermeneutics, ethics, and politics. In R. J. Dostal (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Gadamer* (pp. 79-101). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CCOL0521801931.005>
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Fernwood Publishing. <https://fernwoodpublishing.ca/book/research-is-ceremony-shawn-wilson>
- Woodend, J., Fedoruk, L., Beek, A., Roy, S., Wu, X., Groen, J., & Li, X. (2019). The privileging of English language use in academia: Critical reflections from an international doctoral seminar. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Education*, 2(3), 1-22. <https://researchonline.jcu.edu.au/61166/1/3058-18189-1-PB.pdf>

AUTHORS



Jennifer MacDonald is a PhD candidate of Curriculum and Learning at the University of Calgary in the Werklund School of Education. Emerging from experiences as an outdoor environmental educator and taking secondary students on extended journeys in wilderness settings, her research focuses on embodiment, interpretations of the more-than-human, meaning-making, and ethical ecological relationships. She also teaches courses in Indigenous and Interdisciplinary Education to pre-service teachers.



Dr. Jingzhou Liu earned her doctorate in Adult Learning at the University of Calgary. Her research interests include internationalization of higher education, international students, immigrants' transition to work and workplace learning, and intersectionality theory. She has recently published six peer-reviewed journal articles, one book chapter, and two book reviews. Dr. Liu has presented her research at both academic and non-academic settings domestically and internationally.



Dr. Sylvie Roy is a professor in Language and Literacy at the Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary. Her work related to bilingual education, linguistic ideologies, language policies and ethnography. She is also the co-coordinator of the International Doctoral forum.



As the Division Principal of Chinook's Edge School Division, **Dr. Jody Dennis** is responsible for Teacher and Leader Development. She supports the supervision and evaluation of new teachers in the division, works with universities to coordinate student teacher placements, and mentors new school administrators within the division. Jody received a Bachelor of Education degree from the University of Alberta, a Master of Education degree in Leadership and School Improvement from the University of Alberta, as well as a Doctor of Education degree in Senior Leadership in K-12 Education from the University of Calgary. Jody shared her research on the complex role of the teaching principal at the Beijing Normal University at the 4th annual Doctoral Forum in Beijing, China.



Stefan Rothschuh is a PhD Candidate in mathematics education at the University of Calgary. He received a B.Ed. and a M.Ed. in mathematics education from the University of Potsdam, Germany. Stefan is a former high school mathematics teacher. His research investigates the interconnectedness of action-, image-, and symbol-based mathematics learning, embodied learning designs for mathematical functions and calculus, as well as technology integration in secondary school settings. Stefan teaches STEM education in the undergraduate education program.



Dr. Marlon Simmons is an Associate Professor at the Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary. His scholarly work is grounded within the Diaspora, culture, and communicative network practices of youth. Marlon's research interests include sociology of education, schooling and society, and governance of the self in educational settings. Related to Marlon's educational inquiry are the scholarship of teaching and learning and the role of sociomaterial relations with enhancing student learning.