



Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies

- » JAAACS Home
- » Article Archive
- » Editorial Statement
- » Call for Manuscripts
- » Author Guidelines
- » Editorial Board
- » Review Board

Volume 2

February 2006

Globalization and Curriculum Studies: Tensions, Challenges, and Possibilities

Hongyu Wang
Oklahoma State University

- » Submit An Article
- » Contact JAAACS

Globalization in its recent forms has generated considerable debate. The contested nature of such discussions on globalization and education is captured well in *Globalization and Higher Education*, a book edited by Jaishree K. Odin and Peter T. Manicas (2004). While its focus is on higher education, the collection offers different viewpoints on important issues such as global capitalism, neo-liberalism and its impact on education, the role of technology, regional responses to globalization, new modes of knowledge and pedagogy, and questions related to social justice and democracy. Multiple, sometimes even oppositional, perspectives of chapter authors—from different countries in different disciplines with different professions—provide a layered landscape that demonstrates the complex faces of globalization. Such a simultaneous depiction of multiplicity to negotiate dialogical bridges has a great potential to enrich “a complicated conversation” in curriculum studies.

Recently, efforts to initiate the internationalization of curriculum studies have emerged. The 2000 LSU Conference on the Internationalization of Curriculum Studies, the establishment of the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (IAACS) in 2001 and its affiliates in different countries, and subsequent international conferences, journals, and books have provided the forum and the structure for this newly initiated movement (Pinar, 2003b). The founders of the IAACS claim that they “do not dream of a worldwide field of curriculum studies mirroring the standardization and uniformity the larger phenomenon of globalization threatens” (www.iaacs.org). Here globalization is displaced off the center of attention and internationalization as a term is used to “provide support for scholarly conversations within and across national and regional borders” (www.iaacs.org).

Between the contested discussions in *Globalization and Higher Education* and the recent initiative for the internationalization of curriculum studies, this essay addresses tensions, challenges, and possibilities that are unfolding in an intercultural and transnational society for education, curriculum, and pedagogy. The focus of this essay is to engage a multilayered conversation about globalization and education in general and internationalization and curriculum

studies in particular. It starts with a conceptual reflection since globalization is the concept that the discussed book takes up, while internationalization and the transnational are the concepts that the internationalization of curriculum studies takes up.

Globalization, Internationalization, and the Transnational: Conceptual Reflections

“Globalization” as a concept began to be widely used in the academic world in the 1990s, even though it was arguably formulated much earlier. But there has not been any consensus on what globalization really means. In the opening chapter of *Globalization and Higher Education*, Peter Wagner (2004) refers to globalization as a new condition of our time and asserts that if such a condition has generated considerable ambivalent responses, “there is also some urgency in addressing” (p. 7) the issue. He lists three generally accepted dimensions of globalization (pp. 7-9):

1. Economic: as a central dimension, it refers to the creation of a world market;
2. Cultural: it refers to the contradictory but simultaneous emergence of a homogeneous world culture and a multicultural situation (as a result of transnational migration);
3. Political: as a weak dimension, it refers to the alleged decline of the nation-state and emergent elements of political globalization, but it is not as strong as the economic and cultural dimensions.

Wagner further points out that globalization is the combination of these three dimensions—in other words, market, community, and hierarchy—rather than the simple popularized notion of “marketization.” In acknowledging the diverse forces working in globalization, Wagner insightfully asks us not to step back from the sweeping wave of the technological and economic forces but to understand and participate in such multi-dimensional and complex global processes.

Taking Wagner’s definition, we can sense a homogeneous tendency in globalization even though in the realm of culture the movement is paradoxical, toward both homogeneity and heterogeneity. Due to this unifying tendency, some contributors provide sharp critiques of globalization and its negative impact on education, which I will discuss in more detail as I move to the next sections. Their concerns are shared by curriculum scholars.

Tracing the historical contexts of globalization, David Smith (2003a) starts with such a critique of globalization but he further points out the multiplicity of its meanings and formulates three forms of globalization operating in the today’s world. Globalization One is the dominant form, arising from neo-liberalism; Globalization Two is the various responses to Globalization One, which demonstrate the tensions inherent in such a movement;

Globalization Three points to the possibility of engaging “a new kind of global dialogue regarding sustainable human futures” and of forming “a new kind of imaginal understanding within human consciousness” (p. 35). It seems to me that while Globalization One refers more to a condition in which a global market system prevails and the business mentality is increasingly applied to the social domains including education, Globalization Two and Three are different stages of responding to such a condition with the hope that in the end the human spirit rather than the power of capital will prevail.

Due to the critiques of globalization in its underlying tendency toward homogeneity, the internationalization movement in the field of American curriculum studies has deliberately chosen another term, “internationalization,” to contest the control of Globalization One while responding to changing contemporary world situations. As an alternative concept, however, “internationalization” is hardly free from its own linguistic and social limitations. At the 2000 LSU Conference on the Internationalization of Curriculum Studies, William F. Pinar (2003) acknowledges on one hand the national character of curriculum studies in many countries and on the other hand the danger of implying nationalism when using “internationalization” as an organizing concept. However, internationalization as a concept has the potential to counteract the economic standardization and cultural imperialism under the term “globalization.” Pinar (2004) points out that both the “inter” space and the “locality” implied in affirming inter/national conversations are conditions for sustaining a dynamic movement between locality and globalness.

The concepts of both the local and the global are hardly stable signifiers: the interactions among the local destabilizes the global while the global affects the formation of the local. A dynamic movement between the local and the global questions both as fixed identities, as I will point out later. However, this does not deny the significance of different scopes. It is important, I argue, to recognize rather than eliminating the tensions among the local, the national, and the global. The usage of “internationalization” rather than “globalization” demonstrates a stronger sense of conversation through “in between” fluid spaces where multiplicity and differences are neither excluded nor self-contained. While challenging narrow-minded nationalism, we cannot forget that nationalism historically was linked with the de-colonization struggles of many “Third World” countries. The neo-colonization tendency of globalization still needs to be contested from national, regional, and local levels. Furthermore, internationalization as a concept supports the decentering of both the local/national and the global through a focus on interaction and relationship that lead to transformation of both locality and globalness. What happens at the boundaries and inter spaces—full of tensions, ever-shifting—defies a stable sense of unity, whether at global or national levels. The centralizing control of nationalism as an entity loses its grip when nationality and locality also keep changing in in-between spaces.

In order to keep the generative tension of the local, the interstitial, and the global, Noel Gough (2003) suggests that “internationalizing curriculum inquiry might best be understood as a process of

creating transnational spaces in which scholars from different localities collaborate in reframing and decentering their own knowledge traditions and negotiate trust in each other's contributions to their collective work" (p. 68). The very usage of "trans-" indicates an experiencing of the boundary and an effort to go beyond that boundary. Such transnational spaces not only sustain hybrid movements but also support embodied work to negotiate collaborative trust. Embodied work requires keeping in touch with the concreteness of reality, subjectivity, and life instead of being lost in the virtual world.

To reflect on these concepts, globalization, internationalization, and the transnational, we touch upon some of the central issues in which the internationalization of curriculum studies is situated. Wagner's attentiveness to the multiplicity of the global processes also reminds us that there are inherent tensions between homogeneity and heterogeneity in globalization. This tension, however, is skewed as it swings more towards unity. Taking on the tensionality of differences, internationalization of curriculum studies focus more on what can be offered in the interstitial space to sustain a dynamic movement between the global and the local. To further unfold these issues at different levels, the essay will move from macro to micro considerations.

The Role of Market and Technology

The emergence of the global market driven by new computer technologies is generally considered an essential condition of globalization. Confidence in the forces of the market and competition to create a better world, usually called "neo-liberalism," has greatly impacted higher education, perhaps more than other levels of education. The commodification and privatization of education, the usage of corporate management styles, and the push for accountability and efficiency as a result of the pervasive influence of neo-liberalism have become more evident in recent years.

While Michael Margolis (Chapter 2) laments a "full adoption of the corporate model of education as an investment product" (p. 36) in the near future, Richard S. Ruch (Chapter 5) asks us to learn from the For-Profit side, which can offer valuable lessons for the nonprofit university's self-reflection. Both criticism (albeit with a sense of the inevitable triumph of the market) and celebration (albeit with certain cautions) of the global economic and technological wave are not unusual responses. In such a context of split perspectives, Charles W. Smith's (Chapter 4) insightful analysis of what the market means is particularly refreshing.

Smith (2004) argues that "both proponents and opponents of marketization tend to hold a profoundly inaccurate conception of how real markets function" (p. 71). Smith believes that what is closely linked to the market is ambiguity instead of certainty and that the market allows participants holding different values to interact and negotiate. Thus the prioritizing of the market function is a result of a process in which participants work through

differences. Smith further argues that the current pressure for universities to become more business-like is actually proposing greater hierarchical governance rather than greater reliance upon market mechanisms. But he also suggests that academics lose opportunities to participate in the negotiation of ideas and values by simply rejecting the market. Smith's seminal analysis that reveals the deeper structure of the market behind the taken-for-granted assumptions points out the possibility of rebalancing the value priority of the market towards the collective good.

Jan Currie's (Chapter 3) critique of the neo-liberal paradigm in higher education shares some of Smith's concerns, but she further affirms that the neo-liberal market carries a particular set of assumptions: "heightened competition, increased managerialism, commodification of knowledge, and instrumentalism in the curriculum" (p. 47). If the market is not a neutral force and carries the baggage of social ideologies in its interaction with a situation, perhaps the "natural" mechanism, as Smith proposes, of the market in its ability to negotiate is also limited.

The logic of the market, unfortunately, currently largely functions to support conservative politics in the American educational field, as many curriculum scholars point out. It takes academic freedom away from teachers and imposes a highly competitive rationale for the purpose of national superiority through the marketable language of accountability, standard, and excellence. Such a narrow definition of education excludes human potentiality that cannot be limited by efficiency, utilitarian intentions, or measurable results, and leads to the loss of personhood's existential status.

Discussions about the role of technology also go into diverse directions. Tom P. Abeles (Chapter 13) celebrates the role of new technologies and proposes the self-reorganizing university made possible by computer networks and interactive learning. Margolis (Chapter 2), on the other hand, attempts to unmask the illusion of the efficiency of online distance education, and the blind faith in computer-connected communications.

In curriculum studies, there are also juxtapositions of different viewpoints, but the efforts to question the instrumental neutrality of technology are particularly illuminating.

Influenced by Heidegger's "The Question Concerning Technology," both Ted Aoki (2005) and Kevan Brewer (2003) point out the danger of focusing merely on an instrumental viewpoint of technology. Such a means-end viewpoint tends to reinforce the mentality to control, master, or even dominate, which blocks out other human possibilities. Both ponder the nature of technology, as Heidegger did. Brewer (2003) suggests, "when we look at technology, we are looking at ourselves" (p. 59). For him, what is interesting is the border region in the interconnectedness of technology, society, and self where complexity and creativity emerge. While Brewer's concern is our relationship with technology and our responsibility in actively participating in that relationship despite the ambiguity of consequences, Aoki looks at the interaction between technology and situation. Aoki (2005) poses the problem

of computer applications as a hermeneutical problem: “computer technology, to be understood properly, must be understood at every moment, in every particular situation in a new and different way” (p. 155).

As such investigations into the nature of technology—and the market by Smith—reveal, we need to examine how the market and technology function in particular contexts to interact with particular social economic forces rather than simply assuming that the market or technology is inherently positive or negative. Such issues are fundamentally linked to our understanding of the purpose of education, and ultimately, what it means to live one’s life with others and with/in the global planet.

While in the United States the rhetoric of market and technology currently serves conservative politics, I would like to show a somewhat different picture in another context, as a bridge to the next section on globalization and indigenization. The debates about the role of the market in education have been ongoing for more than two decades in China. Since the market is usually tied to individualism and competition, which are in conflict with traditional cultural values, it poses a paradoxical challenge to Chinese education. While the mentality related to the market threatens to push indigenous cultural traditions away, it also contributes to social transformation in which new values and perspectives promoting individuality are generated. As a result, the market carries conflicting social and educational messages. This brings us to the question of globalization and indigenization, a realm full of its own tensions but also possibilities.

Globalization and Indigenization: A Dynamics toward a Third Space

To highlight different responses to globalization from different parts of the world, *Globalization and Higher Education* devotes one section to viewpoints from less developed countries. I mention two of them, as they have different takes. Su Hao (Chapter 10), looking at the landscape of globalization from Beijing, is concerned with how to educate college students to become “political elites with globalized worldviews” in order to engage global politics. The elitism embedded in Chinese higher education is made evident here and Su’s embrace of globalization is demonstrated in his concern with “how,” indicating the need to catch up with this tide.

Looking from Latin America, Leonardo Garnier (Chapter 11), however, challenges the global economic elitism supported by the World Bank and UNESCO. Unmasking the control mechanism behind the input-output economic calculation, he offers insights into a paradoxical relation between globalization and knowledge. On one hand, the knowledge network is largely expanded; on the other hand, the concentration of knowledge within the hands of the privileged is intensified. Garnier’s critique highlights the tension between the global financial powerful and the local social good.

Since the less developed countries are not located at the center of

globalization, their responses usually demonstrate the tension between globalization and indigenization. There are two extreme responses to globalization from the less advantaged position: one is accepting it and trying to catch up with it, such as Su's response; the other is using one's own cultural tradition to resist it. Between these two positions are various efforts to live with the tensions, challenges, and possibilities opened up by the dynamics between the global and the local. Garnier's response is situated in this in-between space.

In general, globalization implies homogeneity, unity, and oneness while indigenization implies heterogeneity, multiplicity, and pluralism. As some scholars (Wang, 2002; Yang, 2004) point out, the significance of indigenization as a concept is related to the meaning of globalization, so they form a dialectic couple. However, do the global and the indigenous refer to something definite, respectively?

As Gough (2003) points out, what is taken as universal knowledge, such as science, is actually localized knowledge emerging from a specific social and historically Western context. If universal science and technology, as the basis of globalization, is not really universal, what does this mean as we re-think the notion of the global? Along with efforts to problematize the notion of the global, the notion of indigenization is also questioned. As Yuzhen Xu (2005) in a recent conference on the internationalization of curriculum studies in Beijing provocatively asks, what does "indigenization" mean to Chinese educational? Which parts of tradition can be counted as characteristics of native Chinese culture? Can it also refer to the newness of current curriculum research in its hybridity? In other words, the notion of the local is not a static concept either.

When the notions of the global and the local are both problematized and become fluid, the relationship between the global and the local is no longer perceived as a connection between two static entities, but becomes an intertwined, multilayered, and moving relationship to form a network with complex links. In such a process, the global and the local mutually influence and transform each other, creating what I prefer to call a "third space" that incorporates both "inter" spaces and "trans" spaces. To illuminate such a complexity, I will look at the field of Chinese education as a local site, simply because I am familiar with it.

In the Chinese educational field, while many scholars (Li & Xing, 2004; Wang, 2002; Wu, 2004; Yang, 2004) acknowledge the capital expansion and cultural imperialist tendency in globalization, they are preoccupied with how Chinese education can meet its challenges, considering how China already lags behind in advancing science and technology, economic growth, and cultural creativity. Xiao Wang (2002) suggests that Chinese education needs to find "the third way" beyond both rootless total Westernization and narrow-minded ethnocentrism.

For Wang, indigenization does not mean a simple return to one's own tradition, but the transformation of traditions as a result of self-critique and conversing with other traditions. He particularly

warns against the tendency to use the banner of indigenization to serve conservative needs to solidify the taken-for-granted values and thoughts in Chinese culture. He argues that behind what is generally accepted as the humanistic tradition of the Chinese culture is precisely the lack of independent personhood and the suppression of free space for expressing and creating humanness. Wang sees globalization as an advanced stage of modernity, whose challenges for Chinese education, which is still in the process of modernization, are doubled: the doubling of learning from the West but avoiding alienation brought by Western rationalism, the doubling of questioning traditional culture but avoiding losing one's roots, the doubling of achieving individuality but questioning self-centered individualism, and the doubling of deepening scientific pursuit but sustaining humanistic concerns, to just list a few. Such doubling calls for the third possibility.

While Wang emphasizes the possibilities that globalization offers for local transformation, Xianming Xiang (2001) analyzes the notion of indigenization through another angle, shifting the focus to how to promote creativity from within. He makes a distinction between nativization and indigenous evolution. Nativization is a process in which Western culture is assimilated into native culture, while indigenous evolution is a process in which native culture transforms itself to grow beyond itself. The former inevitably has an element of internalized colonization to serve the interests of the powerful while the latter has an element of active learning for the purpose of self-cultivation. In other words, nativization comes from the pressure of external forces while indigenous evolution comes from the agency of internal forces. While a clear-cut distinction between the external and the internal seems untenable to me in a global society, Xiang's critiques unwrap the layers of power relations surrounding the dynamics of globalization and indigenization. His analysis echoes Garnier's questioning of the powerful.

The overlapping yet different foci of Wang's and Xiang's discussions reveal the tension between globalization and indigenization, a tension invisible to Su Hao. When the destabilizing power of globalization which calls the local out of its static conditions, as Wang emphasizes, is situated in "the third space" (Aoki, 2005; Bhabba, 1990; Smith, 1996; Wang, 2004), Xiang's indigenous evolution becomes more possible. Such a space implies not only a sense of self-understanding and respect for others but also a necessity to go beyond the locality to enter into co-creative globalness. In such a process, creativity and co-creativity generated by intercultural, international, and interpersonal transactions are essential to sustaining a healthy globalization-indigenization dynamic.

Challenging cultural essentialism, Homi Bhabba (1990) articulates a post-colonial concept of the third space in which cultural translation and cultural hybridity give birth to "something different, something new and unrecognizable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation" (p. 211). David Smith (1996) borrows this concept to engage an East/West inquiry to approach the issue of identity. Such space is neither East nor West but full of new possibilities. In my own intercultural and gendered elaboration of a

third space (Wang, 2004), contradictions, ambiguity, and uncertainty are embraced. A third space is both an “inter” space and a “trans” space since it values an ever-changing in-between space and the necessity to go beyond the boundary. The moment of going across leads to the birth of the new but this newness is co-creative as it comes from the interaction between doubles to enable other positions and new sites. In a third space, identity, self, and subjectivity are not universal concepts but are destabilized in an ongoing process of becoming and emergence. The post-colonial and post-structural subject does not stay within one place, but travels in between and across different terrains.

Positionality is an important issue in an intercultural and cross-cultural space. Learning *with* others, participants coming from the more centered positions may need to be vigilant of unconscious superiority (along with a disguised fragility covered up); learning *from* others, participants coming from the more displaced positions may need to be mindful of an internalized inferiority (along with holding on to traditions as a defense). If indigenization is seen as a process of transforming the self, it is an important issue not only for the less developed country but also for every country. An interesting question we may ask in looking at such a quick sketch of Chinese educators’ concerns is: what does indigenization mean to US curriculum studies? Where are the locations for potentiality, alterity, and new possibilities? (See Janet Miller, 2005b, for an insightful analysis regarding the worldliness of US curriculum studies and its generative possibilities).

While I leave this question open, it is the location of the individual that I will turn to next. The dynamics of globalization and indigenization, ultimately, call for a new sense of personhood. While discussions about globalization usually stay at the macro socio-economic level, I argue that what is unfolding at the global level regarding simultaneous integration and multiplicity also unfolds at the level of an individual person. Global transformation and self-transformation are mutually dependent upon each other.

Global Transformation, Self-transformation, and Autobiography

Autobiography (*currere*) in the field of curriculum studies is formulated as a meaning-making process in which teacher and student engage educational experiences in a transformative way by linking school knowledge with life history. Only when self-renewal is enabled, as articulated by William F. Pinar and Madeleine Grumet three decades ago, is social renewal possible. Autobiography has contributed to the shift in the focus of the curriculum field from techniques to personhood. In the new wave of internationalization, meanings of personhood are stretched to meet the global.

At the 2000 LSU Conference on the Internationalization of Curriculum Studies, William F. Pinar (2003) pointed out that educational investigation using the category of identity through the site of internationalization can serve to contest American

narcissism and enable new understandings of how the self is historical, relational, and also political. “The study of identity enables us to portray how the politics we had thought were located ‘out there,’ in society, are lived through ‘in here,’ in our bodies, our minds, our everyday speech and conduct” (Pinar, 2003, p. 10). Such an intimate link between the public and the personal reminds us that we need to learn how to build bridges within ourselves if we would like to build bridges between and among differences and multiplicity in the global society. Ted T. Aoki (2005) has a provocative and poetic metaphor for bridge building: “I understand conversation as a bridging of two worlds by a bridge, which is not a bridge” (p. 228). Such a fluid, ever-shifting movement enabled by the tensionality of an in-between space in which self and other negotiate reciprocal relationships must be supported by “a genuine democratization of one’s interiorized elements” (Pinar, 2004, p. 38).

Without negotiating the interconnections within, how can one see “invisible” bridges in the outside world? A fragmented self without a difficult laboring at making connections leads to a fragmented world, and a fragmented world adds divisions to the self. Paradoxically, the search for unity at the global level may provide a niche for the self to have an illusory sense of wholeness which denies the otherness within and the otherness without. Therefore, it is important to probe the depths of subjectivity and intersubjectivity—already and to remain mobilized—in order to weave multiplicity with a renewed sense of interconnectedness. Working at the intersection between the autobiographical and the global is an essentially educational task. While this concern with personhood lurks behind all the discussions of market, technology, university, knowledge, and teaching in *Globalization and Higher Education*, I argue that it is necessary to bring it to the foreground.

In a beautifully composed article, Marilyn Low and Pat Palulis (2004) meditate on “running with and against internationalizing texts of *currere*.” Not only their attempts to breathe “a living pedagogy that is always already in-between movements of translation and transformation” (p. 1) but also their writing in its poetic flow, play with words, and doubling format of page layout amazingly embody a third space that supports the running of *currere*, in which teacher and student engage the struggles of “*speaking one language (yes but) never speaking only one language*” (p. 7). This essay shifts our attention to the messiness of lived experiences in our daily lives shared with students and complicates our own sense of education. We can hear the sound of awakening to the surprising newness and see the dance of fluidity through interstices in such an international and transnational space. The power of connecting the international and personhood is demonstrated well in this essay.

Vital energy can be released by connecting *currere* and the internationalization of curriculum studies. Situating autobiography in the global context does not intend to shift social and cultural problems to the individual so that structural issues at the macro level are pardoned; instead, what it intends to achieve is to mobilize and transform the social through destabilizing the personal. The other side of the coin is that self-transformation, as Lan Ye (2005)

points out, is possible only through participating in societal reform and global change. In the process of engaging the other—another person, group, or the world at large—we encounter the unknown within ourselves to call potentiality into existence.

Autobiography is always in the process of making and negotiating multiple and even contradictory identities (Pinar, 2004; Miller, 2005a); when intersecting with the global, it becomes more complex and uncertain. Ambiguity and multiplicity in a post-modern age have called into question any stable and fixed notion of autobiography that attempts to uncover the truth about the self. When the essence of the human subject is displaced, what is left is the task of creating the self continuously anew through co-creative activities in a social network.

Finally, although global transformation and self-transformation intertwine and intersect, they cannot reduce to each other. Conflation between the global and the self is dangerous: suicidal on the part of the individual, tyrannical on the part of the global. To avoid such a conflation, we must acknowledge the inexhaustible unknown both within the self and in the world so that the two can never quite arrive at each other. A difficult but meaningful autobiographical labor in internationalizing curriculum studies is situated in a mutually enabling space between the self and the global, a space generating possibilities at the boundary and beyond the limit.

The connection between the democratization of the self and the democratization of the global society requires a mode of pedagogy which can embody and is embodied in such multilayered and complicated relationships. This moves us to the world of teaching.

Modes of Knowing and Teaching in an Era of Globalization

Globalization and Higher Education devotes a section to the implications of globalization for pedagogy, raising questions on how to re-think the nature of knowledge, modes of knowing, and visions of teaching. John McDermott (Chapter 7) insists that face-to-face pedagogical relationships cannot be replaced by the computer since “a systemic move away from interpersonal embodiment is a move away from who we are and how we experience ourselves as human beings, ineluctably” (p. 138). By contrast, Jaishree K. Odin (Chapter 9) believes in the power of new technologies and calls for “a paradigm change in the educational process” (p. 147) enabled by multidisciplinary hyperlearning, web-mediated teaching, and interactive modes of pedagogy.

To address this contrast, I find the gap between “digital immigrants” (faculty) and “digital natives” (students) as Odin and other authors in this book refer to them (or “cyber immigrants” and “cyber natives”) to be a provocative metaphor to think about the complexity of pedagogical relationships. The gap is referred to as a problem to solve, as professors as digital immigrants still use “predigital language as well as teaching methods” (Odin, 2004, p.

153) that no longer work well for digital natives. However, I perceive the coexistence of two worlds in digital immigrants as a generative space in which both the possibilities and limitations of technology can be demonstrated. I echo McDermott's concerns about the new forms of disembodiment that virtual reality and virtual connections can bring. Even though stimulating, virtual knowledge is not directly linked with the person or the place through lived experiences, which can result in the disconnection between knowing and being. New internet-based technologies have immensely expanded our access to the global world, so how to make the best pedagogical use of such interconnection is important, but we cannot simply assume that it is a given good. Moreover, the internet does not always lead to connections; it also produces fragmentations.

Virtual reality may stimulate and intensify one's desires beyond the real conflicts of life, whose consequences cannot be simply pushed away by hitting the restart button. If digital natives are caught up in one world in which the digital ideas and images dominate their way of learning and living, there is a danger that they may lose touch with the multiple dimensions of life. Digital natives need to learn how to critically engage the digital world. In this sense, the gap between teacher and student can become an in-between space in which the tensionality of differences can lead to new awareness.

The metaphor of the need for "immigrants" to become "natives" also coincides with how we teach cultural diversity in this country. Now enhanced by internet-mediated teaching about other cultures, the process of consuming immigrants/others becomes quicker, just by clicking away. Without knowing others' languages and experiencing others' lives, one can claim to "know" other cultures. As Cameron McCarthy and Greg Dimitriades (2000) point out, virtual learning has reinforced the superficial ways that multiculturalism is usually taught.

On the other hand, new modes of knowing enabled by technologies, as Odin demonstrates well, have indeed undermined the professor/teacher's traditional authority, and require new teaching strategies that are more learner-centered, more nonlinear, and more cross-disciplinary. Teachers need to allow the challenges of new educational experiences to come back on themselves and engage self-transformation. Furthermore,

the challenges that teaching is facing are not merely technological issues, but involve fundamental questions about humanness that we are co-creating in responding to this specific global time and space. Many authors in this collection ask important questions about the mission of the university and the purpose of education, questions that curriculum scholars also ponder.

David Smith (2003b) calls for "a global conversation, if not confrontation, regarding what it means to live well, humanly speaking" (p. 304) and "a kind of pedagogical hermeneutic that honours globalization's complexity while also honouring... pedagogical integrity" (p. 305). He advocates "intercivilizational dialogue" to decenter the dominant global discourse and to engage

genuine cross-cultural exchange. Such a dialogue must be embodied in our daily interpersonal relationships made possible by global migration rather than staying at an abstract level. It requires a pedagogy that not only values differences but also encourages negotiation with the multiple.

Aristides Gazetas (2003) provides such a vision. Following Homi Bhabha and Minh-ha T. Trinh, he conceptualizes the Third Space to reconstitute “new pedagogies in the interstices between different cultural worlds” (p. 113-114). Such pedagogies situated in the interstices initiate a process of translation and negotiation in which movements of hybridity lead to the birth of the newness that cannot be anticipated. In my own teaching practices, I find this space both unsettling and generative (Wang, 2004, 2005). It is unsettling because the process of open-ended inquiry leads in all kinds of directions and the effect of teaching is unpredictable; it is generative because translation across differences and flow among the multiple build up possibilities of new consciousness and new relationships. Moments of breakthrough in negotiating with multicultural worlds (without privileging any particular framework) usually come unexpectedly in a mode unique to each student who has traveled through history and place to reach new awareness. Each student’s path leading to the birth of the third is different. While the teacher’s own journey is enriched by such a multilayered interaction, she plays the role of the loving third to lead students out (and back) towards new possibilities.

Both the challenges and possibilities for teaching in an era of globalization lie in a space in which cultures and identities mutually—if not equally—impact one another. Such a space is not free from conflicts but is filled with ambiguity, paradoxes, and complexity, and as it shifts, a network of hybrid movements brings new shapes to both the local and the global. In a network, power cannot be over-determinate (as Foucault would argue); possibilities to resist the central control are multiple and specific. Such a space is where a pedagogical relationship is situated, neither authoritarian from teacher to student, nor merging between teacher and student, but keeping an intergenerational conversation going.

Starting with conceptual reflections, working through a space where the global, the local, and the autobiographical meet, now coming back to our daily work—teaching—it becomes clear that the dynamics of in-between space and hybrid movement rather than a binary response to globalization is crucial to releasing educational possibilities in today’s world. Now am I approaching a conclusion?

Personalizing In/Conclusion

Writing a conclusion usually makes me uneasy. It is a time when I would like to find ways to escape closure. Initially I had no intention to bring any personal voice into this writing, yet the deeply felt experiences I have tried to keep at bay insisted upon coming back to mock whatever I put into the computer, disrupting those solid letters I neatly wrote down. In this inconclusive conclusion, I allow the autobiographical to talk back in an

unsettling inter-national time and space.

I wrote this essay right after my one-month trip back to China, so the aftermath of this trip has stayed with me as I struggle with my words. As I drove from Tulsa to Stillwater, Oklahoma on a quiet, sunny afternoon, fighting the lingering impact of jet lag that mixes daytime with nighttime, my drowsiness was accompanied by a strange sensation, bordering at the realm of the unreal, keeping me awake. Unlike a tourist who can marvel at a trip and then put it aside, I was overwhelmed by the juxtaposition of multiplicity I had experienced in a relatively short period of time. It had left its traces in my body, disturbing the smoothness of driving on a speedy turnpike road and the pleasant tranquility of a usual time. The life my parents lived in a rural southern village—still poor—was opened to me as I visited their hometown for the first time. My mother showed me the old home she and her mother used to live in—her father died when she was two years old and I have never met her mother. Then I flew back to my own hometown, a provincial capital in the farthest north part of China. Now I was returning to a university town in another country.

The Chinese rural life my parents used to live is in my blood, the Chinese city life I used to have is both familiar and strange, and the American university teaching life I am experiencing now is both strange and familiar. The striking contrasts among these different scenes coexisting in me stir up a lingering question: How can one carry so many different layers of life all at the same time?

I wonder how the wave of globalization will impact the life of my two-year-old nephew (a grandson of my mother's youngest brother) who already can sing Chinese lyrics with a charming smile in that rural southern village. Will this thing called globalization give him more possibilities or further constrain him in a place largely forgotten in this global planet? As both Chinese education expenses and the gap between the rich and the poor have climbed at a shocking pace, what will happen to my nephew?

Nothing can be settled by globalization: The age-old questions about the human condition and how to live a good life alone and together remain to be answered by each person in her or his particular contexts. Thus I present this ending as a difference, a break with the smoothness of my academic prose, yet also as continuity, like underground water flowing into a dream world, connecting the inarticulate with what can be said, and as an invitation to live many lives, simultaneously and separately. Perhaps here lies the contribution of *Globalization and High Education*, with diverse voices in different tones, asking us to question, to reflect, and to re-imagine the multiple potentiality of the world. Perhaps here lies what internationalization of curriculum studies can bring to us: an invitation to confront the perpetual human questions with unique responses peculiar to our own time, place, and journey of life, with our concern and care for the next generation: what will happen to our children?

References

Aoki, Ted T. (2005). *Curriculum in a new key* (William F. Pinar & Rita L. Irwin, Eds.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bhabha, Homi K. (1990). The third space: Interview with Homi Bhabha. In Jonathan Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, culture, difference* (pp. 207–221). London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Brewer, Kevan (2003). Technology unmasked? In Donna Trueit, William E. Doll, Jr., Hongyu Wang, & William F. Pinar (Eds.), *The internationalization of curriculum studies* (pp. 51–69). New York: Peter Lang.

Garnier, Leonardo (2004). In Jaishree K. Odin & Peter T. Manicas (Eds.), *Globalization and higher education* (pp. 181–201). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Gazetas, Aristides (2003). Re-constituting pedagogies: The (im) possibilities for inter/nationalizing curriculum studies. In Donna Trueit, William E. Doll, Jr., Hongyu Wang, & William F. Pinar (Eds.), *The internationalization of curriculum studies* (pp. 103–115). New York: Peter Lang.

Gough, Noel (2002). The long arm(s) of globalization: Transnational imaginaries in curriculum work. In William E. Doll, Jr., & Noel Gough (Eds.), *Curriculum visions* (167–178). New York: Peter Lang.

Gough, Noel (2003). Thinking globally in environmental education: Implications for internationalizing curriculum inquiry. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research* (pp. 53–72). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Li, Wuyi & Xing, Yongfu (2004). *WTO yushi beijing xia zhongguo jiaoyu qianyan wenti yanjiu* [Studies on Chinese education at the frontier]. Taiyuan, China: Shangxi Educational Press.

Low, Marilyn and Palulis, Pat (2004). Laboured breathing: Running with and against internationalizing texts of *currere*. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry*, 1 (1).

Margolis, Michael (2004). The withering of the professoriate. In Jaishree K. Odin & Peter T. Manicas (Eds.), *Globalization and higher education* (pp. 24–41). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

McCarthy, Cameron, & Dimitriades, Greg (2000). In Nicholas C. Burbules & Carlos Alberto Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education* (pp. 187–204). New York: Routledge.

McDermott, John J. (2004). The erosion of face-to-face pedagogy. In Jaishree K. Odin & Peter T. Manicas (Eds.), *Globalization and higher education* (pp. 7–23). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Miller, Janet (2005a). *Sounds of silence breaking: Women*,

autobiography, and curriculum. New York: Peter Lang.

Miller, Janet (2005b). The American curriculum field and its worldly encounters. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 21 (2), 9–24.

Odin, Jaishree K. (2004). New technologies and the reconstitution of the university. In Jaishree K. Odin & Peter T. Manicas (Eds.), *Globalization and higher education* (pp. 147–162). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Odin, Jaishree K., & Manicas, Peter T. (Eds.) (2004). *Globalization and higher education*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Pinar, William F. (2003a). Introduction. In Donna Trueit, William E. Doll, Jr., Hongyu Wang, & William F. Pinar (Eds.), *The internationalization of curriculum studies* (pp. 1–13). New York: Peter Lang.

Pinar, William F. (2003b). *International handbook of curriculum research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pinar, William F. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ruch, Richard S. (2004). Lessons from the for-profit side. In Jaishree K. Odin & Peter T. Manicas (Eds.), *Globalization and higher education* (pp. 82–103). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Smith, Charles W. (2004). Globalization, higher education, and markets. In Jaishree K. Odin & Peter T. Manicas (Eds.), *Globalization and higher education* (pp. 7–23). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Smith, David Geoffrey (1996). Identity, self and other in the conduct of pedagogical action: An East/West inquiry. *An Interdisciplinary Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 12, 6–11.

Smith, David Geoffrey (2003a). Curriculum and teaching facing globalization. In William F. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research* (pp. 35–51). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Smith, David Geoffrey (2003b). The specific challenges of globalization for teaching...and vice versa. In Donna Trueit, William E. Doll, Jr., Hongyu Wang, & William F. Pinar (Eds.), *The internationalization of curriculum studies* (pp. 293–318). New York: Peter Lang.

Su, Hao (2004). Interaction of global politics and higher education. In Jaishree K. Odin & Peter T. Manicas (Eds.), *Globalization and higher education* (pp. 167–180). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Wagner, Peter (2004). Higher education in an era of globalization. In Jaishree K. Odin & Peter T. Manicas (Eds.), *Globalization and higher education* (pp. 7–23). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Wang, Xiao (2002). *Quanqiuhua yu zhongguo jiaoyu* [Globalization and Chinese education]. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Press.

Wang, Hongyu (2004). *The call from the stranger on a journey home*. New York: Peter Lang.

Wang, Hongyu (2005). Aporias, responsibility, and the im/possibility of teaching multicultural education. *Educational Theory*, 55 (1), 45–59.

Wu, Zhihui (2004). *Jiaoyu quanqiuhua* [Globalization of education]. Shanghai: East China Normal University Press.

Xiang, Xianming (2001). Jiaoyu: Quanqiuhua? bentuhua yu bentu shengzhang [Education: Globalization, nativization, and indigenous evolution], *Journal of Beijing Normal University*, 2, 32–41.

Xu, Yuzhen (2005). In search of the third space in curriculum studies. Presentation at the Conference on the Internationalization of Curriculum Studies, Capitol Normal University, Beijing, China, May 9–10.

Yang, Xiaowei (2004). *Quanqiuhua jincheng zhong de xuexiao biange* [School reform in the process of globalization]. Shanghai: East China Normal University Press.

Ye, Lan (2005). 21 shiji shehui fazhan yu zhongguo jichu jiaoyu gaige [Social development in the 21st century and elementary and secondary educational reform in China], *Journal of the Chinese Society of Education*, 11, 2–7.

Copyright for articles published in this journal is retained by the authors,
with first publication rights granted to the journal.