Glocal Brokers and Critical Discourse Analysis: Conceptualizing Glocality in Indigenous Education Research and Reform

Eric W. Layman
Indiana University (USA)

Eun-Ji Amy Kim
Griffith University (Australia)

Abstract

Few issues encapsulate the tension of "glocality" in education more substantively than the debate surrounding *who* should undertake research on Indigenous education, and *how* it should be done. In this article, two non-Indigenous educational researchers both working with Indigenous Education Research and Reform, alongside the guidance of Indigenous mentors, grapple with the questions of if and how non-Indigenous critical research methodologies can complement, and thereby reduce, the peripheralization of Indigenous knowledges and epistemologies. This article explores the opportunity for dialogue between two often polarized hazards. On one hand, non-Indigenous researchers with non-Indigenous epistemologies risk increasing the marginalization of Indigenous ways of knowing. On the other, research on Indigenous education is threatened with further ostracism if it is inaccurately perceived as only the domain of Indigenous peoples, and only facilitated through Indigenous epistemologies.

The authors share their experiences in using a non-Indigenous critical research methodology, Critical Discourse Analysis, to explore Indigenous Education Research and Reform. Particularly, the authors share their experiences, both in employing non-Indigenous critical research approaches in Indigenous contexts whilst also attempting to honor local Indigenous epistemologies. This article contributes to the discussion of how "trans-systemic" knowledge, the discursive space between Indigenous and non-Indigenous understandings, can illuminate the concept of "glocality" in educational research methods. In conclusion, the authors contend for the role of "glocal brokers" who navigate between Global and Local—between Indigenous and non-Indigenous—understandings to foster connections and communicative opportunities that can further elevate and integrate Indigenous ways of knowing into broader discourse concerning Indigenous Education Research and Reform.

Keywords

Glocality; Glocal Broker; Indigenous Education Research and Reform; Critical Discourse Analysis

Introduction

In acknowledging the importance of relationships guiding our research, we begin this article by introducing ourselves and our work. We are two non-Indigenous educators and researchers in the field of Indigenous Education Research and Reform. Eric Layman was born and raised in the American Midwest, but subsequently has lived the majority of his adult life in East Asia. His interest in sociolinguistic minority education issues began 20 years ago at the turn of the millennium while spending two years studying Mandarin in the ethnically diverse Yunnan province in Southwest China, home to at least fifty ethnolinguistic minority peoples. Eun-Ji Amy Kim was born in South Korea. Part of the 71st generation of Sam-Hyun Tribe of Kim of Kimhae, Amy navigates her identities as a settler to places that she has lived

Citation: Layman, Eric W., & Kim, Eun-Ji Amy. (2021). Glocal Brokers and Critical Discourse Analysis: Conceptualizing Glocality in Indigenous Education Research and Reform. *Global Education Review, 8* (2-3), 62-80.

'other than' her ancestral land--namely Canada and Australia. Eric and Amy met through a virtual academic conference and share a mutual interest and commitment of working towards a goal of *becoming* allies (Bishop, 2015) for Indigenous communities and expanding advocacy in working alongside with Indigenous communities in building trans-local partnerships towards the goal of Indigenous education reform and education for reconciliation. Throughout the article, the authors employ the term Indigenous (with a capital "I") as it emphasizes the collective lived experiences of Indigenous peoples around the world in resistance to colonialism and European imperialism, while term indigenous (with a lowercase "i"), on the other hand, can be used more generically to describe multiple categories of things not possessing a foreign origin (Wilson, 2008).

Building and sustaining relationships with local Indigenous peoples, and taking stances as learners, have become central aspects driving our professional work. Indigenous friends and Elders that we work with have encouraged us to remain critical and understand the power dynamics that exist in diverse levels and finally, in what way, our own personal and professional work and privileges contribute to such power dynamics. Therefore, in this article, we explore these power dynamics that exist across many tiers -- global and local – in Indigenous Education Reform (i.e., Indigenization of curriculum). We first argue that these movements are 'glocal' in nature, and thus are aided by "glocal brokers" who navigate the ideas and perspectives stemming from different local and global spaces. Meanwhile, these glocal brokers need to engage in continual practices of critical reflexivity regarding the power-dynamics that exist in diverse, trans-local discursive spaces and draw from a 'trans-systemic' approach in exploring and analyzing these power dynamics. In defining 'trans', we follow Klein's (2013) understanding of 'trans' where she states that "Inter' is conventionally taken to exist between existing approaches, while 'trans' moves beyond them" (p. 190, emphasis original). Greiner & Sakdapolrak (2013) also take up the notion of 'beyond' of trans in their conceptualization of trans-locality: "emergence of multidirectional and overlapping networks that facilitate the circulation of people, resources, practices and ideas" (p. 375).

Anthony-Stevens (2017) quotes Brayboy et al. (2012) in asserting that the goals of achieving the "emancipatory project" of "self-determination and inherent sovereignty of Indigenous Peoples is rooted in relationships and is driven explicitly by community interests" (p. 85). Anthony-Stevens asserts that "praxis-oriented relationships are necessary" inasmuch as the goals of "understanding and dismantling the patterns that construct educational inequity" require the recognition that, "Power and Whiteness have material and social implications that limit or open opportunities to shape productive collaborations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples" (p. 99). In arguing for the possibility of "opportunities to shape productive collaborations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples," Anthony-Stevens (2017) further asserts that:

> *Critically aware non-Indigenous allies are needed to redress these entrenched institutional inequities and further Indigenous agendas for educational sovereignty. My analysis of these issues has emphasized that allied voices are secondary to Indigenous voices, yet allied voices are nonetheless crucial when cultivated through explicit antiracist, anticolonial commitments to*

> *redirecting the flow of power relations in spaces of schooling. This praxis orientation values relationality and reciprocity even and especially when it is uncomfortable and without immediately gratifying results….It is critical that non-Indigenous scholar-educators contribute to the broader transformative movement of educational paradigms led by Indigenous communities for Indigenous communities….Guided by "the 4 Rs" relationality, respect, reciprocity, responsibility—we need to better assess the productivity of an alliance stance…interrupting inequity in Indigenous education requires non-Indigenous scholar-educators to explicitly prioritize, from the ground up, Indigenous voices as the definers of how and for what purpose allies can and should be of service to projects of educational sovereignty. (p. 101)*

Similarly, Lomawaima (2000) claims that even with the problematic historical baggage between social researchers and Indigenous people, "or perhaps more realistically because of it — many Native communities and schools accept the need for high-quality research guided by locally meaningful questions and concerns," although "researchers must give something back," even if it is something "less tangible but even more enduring: friendship, respect, and simple, honest communication" (Lomawaima, 2000).

In this light, trans-locality goes beyond the mobility of people through (im)migration, instead extending to the mobility of ideas and experiences of people. The notion of 'beyond' is important in conceptualizing trans-locality. As such, 'trans' requires creativity and moving beyond and thinking through what works best for the network of people gathered for a particular situation. We conceptualize 'locals' and 'systems' in the discursive sense, rather than the geographic sense: locals are a network/community of people, ideas and experiences stemming from the same or similar discursive practices. Trans-locality and Trans-systemic approaches are viewed as the networks of people and ideas, created by engaging in communication and reflection together. Our usage of 'trans-local' or 'trans-systemic 'therefore may be considered as local-to-local (community-to-community) connection (or system-to-system), focusing on actual relationships being built through communicative action and reflection that functionally contributes to a global discursive space.

As these trans-local relationships between social actors facilitate sharing and comparing of partial experiences, they must go through what Ang (1998) refers to as 'substantiation and specification' of metaphors and concepts (p. 27). This collective action and reflection on metaphors and concepts together finds the commonalities and separateness of experiences and allows for fostering global solidarity and intercultural understanding. In this process, a joint criticality resulting from trans-local/trans-systemic approaches becomes an important aspect of research and reform and enables locating and investigating the power dynamics that exist in discursive spaces. In this article therefore, we reference and link non-Indigenous a critical research analytic approach, Critical Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 1995). Drawing up on our own research and learning experiences with Indigenous Curricular Reform in Taiwan's Indigenous Experimental Schools (Eric) and Indigenous science curriculum renewal in Saskatchewan, Canada (Amy), we showcase the way in which these two 'critical'

frameworks could be utilized in honoring local Indigenous peoples' perspectives and guidance whilst providing a discursive space wherein researchers can explore the relations and benefits of trans-systemic approaches for research projects on the topics of Indigenous Education Research and Reform.

Examples of "Glocal" Education Policy

Taiwan's Austronesian Indigenous population is comprised of 16 officially recognized ethnicities numbering at approximately half a million people (CIA, 2018). In 2016, the first ever "Indigenous Experimental School" was inaugurated for the Atayal Indigenous people (Lee & Chin, 2016). In the three years following, approximately thirty Indigenous Experimental Schools have opened. Indigenous "experimental" schools seek to greatly increase the proportion of Indigenous cultural content in the curriculum. Eric's research draws from ethnographic and interview data from these Indigenous experimental schools, as well as other schools that are eligible and considering making the transition to "experimental" status. Eric's research also includes data from public forums and training workshops involved with promoting indigenous education development and policy making. Eric employs critical discourse analysis (CDA) of policy documents, curricular materials, and promotional videos about these schools.

Experimental schools are a relatively new phenomenon in Taiwan having only begun in 2015 (Li, 2015). Experimental schools were not initially introduced with Taiwan's Indigenous people in mind at all. Rather, they were heavily influenced by progressive European models of education, such as Waldorf and Montessori educational philosophies, that have begun to grow in prominence in Taiwan, perhaps in response to an educational system that has been heavily exam-centric for many years (Wu & Wu, 2018). Indigenous communities have taken advantage of this recent flexibility in educational regulation by opening "Indigenous Experimental Schools" that retain their status as public institutions of learning but are able to command a greater proportion of curricular programming in order to devote more time and courses for Indigenous education than what is afforded in mainstream schools. We contend that Taiwan's Indigenous Experimental Schools are an example of the "glocal" in that they occupy an 'in-between' space that is not entirely locally Indigenous, while at the same time pursuing an unambiguous Indigenous agenda. Taiwan's Indigenous communities have appropriated an education policy not intended for them, a policy that was itself appropriated from abroad and applied to the Taiwan mainstream educational context. In addition, Indigenous communities are actively partnering with *other* Indigenous communities around the globe in order to gain insight regarding how to structure their *own* "Indigenous" education.

Indeed, the promotion of 'Indigenization' of the education system and 'reconciliation' between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples has increased globally. The international adaptation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UN-DRIP) in 2007 has been a key driver in this global movement. Taiwan's Indigenous Education movement, like so many others, has been inspired in part by the aspirations of UN-DRIP, and related interactions with other like-minded Indigenous communities, Austronesian and otherwise. In Saskatchewan's Indigenous community, particularly since the 2005 curriculum renewal, the Saskatchewan Ministry of Education has focused on creating Indigenous knowledges (IK)-infused K-12 science curricula (Aikenhead & Elliot, 2010). A focus for the renewal was "the integration of First Nations,

Métis and Inuit content, perspectives, and ways of knowing into all curricula to encourage the engagement and success of Indigenous students, and at the same time, to enhance the quality of school science for non-Indigenous students" (Aikenhead & Elliot, 2010, p. 329). Saskatchewan is considered as an exemplary province in making formal schooling more inclusive towards Indigenous ways of coming to know for *all* students towards its goal towards education for reconciliation (Kim & Dionne, 2014). Meanwhile, such IK infused curricula are not only for Indigenous students but for all. The *Core Curriculum* (Saskatchewan Education, 2000), emphasized that such "culturally relevant curriculum and resources foster meaningful learning experiences for all students, promote an appreciation of Canada's cultural mosaic, and support universal human rights" (p. 5). In this way, Saskatchewan's mission for official science curriculum renewal is in line with the goal for Reconciliation with land and between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples of Canada.

We argue that this Indigenous Education Reform as well also illustrates the "glocal" nature of Indigenous Education Reform in that it draws from the actions at the trans-local space of the United Nations, and applies them and links them at the local, Indigenous level. Regarding these various "levels" and how they relate to Indigenous Education Reform, Sandra Styres (2017) mentions that to reduce "hegemonic ideologies that serve to perpetuate dominant Western practices within education," changes need to happen on multiple levels including "administration and infrastructure; networks and relations of power; the ways knowledge is constructed and legitimized within the dominating epistemology; policies, pedagogies, and classroom practices; and the complex issues regarding language, literacies and evaluative strategies" (p. 26). As Goodyear-Ka'ōpua (2013) asserts, "self-determination cannot simply be understood as 'Natives making decisions about what is best for Natives' without keeping in view the structures of power within which such decisions are made" (p. 89). As well, such a multilevel process of IK infused curricula does not necessarily involve a chronologically linear process; it may happen spontaneously at the same time in different places. In the Saskatchewan context, Dr. Glen Aikenhead claims that "it was pressure from a lot of different places that happened to come together simultaneously, besides the Conservative government" that made the curriculum renewal possible (personal communication, March 26, 2016).

In this current time, with all of these policies in place, creating an education system that respects Indigenous ways of knowing, for all students became a mission for the Saskatchewan Ministry of Education. In the context of science education, there is both educational and political value of Indigenous knowledge being put forward by different stakeholders that drive the initiatives of integrating Indigenous knowledges (IK) in science curricula (Aikenhead & Elliot, 2010; Ryan, 2008). Such integration of IK in curricula can help educators and researchers to resist the "tyranny of globalizing discourses" (Foucault, 1980, p. 83) that assert monolithic epistemological Eurocentric modern science and move forward in creating educational spaces that appreciate the multiplication of knowledges-sciences to be shared in classrooms. In turn, the processes and the product of curriculum renewal has been shared locally and globally in the forum of academic settings (e.g., academic journals; books and conferences) informing the similar initiatives in other Canadian provinces and around the globe. These sharing and informing occur in-between *discursive space* of global-local, requiring the

mobility of the actors and ideas in diverse levels (e.g., local, national, and multilateral sectors) to interact with each other. As such, 'local view and perspective from the field' are now associated with the causes and consequences of these trans-local encounters of ideas and people, driven by globalization; and in turn, "the idea of field as methodological concept" needs to consider what Naess (2016) describes as "three field dimensions: glocality, relationality, and transformativity" (p. 3). Our article uses these two examples of "glocal" Indigenous education policy reform as entry points into exploring notions of how "glocal brokers" can navigate between Indigenous and Transnational cultural spaces in order to build and bridge relationships that foster communication and capacity building for Indigenous education reform. The authors draw from critical research frameworks in order to illustrate how a "glocal," discursive space between the global and local—between Indigenous and non-Indigenous critical theories —can help to make sense of current trajectories and possibilities in Indigenous Education Research and Reform.

Conceptualizations of the Glocal in Indigenous and non-Indigenous Epistemological Discourse

Conceptualizations of the interaction between the global and the local in education policy formulation mirror an ongoing interchange between the role of non-Indigenous, mainly "Enlightenment-based" (Donald, 2019) knowledge and epistemology used towards Indigenous Education Reform. According to Aikenhead (2006), colonizing, non-Indigenous forces used the "objectivity and secularism" embedded in Western Modern Science as forces of colonization. For example, emphasizing the value of secularism, natural philosophy promoted "scientific racism" (Deloria, 1998) and "cognitive imperialism" (Battiste & Henderson, 2000): Both promoted the idea that modern secular rational thinking was superior to the "primitive" spirituality imbedded in Indigenous knowledges-sciences (Aikenhead, 2006; Aikenhead & Michell, 2011; Deloria, 1998). Ideas stemming from scientific racism and cognitive imperialism became discourses for rationalizing and legitimatizing the education system that assimilated Indigenous students into Western ways of thinking (Battiste & Henderson, 2000).

In further discussion of the interaction of global and local, Gobo (2011) explicates on the notion of "glocal" research approaches and recounts some of the history of how the "glocal" has been understood and articulated, and also relates this discussion to the debate surrounding Indigenous epistemology. He cites Roland Robertson (1997) in one of the original descriptions of the "glocal" as "the simultaneity – the co-presence – of both universalizing and particularizing tendencies" (p. 428). In this expression of the "glocal," tendencies for localities to embrace and mimic foreign objects and values transpire concurrently with those tendencies for foreign objects and values to be embraced and then transformed by local context. This understanding of the "glocal" is a response to assumptions of unilateral globalizing tendencies that regard a gradual, submissive trend of uniform homogeneity to be inevitable as smaller localities increasingly interact with more powerful global entities. Gobo (2011) points out the need for a more nuanced "glocal" conceptualization of social research in that there are inherent shortcomings in over-emphasizing either polarized formulation of "global" or "local." As he argues, all social action occurs in a particular locality, and not in some ethereal, abstract global space. The "global" exists in idea only and cannot be divorced from the localities where events occur. In contrast, the ongoing interaction of peoples, ideas, and cultures

throughout the millennia have resulted in an untenable formulation of the "local" in that, embedded within every locality, there can be observed evidence of foreign impacts and flows. He therefore rejects the notion of an interaction between the "global" and "local" in favor of multiple "locals" in interaction with one another and posits a taxonomy of three possibilities for conceptualizing "glocal" research. First, he denotes "colonization" as the subjugation of one locality by another, then "localization" as the sequestration of a locality, or finally "inter-locality" as the mutual, discursive interaction between two localities (p. 430). Therefore, in this formulation of the "glocal," an optimistic, even playing field of equally respectful localities exists in reciprocal communication.

In striving to develop a definitive conceptualization of the relatively new field of "global studies" Pieterse (2013) also asserts a bilateral framing global and local communication and advocates for a "multilevel approach" across broads scales of "macro, meso, and micro" (p. 11). In so doing, Pieterse (2013) argues that studies of global dynamics and interactions occupy a middle space between large scale studies and the locally specific. As he points out with regard to Indigenous interests in particular, Indigenous activists are involved in international organizations such as the United Nations and are reaching out into the transnational space to secure resources and policy amendments to act locally on behalf of their own communities' interests. Modern social research therefore requires attention to multiple tiers of activities between the ostensibly minute details of localized activity observable primarily through ethnographic interaction, as well as to the largescale interactions of international organizations, and ultimately the discursive space in between, a space the authors will cover in more detail later.

Arnove (2013) as well has advanced a version of this formulation of a discursive middle ground with regard to international and comparative education policy. He posits that at the center of education policy construction is a "dialectic" between global and local forces. He observes that at times the compulsions of international forces advocating a particular education policy are obeyed and at others acquiescence to those forces is altered to serve the needs and desires of local actors. Moreover, education professionals and academics in parts of the world long considered to be passive recipients of educational directives and policies have been in recent years pushing back and influencing the discourse related to education and development in ways that call for wider recognition and adaption to local circumstances.

However, despite this optimism and positive formulations as to the potential of the "glocal" to be a mutually respectful place of communication, others may see the sanguinity misplaced and inaccurate in representation of the interaction between localized entities and other transnational forces. As Kahn (2014) cites Rockefeller (2011) in the introduction to her volume on *Framing the Global;* by solely fixating on the transnational currents of information, people, and culture, often omitted from the analysis is a "critical consideration of what is flowing" (p. 5). Therefore, social research that espouses a "global" orientation "must not shy away from the inequalities, anomalies, and differences that are intrinsic to global circulation" (Kahn, 2014, p. 5). Thus, while conceptualizing the glocal requires a discursive understanding between the global and the local, social research must not pretend that such interaction happens on equal footing. To consider the global, one must take into account longstanding prejudices and biases that have rendered some "locals" more isolated and

subservient than others, and simultaneously placed on a pedestal mis-labeled "global" perspectives that are in actuality no more inherently valuable or universal than the other "local" epistemologies and understandings that they have usurped and/or disregarded. Social researchers of the glocal must strive to understand how to create equity and reciprocity within the dialogic and intersubjective space between disparate localities.

Glocality and Indigenous Perspectives

The issue of unequal footing in perspectives is a point that has long been argued in the field of indigenous and decolonial studies. As Tuhiwai Smith (1999) famously put, "Research is one of the dirtiest words of the Indigenous vocabulary" (p. 1) as social research has long considered "that Western ideas about the most fundamental things are the only ideas possible to hold, certainly the only rational ideas, and the only idea which can make sense of the world, of reality, of social life and of human beings" (p. 56). Similarly, Edward Said (1978) also stated that research has been "a Western discourse about the Other" (p. 2). The perspectives, knowledge, and epistemologies of Indigenous peoples have long been relegated to the periphery and subservience to Western science and research. Western epistemology and social research have been infused with inherent universality and objectivity while Indigenous perspectives have been considered to be domain of their respective localities alone, and not applicable or relevant to broader contexts. As Tuhiwai Smith (1999) further details, research regarding Indigenous matters has often been a process akin to theft, whereby Indigenous knowledges are acquired by researchers in order to benefit the interests of academia, business and governments rather than the needs and interests of Indigenous peoples. Moreover, this "research" has often engaged in practices that have justified the oppression and marginalization of Indigenous knowledges and viewpoints.

Feminist and decolonial scholar, Trinh Minh Ha (1989) also makes the point as to the fundamentally flawed endeavor of many traditional anthropological pursuits. As she eloquently put:

> *No anthropological undertaking can ever open up the other. Never the marrow. All he can do is wear himself out circling the object and define his other on the grounds of his being a man studying another man. How can he, indeed, read into the other knowing not how the other read into him? (p. 76)*

This is a fundamental question that begs repetition in all social research, not only anthropology. How can any study *of* humans *by* humans, ethnographic or otherwise, find validity without the continuous reflexivity and vulnerability of allowing the one who *studies* to also become the one who *is* studied? This inequity of research capacity and privilege between Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations is indicative and representative of the inadequacy of much "glocal" research that fails to adequately conceptualize the imbalance in dialogue while also requiring that reciprocal discursive processes are taking place.

Tragically, the effects of this imbalance between Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledges have been particularly acute with regard to formal schooling. As Battiste (2014) details, while many Indigenous families are hopeful of the potential of education to be a force for good and reconciliation, despite many decades of formal schooling being used as a tool and means for intentional linguistic and cultural

genocide, still there are many obstacles to overcome in order for Indigenous education and education for reconciliation to realize its potential for both continuation of Indigenous cultural and linguistic traditions, while also attending to redressing longstanding socioeconomic inequities. Battiste (2014) describes the goals of current Indigenous Education Reform as bifold in helping Indigenous communities to escape cycles of material deficiency, while simultaneously elevating the status of Indigenous knowledges and cultures in a simultaneous process of deconstruction and construction. In order to accomplish these lofty goals, she describes a movement reminiscent of the "multilevel" mandate described earlier by Pieterse (2013) with regards to the global studies and makes a call for contributions from educators, scholars, school administrators, "and policy makers [to collaborate] in ways that will make a difference at all levels of achievement [of Indigenous students]" (p. 96). Such collaboration at multilevel towards Indigenous education reform is one that is inherently *Glocal* in that it requires actions at the local level to be tied to those at the trans-local level.

Other Indigenous scholars around the globe have also recognized the need to pursue "trans-systemic" understandings of inter/trans disciplinary research, appreciating diverse perspectives and theories as a means to counter perspectives that have long favored Western, particularly Enlightenment-based approaches, and ignored local Indigenous ways of knowing. As such, Henderson (2014) advocates for a "holistic consciousness that grants Aboriginal conduct its distinct legal, social, and human meaning" (p. 61). He claims that such a trans-systemic understanding "establishes the premises to understand, respect, and substantially converge and reconcile the Eurocentric legal traditions of common law and civil law with the distinct, constitutionalized legal traditions of the Aboriginal peoples" (pp. 66-67). This call of reconciliation and convergence between multiple ways of coming to know whilst centering local Aboriginal perspective, extends to interdisciplinary research as well. As Verduyn (2014) explains in the same volume, "trans-systemic" synthesis requires "thick," as opposed to "thin," interdisciplinarity. As she describes, the 'thin' interdisciplinary approach merely draws from other disciplines and while the former confronts and expands the boundaries of disciplines and is willing to "accept the limits of knowledge and methods" (p. 238). Therefore, the dialogue required within the "glocal", Indigenous and non-Indigenous space is one that can acknowledge and accept difference, while also recognizing the fundamentally flawed hubris of acquiring full knowledge of the Other.

Bhattacharya (2009) speaks as well to the necessity of recognizing the limits of academic research and accepting that there is "no purist decolonizing space devoid of imperialism but spaces where multiple colonizing and resisting discourses exist and interact simultaneously" (p. 105). She rather extends the admonition that research with decolonial aims must reject the furtherance of false dichotomies and instead embrace a "counterculture of polarized discourses" (p. 110) that recognizes the value in an assortment of different epistemologies. Ahenakew (2017) likewise observes the longstanding sentiment from Newhouse (2008) and other Indigenous scholars that disregarding knowledge and epistemologies from sources other than those considered "Indigenous" would in fact be incompatible with traditional Indigenous ways of knowing, and therefore what Indigenous education reform is calling for is in no way a

reliance strictly on Indigenous knowledge[s] and epistemology, but instead an endeavor to construct education wherein "Western and Indigenous knowledges" are considered to "complementary rather than contradictory" (p. 84). In this vein, we recognize that Indigenous research frameworks come from Indigenous epistemologies (Kovach, 2009) that are deeply embedded in one's relations, language, and lived experience in a particular place/land. Well-intentioned research projects, publications, and practices that aim to respect and honor Indigenous ways of being, thinking, and doing can actually lead to their appropriation and misrepresentation (Haig-Brown, 2008). Indigenous mentors, including Dr. Laara Fitznor, we have worked with always have reminded us thus to "draw up from application of Indigenous research frameworks" in guidance of Indigenous peoples, but never employ any types of Indigenous epistemologies in their entirety. Rather we may draw up from the frameworks with the guidance from Indigenous mentors and friends. In this light, "relationship" and "relationality" become centralized aspects for a 'trans-systemic' research approach. It is through relationships with Indigenous peoples, non-Indigenous "settlers" may gain understanding of perspectives, epistemologies and research framework through story-telling (Kim, 2019). Moreover, we have learned that just because non-Indigenous lenses or research frameworks are Eurocentric, or originally used by Western scholars, this does not mean necessarily to avoid using them. Indeed, in a conversation with Kovach (2009), Indigenous scholar Graham Smith said:

> *I am not going to say Western theory is useless that it's white man's knowledge and shouldn't use it and all that stuff. That's a load of bull—we need to use all the very best available theoretical and methodological tools, and where necessary develop new approaches when these tools are inadequate. (p. 91)*

Graham Smith's statement is in line with his partner, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, and her argument that decolonizing research does not necessarily mean avoiding using Western frameworks of research altogether. Rather, decolonizing research it is about centering Indigenous ways of coming to know place (both physical and metaphorical). As we understand it, to avoid the same colonial approach in research, we do not necessarily have to choose between an Indigenous research framework or a Western framework. Both can, in fact, work together to allow "for new ideas and ways of looking at things to be incorporated constantly, without the need to search constantly for new theories" (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 40). Researchers need to remain critical about making methodological and other choices in trans-systemic work. Critical here is not the sense of passing judgement on other people's theories and ideas, but in the sense of reflecting on own's assumptions, privileges and biases in relation to power-dynamics exist in diverse discursive spaces affecting the site of the work and choosing own's use of language, methods and theory by being attuning to the processes of research and relationships embedded in own's understanding.

Critical Discourse Analysis, Indigenous Knowledges, and Glocality

Drawing from Ahenakew's (2017) admonition to consider how non-Indigenous epistemologies might complement Indigenous understandings, we offer a summary of Faircloughian Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) (Fairclough, 1995) as a critical theoretical framework that can aid exploring the glocal

space between Indigenous and Eurocentric. In doing so, we first offer our understandings of "discourse" and thereby also "discursive space" as terms useful in analyzing these issues. Shaw (2008) details how notions of discourse are inseparable from modern ideas regarding Indigeneity, how it can be understood and, "even as these discourses enable Indigenous peoples' political claims, they also continue to be marginalized by and through these same discourses" (pp. 809). As Shaw details, indigeneity is a performative act and "dialogic process" whereby indigenous people construct and re-construct cultural identities as both separate from and integrated with their wider communities (Graham & Penny, 2014, p. 4) and also how notions of an "educated" Indigenous person are constructed within their culture as "product" of and within a specific social context (Levinson & Holland, 1996).

Wodak and Meyer (2009) echo this understanding of "discourse" and a focus on the usage of language as inherently dynamic and both a product and producer of the social environment in that, "discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned" as "it helps to sustain and reproduce the social status quo, and in the sense that it contributes to transforming it" (pp. 5-6). In keeping with this conceptualization, structures within society both constrain, and are constrained by, individual activity. According to Wodak & Meyer (2009), this duality centralizes analytical attention on the questions and effects of power, particularly as to how power can be exercised in linguistic form in order for institutions to limit human agency, and also for human agency to produce and reproduce ideological notions that reinforce constraints on other members of society in order to continue existing social hierarchies. They therefore draw from Habermas in the assertion that language can be understood as "a medium of domination and social force" insomuch that it, "serves to legitimize relations of organized power" (p.10). The function of CDA then is to critique and make explicit how oppressive social relations are bolstered and replicated through linguistic means by examining how implicitly understood social inequalities are shown and justified by language in practice.

Weiss & Wodak (2003) argue that the approach of CDA is therefore one essential to social science research overall. They posit that advocates of CDA are of a similar opinion that one of the key advantages of this approach lies in its unique ability to examine the inter-relationship between human agency and social structure. As they assert, CDA is inherently a research methodology that is able to explore the inter-discursivity between people and the structures that surround them, an issue particularly relevant with regard to Indigenous education reform. Therefore, CDA methodology possesses great promise in resolving this underlying epistemological and ontological debate in social research, particularly with regard to this notion of the middle space of the Glocal. They describe the centrality of this debate between structure and agency as the "wound of sociological thinking in the 20th century" (p. 9) and argue that CDA's fundamentally pragmatic nature provides a welcome antidote to the polarized thinking surrounding it. This "wound," as they describe it, has to do with sociology's recurring inability to reconcile whether substantive and valid social analysis should focus more on the "micro-," bottom-up concerns of human agency, or on the "macro-," top-down concerns of social structure. This offer of reconciliation between the "macro" and the "micro" is particularly appealing with regard to its potential with regard to Indigenous Education Policy Reform.

Weiss & Wodak (2003) assert that CDA is not necessarily concerned with achieving a "grand theory" but can be more accurately described as providing "conceptual tools" that can be utilized in different situations and in response to different problems (pp. 8-9). CDA practitioners do not necessarily need to make a choice between either a "pure" adherence to empiricism or to critical theory but are instead able to "integrate sociological and linguistic positions, to mediate between text and institution, between communication and structure, and between discourse and society" (p. 9). As discourse is inherently positioned as the communicative space between people and wider society, a study of discourse that focuses exclusively on either, the micro- *or* macro-, is fundamentally inadequate. According to this understanding, empirical, "bottom-up" techniques are every bit just as valuable and valid as more "top-down" approaches that rely on broad critical theories regarding societal structure and oppression. Critical analysis of discourse can therefore draw from the resources of both of these inductive and deductive approaches in reaching an understanding of the discursive dynamics between people and social institutions, as discourse is precisely what mutually influences the mediation between the two. For this reason as well, instead of regarding discourse analysts as niche researchers who are constrained to certain techniques that are considered to be acceptable within specific approaches, or unacceptable to others, discourse analysts can rather be considered to have access to a wide variety of approaches and possibilities in recognition of the inherently pragmatic and nuanced nature of their task (Waring, 2018).

Van Dijk (2009) explains as well that a study of discourse requires a confluence of many different theories and disciplines in order to even begin to approach the many facets of social phenomena that comprise discourse, a framing that echoes the inclusiveness of many Indigenous epistemologies as well. As discourse at times can be represented in oral form, in written form, in individual action, in communicative interaction, and in various forms of consumable media and abstract thought; defining discourse requires joining together many different theoretical threads of sociology, linguistics, and psychology. As Van Dijk further describes regarding this discursive process,

> *It is precisely in these macro-micro links that we encounter the crux for a critical discourse analysis. Merely observing and analyzing social inequality at high levels of abstraction is an exercise for the social sciences and a mere study of discourse grammar, semantics, speech acts or conversational moves, the general task of linguists, and discourse and conversation analysts. Social and political discourse analysis is specifically geared towards the detailed explanation of the relationship between the two (p. 83)*

Finally, Fairclough (1995) explains how attention to the interaction between these can be applied in practical terms. He frames CDA as the exercise of focusing on three different aspects of "text, discourse practice, and social practice" and an investigation of discourse practice as one that studies the "processes of text production, distribution, and consumption" (p.9). He likewise eschews the notion of discourse analysis as tied to a particular tier of social activity but insists instead that it should be one that examines how the textual representations of discourse as employed by social institutions are entrenched within social practices. According to this conceptualization of CDA, discourse analysis cannot solely focus on text or on exclusively

linguistic representations of discourse, and rather must also include how these linguistic forms are utilized in the activities of society. Moreover, in reference to the dialogic nature of society and individuals as detailed above, Fairclough's presentation of CDA is one that recognizes that discourses are not only the practical manifestations of language in social practice, but also that discourse is itself a social practice that produces language. This then enables discursive self-reflexivity and serves to develop constraints and possibilities for acceptable activity within certain cultural contexts.

The Role of Glocal Brokers

Therefore, we emphasize the role of Glocal Brokers in negotiating the discursive space between text and social practice in education policy, and also in bringing marginalized voices into wider dialogue and recognition. Anthony-Stevens (2017) further details the important role of Indigenous allies and brokers:

> *What does "acting as a broker" look like for non-Indigenous allies? To act "as 'brokers' of sorts is to negotiate value exchanges to leverage institutional power in support of what Critical Indigenous Research Methodologies refers to as explicitly Indigenous community-driven interests…While non-Indigenous allies will not and should not be the authors of Indigenous educational sovereignty, allies do and can strategically help. The brokering in alliance work negotiates how to consciously leverage available resources—Indigenous voices and Whitestream institutional capital—in order to generate new resources…. Recentering Indigenous voices requires non-Indigenous collaborators to ask questions such as "Who says?" and "What are the impacts of my voice?" in self-reflection and in dialogue with Indigenous colleagues. Harnessing the humility required to act "as brokers of sorts" increases the opportunity space for Indigenous self-empowerment, not for non-Indigenous collaborators to empower Indigenous peoples. (p. 96)*

Similarly, glocal brokers are those who understand the three sociological field defining dimensions: Glocality, relationality, and transformativity (Naess, 2016). Regarding these three, first, glocal brokers are ones who communicate at diverse discursive spaces existing in global-local levels, driven by a strong understanding of cultures, power-dynamics between global-local levels. Such understanding requires yet again relationships at diverse levels. "Relationality" is crucial in the context of working in the topics of Indigenous Education Reform and Research. Secondly, Glocal Brokers facilitate collaborative decision-making and research processes between diverse global-local sectors. In the context of working with Indigenous partners, glocal brokers then need to understand protocols of Indigenous communities and how such protocols can be communicated and be employed at other global and local sectors. Third, glocal brokers work towards transformativity. Glocal brokers understand the importance of the processes and how in turn engaged in processes of glocal brokerage would also change their own perspectives and narratives. However, as Naess (2016) puts it, such transformative aspects of researchers' narratives always have to be put into the context of larger historical and political context. In the context of the glocal nature of education policies, then glocal brokers are required to understand how globalization affects

narratives on history and politics in diverse discursive spaces.

Experiences of Glocal Brokerage and Critical Discourse Analysis

Regarding the authors' respective experiences of utilizing this approach in their own research, we summarize the following examples. In Taiwan, CDA provides a valuable tool for understanding some of obstacles faced in implementing the Indigenous Experimental School Policy. First, there is a widespread dissatisfaction at the use of the term "experimental" to describe these schools. As mentioned earlier, the experimental education in Taiwan was not designed with Indigenous communities and schools in mind, but rather as a way for families who are averse to Taiwan's mainstream, exam-centric education to find alternative forms of education. Indigenous leaders initially latched onto this window of opportunity as a means to address some of their longstanding concerns with the failure of Taiwan's mainstream education to adequately incorporate their culture into school programming. However, many Indigenous leaders are resentful at having to use this particular policy and its description of "experimental" in order to create curricula that matches their Indigenous heritage. As some leaders point out, there isn't anything "experimental" about Indigenous education at all. They have been educating their young people to respect the local environment in Taiwan for generations. Moreover, Indigenous parents who are skeptical that this form of education might further alienate their children from mainstream opportunities have been further put off by the notion that their children might be treated as guinea pigs. Indigenous leaders have tried to stress that Indigenous experimental schools do not teach Indigenous culture *in the place of* or instead of teaching mainstream subjects of math and science, but rather *as a means to* teach math and science. However, there is still a pronounced reticence for a full embrace of the policy from many in the Indigenous community. Moreover, with regard to the notion of autonomy, even if the schools all immediately dropped the problematic designation of "experimental," the framework of policy implementation still requires that these schools have to prove themselves of being worthy and capable enough so as to continue to justify spending additional time and resources on the development of Indigenous-centered curricula. Also, many Indigenous educators are wary that the meaning attached to the term could imply that the "experiment" can at some point in the future be deemed a failure, perhaps through lack of improvement in academic performance of students, or through low enrollment, at which point an Indigenous Experimental School could be asked to revert to the mainstream national curriculum.

Another difficulty with regard to the policy is a common misunderstanding as to the purpose of the schools, and the assumption that their goal is help Indigenous groups "preserve" their culture. This posturing orients the policy towards the *past*, further worrying some Indigenous parents that their children's participation in Indigenous Experimental Education will further alienate their children from economic opportunities. However, as one Indigenous leader explained to me, "We are not trying to preserve our culture. You only preserve things that are dead" (personal communication, August 9, 2019). As Indigenous culture is alive and dynamic, Indigenous leaders want to create an entire educational structure that will nourish that development. Therefore, another problem with the Indigenous Experimental Education policy is that it is overwhelmingly represented by schools at only the primary school level. Thus,

leaders are concerned that their efforts will largely be in vain as students progress through secondary and post-secondary education without the reinforcement and further development of Indigenous knowledge and ways of knowing.

Drawing from Fairclough (1989)'s three-tiered model, Amy conceptualized different discursive relations that are at play in integrating Indigenous Knowledge Systems in Saskatchewan's science curricula (Kim, 2018). The three-tiered model allowed her to select and collect data sources and analyze them according to different discursive relations. While the three-tiered model was helpful in many ways, at times the analyzed data told stories that did not adhere completely to the fixed three-tiered model. As such, in coming to conclusions she was reminded of the notion of "self-in-relation" (Graveline, 1998) as well as Dr. Fitznor's advice for decolonization to her to think about, "What do I encourage through this activity?." She found that it was her, the re/searcher, who vacillated between different discursive formations, finding different connections at play and disparate relationships. Through these alternating associations constructed throughout different discursive formations or herself as the researcher, the learner, and the participant, she found a way to tell a tale of integration of Indigenous Knowledge Systems in Saskatchewan's science education reform.

Engaged in re/search practice that focused on both process and product as well as the relationship between data and different discursive practices, she was able to explore curriculum as both instrument and object of power (Foucault, 1980). As such, this project itself is in the circle of previous and future developments of curriculum-to-come. The Saskatchewan Ministry of Education acknowledged Indigenous Knowledge Systems as a source of valid knowledge foundation and emphasized the importance of diverse ways of knowing nature to provide a strong science program. However, the Ministry never challenged the hegemonic dominance of non-Indigenous knowledge systems. As such, the Saskatchewan Ministry of Education took a "multiculturalist position": acknowledging the diverse ways of knowing nature and creating a space for dialogues, however never acknowledging the imbalance of power inherent in the relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous knowledge systems. In order to create science curricula and programs that authentically appreciate Indigenous Knowledge Systems and promote harmony among multiple ways of knowing nature, "the existing cultural interpretative monopoly of European knowledge, assumptions, and methodologies" has to be explored by all educational stakeholders involved—curriculum writers, teachers, and students (Battiste, 2013, p. 103). The legitimacy of non-Indigenous knowledge was not challenged in the various formations of the curriculum and the earlier natural philosophers remained prominent in the Saskatchewan curricula. For example, their usage of the term *science* was only in association with non-Indigenous knowledges and their descriptions and usages of the term of *scientific inquiry* were entirely associated with Baconian inductive scientific methods. The curricular reform did not incorporate the creation of an equal sharing place and continue to ask ontological questions between Indigenous and non-Indigenous ways of knowing. In terms of respecting sacred ecology, the continuous fostering of relationships with Indigenous people, and productive reflection with Indigenous Elders and knowledge keepers, there yet remains much that can be done in terms of Indigenous curricular reform in Saskatchewan.

Conclusion

As the chief concern of our work is how broader education policy affects Indigenous peoples, a non-Indigenous presence and perspective in the discussion are both warranted as Glocal Broker allies, and in utilization of a non-Indigenous research framework, namely Critical Discourse Analysis. The goal of our research is to address as problematic not Indigenous peoples or practices, but rather societal structures, institutions, and policies that render Indigenous ways of knowing marginalized and cast out from representation. Critical Discourse Analysis links the problems at the level of discourse of these policies alongside the macro-implementation of the policies. Thereby our research addresses the deficiencies of mainstream education policy at being inclusive of Indigenous viewpoints. Therefore, we build on the arguments of Native American scholars in advocating for a more deliberate shift in focus from not only how to change Indigenous education in localized settings, but also towards the broader contexts and policies that render Indigenous perspectives marginalized. This work requires attention to not only the Local or the Global, but primarily to the *Glocal* space in between. Finally, we argue that an inherent part of methodology is not only the critical theoretical framework being used, but also an acknowledgement of *who* is employing the methodology, and of the inherently complex role of Glocal Brokers, Indigenous and non-Indigenous. Individuals who fill this crucial role recognize the need to traverse between Local and Global perspectives and reconcile these disparate viewpoints in ways that facilitate mutual edification, harmony, and reconciliation.

References

Ahenakew, C. R. (2017). Mapping and Complicating Conversations about Indigenous Education. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, *11*(2), 80–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/15595692.2017.1278693

Aikenhead, G. S. (2006). Cross-cultural science teaching: Rekindling traditions for Aboriginal students. In Y. Kanu (Ed.), *Curriculum as cultural practice: Postcolonial imaginations* (pp. 223–248). University of Toronto Press.

Aikenhead, G. S., & Elliot, D. (2010). An emerging decolonizing science education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education*, *10*(4), 321–338.

Aikenhead, G. S., & Michell, H. (2011). Bridging cultures: Indigenous and scientific ways of knowing nature. In G. S. Aikenhead & M. Ogawa (Eds.), *Indigenous knowledge and science revisited* (Vol. 3, pp. 539–591). Pearson Canada Inc.

Ang, I. (1998). Doing cultural studies at the crossraods: Local/global negotations. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, *1*(1), 13–31.

Anthony-Stevens, V. (2017). Cultivating Alliances: Reflections on the Role of Non-Indigenous Collaborators in Indigenous Educational Sovereignty. *Journal of American Indian Education*, *56*(1), 81–104.

Arnove, R. F. (2013). Introduction: Reframing Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local. In R. F. Arnove, C. A. Torres, & S. Franz (Eds.), *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local* (Fourth, pp. 1–26). Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing Education: Nourishing the learning spirit*. Purich Press Publishing.

Battiste, M. (2014). Ambidextrous Epistemologies: Indigenous Knowledge within the Indigenous Renaissance. In S. Kamboureli & C. Verduyn (Eds.), *Critical Colloborations: Indigeneity, Diaspora, and Ecology in Canadian Literary Studies* (pp. 83–98). Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Battiste, M., & Henderson, J. (2000). *Protecting Indigenous knowledge and heritage*. Purich Press Publishing.

Bhattacharya, K. (2009). Othering Research, Researching the Other: De/Colonizing Approaches to Qualitative Inquiry. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory of Research* (Vol. 24, pp. 105–150). Springer.

Bishop, A. (2015). *Becoming an Ally: Breaking the cycle of oppression in people*. Fernwood Publishing.

CIA. (2018). *Taiwan: People and Society*. Central Intelligence Agency. https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/tw.html

Deloria, P. J. (1998). *Playing Indian*. Yale University Press.

Donald, D. (2019). Place. In J. Wearing, M. Ingersoll, C. DeLuca, B. Bolden, H. Ogden, & T. M. Christou (Eds.), *Key Concepts in Curriculum Studies: Perspectives on the Fundamentals* (pp. 156–162). Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.

Foucault, M. (1980). Truth and Power. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977* (pp. 109–133). Harvester Press.

Gobo, G. (2011). Glocalizing methodology? The encounter between local methodologies. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *14*(6), 417–437. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2011.611379

Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, N. (2013). *The Seeds We Planted: Portraits of a Native Hawaiian Charter School*. University of Minnesota Press.

Graham, L. R., & Penny, H. G. (2014). Performing Indigeneity: Emergent Identity, Self-Determination, and Sovereignty. In L. R. Graham & H. G. Penny (Eds.), *Peforming Indigeneity: Global Histories and Contemporary Experiences* (pp. 1–31). University of Nebraska Press.

Graveline, F. J. (1998). *Circle works: Transforming Eurocentric Consciousness*. Fernwood Publishing.

Greiner, C., & Sakdapolrak, P. (2013). Translocality: Concepts, applications and emerging research perspectives. *Geography Compass*, *7*(5), 373–384.

Haig-Brown, C. (2008). Taking Indigenous thought seriously: A rant on globalization with some cautionary notes. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, *6*(2), 8–24.

Henderson, S. (2014). Trans-Systemic Constitutionalism in Indigenous Law and Knowledge. In S. Kamboureli & C. Verduyn

(Eds.), *Critical Collaborations: Indigeneity, Diaspora, and Ecology in Canadian Literary Studies* (pp. 49–68). Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Kahn, H. E. (2014). Introduction: Framing the Global. In H. E. Kahn (Ed.), *Framing the global: Entry points for research* (pp. 1–17). Indiana University Press.

Kim, E. A. (2018). *The Relationships at Play in Integrating Indigenous Knowledges-Sciences (IK-S) in Science Curriculum: A Case Study of Saskatchewan K-12 Science Curriculum*. McGill University.

Kim, E. A. (2019). Positioning myself in Turtle Island: The storied journeying of a first-generation Korean immigrant-settler to Canada. In E. Lyle (Ed.), *Identity Landscapes: Contemplating Place and the Construction of Self*. Brill/Sense Publication.

Kim, E. A., & Dionne, L. (2014). Traditional ecological knowledge in science education and its integration in grades 7 and 8 Canadian science curriculum documents. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education*, *14*(4), 311–329.

Klein, J. T. (2013). The Transdisciplinary Moment(um). *Integral Review*, *9*(2), 189–199.

Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations and contexts*. University of Toronto Press.

Lee, T., & Chin, J. (2016, August 28). Aboriginal experimental school opens in Taichung. *Taipei Times*. http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/taiwan/archives/2016/08/28/2003654039

Levinson, B. A. U., & Holland, D. C. (1996). The Cultural Production of the educated person: An introduction. In B. A. U. Levinson, D. E. Foley, & D. C. Holland (Eds.), *The cultural production of the educated person: Critical ethnographies of schooling and local practice* (pp. 1–54). State University of New York Press.

Li, X. J. (2015). 教育發展新契機-實驗教育三法 (New Opportunity for Education Development-Three Methods of Experimental Education). *Taiwan Ministry of Education Newsletter*. https://www.edu.tw/news_Content.aspx?n=9E7AC85F1954DDA8&s=C5AC6858C0DC 65F3

Lomawaima, K. T. (2000). Tribal Sovereigns: Reframing Research in American Indian Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *70*(1).

Naess, H. E. (2016). Creating "the Field": Glocality, Relationality and Transformativity. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *17*(3), Art. 15. http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs1603152

Pieterse, J. N. (2013). What is Global Studies? *Globalizations*. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2013.806746

Ryan, A. (2008). Indigenous knowledge in the science curriculum: Avoiding neo-colonialism. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, *3*, 663–702.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon.

Saskatchewan Education. (2000). *Core curriculum: Principals, time allocations, and credit policy*. Saskatchewan Ministry of Education.

Shaw, K. (2008). *Indigeneity and Political Theory: Sovereignty and the limits of the Political*. Routledge.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Zed Books.

Styres, S. D. (2017). *Pathways for remembering and recognizing Indigenous thought in Education: Philosophies of Iethi'nihsténha Ohwentsia'kékha" (Land)*. University of Toronto Press.

Trinh, M.-H. (1989). *Woman, native, other: Writing postcoloniality and feminism*. Indiana University Press.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). Critical Discourse Studies: A sociocognitive approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed, pp. 62–86). SAGE.

Verduyn, C. (2014). Critical Allegiances. In S. Kamboureli & C. Verduyn (Eds.), *Critical Collaborations: Indigeneity, Diaspora, and Ecology in Canadian Literary Studies* (pp. 227–239). Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Waring, H. Z. (2018). *Discourse Analysis: The Questions Discourse Analysts Ask and How They Answer Them*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (2003). Introduction: Theory, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Discourse Analysis. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity* (pp. 1–34). Palgrave Macmillan.

Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Fernwood Publishing.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical Discourse Analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Anlaysis* (pp. 1–33). SAGE.

Wu, J. H., & Wu, J. X. (2018). Shiyan Jiaoyu Ruhe Qujing Huadefu Xuexiao de Banxue Jingyan (How does experimental education learn from the experience of Waldorf Schools?). *Taiwan Jiaoyu Pinglun Yuekan (Taiwan Education Monthly Review)*, *7*(1), 72–75.