Horizons of Belonging:
Co-Creating Transformative Indigenization and internationalization in Higher Education

by

Derek Tannis

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in
Theoretical, Cultural and International Studies in Education

Department of Educational Policy Studies
University of Alberta

Abstract

Across Canada, post-secondary institutions are embarking in policy-driven strategies to engage Indigenization and internationalization of their campuses. These strategies are tied to national and provincial policies with multiple intent, ranging from increasing fee-paying international student enrolment to enacting recommendations from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Policy analysis of these policy emphases in higher education are typically treated separately, where in practice, they are often lived concurrently by faculty, staff and students, in their day-to-day work.

This interpretive research study explores the tensions and intersections of these policy and strategy emphases as they are lived by faculty, staff and students. Drawing from a post-intentional phenomenological methodology, this study seeks examines the question: *What is it like to engage in transformative intercultural practice in higher education and how can a deeper understanding of this practice inform Indigenization and internationalization policy-making in the post-secondary sector?* Transformative intercultural practice is a term developed to reflect the scope and intent of deep, integrative and transformative approaches to Indigenization and internationalization in higher education, including teaching, helping or leading individuals or groups of students, staff or faculty in a manner that assumes shared responsibility for creating the conditions for critically aware engagement in the pursuit of meaningful inclusion, equity, reconciliation and social justice on campus and beyond.

Research involved interviews and focus groups with 23 faculty, staff and students, as a phenomenologically oriented study, drew further insights from academic literature, poetry, film and theatre. Each analysis chapter interweaves insights upon the deliberation, enactment and co-creation of transformative Indigenization and internationalization, culminating in three broad

themes: the importance of beginning with belonging; gathering with intention/attention; and, honouring freedom.

Analysis of the deliberation of transformative Indigenization and international leads to a discussion on what it can be like to experience refusing, acknowledging and inviting what and who is (being) spoken of in relation to (un)speak-able known, unknown and hidden entities in spaces of deliberation on Indigenization and internationalization. From this perspective, enactments of transformative Indigenization and internationalization are shown to involve (at)tending to and allowing for the experiences of one's own and others' sense of vulnerability, imminence/immanence and purposefulness in spaces of (up)rooting that come with initiating and cultivating transformative intercultural practices.

The co-creation of such spaces of deliberation and enactment of transformative Indigenization and internationalization is shown to engage us in the lives of our colleagues and students in ways that can be deeply personal. In the evolving certainties and enduring liminality of our work, it is also shown how the demands of kindness can often intercede, revealing our inherent responsibility for one another, through the sharing of difficult life events and traumatic histories, in dealing with highly charged situations with serious implications, and in seeking to overcome what would seem to be irreconcilable differences.

Keywords: Indigenization, internationalization, interpretive policy analysis, higher education

Preface

This thesis is an original work by Derek Tannis. The research project, of which this thesis is a part, received research ethics approval from the University of Alberta Ethics Board, Project Name "Ethics and Enactment of Internationalization and Indigenization Policies and Priorities; A Phenomenological Study of Critical Intercultural Practice on a Canadian University Campus", Pro00064036, May 15, 2016.

Parts of Chapters 1 & 2 have been published as D. Tannis, "Security in a world of strangers: Exploring the lived meaning of help giving to international students", L. Shultz & T. Pillay (Eds.), *Global Citizenship, Common Wealth and Uncommon Citizenships,* Boston, MA: Brill Sense, 111-124. Parts of Chapters 1, 5 & 6 are in review as D. Tannis, "Making spaces for truth: Deliberating reconciliation in higher education", S. Wiebe & L. Levac (Eds.), *Creating Spaces of Engagement,* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

initiatives that most others would never consider, I would truly not have come to known what is possible in relation to Indigenizing internationalization. Our friendship has become an anchor for me in the uncertain waters of our ever-evolving field of student affairs. To Karen Pheasant, Thashika Pillay and Evelyn Hamdon, thank you for welcoming me into your lives and your PhD journeys. Your critical, honest and encouraging appraisals of my work helped me keep true to myself and our shared values.

I cannot express enough gratitude to my supervisory committee, Lynette Shultz, Ali Abdi and Evelyn Steinhauer, for their mentorship, critical engagement with my work, and trust in my abilities to complete this dissertation. You allowed me to explore issues that matter deeply to me and pushed me further into areas I would not have explored otherwise. You modelled to me the lived meaning of academic mentorship and have shown me, in a personal and direct way, how kindness transforms the lives of students.

To my mother, father, mother-in-law and father-in-law, sister and brother-cousin, thank you for your continuous affirmation and sharing in the joys and struggles to reach this achievement. To my late, and dearly loved and missed, Aunt Jeannette, I wish I could share this accomplishment with you over dinner and a bottle of wine. Your reflections on and pride in my work helped me overcome self-doubt and persevere at the most important points in time.

The sacrifices that I have made over the years to reach this point and submit this dissertation were not borne alone. This dissertation is a testament to the patience, fortitude and love of my son, Morgan and my life partner, Tina. These pages represent hours, days, weeks and months dedicated to studies that took me away from our family life together. If every act of your love and support was like another book on my shelf, it would be the largest library on earth.

Table of contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Crossing

In order to imagine higher education differently, we may need to first historicize and denaturalize existing educational patterns, face the complexities, complicities and contradictions that make up our current system. This would likely include acknowledging our own investments in this system, and honestly assessing the gifts, harms and limits of existing regimes of knowledge, including our own critiques. As long as we fail to do so, we may lose the opportunity to nurture other kinds of relations, experiment with other ways of knowing, and imagine other worlds than the one we have inherited.
- Stein, 2017, p. 23

The Iron Footbridge

When I was eighteen years old, I spent 10 months as an exchange student in Germany. At one point, I went to see a doctor and was told I had homesickness. Over dinner that night, my host family chided me and I swallowed tears until I could hardly speak. The next day, I called my father and one of the first questions he asked me was where I felt my sadness.

> *"In my chest", I replied.*
> *"And where do you feel joy?" he inquired further, surprising me.*
> *"In the same place", I answered, after some thought.*
> *He paused.*
> *"Derek, you will never understand deep joy, if you don't know what it means to experience deep sadness. Joy and sadness are from the same wellspring."*

I don't recall what he said after that, but the message was clear. I wasn't going home. Two months after this phone call with my father, I was standing alone on the Eiserner Steg, a pedestrian bridge in Frankfurt. My closest German friend had decided to leave me there, fed up with my terrible mood. I stood on the bridge for a long time, not wanting to cross in either direction. I felt the river flowing beneath me as if it were my last connection with home. In my exchange year abroad, I learned German, lived with German families, went to a Gymnasium and made many friends. Yet, what I remember most vividly is crossing a bridge in Frankfurt during one of the loneliest nights of my life. I also remember finally returning to my

host family that night and learning that I had been transferred to a new home. Within hours, I found myself in the midst of a loving family who embraced me in a way that helped me re-ground myself and rediscover my surroundings. Months later, I received a call from an exchange counselor in another city. A new exchange student was experiencing difficulties adjusting and he wanted to know if I could help her. The exchange student called me, and shared with me her feelings of tremendous sadness, of how her confusion and homesickness was affecting her health. Very soon, I found myself in a new role. I had become a mentor to recently arrived exchange students. This is a role that I have had in my work life, albeit at a different scale. It is a role that I valued deeply. A role that changed who I am. A role that, in no small measure, led me to this study.

Twenty years since this experience, I have found myself working with post-secondary international students, some of whom share with me feelings of homesickness, loneliness and frustration in facing personal and academic difficulties. When students have told me their story, I have wanted to help them feel a sense of safety, care and belonging. Sometimes, I have shared my story of crossing Eisener Steg and students have opened up, sometimes with tears streaming down their cheeks. Even though I have felt comfortable in this role, I have continually asked myself about the meaning of my work. At particular moments when I have been helping a student who was overcome by feelings of exclusion or isolation, I sought to remind myself of what my role was. I have supervised staff, advised students, worked with faculty, conducted training and workshops, advocated for international students, and helped shape policies and strategies associated with internationalization, and via their tensions and intersections, Indigenization in higher education. Yet, these are all tasks, accountabilities. In my work, which has involved issues of inclusion, social justice, and in relation with Aboriginal students and

colleagues, reconciliation, I have learned that while it matters *what* I do at my institution, what matters more is *how* I do what I do.

In this chapter, I explore how my experiences, such as those which I have just relayed, have led me to this dissertation topic on the co-creation of transformative Indigenization and internationalization in higher education. In the first section, I position myself as a researcher and practitioner in post-secondary education, exploring my roots as a settler and asserting my deeply held commitment to actively and respectfully honour and advance Treaty relations. I also underscore the relevance of Treaty relations in the context of contemporary realities of the lived work of internationalization and Indigenization in post-secondary student affairs. In the second section of this chapter, I reflect on the necessity of self-awareness and moving beyond dominant, established ways of thinking and doing, by asking and being prepared to hear responses to difficult, critical questions regarding Indigenization and internationalization. In the third section, I reflect on the intersecting, transformative aspects of Indigenization and internationalization, as they relate to the day-to-day, lived practices of faculty, staff and students. I propose that such transformative approaches to Indigenization and internationalization are not abstractions and can and should be looked at as having complementary aspects in their practical, critically-informed deliberations and enactments. I argue that, from a transformative perspective, Indigenization and internationalization may have potentially more in common, at a fundamental level, than we might, at first glance, perceive, especially in context to the largely symbolic or superficial policy and strategy enactments that we may mostly be accustomed to experiencing on our campuses. In the concluding section of this chapter, I outline the overall chapter structure and content of my dissertation and reflect on the centrality of lived experience in taking an interpretive policy analysis perspective, grounded in phenomenology, on transformative Indigenization and

internationalization. This centrality of lived experience thus demands that we acknowledge our positionality as researchers, returning to the importance of positioning oneself as a researcher. It is therefore to my self-positioning, as a researcher and practitioner in post-secondary education, and as settler-ally, committed to a pragmatic-ethical understanding of the intersections and tensions between transformative Indigenization and internationalization in higher education, that I now turn.

Settler crossings

I come from a mixed heritage, from a lineage of teachers, preachers and businessmen. My father is of a Lebanese-Syrian ancestry. He is a first generation Canadian and the only one of his generation to graduate from university. He is a lawyer, a pioneer in mediation and is well-respected for his social justice work in the areas of Aboriginal justice, inter-faith dialogue and advocacy for people with disabilities. My paternal grandfather was from Lebanon, a successful businessman who started a family business at which I worked for many years. My father's mother, my *Sitto*, was born in Montreal, the eldest of twelve siblings. She was poor, had little formal education and worked from a young age. Her father was a self-taught, Orthodox priest who had arrived in Canada with my great-grandmother as refugees from Syria in the early 1900s.

An irony is that my father, the Lebanese-Syrian grandson of an Orthodox priest, met my mother, the Scottish-Irish middle daughter of a United Church minister, at a Jewish Community Centre in Ottawa. As an indication of how foreign their matching was at the time, when my mother introduced my father to her family, my mother's eldest sister broke the silence by stating, "So Ernie, I hear that you are a lesbian"! Unfortunately, their marriage only lasted six years and one of my earliest memories is of my father leaving our home. I grew up, like many children in the 1980s, in a single parent household. Times were not easy for single parent mothers, not that

they are easier now. My mother is a retired music and drama teacher who, with two young children, completed her undergraduate degree by taking televised, distance education courses.

When I lived in Montreal during my twenties, I felt a connection to my father's roots. However, now that I live in Saskatoon, where my mother's parents met as university students, I have come to learn a new aspect of my heritage. Growing up, I would hear stories about Saskatchewan; a land and lifestyle that seemed harsh and distant. As I have come to learn the history of the West, I am shocked by the relatively recent cessation of apartheid-like control over First Nations and Métis people. My cousin once visited me from Regina, bringing photographs of my maternal great-grandparent's homestead. She showed a land certificate, dated 1913, and explained that the wood for the house had been transported from Ontario. At that moment, I realized my great-grandparents lived in a sod house during the first years of their homesteading, in one of the greatest waves of settlement in Canadian history, an intentional act to displace and disenfranchise the First Nations and Métis people of Western Canada (Waiser, 2005).

In this place I call home, my family and have benefited from the Treaty Six relationship established over 140 years ago. This Treaty was signed under the supposed auspices of their negotiators, that, as settlers, "we have not come here to deceive you, we have not come here to rob you, we have not come here to take away anything that belongs to you" (Commissioner Rev. McKay, quoted by Morris, 2000, p. 212). I have worked in institutions that struggle with and are seeking to overcome such colonial foundations, traceable to troubled and broken Treaty relationships. In my work in international education, I have found myself enmeshed in "activities more related to the concept of globalization (higher education as a tradeable commodity)" than "under the flag of internationalization" (Brandenburg & De Wit, 2011, p. 16). In the context of increased international student enrolment, I am implicated in this global,

commodification of education (Wildavsky, 2010) and in the continuing settlement of this land (Mackey, 2016). This intersection of commodification and settlement are evidenced by government reporting. For example, a Global Affairs Canada report by Kunin & Associates (2016) reports that "Canada's international education services ($11.4 billion) amount to 11% of Canada's total service exports to the world" through "international student spending" on "tuition, accommodation and discretionary spending", supporting 152,700 jobs (p. iii). Additionally, in a report for the Ministry of Innovation, Science and Economic Development, Lu & Hou (2015) explain that, "[d]epending on the cohort of arrival, between 20% and 27% of international students became permanent residents in the 10 years after their first study permit was issued", a statistic they argue will only rise as the Canadian government has set a target of 450,000 international students to Canadian post-secondary institutions by 2022 (p. 6). As a past institutional leader in overseeing study abroad programs, I sought to better understand and address the socio-economic gaps in student participation that reflect the privileged, global enterprise of the field (Killick, 2015). In tandem, explicit institutional efforts to develop intercultural competencies in students, staff and faculty have required that I seek to reveal underlying tensions and prejudices that shape institutional and dominant socio-cultural conceptions of what constitutes inclusion and intercultural learning and development (Ahmed, 2012; Marginson & Sawir, 2011).

I think about these issues regularly, as I try to be a stronger settler-ally in how I live my life and approach my work. I recognize that I have had many opportunities in my life that have led to this point where I am working in the job that I have, at workplaces that have helped pay for my studies and have supported me in taking extended, unpaid education leaves to complete graduate studies. I do not take these things for granted. I have tried, throughout this research

process, to find practical ways to apply what I am learning in order to improve the campus experiences of students, staff and faculty at my institution and beyond. This is a commitment that reaches back in my studies.

My first major research project in my undergraduate degree was based upon a year I spent volunteering at the Kahnawake reserve outside of Montreal. I had convinced my psychology professor to allow me to submit a final research paper in place of a final, multiple choice exam, an assessment method at which I am particular poor. At the outset of my volunteering, I had trouble connecting with the student that I was working with. At the end, however, we developed a strong bond. I vividly recall standing by the swing set of the Kateri school grounds, with my student's teacher close at hand, at the place where my student wanted to say goodbye to me, as she was leaving with her family to another city. As a parting gift, I offered her a copy of the *The Giving Tree* by Shel Silverstein (1964/1997). It is one of my favourite children's books and, by her demand, for almost two months we focused entirely on this story, to the point where she could recite and write it word-for-word. In our parting, after I gave her my copy of the book, she handed me the folder of all the work we had done together.

While I was tutoring her, I was also engaged in research at the Kahnawake Language and Cultural Centre, investigating the history of the reserve and the nature and role of First Nations education policy. It was two years after a crisis involving Mohawks in Kanesatake, the police and the army over a land dispute in Oka, Quebec. The 78-day stand-off was accompanied by a blockade of the Mercier Bridge by Mohawks in Kahnawake. This bridge connects suburban commuters to the island of Montreal and, as a result, many residents were infuriated and deep-seated racial tension surfaced. I vividly recall the media images of Châteauguay residents burning effigies of Mohawks. I think of the poetry of Louise Bernice Halfe (1998), a Cree writer

from Saddle Lake Cree Nation in Alberta: "*The land weeps / I am choking, choking / The buffalo are a mountain of bones / My son is shot for killing their cow*" (p. 19).   When I think of my experiences at the school I volunteered at in Kahnawake and of my Mohawk friends, I struggle with how such a violent, racist gesture was, and is still, possible; actions that have tragic, senseless historical antecedents and far-reaching, long-term impacts on Aboriginal-Settler relations (Simpson, 2014).

When I recall these memories, it is as if the incidents are happening now, somewhere just beneath the surface of my consciousness. Recently, one of my close friends from Kahnawake sent me a copy of my research proposal from 1993, which included a poem I had written at that time and that I feel as if I could have written today.

breakfast in Kahnawake

pale shores of yoke sizzle and spit
crushed egg shells on the counter

in the iron palm grip above the element
red spiral flame scorches egg whites open

the yoke bursts into the longhouse kitchen
splattering itself on women and children

breakfast again is broken

eating of the chicken's womb
I see my yoke reflection

This poem reminds me of the commitment I made 25 years ago to seek to understand the history and centrality of Aboriginal peoples and of Aboriginal-Settler relations in the way in which I live upon the land and within the communities that I was born into and raised upon. This commitment and search were then, and continue to be now, fraught with questions. In my proposal for my undergraduate psychology research paper, I wrote: "Is there just one topic? Just

one selection, or one description? Or are there just words, words and more words? How many papers have been written on this subject already? How many people have tried to understand and impart the knowledge they have acquired? And how many lives have been affected in the meantime?" As I read these questions and consider the meaning of my poem, I sense the depth of my underlying struggle at that time to remain optimistic in the face of a staggeringly brutal history and troubling contemporary reality surrounding Aboriginal-settler relations.

Now, years later, living in Saskatoon, a prairie city with multiple bridges over a glacier-fed river, I find myself in another place that holds deep historically-rooted divisions, between east and west, richer and poorer, non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal, and, at one time, a strictly-ordered temperance colony, and a booming, chaotic railway town (Waiser, 2005). When I first arrived in Saskatoon, I recall being with my two-year-old son at a children's park across the river from the university where I worked. A parent and I struck up a conversation and, when she discovered I was new to the city, she proceeded to provide advice. Her ensuing, bitter statements about Aboriginal people left me wondering what I had done to invite such an onslaught of racial animosity. Even though this occurred so long ago, I still recall standing with this parent, our discussion becoming increasingly tense, my voice constricted by emotion, as our children played in the sand. I remember sharing thoughts on historical and contemporary injustices, trying to find some aspect of common ground, some thread that could hold together our nascent, neighborly connection and allow a space of respect, of understanding, and of truth, as foundations of reconciliation.

Imaginary crossings

I have come to feel that, unlike the rhetoric often employed, it is naïve to state that the bridges of Saskatoon, in themselves, bring our citizens and communities together, including First

Nations, Aboriginal and Métis peoples, settlers and new immigrants, such as international

students. The bridges represent location, land, history and futurity, but also act as invisible

borders, more easily crossed by some than others. Natalie Scenter-Zapico's (2013) poem,

Crossing, captures the significance of the bridge as this metaphorical dividing line or relational

threshold. The final lines of her poem reveal the intersections of racial stereotyping, immigration

control and socio-economic disparities that mark the fenced bridge which acts as the El Paso,

Texas and Juárez, Mexico border crossing:

> I'm too white to tell and you look clean enough, but one of us is illegal.
> No one says a word – we all breathe pollution and blood clots. To think
>
> we didn't need a visa. To think we could have saved the fifty dollars.
> *Still easy,* we laugh and agree to cross again next weekend. We wonder
>
> why we call each other Cielo, why we call each other Angel. We wonder
> how two cities are split, how they grow. But mi amor, watch how they collide.
> (Scenters-Zapico, 2013, p. 59)

Students, staff and faculty in my institution in Saskatoon cross metaphorical intercultural

bridges and literal international borders and, for both those that do and do not cross, their worlds

go on, each in their own ways. Between Mexico and the US, between Isreal and Palestine,

between Saskatchewan towns and First Nations reserves, between Kahnawake and Châteauguay,

between east and west side Saskatoon, between international and domestic students, Aboriginal

and non-Aboriginal communities, in the words of Scenter-Zapico (2013), we continue to be

"split", to "grow" (together/apart) and to "collide" economically, socially, politically and

culturally. The work of Indigenization and internationalization requires us to confront such

complex issues, including deep-seated and structural racism, the long-term effects of

colonialism, or the social injustices that can be exploited through globalization. As a practitioner

in the field of post-secondary education, I have come to understand that I must continually

question my own knowledge and understanding, including how inaction over what might appear

to be mundane, socio-economic realities can make me morally responsible for persistent social

injustice (Young, 2013: Fraser, 2009). In the words of Andreotti (2015):

> The modern/colonial imaginary is extremely powerful and works as an invisible frame
> that structures specific configurations of cognition, affect, embodiment, imagination, and
> aspiration. For those of us over-socialized within it, the imaginary is normal, natural and
> unlimited in its capacity to apprehend reality. It defines what is intelligible, the range of
> questions that can be formulated, and the appropriateness of responses: what is possible
> to think and to identify with. (Andreotti, 2015, p. 225).

I heard Dr. Vanessa Andreotti present on this theme of the modern/colonial imaginary at

the Center for Global Citizenship and Education Research 2013 bi-annual conference (Andreotti,

2013b). She spoke of her work in global citizenship education, addressing the complexity of

enacting critical, post-colonial theory at the level of policy and pedagogical practice in the

context of embedded, unquestioned discourses in higher education (2011). She employed the

concept of "hospicing", borrowed from Wheatley & Frieze (2011) to describe the resistance,

grief and anger she had come to see her students go through as they transitioned from an

idealistic view of modern, Western society to one that is more critically aware and balanced.

Andreotti, Stein, Ahenakew and Hunt (2015), describe this transition as a discursive turn that

requires educators and students to continually question assumptions and be prepared, by doing

so, to lose control of the agenda, to enter into antagonistic and agonistic conflicts with

established systems and practices.

In my research, writing and day-to-day work on my campus, I try to continually

acknowledge and challenge my socialization within this "modern/colonial imaginary"

(Andreotti, 2015, p. 255). It does not escape me that this effort is paradoxical. I recognize this

paradox, not as failure or excuse, but as a truthful starting point. My intent, in this dissertation,

and in my work, is not to represent, explain, nor propound definitive analyses. I do not presume

to be unbiased, nor fully cognizant of the limited ways in which I have written this document, formulated my research questions and structured my analysis. I have taken an interpretive policy analysis approach to explore what it is that we think we are doing when we deliberate and enact Indigenization and internationalization. I do this so that I, and by extension, my peers engaged in Indigenization and internationalization, might not foreclose our imaginations and cease questioning the "appropriateness of" our "responses", of "what is possible" for me "to think and to identify with" (Andreotti, 2015, p. 225). As I consider these concepts, it is as if I stand on the Iron Footbridge in Frankfurt, facing the "abyssal thinking" that Santos (2007) speaks of, uncertain of what it might mean to take (ano)the(r) / (fur)the(r) discursive turn. I look down at a river of ideas, concepts and arguments, and am reminded of my artificial comfort of being on the perceived 'solid ground' of a formal knowledge base. I can cross the bridge to (an)other side of academic knowledge yet can also shift my position and look upriver.

In her article, Andreotti (2015) describes the significance of going up river as a quest to seek the sources of injustices, inequities, disparities and struggles between individuals, classes and entire regions of the world. To make this point, she employs a parable of the village by a river in which there is an ongoing stream of drowning children they keep trying to save. After some time, the villagers start to wonder why this tragic situation continues to exist. Finally, one villager suggests they should look upstream to find the cause. Perhaps then, the villager hypothesizes, the source of the danger could be found and dealt with. I have retold this parable in relation to student affairs, whereby it is student affairs practitioners who deliberate and act upon ways to save students who keep appearing at their doorsteps lost and confused, drowning in the academic and non-academic expectations of their institutions. The point of this parable, for Andreotti (2015), is that "[g]oing up the river work, while rescuing children [students] in the

river, involves asking essential, difficult and often disturbing begged questions that may implicate rescuers in the reproduction of harm" (p. 227). To go up river is to seek a wellspring, to look for origins. Going up river requires remaining open to other ways of seeing and understanding the day-to-day work of faculty and staff, including myself, who are responsible for, or seek to be involved in, creating an inclusive and socially just intercultural, diverse community of academic life. In the words of Willie Ermine (2007), such a community might embody a "cooperative spirit between Indigenous peoples and Western institutions" that could "create new currents of thought that flow in different directions and overrun old ways of thinking" (p. 203).

Transformative crossings

What I see in the day-to-day of the work of Indigenous and non-Indigenous advisors, professors, senior administrators and administrative staff, including my own, is an intermingling of complicated, competing, detailed and at times, seemingly irreconcilable issues related to both Indigenization and internationalization. These issues range from taking up Truth and Reconciliation Calls to Action, to engagement in institutional, financial and curriculum planning to creating spaces for religious and cultural pluralism, to teaching classes of diverse students from around the world, to addressing student immigration, financial, personal and mental health needs, among other competing priorities and issues. As a professional who has been engaged in teaching, research, leadership and student affairs, involving, directly or indirectly, to a greater or lesser degree, Aboriginal and international faculty, staff and students, I have found that I have had to develop and draw upon cross-cultural and intercultural knowledge and skills in my day-to-day work. I could say that I have developed and applied my knowledge of intercultural theory and practice whenever I have advised international students, have coached and mentored my

staff to engage meaningfully in the Indigenization of our work, have involved Indigenous and international students in the work of our office and have collaborated with colleagues on projects that engage intersections and tensions between Indigenization and internationalization.

Yet, I have not reflected on a daily basis upon this theory and practice. When I received a call informing me that three of our exchange students had been in a serious traffic accident and later that day speak in French and broken German with the students' families over the phone, it was as if I was standing with the families in their living rooms, with the students' parents and siblings holding back emotions, gasping at the details of the accident as they pressed me for more information. After being called at midnight to remove an international student from a homestay because of a grave cross-cultural misunderstanding, I find myself an hour later, driving the student to a hotel, gently reassuring him as he weeps inconsolably. In situations like these, there wasn't a policy manual that I referred to, a set of prescribed steps to follow. Rather, as I, and my colleagues came together to address such situations, we were each, in our own ways, asked to deliberate and enact what would be the best steps to take, based on, and sometimes in tension with, written and unwritten policies.

This dissertation is drawn from these types of experiences and reflections, both my own and, more importantly, my participants'. Throughout my doctoral studies, I have thought and written about the different aspects of the work that I and my colleagues are engaged in, from advising international and Aboriginal students and adapting student services and support programs to meet their needs, to teaching or holding events related to reconciliation, decolonization or global citizenship and global social justice, to creating pathways for intercultural learning and for addressing issues of risk, safety and wellbeing in international and reconciliation education. This work may be broadly conceived of as deliberating and enacting

intersections of what, in our field, is being called Indigenization and internationalization, and encompassing such policy and strategy areas as inclusion, reconciliation, diversity, equity, human rights, and social justice. While these are separate, sometimes complementary, competing and even conflicting areas of policy and strategy, in practice, I have experienced them as if they were a woven net, cast into the rivers of my institution, into the words, actions, hopes, concerns, interests, frustrations and relationships of those with whom I work. In some way, this thesis is like an (un)raveling of the threads of this net, extracting from it experiences that have stayed with my participants and, in listening to their reflections, have resurfaced in my own recollections of my work.

(Un)raveling these tensions and intersections between Indigenization and internationalization policy and strategy, as they are lived, in practice, is not to detract from their fundamental differentiation, nor is it to draw them into a rebranded form of superficial multiculturalism. As Pidgeon (2016) wrote, while Indigenization and internationalization are often "seen as opposing and competing for institutional resources […] assumptions cannot be made that creates a binary of Indigenous and international" (p. 87). In our institutional contexts, where "Aboriginal peoples can also be from an international context and attend Canadian post-secondary institutions", Pidgeon (2016) argued that, in contrast to a competitive approach to policy framing, our focus should be to collectively seek "equitable approaches to decolonization and intercultural development, as part of Indigenization" with an emphasis on teaching and learning, and "high quality programs and services" that "truly value the contributions of the past, present and future of Indigenous peoples" (p. 87). Pidgeon's (2016) position is echoed, from an international education perspective, by Knutson (2018), who wrote:

> While efforts to internationalize the academic gain momentum, ironically, the Canadian
> international education discourse is largely silent when it comes to analysis of

marginalized peoples and knowledges. […] Those involved in international education in Canada have the opportunity now – through respectful learning from the decolonizing, emancipatory, and activist perspectives of indigenization – to develop foundations for a critical approach to internationalization, unique to the Canadian context but perhaps with broader relevance. (Knutson, 2018, pp. 28-29).

At the core of what Knutson (2018) and Pidgeon (2016) argue is that both Indigenization and internationalization are forces of transformation in the higher education context and, if looked at and engaged with critically, can and do share common ground. At the same, they also argue that what we often see, in practice, is that the rhetoric of the transformational aspects of Indigenization and internationalization do not materialize. Often, our efforts at Indigenization remain at a surface "inclusion" level, focusing, for example, on increasing demographic representation of Indigenous students, staff and faculty (Gaudry & Lorenz, 2018). Similarly, we may find that our current collective, institutional efforts at internationalization largely remain at a "soft critique" level, as a means to advance the perceived social goods of internationalization without questioning underlying neo-liberal, economic and geo-political imperatives (Stein, 2017, pp. 12-14). For Knutson (2018), and for myself, as a post-secondary practitioner, this pervasive "lack of transformative purpose" in international education "remains a grave concern" and presents us with both a "challenge" and opportunity (pp. 34-35). In Knutson's (2018) words, this "challenge" is "for the field" of international education "to examine its philosophical grounding: to acknowledge and transform" (p. 35).

For Stein (2017), such transformation in higher education, resulting from what she terms a "liminal critique" of internationalization, will avoid leading to "new solutions posed with the same conceptual frames" and instead open to "new ways of framing problems, asking questions, and envisioning and enacting different horizons of possibility" (p. 3). This dissertation is, in some measure, a contribution to this "liminal critique", insofar as it seeks to explore how

students, staff and faculty co-create, through their deliberations and enactments, "different

horizons of possibility" of what Indigenization and internationalization can lead us to, as policy

actors, and as institutions (Stein, 2017, p. 3). As the title of my dissertation alludes to, such

horizons of possibility, as shared practice, draw from our senses of belonging and open towards

new relations of belonging within and beyond our institutions. Such relations are ultimately

"based on balancing power relations between Indigenous peoples and Canadians, transforming

the academy into something dynamic and new" (Gaudry & Lorenz, 2018, p. 219). This notion of

transformation is not an abstraction, but is rather a sustained practice of "untangling" of the

"ever-evolving knots" associated with established power-imbalanced relations that shape our

institutional contexts (Stein, 2017, p. 18). This is a practice that requires, as Stein (2017) wrote,

referring to the decolonizing intersections between Indigenization and internationalization, an

"enormous, non-linear and contradictory process" of "actively dismantling sedimented social,

political, and economic architectures, enacting significant redress and reparations at symbolic

and material levels" (Stein, 2017, p. 18).

In this perspective of transformative Indigenization and internationalization, our

institutions are not impassive structures, but are the culmination of the horizons of belonging that

we bring to them, and the "horizons of possibility" that we seek for them (Stein, 2017, p. 3). In

this perspective, these possibilities are therefore not ideological and perfectionist, but actual and

evolving. These possibilities are lived, in practice, in the day-to-day of our work, where, as a

community of faculty, staff and students who are seeking to co-create transformative

Indigenization and internationalization on our campuses, we may often find that we must

"interrupt" policies and strategies that perpetuate "cycles of harm" and "reorient our desires

toward different horizons" (Stein, 2017, p. 23). As I quoted Stein (2017) at the outset of this

chapter,

> In order to imagine higher education differently, we may need to first historicize and denaturalize existing educational patterns, face the complexities, complicities and contradictions that make up our current system. This would likely include acknowledging our own investments in this system, and honestly assessing the gifts, harms and limits of existing regimes of knowledge, including our own critiques. As long as we fail to do so, we may lose the opportunity to nurture other kinds of relations, experiment with other ways of knowing, and imagine other worlds than the one we have inherited. (Stein, 2017, p. 23)

While I only came into contact with this quote from Stein (2017) near the end of my

dissertation writing process, I feel that it exemplifies what it is that I have sought to explore

through my research. In the pages that follow, I have not attempted to advance a theoretical

explanation of what should be done in relation to Indigenization and internationalization in

higher education. Rather, I have attempted a sustained reflection on the lived experiences of

those who, through their day-to-day deliberations and enactments, are committed to the co-

creation of transformative Indigenization and internationalization on the campuses. I have not

sought to judge the impact, validity or worth of the deliberations and enactments that the

participants in this study have shared with me. Rather, I have sought to understand better what

they have experienced, in their own crossings into transformative spaces of deliberating and

enacting Indigenization and internationalization policies and strategies on their campuses.

En(compass)ings

By positioning myself, as I have in this chapter, and by positioning this research within

the realm of transformative Indigenization and internationalization, I open to the "complexities,

complicities and contradictions that make up our current system" (Stein, 2017, p. 23). At the

same time, I also open to the ways in which we, as practitioners who are committed to

transformative Indigenization and internationalization, seek to "nurture other kinds of relations,

experiment with other ways of knowing, and imagine other worlds than the one we have inherited" (Stein, 2017, p. 23). In this sense, there is an encompassing aspect to this research, insofar as it is not about any particular role or policy or strategy, but is rather about the ways in which multiple policy actors deliberate and enact transformative Indigenization and internationalization policies and strategies, as they intersect, both vertically and horizontally, within our institutions. At the same time, as expressed thus far, there is a directionality, or a philosophical compass of sorts, that has led this research exploration, as a form of "up the river work" (Andreotti, 2015, p. 227). This compass is grounded by an interpretive policy analysis lens, rooted in lived experience, drawn from hermeneutic phenomenology, both methodologically and philosophically, and oriented towards critical, pragmatic and ethically-driven approaches to Indigenization and internationalization.

The next chapter opens to the guiding research question of this dissertation and further delves into the hermeneutic phenomenological and philosophical issues that may be at play in relation to transformative Indigenization and internationalization. In a sense, the chapter attempts to "denaturalize" what we might consider to be a mundane interaction with an international student, in order that we might open to the "liminal critiques" of our practice (Stein, 2017, p. 23). The chapter also introduces the concept of *transformative intercultural practice* as a depiction of the encompassing scope of work of transformative Indigenization and internationalization. Chapter 3 provides an overview of the historical roots and contemporary manifestations of Indigenization and internationalization, contrasting symbolic and transformative approaches to Indigenization and internationalization. The chapter then explores how an interpretive policy analysis approach can help in locating the shared accountability, sensemaking and action-sensitivity of transformative Indigenization and internationalization

policy and strategy deliberations and enactments. Chapter 4 outlines the methodological

foundations and approach of this dissertation, including positioning the post-intentional

phenomenological orientation and underlying principles of the research. The chapter also

provides a description of the research methods, interview protocols, participant sampling, and a

description of the participants who were involved in the study. Chapters 5, 6 and 7 each explore

different aspects of analysis drawn from the interviews and related back to relevant literature in

the field. Chapter 5 explores the lived experience of deliberating transformative Indigenization

and internationalization, while Chapter 6 explores the lived experience of their enactment and

Chapter 7 further delves in their co-creation, as a matter of transformative intercultural practice.

Each chapter builds upon the other and opens to broader thematic insights that are further

explored in Chapter 8 where I offer policy and strategy related recommendations and suggest

areas of future research.

Researching and writing this thesis and coming to a cohesive dissertation, over a period

of almost 3 years, has been humbling, inspiring and daunting. Even as I complete this final draft,

I can feel the edges of analysis blurring and new threads emerging. In this sense, this dissertation

is encompassing of the experience and reflections of the participants in this study and my

associated writing and analysis, based in the academic literature in the field. However, it is not

encompassing of all experiences with, or perspectives of transformative Indigenization and

internationalization. This dissertation is, in a sense, a crossing into a topic of critical importance

and practical relevance to our contemporary post-secondary context. It is a journey up the river

into what might be considered the immanent present and possible futures of transformative

Indigenization and internationalization in higher education.

It has been an honour to be entrusted by my participants with their stories and reflections of their own "up the river work" (Andreotti, 2015, p. 227). It has been humbling to be writing alongside their words. As I have read and re-read the lived experience descriptions that the participants shared with me, I have been reminded, continuously, of the complexity of our work, of its agonies and elations. I have struggled at times to write of the racism, sadness, frustration and loneliness that my participants have experienced and shared with me and that I can recognize, in some manner, in my own work. I have sensed the depth of commitment and care that my participants have for the well-being of students, faculty and staff at their institution, and of the communities that they and their institution interact with. In writing this thesis, I have often felt as if I was standing on that bridge in Frankfurt, wondering if I would ever cross, feeling both a deep sadness and a sense of joy. In the following pages, I thus attempt, and invite you as a reader, to cross a bridge of transformative Indigenization and internationalization, each in your own way, and then to walk with me along a meandering path upriver. I don't pretend to offer a map or prescription for co-creating Indigenization and internationalization policies and strategies. Rather, along this path that I have forged with my participants, I have intended to describe, explore and allow for the revealing of the lived meanings of our work, of the *how* of what we do, in the spaces of connection, conflict, exclusion, potential, longing and hope that we might find ourselves in and with students, faculty and staff, on any given day.

Chapter 2: Entering

Identity is the landing point – or the point of inscription, one might say –
whence a path can begin to be traced out. [...] A point and a labyrinth, such
is the secret of an identity.
- *Jean-Luc Nancy, 2015, p. 22*

Labyrinth

Each Friday we sit on the same bench.
"I feel like a silver ball on a wooden toy labyrinth", she says,
searching for cracks in the grey limestone walls.
"They are controlling the board.
I am so afraid I will fall into one of the little holes and lose everything."
She buries her face in her hands.
My cell phone rings again, my son asking when I would be home.
"I am so sorry. I am wasting your time."
She gathers herself, breathes the fragrance of mid-summer.
"It's OK", I reply, "I am here to help."
Wanting to still the silver ball, wishing I could do so much more.

I wrote this free-verse poem years ago, recalling a difficult period during which I helped an international student work through a charge of academic misconduct. I have re-written this piece many times. However, the analogy of the labyrinth remains its focus.   As I sat with the student on that bench, I knew I could not reverse the hearing process and could not fix the supervisory committee conflict she was going through. I could, however, help her navigate the process and advocate for herself, and could continue to attend to issues of fairness and well-being. I could help her prepare and persevere. I could help her remain steady and self-assured as she stumbled, confused and anxious, through the labyrinths of higher education.

The labyrinth is an ancient symbol, a literary trope, game design and spiritual practice that has evolved over millennia (Eason, 2004).   As a site of meditation, the labyrinth is intended to be entered and exited through a methodical tracing of a single path from beginning to end (Artress, 2006). As a site of mystery or as a trap, the labyrinth may resemble more of a maze,

insofar as a maze "offers not one path but multiple choices, of which each may be freely made but most lead to dead ends" and thereby "does not open up to the world, as the labyrinth does" (Ingold, 2013, p. 9).   In this sense, the designs of the labyrinth, including mazes, can "be simple or complicated" containing "a single path of a multitude of branching passages" which "involve reaching the centre, crossing its expanse or reaching a designated exit" (Kociatkewicz & Kostera, 2015, p. 58).   In each manifestation, the labyrinth is experienced uniquely by the individual who enters it, or in the case of the student I sat with on that bench, feels manipulated by it. Following this analogy, labyrinths of higher learning may be as much defined by their complex physical infrastructure as by "all that is absurd, unnecessary and undesired in contemporary organizations" (Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2015, p. 66).

In their ethnographic narrative account of the labyrinth as a metaphor and Jungian archetype of "transitional space", Kociatkiewicz and Kostera (2015, p. 58) wrote:

> [The] negative view of the labyrinth in much of the academic writing is understandable, and it represents a strand of the mythical understanding of the concept: wandering dark and murky corridors can be dangerous as well as confusing. And the labyrinth center may well house a terrifying monster, the confrontation with whom requires skills quite different than those needed for traversing the winding passageways. (Kociatkiewicz and Kostera, 2015, p. 66)

This "terrifying monster" that Kociatkiewicz and Kostera (2015, p. 66) spoke of is the myth of the Minotaur. Ovid's (1958) retelling of this myth is tragic, ending with the violation and abandonment of Ariadne by her lover, Theseus, whom she helped to slay the Minotaur, the unnatural offspring of her mother. Interpretations of this myth have varied over time: through a classical, stoic lens that viewed the Minotaur as the symbol of earthly desires, Ariadne's thread, which draws Theseus out of the labyrinth, as our connection to divinity and the labyrinth as emblematic of our life journey (Konstan & Russell, 2005); through a Spanish Baroque lens, which portrayed Theseus as the son of God, the labyrinth as "the path of life when it is ordered

by Satan", Ariadne as seduced by sin and the Minotaur as the servant of the Devil (Hughes,

1984, p. 32); or through a contemporary analysis of the Ancient Greek myth as being a re-

interpretation of an ancient goddess worship ceremony (Eason, 2004). The meaning of the

Minotaur is what we make of it.

In an analogical sense, when it comes to teaching, helping and leading on a multicultural

campus, the "terrifying monster" (Kociatkiewicz and Kostera, 2015, p. 66) at the heart of the

labyrinth may be associated with a number of possible experiences: confronting exclusionary

notions of academic tradition and disciplinary divisions; dealing with personal suffering and

injustice in the face of resistance, racism and hostility to change; or seeking reconciliation amidst

fears of a loss of cultural and personal identity. The following reflection by an instructor of a

race relations course provides a good example of the Minotaur in the higher education maze:

> In addition to isolated cases, consistent hostilities can develop between and among a few
> students. […] When this happens, I personally meet with the students in question. I first
> sympathize. I let them know that I recognize that it is not easy talking about sensitive
> race issues with other classmates. At the same time, however, I tell them that we do not
> need to have World War III to talk frankly about race and explain the value of learning to
> civilly talk to one another about dissenting issues. I then remind them about the class
> goals and code of conduct and warn them that I will drop them from the course if their
> disruptive behavior continues. (Kim, 2008, pp. 78-79)

In the literature on anti-racist education (Guerrero, 2008; Keating, 2007; Marginson & Kawir,

2011), reflections such as Kim's (2008) are not uncommon. Kim's (2008) sharing of her

pedagogical practice reveals a contradiction: the punitive consequences of hostile behavior in a

course meant to teach civility. Kim describes being sympathetic, yet alludes to the potential for,

and effects of, escalation. What if the student who breaks the code of conduct does not

understand its cultural basis, is deeply racist or mentally ill? What is her lived relationship with

the student when she enters into this discussion? Is Kim like Ariadne, holding the thread to help

her students find their way out of the labyrinth of her race relations course or is she, or her faculty colleagues, like King Minos, sending her students into the maze to fend for themselves?

Transformative intercultural practice

In touching upon the potential significance of my own and Kim's (2008) reflections, I open to the central question of this dissertation: *What is it like to engage in transformative intercultural practice in higher education and how can a deeper understanding of this practice inform Indigenization and internationalization policy-making in the post-secondary sector?* Transformative intercultural practice is a term that I have developed to reflect the scope of work that I have come to experience, read about and observe as being involved in both Indigenization and internationalization in higher education, including such work as de-colonization, human rights and equity training and advocacy, anti-racist education, reconciliation and student-centered and culturally-sensitive student supports. Transformative intercultural practice comprises, for the purposes of this study: *teaching, helping or leading individuals or groups of students, staff or faculty in a manner that assumes shared responsibility for creating the conditions for meaningful inclusion, equity, reconciliation and social justice on campus and beyond.*

This composition of transformative intercultural practice is intentionally a broad scope of practice, at least at the top of the funnel of what it portends to encompass. In this dissertation, transformative intercultural practice does not refer to a specific role or position, nor to specific theoretical approaches to policy deliberation and enactment, including those applied in pedagogical, strategic planning or student services spaces. It does however, refer to how we deliberate within and across Indigenization and internationalization. As Mihesuah (2004) wrote, Indigenization demands thoughtfully working with and attending to the issues raised by the "professionals who work closely with Native students and are truly concerned about their

welfare" (p. 199). For Mihesuah (2004), it is through "campus-wide efforts and commitments"

that extend across institutional boundaries, and into the Indigenous communities that the

institution serves, that will ultimately bring about positive institutional change (p. 199).

In this dissertation, transformative intercultural practice relates to the 'how' of such active

engagement in campus-wide efforts as they are experienced through Indigenization and

internationalization deliberation and enactment. In this approach to policy analysis, as Forester

(2000) pointed out,

> The process of deliberation and participation is better seen not only as argumentative or
> dialogical in terms of who knows what, not only as allocative, in terms of who gets what,
> but as transformative, in terms of who comes to create new relationships and act on new
> commitments in actual practice. (Forester, 2000, p. 144)

Fischer (2009) further described this transformative, relational "process" of participation in

policy making as resulting in "learning", whereby "even when" our efforts as policy actors

"might not solve the immediate problems at hand, engagement in the process typically facilitates

certain kinds of learning – strategic or otherwise" (p. 215). When, as deliberative practitioners,

we see ourselves as learners, we may open to the knowledge and experience of others in relation

to how each person is situated with deliberations and enactments of Indigenization and

internationalization on our campuses. From a transformative intercultural practice perspective,

"we might therefore imagine that the most significant aspect of" how we approach

Indigenization and internationalization policy and strategy deliberation and enactment "lies not

in the *outcomes* of learning, but in this *process* of learning" (Timmermans, 2010, p. 3). In that

sense, our "purpose" may be "much less about fostering growth in *what"* we, our students and

our colleagues know "than facilitating development of the *ways* in which [we] know", including

how we express that knowing with one another (Timmermans, 2010, p. 14). This comprehensive

focus on "process" (Foster, 2009, p. 215) and "growth" in the "ways in which we know"

(Timmermans, 2010, p. 14) extends beyond "perspective transformation" to matters related to "self", "epistemology", "ontology", "behavior" and "capacity" (Hoggan, 2016, p. 70). In this more comprehensive, meta-analytic understanding, "transformative learning refers to the processes that result in significant and irreversible changes in the way a person experiences, conceptualizes, and interacts with the world" (Hoggan, 2016, p. 71).

Taking this transformative learning approach to exploring Indigenization and internationalization policy and strategy deliberation and enactment may help in remaining open to alternative perspectives in the field, including such things as intercultural competence and related developmental theories (Marginson & Sawir, 2011). In higher education, culture is often incorporated into hidden curriculum or may be purely disciplinary in perspective, such that culture is itself presented as value neutral, or as a purely academic construct, whereby Indigenous cultures or different cultural perspectives, for example, are treated as knowledge to be acquired within an existing cultural construct (Battiste, 2013). In this manner, transformative intercultural practice can be quite expansive, if viewed as encompassing multicultural and cross-cultural elements as well. It is necessary to make this extension, given that the terms are sometimes used interchangeably and yet can also signify critical differences (Palfreyman & McBride, 2007). For example, when multicultural or cross-cultural learning are viewed descriptively or instrumentally, then the problem to be solved can become generally related to the assimilation of a particular worldview, even where multiculturalism is a national or institutional value (Day, 2000).

To speak of transformative intercultural practice, then, is to orient this dissertation towards explicit acknowledgement of the different cultural backgrounds, knowledges, skills and unique life experience that we, as faculty, staff and students, bring to our institutions (Mezirow,

2000). As transformative intercultural practitioners, we might say that we seek to engage

ourselves, colleagues and students in deliberations and enactments of Indigenization and

internationalization that can help us develop "perspectives that are more inclusive,

discriminating, and integrative of experience" (Cranton, 2006, p. 19).   Transformative

intercultural practice, in this sense, speaks to a process that involves our critical questioning,

developing upon our knowledge and experience as policy actors, rather than unreflectively

reproducing existing patterns of thinking and acting. In the words of Fischer (2009),

> Transforming a meaning perspective thus involves a process of becoming critically aware of how and why our assumptions have come to shape and constrain the way we perceive, narrate, and feel about our world, and thus changing the structures of habitual expectation to make possible a more inconclusive discriminating, and integrative story upon which action can be based. Often this involves critical reflection upon so-called "distorted" premises sustaining one's underlying structure of understandings and expectations. Given the embeddedness of meaning perspectives in the very core of self-definition, such reflection is quite challenging; it often encounters significant resistance, including deeply felt emotional resistance. (Fischer, 2009, p. 231)

Agency

A further assertion in this dissertation is that, as transformative intercultural practitioners,

the development of this critical self-awareness is an enactment of our agency in relation to *how*

we do we what do (Fischer, 2009). In our work, we might be lacking in any number of things:

we might not have the resources we need to do what we want to do; we might not have the

authority we would like to help encourage the change we want to see; and, among other

possibilities, we might lack a full enough understanding of our organization or of the issues that

we want to address. However, even with such limitations, we can still try to persevere and be

catalysts for transformative change in our organizations. As Keating (2007) described in relation

to teaching anti-racism in higher education, these challenges we may face in relation to our sense

of agency, may require us to overcome the "status-quo stories" that we may find our students, colleagues and ourselves telling one another and ourselves about the world around us:

> Status-quo stories foster dualistic worldviews, self-enclosed individualism, and other forms of binary-oppositional thinking. [...] Status-quo stories deny personal agency, complicity, and accountability. When we live our lives according to status-quo stories, we're convinced that the way things are is the way they have always been and the way they must be. This belief becomes self-fulfilling; We do not try to make change because we believe that change is impossible to make. (Keating, 2007, p. 123)

In this chapter and in the subsequent chapters that draw from my interviews with my research participants, I have aimed to engage with the sense(s) of agency in the ways in which we deliberate and enact Indigenization and internationalization. I have aimed to sustain a "practice of a post-intentional phenomenological philosophy" by sustaining an "open, flexible, and contemplative" approach in my "thinking, acting and decision-making" (Vagle, 2014, p. 119) and in how I have elicited and interpreted such *non* "status-quo stories" (Keating, 2007, p. 123) from my own and my research participants' lives. In higher education, reflection on such stories may enable us to "make sayable" what is lost in other methodological approaches to studying our work as policy actors, allowing "us to interrogate the 'taken-for-granted' in higher education, such as the role of imagination and subjectivity" (Scutt & Hobson, 2013, p. 24). Reflecting on our own experiences and attending to the experiences of colleagues asks us "to consider not only the consequential outcomes of planning, not only the general principles of planning practice, but the demands, the vulnerable and precarious virtues required of a politically attentive, participatory professional practice" (Forester, 1999, p. 35).

I began such a contextual process of reflection years ago when I first wrote the poem I shared at the outset of this chapter. Now, years later, as I re-read the poem, I consider what I have learned through my work and studies since writing it and realize its potential significance as it relates to this dissertation. Over time, in completing my doctoral studies, I have come to view

this poem as a personal, philosophical entrance point to my research topic. For, it is through

reflection on, and vocatively writing about, recollections such as that which is captured in this

poem that I and those who read this dissertation might, through their own reflections and related

insights, gain "deeper and original insight, and perhaps, an intuitive or inspirited grasp of the

ethics and ethos of life commitments and practices" as they relate to deliberating and enacting

Indigenization and internationalization in higher education (van Manen, 2014, pp. 355-356).

The next sections of this chapter therefore seek to more deeply explore this lived

experience with this particular international student facing a charge of academic misconduct. I

undertake this exploration as this experience may be viewed not in "isolation" but rather as inter-

related with the "contexts or horizons" of similar experiences I have had, and the ways in which I

interpret them (Ehrich, 2003. p.51). By taking this approach, I also aim to disclose how,

throughout the process of research and writing this dissertation, I have been continually refining

and redefining my understanding of transformative intercultural practice and my understanding

of the lived meanings of my research participants' deliberations and enactments of Indigenization

and internationalization policies and strategies in higher education. As an interpretive research

study, drawing from phenomenology, such an investigation begins with myself, as researcher, to

examine, question and expand upon my own understanding of the phenomenon under

investigation, beginning from my own day-to-day life experiences (Lopez & Willis, 2004), and

seeking, through this investigation, the potential "revelation of something hidden" (Alvesson &

Sköldberg, 2000, p. 57). With this "double hermeneutic" whereby I seek to "make sense of" the

reflections shared by the participants of my research study, who are also "making sense of"

Indigenization and internationalization from their own lived experience (Smith, Flowers &

Larkin, 2009, p. 35), I return to the poem that I wrote years ago, and have returned to many times

since, to reflect upon my own and my colleagues' work and related agency as transformative intercultural practitioners and policy actors in higher education.

Responsibility

Each Friday we sit on the same bench

Taken in and of itself, this first line could be referring to any relationship or set of relationships with any person or persons, on any bench or each Friday of any or every month, any year, or many years. It is not this line alone that signifies, but what comes before and after, in its relationality and potentiality. This line relates to meeting the same student each Friday at the same bench, wherein, with each meeting, the student and I had acted and reflected on the evolving interpersonal and bureaucratic context of the academic misconduct charge that was at the core of our connection with one another. Seeing each other each Friday, we had decided that, amidst all of the people we could meet with, it was important for us be together again. Why did we choose to keep meeting each week? What was the intended value and meaning of our meetings?

In education, repetition of action is not uncommon, like starting a class, opening an advising session, or beginning a weekly staff meeting. We believe we understand the value and meaning of these repeated actions. If we assume to know their signification, do we also assume to know the origination of their value? Does this value and meaning come from ourselves, our students, our staff or, perhaps, all of us? Does it originate from the institution, from our life story, from our cultural backgrounds? Is there a set of values that is timeless, superseding all origination? By posing questions such as these, our focus and intention move to explanation. We want to answer the question.   If, in answering these questions, I articulated a stance that emphasized individual perception and interpretation, I would fall into what Nancy (1997)

described as absolute relativism. Like Daedelus, in his construction of the labyrinth at Mynos, I would see myself and others as the architects of value and meaning. On the other hand, if I were to ascribe value and meaning that transcends our lived experience sitting together on the bench, I would fall into what Nancy (1997) described as relative absolutism. It would be as if, in our meeting on that bench, we were simply following a pre-destined path, reaching toward value and meaning that are always just beyond reach.

For Nancy (2000), this tension in how we view value and meaning is the crisis of our contemporary age, inherent to the finite, singular nature of our being in a world of singular plural beings that exist, before and after us. We experience a world with value and meaning that is already always being given. We wake each day into a world, working at our institutions, while known and unknown colleagues, who do similar jobs to ours, are also possibly working on projects or in meetings related to matters quite similar to those that fill our lives. In day-to-day campus life, we may work singularly on tasks and yet do so within the plurality of our collegial environment. For Nancy, in existential terms, we are one among many in our singular plural being and, in the communities in which we live and work, we are also plural singular beings. Our singularity is embodied in our finite, physical and temporal being and our plurality in our intersectionality of our ever-changing identity(ies) and our inter-relationality, not just with other human beings, but with all Being. In this way our "*[f]initude is the responsibility of sense*, and is so absolutely" (Nancy, 2003, p. 13). Our finite *being-with* is inherent to Being and correspondingly, our *being-with* is inherently lived as a "responsibility of thinking taken to the limit of all our meanings" (Nancy, 2003, p. 29).

By stating this, we redefine responsibility outside of normative meaning(s) that we might ascribe to the term. For Nancy (2000), *being-with* is equivalent to Being. In our very conception

and birth, we are called into *being-with*. Drawing from the work of Levinas (1969; 1981), Nancy (2000) asserted that even before there is another person before me, I am responsible. Responsibility, from this perspective, does not come to us with meaning, but rather opens us to the origination of value and meaning-making, or in Levinasian (1969) terms, to the origination of ethical relations. For Nancy (2000), *being-with* is without meaning and value, and yet requires of us, or makes us responsible, to make meaning and bring value. Such value and meaning cannot, according to Nancy, come from nothing. We make meaning and value through our interaction with the world around us, through listening, touching, tasting, seeing, including what we do, read and reflect upon. And yet, this is not enough to explain our responsibility. For beyond our perception of sense, is Sense itself, Sense that is beyond our making sense of sense, or in deriving value and meaning from the sense of the world (Nancy, 1997). It is Sense that, "for its part, is the movement of being-*toward* [l'être-à], or being as *coming* into presence or again as transitivity, as passage to presence – and therewith as passage *of* presence" (Nancy, 1997, p. 12).

When I met with the student each Friday on the same bench, I might say that the *being-with* of our being there together on the bench was the lived experience of our responsibility to the *sense* of our *being-with* in Being, or rather, to the *making sense of our being-with* in Being. I am there, on the bench, "in the passage of presence" with a student who is going through a major life crisis (Nancy, 1997, p.12). I *experience* the *responsibility* of our *being-with* each other on that bench. As the student begins to cry and shifts her position on the hard, wooden bench, as the sun sets, casting long shadows, the scent of flowers and the sounds of students passing by enter into consciousness. In that moment, I *open to the opening* of transformative intercultural practice, where "forces and energies" within Being draw us, in the "tragic sense", to takes risks in the face

of sadness, hope, fear, loneliness and redemption (Rocha, 2015, p. 12). For Levinas (1969), such

inherent potency of responsibility is experienced by what we do and do not say or enact, as

embodied discourse with others. He wrote,

> The fact that the face maintains a relation with me by discourse does not range him in the same; he remains absolute within the relation. The solipsistic dialectic of consciousness always suspicious of being in captivity in the same breaks off. For the ethical relationship which subtends discourse is not a species of consciousness whose ray emanates from the I; it puts the I in question. This putting in question emanates from the other. (Levinas, 1969, p. 195)

Following this assertion from Levinas (1969), each Friday when I sit with student on the

same bench, she puts "in question" my presence and my *being with* her in our *making sense of*

Sense. I am the other to her and she is the other to me and thus, I must admit her own

responsibility, in relation to her own set of relations, extending across time, distance, and

cultures. Morgan (2016) reflected on this "human social experience" of Levinas' notion of the

"face-to-face", which was "characterized by the claim of the other on the self, the way the other

person's needs or vulnerability targets the self and puts the self into question" (p. 11). Morgan

(2016) explained that at the same time that Levinas examined the "face-to-face", as a relation

between I and Thou, he extended the face-to-face to a "relational nexus" that was "accompanied

by a vast array of other modes of relation" (p. 11). In this sense, when I am sitting with the

student on the bench, it is not only her and I alone together. We are, rather, joined by "a

complex, infinitely arrayed network" of relations of students, faculty, staff, family, government

officials, employers, and others who "make up our social lives, and politics, in the narrow sense"

(Morgan, 2016, p. 11). When we are sitting on the bench together that Friday, our "face-to-face"

relation is entwined in the "structures, practices, policies, and institutions", extending

responsibility to the mutuality of our making of sense of the 'human social experience" we are in

together, within in each of our intersecting relational networks (Morgan, 2016, p. 11).

At such a "relational nexus" between myself and the student (Morgan, 2016, p. 11), we also could say that, in some manner, we face a lived, experiential difference between what we might describe as intercultural competence and intercultural learning (Marginson & Sawir, 2011). In the first case, we might emphasize the knowledge or skills that we should have or should exhibit that demonstrate our intercultural competence, however that may be determined. In the second case, we might emphasize the context(s) of interaction and learning that involve(s) ourselves with (an)other student(s), staff or faculty, from more than one cultural background. In both cases, there is a common characteristic: neither assert the intent or outcome of such competency or learning. Inherent in their respective literature, distinctions between intercultural competence and intercultural learning are exemplified insofar as they acknowledge particular bias and/or refrain from doing so. As Marginson and Sawir (2011) explain, in some cases, the term intercultural is underwritten with specific intention and in others, the term intercultural is presented in such a way as to either assume intention or subsume any and all intentions. This is problematic from an interpretive policy analysis standpoint, insofar as it matters how intercultural competence, and what we might view it as encompassing, is experienced interculturally, as learning.

Along this line of critical self-reflection, for example, it is quite possible that I could, from a framework of intercultural competency, assume responsibility in my *being-with* the student to instruct her. I might take a position as an "expert" and assume that the student is lacking intercultural competence in dealing with her situation effectively. Whether or not my assumption is correct is not the point, however. This point is that, in making this assumption, I preclude our shared responsibility for the making sense of the sense of the situation she, and I, are experiencing together, each in our own ways. In that sense, transformative intercultural

practice is not model of competence, but a descriptive term for the enactment of such shared responsibility in the making sense of sense. At the moment I am sitting with the student on the bench, we enter into the potential for transformative intercultural practice. As policy actors, where we choose to be matters. Where we are and with whom we interact opens us to different potentialities for what we come to know and the attendant meanings we make together on our campuses with regard to Indigenization and internationalization. The making sense of Indigenization and internationalization strategies and policy-related matters in the "complex, infinitely arrayed network" of the day-to-day workings of our institutions may be happening as much in the leather swivel chairs of campus board rooms as on the park benches of our campus green spaces (Morgan, 2016, p. 11).

Risk

"I feel like a silver ball on a wooden toy labyrinth", she says,
searching for cracks in the grey limestone walls.
"They are controlling the board.
I am so afraid I will fall into one of the little holes and lose everything."
She buries her face in her hands.

As the student shared her understanding with me of what was happening to her on campus, I recall her words and gestures, how they revealed her sense of helplessness. We were sitting on a bench in the university's communal open space, surrounded by university buildings all constructed using the same signature grey limestone. The architecture of the university is a source of pride. At that moment, however, for the student, I wondered what she saw in the architecture, if she was looking at it all. She expressed feelings of inconspicuousness, manipulation, powerlessness and fear of losing "everything". What led to these feelings? Potential differences of opinion in her supervisory committee? Potential difficulties with the English language? Potential lack of understanding of the explicit and implicit Western cultural

notions of academic integrity? Potential disability, anxiety or depression? Potential

discriminatory bias in the academic hearing process? What was at stake when she spoke of

"losing everything"? Her academic progress? Her well-being? Her status, reputation or self-

concept? Her success and prosperity? I wondered, as I sat with her, how serious the situation

was or would become. What was the likelihood that she would be charged with academic

misconduct? What might the penalty be if she was charged? How might a severe penalty affect

her future?

In such moments, when I pose questions such as these, I know I *have* responsibility,

bestowed upon me in my role at the university, to assist a student through a difficult period in his

or her life. In this sense, responsibility is defined. It is a responsibility that has boundaries and,

within the confines of my position, makes me implicit in the lived experience that the student I

am helping is going through. My job makes me responsible. It is not something I must actively

seek: as accountability to what student affairs professionals often term "student success",

responsibility is assigned (Cox & Strange, 2010). In Levinas' terms, my responsibility exposes

the passivity of my assigned role through the "proximity" I have with the student with whom I

speak with (1981, p. 137). Using an analogy of the "neighbor", Levinas (1981) wrote of the

demands of proximity,

> In the non-indifference to a neighbor, where proximity is never close enough, the
> difference between me and the other, and the undeclinability of the subject are not
> effaced, as they are in the situation in which the relationship of the one with the other is
> understood to be reciprocal. The non-indifference to the other as other and as neighbor in
> which I exist is something beyond any commitment in the voluntary sense of the term, for
> it extends into my very bearing as an entity, to the point of substitution. […] In the
> saying of responsibility, which is an exposure to an obligation for which no one could
> replace me, I am unique. Peace with the other is first of all my business. The non-
> indifference, the saying, the responsibility, the approach is the disengaging of the unique
> one responsible, me. The way I appear is a summons. I am put in the passivity of an
> undeclinable assignation, in the accusative, a self. (Levinas, 1981, p. 138-139)

To consider my relation with the student as a "summons" that makes me irreplaceable, through an "undeclinabled assignation" of my "self" in the "accusative", is to say that, rather than *having* responsibility at that moment with the student at the bench, I *am* responsible to her, through our "proximity" to one another (Levinas, 1981, p. 138-139). It is qualitatively different to speak of *being* or *feeling* responsible than to speak of *having* responsibility. Following Levinas (1981) and Nancy (2000), it is my exposure to *being-with* the student *in the making sense of the sense* of the diverse community of academic life in which we find ourselves together that I must accept my *unique assignation*, and the "business" of sustaining a hopeful potential, or "peace" through our interaction with one another (Levinas, 1981, p. 138-139).

As the student expresses her sense of her situation, I am uniquely called to make sense with her. In our *being-with* with another on the bench "*we* have already begun to understand meaning, to understand ourselves and the world as meaning" (Nancy, 2000, p. 98). As a university employee, I am part of the situation, infused with value and meaning, drawn into the becoming of the situation and the (re)creation of value and meaning. As part of our community, I find myself seeking "how to do justice, not only to the whole of existence, but to all existences, taken together but distinctly and in a discontinuous way" and "held by a *co-* that is not a principle, or that is a principle or archi-principle of spacing in the principle itself" (Nancy, 2007, p. 61); our sitting together on the bench is, in itself, an act with value and meaning.

In that situation, the lived meaning of what might be termed culture, culture shock and cultural adaptation and language, life history, self-concept and self-preservation intersect with the lived meaning of the explicit and the implicit re-creation of the intercultural community of academic life in which we find ourselves. In acting, in the *making sense of the sense of the world*, I am drawn into feeling that might be describable through cultural theory or human

psychology yet is also experienced immanently as I assist the student through a charge of academic integrity, in the realm of the (re)created value and meaning of university policy and procedure. In being drawn to *make sense of the sense of the world*, in seeking shared value and meaning, I take a risk. With "[e]very act of language, every exchange of signs" I seek "the promise or guarantee that what ought to come from the other alone and be or make sense only in, for and by" her, as the other, "as well as the other in me" (Nancy, 2003, p. 295). Following Nancy (2003):

> As such, it's not that I grant sense because I already possess it. It's not that I draw from a secure reserve of sense that I simply then transmit. Rather, I promise, I anticipate a sense that is not yet there and will, in fact, never be there as something completed and presentable, a sense that is always in and according to the other, making sense by only being exposed to the other, to the risk of not making sense, to the always certain risk of changing the sense of the other and so of always being other, always being altered, always being outside, being by itself, as sense, a being-infinitely-for-the-other. (Nancy, 2003, p. 295)

Together, on that Friday, and each Friday at the same bench, we act and with each action we create value and meaning. We try to predict how our actions will affect the world around us, yet we are always limited. We cannot ever fully know the values and meanings that each person brings and takes away from our interactions. Risk exists, regardless of degrees of certainty (Council of Standards of Australia and New Zealand, 2009), and in this way, risk is an elemental aspect of education and transformative intercultural practice (Biesta, 2013; Care, 2000). The student, in speaking her fear and burying her face in her hands, shares with me how she is creating sense from the sense of the world, and in the responsibility of the *being-with* of being, we act, and in so doing, we both take risks. I *have* responsibility to assist the student as dictated by my position, yet *feel* responsibility in our lived, temporal-spatial *being-with* of being. I might also say that, while I *have* responsibility in my position to *manage* risks associated with the

student's situation, I *experience* risk singularly through *being responsible* in the *taking of risks* in *the making sense of the sense* of our *being-with* in being.

In transformative intercultural practice, self-recognition of risk-taking may be more pronounced. At such moments, my actions may come from a place where "[I do] not know what to do, when the performance and craft" of my practice 'is the only content'" (Rocha, p. 75). In that moment, I enact the "ethics" of my practice that reflect the "ethos of life commitments" in the context of my work at my institution (van Manen, 2014, p. 355). As transformative intercultural practice, in that specific enactment of internationalization as an intersection of strategies and policy-related matters, how I act with the student and my colleagues involved in the situation reveals whether or not, as a policy actor, I have "intention to critically explore avenues of thinking and action" (Bedinger, 2011, p. 60). In the context of a charge of academic misconduct, I may choose, as a policy actor with the student, and with those involved in the situation, to engage in "dialogical reason" or in a "communicative" approach to deliberation that serves as "deference and conciliatory caring" in the face of "disagreement, anger, counterargument, and criticism" (Young, 1996, pp. 129-130).

Within the complex organizational structure of higher education (Bess & Dee, 2008), the "delegation[s] of authority and participation" of myself in relation to this international student who is going through a trying period of her academic career, may be experienced as a deliberative space where she, her faculty and university administrators may each, in their own way, be seeking to be "able to move events in a desirable direction" (Fischer, 2009, p. 69). In higher education, where established structures and processes are often at issue in relation to Indigenization and internationalization, such conflictual situations among students, staff and faculty can reveal "hidden emotional and symbolic issues", such that "a small concern" to some

"is actually about big issues such as civic identity, cultural history, and social injustice" (Fischer, 2009, p. 287). As Fischer (2009) writes, the work of enacting and deliberating an issue related to matters as complex as Indigenization and internationalization in higher education requires "combing confrontation and dialogue across the divide of cultural differences" such that the policy practitioner needs "to be knowledgeable and fluent in various modes of communication, from storytelling and listening to interpretive visual and body language" (Fisher, 2009, p. 291).

In moments of transformative intercultural practice associated with Indigenization and internationalization, I must acknowledge that others will judge the appropriateness of what I and the student decide to do or not do, or say or not say, according to their own values and standards. By enacting our responsibility, in each our own ways, in the making sense of sense, we inherently and substantively take risks, in word and action. Each of our successes in addressing the situation, in a post-secondary educational setting, could be said to largely depend on whether or not our words and actions are deemed *reasonable* by one another, by the faculty involved, by university administration, by our social and cultural communities, and by the ethical standards of our fields and/or by some other measures. This dimension of reasonableness poses new questions and reposes questions already explored, like the following of a single path in a cursive labyrinth.

Reasonableness

My cell phone rings again, my son asking when I would be home.
"I am so sorry. I am wasting your time."
She gathers herself, breathes the fragrance of mid-summer.
"It's OK", I reply, "I am here to help."

Wanting to still the silver ball, wishing I could do so much more.

Just minutes after the student expresses her fear about her impending academic misconduct hearing, my son calls and the student expresses what sounds like guilt for keeping

41

me after work hours. She refocuses herself and, I assume, in consideration of my relationship with my family, she begins to gather herself, preparing for my departure. There are many possibilities as to what I could do after my son calls me. There isn't one action that could be deemed absolutely "right", insofar as being "right" would mean that there wouldn't have been other "right" things to do. It seems more important that what I am doing feels *reasonable* to myself, the student, my family, and beyond, including university administration.

Like responsibility and risk, reasonableness comes with normative meanings tied to dominant fields, such as politics and law. In the co-creation of an inclusive and socially just intercultural community of academic life, I cannot, in my interactions with students and colleagues, avoid what may be called the lived meaning of reasonableness. Leading up to that moment on the bench when my son calls me, for example, I have to measure if administrative procedures and legal requirements have been properly followed, including: if there has been transparency in outlining the charges against her; or if reasonable accommodation has been properly assessed and made in her case, in relation to the degree of undue hardship for her professor or our institution providing accommodation, if required (Kaplin & Lee, 2009). At the same time, I have to remain open to the potential culpability of her actions. I know that, I too, will be assessed in terms of the reasonableness of my behavior with the student.

In interactions such as this, I sense that I must be prepared to be judged against the standard of a "reasonable person" in a similar situation, based on a demeanor of fairness and toleration that I have acquired in the Western cultural environment in which I have been brought up (Rawls, 1999, p. 177).   For "[e]xistence is not made alone" and "is nothing other than being exposed; expulsed from its simple self-identification and from its pure position, exposed to the event, to creation, thus to the outside, to exteriority, to multiplicity, to alterity, to alteration"

(Nancy, 2007, p. 110).   In this mutual exposure, "[t]o-be-with" the student "is to make sense mutually, and only mutually" (Nancy, 2000, p. 83). When the student expresses sadness and fear, we each have to decide what to do next. We have *no alibi* in our *being-with* one another on that Friday that late afternoon (Bakhtin, 1993). In that *non-alibi of being*, when the student expresses guilt, for whatever reasons, I am *answerable* to what she says or does (Bakhtin, 2003). I have to respond by *giving* and *receiving* reasons (Erman, 2007). Even to say or do nothing is a response. In that moment, to feel that one or another of our words or actions is or isn't reasonable hinges upon what is and is not mutually understood by both of us to have had value and meaning.   Each of us has our own *answerability*, of facing and receiving the "other" as we are in that moment, opening to a situated ethics (Bakhtin, 1993; Levinas, 1969; Nancy, 2000, van Manen, 2015). This is an ethics that is experienced as a "staging of co-appearance, [a] staging which is co-appearing" as "we are already always there at each instant", and in each instant "the stage must be re-invented; we must re-invent it at each time, each time making our entrance new" (Nancy, 2000, p. 71).

   As my son calls, I must respond to his desire to be with me and I to be with him. As the student responds to the call from my son, so I must respond to her, recognizing her feelings of what appears to be a self-conscious contrition. If I were to ignore the particulars of the situation and assume that I knew everything there was to know about the student, for example, I might not recognize her shift in behaviour. If I were to perceive the situation as involving just another international student facing an academic hearing and view her as interchangeable or unchanging in her thoughts, emotions and behaviours, I might objectify her. In objectifying her, my preconceptions can dominate my response. I could infuse a form of symbolic violence into the meaning and value I draw from our relationship (Levinas, 1969). If I don't believe that the

student can receive reasons, then I am no longer reason-giving at all (Erman, 2007). I would be making orders, or worse enacting a form of oppression. As I determine what to do next, whether to stay or to leave, reasonableness, as *ethos*, as a way of being, evades prescription.

Without prescription, there is, yet, intent. In the moment of sitting together with the student, I experience a desire to reach into, and if possible, reduce, her sense of helplessness. I recall wanting to calm her down, to reassure her. I want to bring her peace of mind and do more to help. Yet can I? Should I? What would bring her peace of mind, balancing the gravity of the situation with a sense of purpose and hopefulness? What could I do that would assist without diminishing her autonomy? The student is an adult, from another country, with her own life story, a pathway that has brought her to Canada as a graduate student. I must be careful not to overstep, presume, dismiss or enable. In facing the unknown, in the labyrinth where I find myself walking with her, I can retreat, or continue forward. By carrying forward, I can embark "upon a powerful journey, one that may lead into completely new realms and realities" and "by learning to know [myself]", I might "lose and find [myself] anew" (Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2015, p. 58). In making that choice, to retrace steps, to walk a different path, I find myself with the student tracing the secret(s) of our identities, as a "a labyrinth" and as "point[s] of inscription, one might say – whence a path can begin to be traced out" (Nancy, 2015, p. 22).

While I have an official responsibility in helping the student, I also identify with her and feel a sense responsibility towards her. In identifying with her, I wish to do something, to act, to take a risk. I seek an empathic understanding of her situation. As I identify with her, I may, or may not consciously, acknowledge or apperceive my identity in relation to hers. I may sense the intertwining of my identity with my culturally-informed knowledge and behaviors, my role as an international student affairs practitioner in a Canadian institution, my personal experience as a

past international student and my commitment to creating the conditions for inclusion and social justice on campus, among other threads of what I might call my identity.   In this "melée of the traces of sense that gets lost as it seeks itself and invents itself" (Nancy, 2003, p. 288), I attend to the uniqueness of the student and the situation that she is in, and that we are consequently in together, aware of each our own individual and shared agency. For, even though the student that I sit with at the bench expresses helplessness, she also appears to pull herself together in advance of my departure. Is there a shift in her bearing? Is she gathering herself more quickly, more confidently than before? In that moment with the student, I try to be attentive to my own actions and reactions to her actions and reactions. And, yet, what exactly would I do, if I were to do more? In walking with her in the labyrinth of the institution that we are in together, I must choose, and in so choosing, I enact my *ethos* and *praxis*, as my bearing upon the world (Nancy, 2000, p. 21). In this way, my ethical choices are not separable from my way of being in the world, as "only ontology, in fact, may be ethical in a consistent manner" (Nancy, 2000, p. 21).

The problem is that I cannot prepare for this exact moment on the bench with the student, no matter how much knowledge and experience I bring to bear. Like a jazz soloist who has practiced and played the same tune many times, I "cannot play willfully extracted memories from a previous lesson or isolated repetitions that are somehow disconnected to the past or present, with no future direction" (Rocha, 2015, p. 87). I must rely on "a thicker memory that is the sum total of things voluntary and involuntary, determined and free" and in taking an action, I do "something that cannot be learned but must be acquired and can never be bought or sold and many times can only be offered" (Rocha, 2015, p. 87). As pragmatic-ethical practice, my actions may be like an Areadne's Thread, extending through reasonableness, risk and responsibility.   In wishing I could do so much more for the student, I resist potential foreclosing on what may be

possible in the face of policies that might seem to preclude potentialities. Morgan's (2016)

analysis of "how Levinas distinguishes between ethics and politics and how he understands their

interrelationship" to be "mutually interdependent" speaks to the lived experience of such

pragmatic-ethical practice. He wrote,

> [A]s Levinas says in his famous remark in the discussion following his paper
> "Transcendence and Height" in 1962, […] there are tears that the civil servant cannot see.
> In one sense, insofar as the civil servant represents the order or domain of justice, the
> political order, he or she simply cannot attend to such tears. They are outside his
> purview. In another sense, however, they are tears of particular persons, each with his or
> her particular needs and concerns, worries and suffering, that need to be and ought to be
> seen. It is one purpose of the ethical critique of political institutions to disclose those
> tears and to see to it that a way is found to see them and respond to them – with humanity
> and concern. This disclosure is not only the job of critique; it is also what makes our
> societies and civil institutions humane and caring settings in which to live. (Morgan,
> 2016, p. 19).

In the face of the systems of academia that would judge an international student harshly

for academic misconduct, I find myself faced with a student's tears, trying to understand her

"needs and concerns, worries and suffering" (Morgan, 2016, p. 19). One summer, I spent each

Friday with an international student on the same bench, working with her through her academic

conduct defense, helping her think through responses to her committee, reaching out to

colleagues to ensure fairness and make sure the student's concerns were heard and taken

seriously. Each Friday, I urged the student to persevere through the weekend, reminding her of

her strengths, trying my best to help her understand how she could also turn the knobs of the

wooden labyrinth that she felt manipulated by. In the months that led to her final hearing, I

sought to remain open to the situation, to the student, to the unexpected, to the changing and

changeable, to a next time that we met together. Her hearing came, and, in the end, she was able

to continue her studies and eventually graduated from the institution and moved on to attain

other life and career achievements. I could only hope that in the midst of that student's

experience with the "order of justice" of a Western education system, I was able, with her, to both substantively critique that order, where and when necessary, and, in being summoned to the responsibility of the "face-to-face" (Levinas, 1981) to do so with a sense of "humanity and caring" (Morgan, 2016, p. 16).

Tracing a path

While this philosophical exploration on working with an international student through a charge of academic misconduct is limited in scope, it opens to the kinds of tensions and intersections that we may experience in deliberating and enacting Indigenization and internationalization policies and strategies in our post-secondary institutions. Such lived tensions and intersections underlie the central question that frames this dissertation: *What is it like to engage in transformative intercultural practice in higher education and how can a deeper understanding of this practice inform Indigenization and internationalization policy-making in the post-secondary sector?* This central question at once grounds this dissertation in the day-to-day lived experience of Indigenization and internationalization policy and strategy deliberation and enactment and yet also extends its related scope and potential relevance for interpretive policy analysis in the post-secondary sector.

If we include such experiences as helping an international student deal with a charge of academic misconduct in our scope of what constitutes transformative intercultural practice in higher education, then we open to the ill-structured, emotionally-charged and intellectually and psychologically challenging interpersonal conflicts that happen in classrooms, offices, meetings, residences and hallways all over campus, involving students, faculty and staff. By including these experiences, we acknowledge that our work involves often difficult, vulnerable spaces of personal and professional engagement and learning required of all involved, in a manner that

demands self-reflection in action. Such reflective action requires us to draw from our prior

knowledge and past experience, and to be capable of emotionally and intellectually integrating

new, potentially foreign or contradictory information, confusing or surprising reactions, or

different ways of expressing knowledge in such a way that sustains connection with the students,

faculty and staff that we are interacting with.

In this approach to the deliberation and enactment of Indigenization and

internationalization, we remain open to the lived meaning of what might appear to be mundane

acts and interactions that we experience, together. In our *sense-making*, *risk-taking*, and *reason-

giving and receiving* in our work*,* we might experience how ordinary gestures, words or actions,

such as experiencing an extended pause in a tense or emotional conversation, can signify much

more than we can, at any one time, fully comprehend. We might sense Rocha's (2015) depiction

of the excess of meaning that we can experience in our day-to-day lives:

> Being is the sea, and we are within it, pulled by the subsistent tides and forces, existing as
> an embodied sponge, always gushing with excess − saturated with and within Being, alive
> with energy and spirit. (Rocha, 2015, p. 26).

In our work in Indigenization and internationalization, we might feel, at times,

overwhelmed by the complexity and scope of the various issues we are addressing or that need to

be addressed, like we have been dropped into the "sea", so to speak. We can also feel humbled

and exhilarated by the "energy and spirit" of the spaces of deliberation and enactment that we co-

create with our students and colleagues. Through the posing and exploration of reflective

questions and attentiveness to the details of our experiences as transformative intercultural

practitioners, we may deepen of our understanding of such juxtapositions. By paying attention to

and reflecting upon details we might normally dismiss, we wade into such excesses of meanings

in our interactions with students, faculty and staff, in the sense-making that we bring to our interactions as professionals. In the words of Kociatkewicz & Kostera (2015):

> [L]abyrinths can only be traversed by walking the whole way, with no shortcuts allowed or even possible, until the end which is not, in itself, a solution. The end which does not provide an answer nor an artefact gained, but is just – and only this – an opening. A meeting between yourself and the path you have walked. (Kociatkewicz & Kostera, 2015, p. 68)

In our day-to-day traversals of the labyrinths of higher education, we can find that we do not necessarily progress in ways we intend. We may find ourselves, at the end of our traversal, back at the beginning, and yet, in our return, we may see ourselves, our students, our colleagues, our institutions, differently. In a dissertation of this nature, such lived experience in higher education and written reflection upon it constitute a kind of double labyrinth. In the words of Borges' (1964), in his short story *Forks in the garden path*:

> Ts'ui Pên must have said once: *I am withdrawing to write a book.* At another time: *I am withdrawing to construct a labyrinth.* Everyone imagined two works; to no one did it occur that the book and the maze were one and the same thing. (Borges, 1964, p. 25).

I quote this excerpt from Borges (1964) because this dissertation is written in a manner that moves, like a labyrinth, in and out of policy studies, philosophy and empirical studies, and yet seeks to remain grounded in the description and interpretation of lived experience. Chapters are written in a spiraling manner, building upon each other and eventually concluding without the intent "to provide an answer or an artefact gained" (Kociatkewicz & Kostera, 2015, p. 68), but rather to "open up possibilities for creating formative relations between being and acting, between who we are and how we act" (van Manen, 2014, p. 70).

As transformative intercultural practice is a broad and notably fluid categorization of work and related policy in higher education, another place of entry is to locate this practice, however partially, within a socio-historical and socio-political context. Transformative

intercultural practice, as a matter of deliberating and enacting Indigenization and internationalization in higher education, happens at particular times and places, with particular individuals in particular institutions that have been and continue to be shaped by distinct social structures, histories, cultures, economics and politics. To locate such transformative intercultural practice in relation to how it is embodied and enacted is to speak further to the ethical nature of such practice, as it is lived, in the 'here and now' amongst individuals who work and study in higher education settings.   The next chapter thus explores this intersectional, pragmatic-ethical educational policy concern of transformative intercultural practice of deliberating, enacting and co-creating Indigenization and internationalization by firstly locating this practice within their socio-historically and socio-political context, and then exploring how such practice may be viewed from an interpretive, and necessarily embodied, policy analysis perspective.

Chapter 3: Orienting

Bringing two diverse knowledge systems together needs some consideration of the assumptions underlying each foundation and where the points of inclusion or merging might seem advisable. The need then becomes one of developing "trans-systemic" analyses and methods – that is, reaching beyond the two distinct systems of knowledge to create fair and just educational systems and experiences so that all students can benefit from their education in multiple ways.
- *Marie Battiste, 2013, p. 103*

Introduction

It is early September and the lecture hall is filled with newly arrived international students. The first presenter is an Aboriginal Knowledge Keeper, well known throughout the province for his work in Treaty education. For the next 10 minutes, the students are transfixed as he shares parts of his personal story, with humour and integrated within the story of First Nations who have, for thousands of years, inhabited the territory upon which their university is situated. He ends his talk with an honour song and the students clap uncertainly, not sure if they should respond in silence or in sound.

Indigenous welcome protocols described above are increasingly common in higher education contexts. These protocols orient towards historical and current relations between settlers and the First Nations of Turtle Island, a spiritual, cosmological and governing Indigenous relation to, and naming of, the land that came to be called North America through colonization (Simpson, 2008; Watts, 2013). There is layered significance of these protocols when enacted with international students. Most Aboriginal post-secondary students are the first generation in their families and communities to attend university or college (Stonechild, 2006), while most international students are the first generation to study at a post-secondary institution outside of their home country (Marginson, Nyland, Sawir & Forbes-Newitt, 2010). For post-secondary institutions in Canada, increased attendance of Aboriginal students, alongside increased global flow of international students, represents demographic shifts which are so comprehensive that, taken together, they may constitute a fundamental change in the way such institutions will operate in the years to come.

And yet, Indigenization and internationalization of higher education in Canada are policy goals that defy straightforward problem definition and specified policy instruments. As policy goals, they are typically treated separately and vie for attention in a crowded higher education policy space. The distinctions between Indigenization and internationalization in higher education risk being under-examined, over-stated or over-simplified. Horizontal policy integration around concepts such as retention, student experience and success, and diversity may be particularly appealing in post-secondary institutions that are marked by a growing Aboriginal population and an increasingly international student demographic. However, there are reasons for making distinctions between the definitions, goals, and instruments that underlie these two contemporary policy issues, especially in context to governmental policy directions. From an interpretive perspective, Indigenization and internationalization can imbue transformative significations for post-secondary education, while also being problematically intertwined with the demands and constraints of globalization and the impacts of ongoing colonization.

In the following chapter, I explore the context of these distinctions and commonalities, as a means to frame an interpretive policy analysis approach to the study of the deliberation, enactment and co-creation of Indigenization and internationalization policies and strategies, and related matters of policy and strategy, in higher education. I begin this chapter with a historical and legal background regarding the increasing inclusion of international and Aboriginal students in the Canadian post-secondary sector. I then examine Indigenization and internationalization from its symbolic and transformative orientations. Following this analysis, I explore the rationale for taking an interpretive policy analysis approach to the study of transformative Indigenization and internationalization policy deliberation and enactment[1].

---

[1] For the purposes of this chapter, I will follow the terms used in The Accord on Indigenous Education (2010), whereby Aboriginal is inclusive of Aboriginal, First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples, and Indigenous is inclusive of

Historical and legal context

Over the 10 years that I worket at my previous institution, enrolment demographics changed dramatically. By the time I left, we had almost as many registered, self-declared Aboriginal, Métis and First Nations students as we had registered, international students, and some of our international students self-declared as Indigenous. In its 2017/2018 census, approximately 6,202 of this institution's 24,922 students were Aboriginal or international, equaling one quarter of the student population (University of Saskatchewan, 2018). This figure is underlined by the fact that the total undergraduate enrolment at the institution had not increased as dramatically. Such a shift in demographics at this institution is not unique. The enrolment demographic in higher education is changing across both the North American and European contexts and can be traced to various contemporary factors and historical antecedents (de Wit, 2002, Stonechild, 2006).

Enrolment woes and rights-based inclusion

In a span of 50 years, towards the end of the 20th century, post-secondary institutions became the forefront of national interest. Institutions expanded enrolments at an exponential scale as governments came to terms with a post-industrial, globalizing society. Beginning in the post-WWII era, post-secondary education became more widely available to broader segments of the population, setting in motion a rights-based and diversity discourse that extends to this day. This was due to increased public expenditure for expanded access, with multiple intentions: to institute a retraining program for veterans; to address a post-war baby boom; to meet and stay

---

the term Aboriginal as well as "the more global context of First Peoples' epistemologies, ways of knowing, knowledge systems, and lived experience" (p. 1). As a foundation for this chapter, I also draw on Pal's (2014) definition of policy as "[a] course of action or inaction chosen by public authorities to address a given problem or interrelated set of problems" (p. 2). In the field of Indigenization and internationalization in higher education, I have found this definition to be helpful in relating a policy's closeness and connection or distance and disconnection with lived practice, not as an abstraction, but as contextualized actions or lack of action that we may find ourselves engaged, or not engaged, in.

ahead of rapid advances in science and technology; and to meet increased demands for a more socially just society, including increased attendance of women and minorities in higher education (Cox & Strange, 2010). This investment and demographic growth phase, however, began to wane in the 1990s. In the face of these changes in demographics and decreased public expenditure under New Public Management and neo-liberal government policies, higher education institutions, nearing the end of the 20th century had to find new sources of students and revenues to maintain its expansion and role as a driver of knowledge creation, innovation and employment preparation (Pal, 2014; Bess & Dee, 2008).

Thus, in the early 2000s, higher education institutions had fully turned their attention towards new demographics to address enrolment gaps and increase national and international profile. Canadian higher education shifted towards greater inclusion of students with disabilities, mature students, Aboriginal youth, first and second-generation Canadians and international students. Shifting demographic patterns of student enrolment also came with specialization and research intensiveness, as universities around the world began to compete globally for top faculty and graduate students in areas of research strength (Wildavsky, 2010). In this evolving context for higher education, international student enrolment in Canada has tripled in the last twenty years to approximately 96,000 international students per year (Lu & Hou, 2015). At the same time, while Aboriginal post-secondary student enrolment has largely remained stagnant (Ottman, 2013), Aboriginal youth "are the fastest growing segment of the Canadian population" (AUCC, 2013, p. 5) and post-secondary education is viewed as a primary form of economic, social and cultural sustenance for future generations (Stonechild, 2006). The intention is that higher education institutions become more capable of program innovation to meet student needs,

societal expectations and, in the case of professional and specialized programs for Aboriginal students, for example, the demands of government, industry and civil society (AUCC, 2013).

These changes in demographics in Canadian society and in post-secondary enrolment have been in parallel with changes in the legal context of higher education. Up until the early 1970s, universities held a quasi-extrajudicial status in Western, and more specifically North American, society, viewed largely as a closed network with established privileges, traditions and practices, and serving a largely white, male population (Cox & Strange, 2010; Gadja, 2009). As Gadja (2009) writes, "[l]ong-standing concerns about judicial entanglement, reflected in both common-law and constitutional doctrines, emphasized the limited competence of judges to superintend expert judgment in narrow academic specialties and the broad compass properly allowed to universities in shaping their institutional futures" (Gadja, 2009, p. 57). This concern over "judicial entanglement" extended into areas that are now the fodder of legal jurisprudence in the area of higher education law, from free speech, discrimination and harassment to accommodation and assessment to intellectual property, contractual agreements and tort law (Gadja, 2009; Farrington & Palfreyman, 2006; Kaplin & Lee, 2009).

In Canada, the introduction of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms accentuated these demands with constitutional rights for accessibility and due process (Manley-Casimir & Manley-Casimir, 2010; MacKay, 2010). With the introduction of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Smith & Foster (2010) write that "the struggle for equal educational opportunity first focused on the right of access, and then shifted to its current emphasis on in-school issues such as appropriate educational services", such that "providing equal educational opportunity rights often involves a *balancing act* of competing interests and beliefs" (p. 16). This balancing act creates what MacKay (2010) calls the "dual responsibility of institutional officials", described as

the requirement to "address both individual accommodation needs, particularly in the short term, as well as engage in a process of institutional analysis to uncover the often hidden barriers and make changes to reduce the negative impact of the system or institution" (p. 47). According to MacKay (2010), the process of redressing hidden barriers has long term impacts. These impacts are, however, not only situated within an institution, as they represent the larger redress of exclusion and symbolic and real violence enacted through European and Canadian colonization, including the colonization of Indigenous peoples of Turtle Island (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2012; 2015a). As Canadian higher education institutions open themselves to populations of students that had been previously disregarded and/or treated as inferior, institutional tradition is also being subjected to critique and realignment.

Contemporary challenges to institutional practices

At the heart of critically-informed approaches to Indigenization and internationalization policy in higher education are issues of reciprocity and socio-cultural and linguistic diversity. From a policy perspective, reciprocity and diversity are notions that are grounded in both Treaties and ethical codes of practice. Treaties and codes of ethics are not, however, enforceable in the same manner as the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In practice, the demands of reciprocity and diversity are highly affected by the interpretation and framing of higher education policy within the context of each institution and are affected by societal attitudes, relationships amongst various policy proponents and opponents and the political will of governments (Fisher, 2003). The potential implications of reciprocity and recognition of socio-cultural and linguistic diversity question the traditions of individual institutions and, from a global perspective, demand that systems of Western higher education adapt to the diversity of faculty, staff and students in post-secondary academic communities.

For the Aboriginal peoples of Canada and in the context of Indigenization of Canadian higher education, reciprocity is, by relation and by law, grounded in the original Treaties signed with the Crown of England (Morris, 2000). There is, however, more to the written text of Treaties: there is an understanding of reciprocity, of a long-term relationship and safeguarding of shared resources for future generations in the shadow of colonial aggression (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2012; Saul, 2008). As the authors of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2012) write "First Nation leaders entered into the Treaty making process for the purpose of establishing a relationship of respect that included an ongoing set of mutual obligations including land sharing based on kinship and cooperation" (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2012, p. 7). The tragedy is that, since the signing of the Treaties, the perception and intention of the Canadian government and, by extension the Canadian people, has largely been assimilation, rather than the recognition of the sovereignty of Aboriginal people (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2015a; Turner, 2006). For over 100 years, from the late 1800s to the late 1900s, the Canadian government instituted a residential school system for Aboriginal peoples, which involved confiscating Aboriginal children from their families and forcing them into church-run boarding schools, where the children could no longer speak their language, nor practice their cultural traditions, and where many faced physical, mental and sexual abuse. According to the authors of the Truth and Reconciliation (2015a) report, this practice constituted a cultural genocide in Canadian history, and as such, requires reconciliation, defined as "an ongoing process of establishing and maintaining respectful relationships" that "involves repairing damaged trust by making apologies, providing individual and collective reparations, and following through with concrete actions that demonstrate real societal change" (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2015a, p. 16). In the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2015b)

calls to action for education in relation to post-secondary sector, the authors call for increased

Indigenous content in programs, including the learning of necessary intercultural skills to

flourish in a diverse society, increased recognition and support for the maintenance of Indigenous

language and culture, and increased requirements for all students to learn about the history and

context of Aboriginal peoples of Canada.

This historical legacy of colonization and contemporary momentum to move beyond neo-

colonial discourses has parallels in the internationalization of higher education (Shultz, 2013). In

her review of the international partnership principles and ethical guidelines for international

higher education, Shultz (2013) found, in her analysis of the efforts undertaken by the Canadian

Council for International Cooperation to establish "partnership principles to guide Canadian civil

society and organizations in building equitable and just partnerships in their international work",

that "[w]hile a vast number of international partnerships arranged by Canadian university

demonstrate a profound lack of awareness of the impact of their internationalization goals on the

world, there are certainly other partnerships that act as places and voices of solidarity and

struggle" (p. 76). An example of this broader context is the ethical code of practice that has

been adopted by the Canadian Bureau of International Education (CBIE, 2013). In relation to

international students, CBIE members shall, "[p]romote the interests of international students in

the institutional community and provide meaningful opportunities for interaction that promotes

intercultural and mutual understanding between international students and other members of the

institutional community and, to the extent possible, the surrounding community" (III.1). CBIE

members involved in international relations shall, "[e]nter into partnership agreements that are

based on respect and cooperation and are in the mutual interest of all partners" (VI.1) and

"[e]ndeavour to ensure that their cross-border activities serve the interests of the host community

and country" (VII.2). In many respects, the CBIE code of practice responds to the legacies of unilateral, international development-oriented initiatives of the first wave of post-WWII internationalization approach of Western higher education institutions (de Wit, 2002).

Higher education has a tradition of being entwined with a Western development discourse that arguably continues to this day in the guise of Indigenization and internationalization rhetoric. This includes, for example, complex and contested notions of what constitutes Indigenized curriculum (FitzMaurice, 2011; Kuokkanen, 2007) and global citizenship (Beck, 2013). This discourse is often based on unilateral notions of cultural and knowledge transfer or assimilation and unchecked privilege. As a form of response to this historical precedent, the CBIE Code of Ethical Practice demands of practitioners a reflective, inclusive and socially just mindset in approaching their work by speaking to issues of mutual understanding, interests and respect. According to Altbach & de Wit (2015), such efforts taken by CBIE represent a re-inscription of the cosmopolitan ethical principles of previous historical and socio-cultural manifestations of international higher education.

In their article, Albach & de Wit (2015) acknowledge that, with the potential for increasing global peace that internationalization can harness, there are pitfalls, including the potential for linguistic and cultural assimilation. They point out that, if we are not cautious, we might witness a resurgence of the kind of nationalism and closing of student mobility flows that persisted in the 18th and 19th centuries in Europe. They recognize that this reduction in global mobility flows was, in part, affected by the rise of national languages and the diminishment of Latin as the language of academia in Europe. At present, the global language of the academy has become English, which is both an opportunity and concern for the realization of both Indigenization and internationalization policy in higher education. Underscoring increased

enrolment of a diverse student population, student mobility and increased international research collaboration is the assumption that such increases will require hundreds of thousands of students globally to study and research in a language other than their own.   Of equal importance in the context of higher education is the way in which certain critical discourses are framed. For example, for an Indigenous research methodology to co-exist in this global, competitive, Western-dominated context, it is argued that foundational Indigenous approaches to reciprocity, respect for nature and spirituality, relationality, situated knowledge and Indigenous epistemes, must be incorporated (Steinhauer, 20020; Kovach, 2009). For Alfred (2004), such foundational approaches to Indigenous research is a form of "warrior scholarship" that nurtures a "proud and powerful future for coming generations" based in notions of solidarity, structural mobilization and empowerment through action" (pp. 96-98).

On a Canadian policy level, Indigenization and internationalization may manifest as reframed multiculturalism, which has historically been an agenda of assimilation (Day, 2000; Turner, 2006). Internationally, such an agenda may, whether intentional or not, be embedded in the expanding global standard of the English language and Western research standards in higher education. This global standard represents a challenge to both national governments and local communities as institutions and individuals strive to succeed in an increasingly competitive, mobile higher education environment (Bhandari & Blumenthal, 2011; Lasanowksi, 2007). In this emerging global context of higher education, social and financial investment in the preservation of languages, cultures and Indigenous knowledge is juxtaposed against requirements to standardize programs and services and provide undergraduate and graduate course and degree options offered in the English language largely based on universalistic notions of scientific rationality. Thus, in order to serve the needs of a new, diverse generation of post-

secondary students, in the coming years, provinces and institutions within Canada must frame their policy and strategy responses to the emphases of Indigenization and internationalization in ways that address tensions between de-colonizing and neoliberal approaches to higher education (Andreotti, Stein, Ahenakew and Hunt, 2015).

Responses to Indigenization and internationalization

The framing of Indigenization and internationalization policies in post-secondary institutions must contend with such competing, if not conflicting policy goals, within a network of policy actors that are presumed to be both global and local, self-interested and altruistic, unidirectional and multi-dimensional. For example, from the perspective of the province in which I currently live, the 2020 International Education Strategy of the Government of Saskatchewan (2014) states that international education "helps to create new economic opportunities, assists in solving current and future demographic challenges, creates more culturally sensitive and sustainable communities, stimulates innovation, and prepares the people of Saskatchewan for acquiring skills and abilities to work within a global context" (Government of Saskatchewan, 2014, para.1). In another, overarching document, The Government of Saskatchewan's (2012) *Plan for growth: Vision 2020 and beyond*, the government also identifies the "young and growing" Aboriginal population as key to province's growth, with the stated goal that, by 2020, "Saskatchewan leads the country in graduation rates and the graduation disparity between First Nations and Métis students and their non-Aboriginal peers has been reduced by 50 per cent" (p. 60).

These policy statements are tied to perceived and/or acknowledged policy problems, such as Aboriginal unemployment rates, decreasing post-secondary enrolment, economic stagnation and rural decline, among other issues. Thus, while the Government of Saskatchewan's (2012)

Plan for Growth refers to high school completion for Aboriginal students, that goal is ultimately related to labour market participation and the reduction of the Aboriginal unemployment rate. Thus, as a policy instrument, post-secondary institutions are tasked to "build on promising programs underway that assist in transitioning First Nations students moving off reserve to pursue jobs and educational opportunities" (Government of Saskatchewan, 2012, p. 39). With regard to international education, the stated policy goals are to increase study abroad participation by 50% and international student enrolment by 75%, with government policy instruments including increased scholarships for study abroad and a new province-wide International Education Committee (Government of Saskatchewan, 2014). An underlying message, tied to the *Plan for Growth* (Government of Saskatchewan, 2012), is the intention to retain international students as future immigrants, through clarifying "the multiple provincial and federal immigration pathways for international students to live and work in Saskatchewan" and working "with post-secondary institutions, career centres and employers to increase awareness of employment opportunities and supports for international students" (Government of Saskatchewan, 2014, para. 7). This provincial policy goal is being vertically integrated, across Canadian provinces, with federal immigration policy which now favours international students, skilled workers and entrepreneurs as preferred applicants for permanent residence (Assailly, 2012). International students are also now potential new immigrants, with approximately 50% arriving at their place of study in Canada with the intention to immigrate (Canadian Bureau of International Education, 2015) and over 25% of international succeeding in doing so (Lu & Hou, 2015).

While these policy goals speak to issues of well-being, opportunity and improved quality of life, the goals also substantively reposition post-secondary institutions in their recruitment,

curriculum and retention strategies. A challenge for higher education is that this form of economically-driven demographic repositioning can act as a form of assimilation into a meritocratic system that is tightly integrated with corporate and state interests (Brown & Baker, 2007). As institutions expand their involvement in recruiting international and Aboriginal students, faculty and staff must also go beyond traditional constituents and extend into the diverse socio-cultural backgrounds and contacts of the campus community. Connections need to be forged provincially and internationally transfer credit agreements, special recruitment and retention initiatives, and teaching, learning and research innovation. These activities involve multiple stakeholders that change the lived experience that faculty, staff and student have in their diverse community of academic life, including how such activities may create divisions in approaches to Indigenization and internationalization. Such measurable outputs may act as indicators, yet do not point towards how such outputs are lived in practice.

Symbolic Indigenization and internationalization

The challenge in measuring such value and success for Indigenization and internationalization, is that, at present, post-secondary Indigenization and internationalization efforts can largely remain "marginalized within academic settings" (Kuokkanen, 2007, p. 15), resulting in instrumentalist or purely *symbolic* approaches to policy and practice (Turner & Robson, 2008, p. 34). In the field, symbolic Indigenization and internationalization policy frameworks focus upon easily measured outcomes, such as increased international and Indigenous student enrolment, retention and graduation rates in long established fields and professions, the number of students who study abroad and the number of citations of internationally co-authored journals. While these measures do indeed provide an indication of the success of an institution's Indigenization and internationalization efforts, the drive to achieve

often arbitrary targets can result in an almost frantic push to stream international and Indigenous students into an educational environment "based on existing institutional models" (Turner & Robson, 2008, p. 30) without examining the structure or approaches of the institution to achieve such goals. Gaudry & Lorenz (2018), term this approach to Indigenization, *Indigenous inclusion*, arguing that such a policy "is a vision that expects Indigenous people to bear the burden of change" in context to teaching, learning and research supports geared towards helping Indigenous student, staff and faculty be successful "within existing structures" (p 220). Similarly, Stein (2017) describes this symbolic approach to internationalization as being a "soft critique" that, while "emphasizing the potential for collaboration" does "not always thoroughly address contradictions and uneven power" the underlie the foundations of the global international education sector (p. 14).

In this respect, symbolic Indigenization and internationalization targets can be easy to set, yet hard to achieve. Institutions might not meet their targets unless their dialogue and planning extend beyond what our departments, colleges or units *do* or *should do*, to what their institutions *are* or *should be* (Turner & Robson, 2008). For example, Battiste (2013) argues that such surface measures can require staff, faculty and university leadership to ignore fundamental issues such as the survival of Aboriginal languages and epistemologies, and as such, deprive Aboriginal students "of their inheritance" and "perpetuate the belief that different cultures have nothing to offer but exotic food and dances or a shallow first chapter" (Battiste, 2013, p. 168). Battiste's (2013) argument can extend to internationalization efforts as well, which as mentioned previously, tend towards the proliferation of English as the international language of the academy, sidelining the unique cultural knowledge and needs of international students and by

extension faculty and staff who are not of the dominant culture (Marginson, Nyland, Sawir & Forbes-Mewett, 2010).

Underlying a purely symbolic approach to Indigenization and internationalization is the assumption that by having more international and Aboriginal students on campus or by sending more students abroad, an institution will have proven its success and that attendant benefits will follow. However, research indicates that without intentional engagement and meaningful, critically-minded curricular integration, the implicit benefits of increased contact between international and domestic students, and of increased opportunities for domestic students to study abroad are more contested than established facts and more varied and nuanced in their outcomes and intentions than might even be evident to the organizers of such programs (Jefferes, 2008; Montgomery, 2010; Rhoads & Szeléni, 2011; Shultz, 2011). The hosting of international students and the implementation of study abroad programs do not, in themselves, engender intercultural, nor language, learning; rather, without strong theoretical and pedagogical foundations (Brewer & Cunningham, 2009a; 2009b), these institutional initiatives seem to reinforce stereotypes and encourage unchecked notions of priviledge (Jorgenson,2011), lack meaningful student engagement towards deep learning (Rourke & Kanuka, 2012), or result in negligible improvements in foreign language learning, if not for long enough periods of time for deeper levels of self-reflection and personal development to occur (Dwyer, 2004).

According to much research in the field, without meaningful intervention, international, Aboriginal and domestic students will not necessarily integrate well. While we might wish to underplay this potential requirement for intentional integration efforts, possibly for financial reasons, we cannot ignore reports that many international and Aboriginal students, staff and faculty state that they experience racism on North American campuses (Ahmed, 2012; Crosby,

2010; Lee & Rice, 2007; Marginson, et. al., 2010; Pope, Reynolds & Mueller, 2004; 2014).

Lambert & Usher's (2013) conclusion from their Canadian study regarding student perceptions of internationalization provides a striking insight into the divergent perspectives on the value and intent of campus internationalization. The authors reported that, while there were positive views expressed by domestic Canadian students regarding internationalization at Canadian higher education institutions, at the same time, "[a] third of students reportedly disagree with the notion that international students have enriched their education, and a similar proportion suggest that there have been occasions that have actually been hindered by the presence of international students" (Lambert & Usher, 2013, p. 21). Research such as Lambert & Usher's (2013) sheds light on an intercultural community of academic life on diverse campuses that is not as inclusive and integrated as might be assumed.

The challenge with such research is that the recommendations often focus on how to "fix" international or Aboriginal student problems. For example, attendant with a symbolic approach to Indigenization and internationalization efforts is a deficit-oriented policy framework, focused on addressing performance gaps of non-traditional students (Marginson, et. al., 2010). In such context, staff and faculty find themselves at meetings with colleagues or students who talk about international and Aboriginal students as if they were a homogenous group, needing prescriptive interventions to improve their well-being and/or academic performance. In these interventions, institutions focus their efforts on minimizing the difficulties faced by international or Aboriginal students in terms of academic acculturation and cultural integration, and yet, in taking action, might not address the institutional barriers that hinder international and Aboriginal students' success. A purely symbolic approach creates ways to get around barriers, developing tactics and approaches to better support students who are not of the majority, for which it is

presumed the education system is most suitable (Jones, 2010; Marginson et. al., 2010; Montgomery, 2010). This is arguably necessary in the short-term and yet may be exacerbated by the push to admit as many international and Aboriginal students, without considering the needs of such students in advance (Kuokkanen, 2008; Ottman, 2013; Unterhalter & Carpenter, 2010). As well, specialized supports set up outside of the mainstream support system network, allow established admissions and teaching practices to remain intact and assign poor performing non-traditional students to remedial services (Marginson et. al., 2010; Turner & Robson, 2010).   In Aboriginal post-secondary education in Canada, a contested, yet potentially valuable practice along these lines is self-identification for the purposes of targeting specific supports for Aboriginal students, a practice that has layered, historical signification, resulting, for example, in an unknown yet presumably high number of Aboriginal students on our campus who do not self-identify (Restoule, Mashford-Pringle, Chacaby, Smillie & Brunette, 2013).

Correspondent with what might be termed a superficial or remedial response to the social, cultural and academic experience of Indigenous and international students on our campuses, in a *symbolic* Indigenization and internationalization policy contexts, we might also experience passivity in relation to campus racism, superficial and neocolonial versions of inclusion, and uncritical stances on globalization. According to Dua's (2009) analysis of anti-racist policy statements and actions in Canadian higher education institutions, while there is evidence of progress in advancing an anti-racist policy agenda, there continues to be a lack of buy-in from senior leadership. This has resulted in primarily voluntary initiatives and piecemeal efforts at the student learning level. To make progress, Dua (2009) proposes that policy documents need to be written in a manner that makes them palatable to faculty and staff who are averse to the topic of anti-racism. Alternatively, from an inclusion perspective, there are real concerns regarding who

is being included and what such inclusion requires of the newly included, such as wholehearted adoption of Euro-American, capitalist ways of thinking and being (Vermette, 2012). For Vermette (2012), current trends toward "symbolic inclusion" are evident in the "symbols of enrollment tracking, in offering material in our courses which teaches Aboriginal ceremony (as if that is how we truly understand Aboriginal Peoples' condition in this world) and by incorporating artwork or ceremonial shows on campus" (p. 21). If we do not go beyond this superficial approach, according to Vermette (2012), the "natural consequence" will be the "death of Aboriginal cultures" (p. 21). While Dua's (2009) and Vermette's (2012) cautionary positions might seek compromise or push the boundaries, for Samier (2008), the alternative to their positions would be silence, a form of moral abdication.

As moral abdication, internationalization can be unreflectively interconnected with naïve or opportunistic conceptions of globalization and become lost in the discourse of neoliberal logic, forging ahead without addressing how certain internal structures and practices may actually hinder progress (Knight, 2008). As Sanderson (2004) writes, paraphrasing Knight (1999), "put simply, internationalization is both a response to, and an agent of, globalization" (Knight, 1999, p. 14, cited in Sanderson, 2004). Indeed, staff and faculty might come face-to-face with the *shadow of modernity* – a legacy of colonization, exploitation and socio-economic disparities, marked by largely Western economic and political influence – and yet not know what, if anything we can do about it, or more disconcertingly, whether we would be putting our own careers in jeopardy if we pressed too hard against established principles and practices that might question some of the long established practices of our institutions (Andreotti, et. al., 2015). From a position of individual influence, an institution's *symbolic* internationalization agenda, which may be grounded in an unreflective, assimilatory stance can act as an agent of *weak*

globalization and perpetuate patterns of domination (Appadurai, 2000), and, from an Indigenous perspective, become a force of what Battiste (2008) terms *cognitive colonization*, negatively impacting, or even subsuming, Indigenization efforts within that same institution. This is especially the case where transformative approaches to intercultural teaching, helping and leading have been delegated to the work of a single office (Ahmed, 2012) or siloed service units (Pope, Reynolds & Mueller, 2004), thereby further marginalizing the potential, integrative value and impact of Indigenization and internationalization. In practice, however, a purely symbolic Indigenization and internationalization policy may not be feasible. So long as institutions direct their interests towards Indigenization and internationalization goals and priorities, the transformative aspects and challenges of such policy directions will inevitably surface.

Transformative Indigenization and internationalization

Symbolic internationalization or Indigenization can be contrasted with a transformative approach that is comprehensive in nature, affecting all aspects of our intercultural communities of academic life. Knight's (2004) definition of internationalization and Battiste's (2013) concept of "trans-systemic" education (p. 103) are useful to help orient towards the phenomena that is of interest in this study. Knight (2004) writes that internationalization is "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, function or delivery of post-secondary education" (p. 2), a definition that has recently been addended by de Wit (2015), as:

> [T]he *intentional* process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, in order *to enhance the quality of education and research* for all students and staff *and to make a meaningful contribution to society*. (de Wit, 2015)

Following along the lines of Knight and de Wit, Hudzik (2015) provides a list of outcomes for internationalization that extend into student intercultural learning, program quality and diversity, including such things as "incidence and quality of integrative living/learning

experiences between international and domestic students" (p. 115). In Hudzik's (2015) terms, a "comprehensive and strategic form of higher education internationalization" requires recognizing "the diversity of motivations, interests, measures of success and accountability, and methods that will draw together a critical mass of institutional leadership and participation necessary to make it possible" (p. 43). Turner & Robson (2008) argue that such a comprehensive approach to internationalization requires a significant change to how an organization operates. They write:

> Within an overall framework of international effort, it seems clear that the personal engagement and positive motivations of individual people within an institution are not only essential in securing a shift to the ethno-relative position inherent in deep internationalization orientations but are also prerequisites for long-term international engagement at an institutional level. To that extent, therefore, an international institution is recognizable from within its own psyche – deep internationalization acts normatively on the values and practices of institutional communities, shifting individual and institutional orientations to existential internationalization. (Turner & Robson, 2008, p. 39)

Turner and Robson (2008) draw from Sanderson (2004) in comparing transformative internationalization with existentialism, described as "the deconstruction of our own identity" so "that we can begin to appreciate what we stand for and how we see the world, including how and why we construct Otherness as we do" (p. 16). A transformative approach to Indigenization and internationalization reaches deeper into our "psyche" as staff, faculty and administrative leaders in our institution, as we seek to create conditions for changes in the way we work collectively within our institutions (Turner & Robson, 2008, p. 39).

In a similar vein, Indigenization of higher education is associated with what Battiste (2013) describes as an "ethical, trans-systemic" approach that integrates, rather than subsumes, indigenous epistemologies and ontologies. Battiste (2013) refers to Willie Ermine's "two sets of intentions confronting the in-between space that connects Indigenous and Eurocentric knowledge systems" and his "inspiration" that "came from the space that is created when Indigenous and

Western thought are brought together" (p. 105). She concludes that such a trans-systemic space

must make a person "consider the limits of the boundaries one chooses, and reconsider how what

one chooses may infringe on another's space or standards, codes of conduct, or the community

ethos in each community" (Battiste, 2013, p. 105). Kuokkannen (2007) describes this ethical,

trans-systemic approach to Indigenization in higher education as a "recognition of the gift" of

Indigenous knowledge systems and ways of knowing, extending beyond specific programs and

services serving Indigenous students and compartmentalized Indigenous studies to include

"active participation and ongoing engagement with intellectual and epistemic conventions other

than one's own" (Kuokkanen, 2007, pp. 7-8). This constitutes a change not only in what courses

and services are provided at an institution, but how and by whom these courses and services are

provided (Ottman, 2013).

Thus, the point Kuokkanen (2007) makes is not that specialized services and programs

are unnecessary. Rather, she points to a collective purpose and intent of Indigenization that

reaches beyond a particular group of students or academic discipline. In this regard, Kuokkanen

(2007) speaks to the personal and professional identification with the importance of

Indigenization as a shared, plural endeavor extending beyond special interest groups. In the

context of indigenization, the lived relations involved in transformative intercultural practice

must also therefore include acknowledging and seeking to reverse the lasting impacts of

colonization. As Battiste (2013) writes, Indigenization in education necessarily includes:

> [R]aising the collective voice of Indigenous peoples, exposing the injustices of our
> colonial history, deconstructing the past by critically examining the social, political,
> economic and emotional reasons for silencing Aboriginal voices in Canadian history,
> legitimating the voices and experiences of Aboriginal people in the curriculum,
> recognizing it as a dynamic context of knowledge and knowing, and communicating the
> emotional journey that such explorations will generate. (Battiste, 2013, p. 167).

A challenge for developing and implementing such critical intercultural practice in higher education, such as that proposed by Battiste (2013) and recommended in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2015b), is made evident in the internal contradictions and hidden assumptions between what is termed intercultural competence and intercultural learning (Marginson & Sawir, 2011). According to Marginson and Sawir (2011), in the first case, the emphasis is upon knowledge or skills to be learned. In the second case, the emphasis is upon a context of learning that involves learners from more than one cultural background. Marginson and Sawir (2011) argue that both terms do share one common characteristic: they do not assert the intent or outcome of such competency or learning. Inherent in their respective literature, these distinctions are exemplified insofar as they acknowledge particular bias and/or refrain from doing so. In some cases the term intercultural is underwritten with specific intention and in others, it is presented in such a way as to either assume intention or subsume any and all intentions.   The problem with this is that it matters how intercultural competence is enacted and experienced. In Abdi's (2009) terms, the demand of transformative intercultural practice could be associated with the need to open to multi-centric epistemological foundations for the shared work of inclusion and social justice. This includes, for example, going beyond a universal construct of global citizenship to pluralistic, alternative, de-centered and re-centered conceptions of global citizenships (Abdi, 2009).

A translation problem with notions of pluralism in transformative intercultural practice is that it becomes a form of unreflective, ideological practice in and of itself. It is quite possible that a workshop or course on intercultural competence, even presumably using critical pedagogy meant to teach multiple perspectives, can be applied in such a way as to stifle dialogue, silence dissent and foster resentment amongst privileged students (Allen & Rossatto, 2009). Ellsworth

(1989), in her seminal article questioning the impact of critical pedagogy, highlighted this challenge:

> [W]hen participants in our class attempted to put into practice prescriptions offered in the literature concerning empowerment, student voice, and dialogue, we produced results that we not only unhelpful, but actually exacerbated the conditions we were trying to work against, including Eurocentrism, racism, sexism, classism and "banking education". (p. 298).

Within higher education, where the advancement of human knowledge is a central mission, critical thinking has arguably been, and continues to be, integral to its longevity and relevance, especially with regard to individual and cultural flourishing and intercultural understanding (hooks, 2010). Coursework, training or other policy implementation approaches geared towards intercultural competence can, however, fall into a trap where there is little critical thinking involved, lacking alternative perspectives on intercultural theory and reflection on practical application (Marginson & Sawir, 2011). There may be little existential or institutional transformation that may result from such an approach.

If we view higher education contexts as learning organizations (Senge, 1990) that are undergoing radical change (Knight, 2008), we may also therefore acknowledge the importance of critical thinking and transformative approaches to helping, teaching and leading (hooks, 2010). The term *transformative*, applied to higher education, is most commonly understood as an acknowledgement and incorporation of the knowledge, skills and unique life experience that adults bring to their learning environments (Mezirow, 2000; Cranton, 2006). As a transformative endeavor, intercultural practice can be said therefore to affect all areas of an institution, including all actors involved in decision-making at all levels of policy development, implementation and evaluation. As Fischer (2009) writes, "from the perspective of transformational learning, one cannot truly engage in a process of critical learning without examining the workplace activities

in the context of the larger system in which one is a part", which includes "the "structural characteristics and ideological premises of the underlying system" (Fischer, 2009, p. 230). For transformative intercultural practice, interpretive policy analysis could therefore be viewed as both a means and an end. Policy, from a transformative intercultural practice perspective, is imbued in both the content and enactment of the workplace activities of teaching, leading and helping students, staff and faculty in the co-creation of an inclusive, socially just intercultural community of academic life and beyond.

Policy embodiment and transformative intercultural practice

This pluralistic context of Indigenization and internationalization policy may be viewed as the very source of an interpretive, critical approach to its analysis. For example, to approach Indigenization and internationalization policy analysis as both means and end is to acknowledge that, from an interpretive perspective, problem definition is always necessarily emergent and incomplete. As Fischer (2009) writes "policymaking is regularly a discursive struggle over the assumptions that shape problem definitions, the boundaries of the categories used to explicate them, the evaluative criteria for their assessment, and the meanings of the ideals that guide particular actions" (p. 173). For higher education, the discursive struggle over policy definition, goal formation, tool development and implementation are perhaps the most marked of any sector, and for Indigenization and internationalization, this presents a great challenge for policy analysis. As Pal (2014) notes, while problem definition is a primary concern for policy analysis, "the central concerns of the policy analyst have less to do with the disciplines that seem to be 'naturally' aligned to the policy issue than with the larger issues" of technology advancement, globalization and economic, environmental and nation-state instability (p. 16).

The intermixing of policy definition, goals, and tools is, however, also not uncommon for higher education in the North American context. North American post-secondary institutions are complex organizational structures, marked by multiple internal and external regulatory influences, including government, institutional governance bodies and professional associations and organizations, all of which "generate significant challenges for institutions seeking clear-cut roles that can be used to provide efficient guidance for policy and action" (Bess & Dee, 2008, p. 888). In the contemporary policymaking context, Pal (2014) adds to this complexity the "constant stream of data, information, and arguments about the range of existing and emerging problems that require a policy response" (p. 123) as well as a need to be prepared to make decisions under pressure in quickly shifting circumstances that are increasingly involving crises situations. Thus, even when transformative Indigenization and internationalization of higher education may be of central importance to an institution, neither policy area is easily assignable to any one office in that institution to dictate what is to be done or to take full accountability for what is and is not to be accomplished.

Shared accountability of Indigenization and internationalization policy

The challenge for this dispersal of accountability in higher education is that it can result in a confusion of initiatives and disconnected unit level strategies. As a governance platform, the seemingly opaque accountability mechanisms in higher education are increasingly being challenged in the contemporary public policy context. A major shift has occurred in organizational decision making in context to these external and internal pressures, whereby "[d]ecisions previously made at lower administrative levels and/or by faculty members are now being pushed toward upper levels in the administrative hierarchy" (Bess & Dee, 2008, p. 173). A rationale for this shift is that the lack of impact applied research on higher education has had

upon its outcomes, such as improved teaching practices (Clark & Norrie, 2013). For post-secondary education stakeholders, this lack of progress can be frustrating and, in response to pressures to make rapid advances in key areas of policy, for senior administration "[t]ime for analysis, reflection and consultation is often sacrificed in favour of speed and efficiency" (Bess & Dee, 2008, p. 173).

The dichotomy between speed and efficiency and deliberation and complexity make Indigenization and internationalization a policy issue that is both inclined and resistant to adoption across an institution. For example, while studies have shown that top down policy can be somewhat successfully implemented in countries with strong centralized higher education sectors, policy scholars admit the limitations of the findings with regards to cross-application in an international context and in understanding the ways in which policies are transformed through their enactment within and across institutions (Gornitzka, Kyvik & Stensaker, 2005). A purely top down policy analysis does not provide the detail necessary to understand how the policy was enacted to make it reach or not reach top level policy objectives, including how such policy is interpreted, adopted and adapted by different policy actors throught an organization (Sabatier, 2005).

Sensemaking of Indigenization and internationalization policy

From a critical policy analysis perspective, the complexity of higher education systems provides context for the analysis of ambiguity in problem definition and implementation analysis The highly interpersonal negotiated social realities found in higher education organizations can be seen a potential threat to what is often viewed as more objective, evidence-based and outcomes-focused practice (Weingarten, 2013). Alternatively, from an interpretive policy perspective, subjectivity is assumed and, as such, is understood to be incorporated into the very

determination of which data is to be collected and for what purposes (Fischer, 2003; 2009).

Thus, in a study of transformative intercultural practice, it is the very sense making of policy, or

policy narratives as they are lived, which need to be explored more deeply, and, in their

exploration, questioned.

On this point, Scutt and Hobsen (2013) share a particularly poignant depiction of the

value of interpretive research in higher education:

> Narratives can assist research of higher education to extend the boundaries of sight
> beyond the usual 'things' of aligned curriculum, transition and access, effective
> pedagogy, improving research outputs and so on, to forgotten things, which disrupt the
> boundaries, not for the drama of the disruption, but for the necessity of extending the
> frame so that the observer is included, not just as acknowledgment of perspective, but as
> an intertwined part of the narrative. (Scutt & Hobson, 2013, p. 25)

The critical point that Scutt & Hobson (2013) make is that higher education policy analysis can

be positively challenged and broadened by exploring the lived experience of those who

implement the "things" of higher education practice. In this practice perspective, decision-

making is open to the ambiguity and uncertainty of higher education contexts, where "goals and

values are not neatly separated from each other or from the process of choice" and where, "in

making decisions, we often clarify what we want and what we believe only through the process

of concrete choices in specific situations" (Pal, 2014, p. 23). To speak of the day-to-day in

policy analysis is to reach into the concrete and contextual situations in which policy is enacted.

Such concrete choices are embodied in specific contexts and, from an interpretive

research perspective, such choices are framed by particular discourses. As a form of

interdisciplinary analysis, such an approach aims at a framework that can extend the boundaries

of previous paradigms and uncover hitherto ignored phenomena, such as empathic and/or

spiritual understandings in higher education (Ferrer, Romero & Albareda, 2010). For example,

Evans & Davies (2012) explored how the concepts of policy emplacement, enactment and

embodiment relate to how discourses on obesity are translated into pedagogical programs and approaches within different schools. They propose a methodology which seeks to understand how "policy discourses, like pedagogical practices, are always and inevitably mediated for individuals through their material (flesh and blood, sentient, thinking and feeling) bodies, their actions and those of their peers, parents/guardians and other adults" (Evans & Davies, 2012, p. 624). Following Evans & Davies (2012), it may also be asserted that mainstream discourses can foreclose, or unknowingly bias, our analysis of transformative intercultural practice, as theories of intercultural development are, more often than not, North American and European centric and, as such, presume particular dispositions, values and intentions of their fields (Deardorff, 2006; Marginson & Sawir, 2011).

In this manner, an interpretive perspective of Indigenization and internationalization of higher education, policy enactment is viewed as being sense making through the work of individuals and teams throughout an organization, not by hierarchy nor by title, but by shared and interconnecting functions. Traditional distinctions, for example, between teaching and student affairs cannot be taken as a fixed category as these roles increasingly overlap in multiple ways (Hamrich, Evans & Shuh, 2002; Manning, Kinzie & Shuh, 2006). Further to, and interconnected with this overlap, post-secondary institutions are experiencing a rise of what Whitchurch (2013) calls third space professionals. These are individuals who are often brought in from outside of the institution and the post-secondary sector and assigned to project specific initiatives or around quality assurance categories, such as diversity and inclusion (Whitchurch, 2008a) and thus develop specialized niches, champion issues and innovative practices and facilitate resolution of complex issues (Whitchurch, 2008b).

Action-sensitivity of interpretive policy analysis

As interpretive policy analysis, my dissertation research is therefore not focused on a particular job or level of authority in higher education administration, but upon individuals within post-secondary education who self-identify as being committed to, or responsible for, the ongoing co-creation of a de-colonized, inclusive and socially just intercultural community of academic life. This research is also therefore not focused on a particular context, such as a classroom, boardroom, advising office or learning commons. This is because transformative intercultural practice is not conceived in this study as a particular action by a particular professional in a particular position, but rather it is conceived as a matter of how an action is undertaken, as transformative intercultural practice, regardless of one's position or role. The focus of my dissertation is therefore on the concrete, lived experience of transformative intercultural practice, as a means to provide an in-depth contribution to a bottom up analysis of the problem definition of Indigenization and internationalization in higher education.

This interpretive approach to the study of Indigenization and internationalization policy represents a distinct research methodology that addresses a gap in the literature in the field. There are many texts that explore faculty perceptions and experiences in intercultural or cross-cultural contexts, resulting in various prescriptions and guidance for teaching methodology (Castañeda, 2004; Dallafar, Kingston-Mann & Sieber, 2011; Guerrero, 2008; Henry & Tator, 2009; Mayberry, 1996; Mihesuah & Wilson 2004; Northedge, 2003; Palfreyman & McBride, 2007) and there are also texts for student affairs practitioners and diversity workers resulting in frameworks for multicultural engagement (Chickering & Rieser, 1993; Cox & Strange, 2010; Kuh, Kinzie, Shuh, Whitt, & Associates, 2005; Pope, Reynolds & Mueller, 2004; 2014) as well as research in relation to social justice, diversity and ethics in leadership (Ahnee-Benham, 2002;

Bates, 2006; Blackmore, 2006; Langlois, 2011; Starratt, 2012; Washington, 2004).   While this

research provides insight into policy and strategy sense making; however, it does not explore the

lived meaning of the work as an existential, meaning-making relation with others.

An interpretive research study of Indigenization and internationalization higher education

policy, drawing from a hermeneutic, post-intentional phenomenological approach, aligns with a

"multi-perspectival" exploration of the "particular" cases or instances of lived experience (Smith,

et al., 2009, pp. 37-53) that "can join the conversation about multiplicity, difference, and

partiality" (Vagle, 2014, p. 114). In education, the particular may be understood through broadly

theorized pedagogical relations (van Manen, 2015; Saevi, 2011). From an education perspective,

transformative Indigenization and internationalization places primary significance on educational

decision-making, for example as experienced in one-to-one contact with students.   For van

Manen (1991), such action-sensitivity goes against the tendency for education to be viewed as a

"a technical production process, with input, treatments and outputs" applied uniformly across an

institution or for a particular group in favour of an approach that integrates the "intuitive,

dynamic and non-rational features" of teaching, leading and helping others in educational

contexts (p. 105). As transformative practice, Indigenization and internationalization of higher

education can thus be said to be deeply embedded in the lived relations between staff, students

and faculty. In this manner, the focus of an interpretive policy analysis of Indigenization and

internationalization of higher education must be upon interpersonal, lived relations and the lived

meaning of actions experienced through transformative intercultural practice. As van Manen

(1997) wrote, a phenomenologically-grounded approach to research and practice does not

connote acquiescence in the face of issues requiring candor:

> [T]o become more thoughtfully or attentively aware of aspects of human life which
> hitherto were merely glossed over or taken-for-granted will more likely bring us to the

edge of speaking up, speaking out, or decisively acting in social situations that ask for such action. (van Manen, 1997, p. 154).

In this sense, in transformative intercultural practice, one's sense of responsibility may possibly exceed the policy framework of an institution, especially where such policy is more symbolic than transformational in its alignment. Along these lines, Kuokkanen (2007) states that "responsibility links consciousness with conscience" as "it is not enough to merely know one's responsibilities; one must also be aware of the consequences of one's actions" (p. 115). This statement, I believe, encapsulates the shared accountability, sense-making and action-sensitivity of the policy embodiment of transformative Indigenization and internationalization in higher education.

Conclusion

In the introduction to this chapter, I provided an experience of policy enactment, relating a scenario involving an Aboriginal Knowledge-Keeper who opens an international student orientation with a traditional welcome. In writing this scenario, I excluded details, including all of the work that went in to organizing that particular traditional welcome, which I was overseeing. We came very close that year to not having an Aboriginal welcome and honour song. Two days before the event, the original presenter backed out and there was pressure to forgo that part of the program. It is at such a moment when the values and priorities ascribed to how things are done at my institution and within my unit are challenged, not by the institution, but by those who are responsible for the work of our institution. What would have been lost if our team hadn't persevered to find an alternative presenter? The new international students would not have known the difference. However, through our discussions, we knew that by forgoing the presentation and not persevering to find an alternative, we would have made an important statement about our own individual and collective values and priorities. Indeed, it is

what we did that matters in relation to how we proceeded, not what we said or could have said about our options and choices. And yet, even with all that led up to its inclusion, ensuring an Aboriginal welcome remains, arguably, only symbolic in its meaning.

As shown in this chapter, a matter as seemingly simple as including an Aboriginal welcome for newly arrived international students can carry a layered signification from an interpretive policy analysis perspective. Such a presentation can reflect both the Indigenization and internationalization policy orientation of an institution. The inclusion of an Aboriginal welcome speaks to the practice of Indigenization and internationalization, possibly as a symbolic gesture, but also possibly as indication of the transformative work being undertaken to seek both reconciliation and intercultural understanding. From an interpretive policy analysis perspective, this seemingly simple event may be "gushing with excess − saturated with and within Being, alive with energy and spirit" (Rocha, 2015, p. 36).

It is thus, not enough, from a phenomenological perspective to simply describe such an event. As Rocha (2015) writes,

> The phenomenologist tries – and always must fail – to explore the very horizon of saturation and gain insight into the ontological excess that eludes our particular ways of being-within, subsisting, and existing, thereby extending potentiality, the saturation-point of the imaginable, the possible, the real. (Rocha, 2015, p. 27).

The intent of an interpretive research approach, rooted in a hermeneutic, post-intentional approach to the study transformative intercultural practice, is to "chase intentionalities and their various possibilities as they take complicated shape in multiple, sometimes competing contexts" (Vagle, 2014, p. 41). In this sense, where we may reach "saturation-point of the imaginable, the possible, the real" lived experiences of transformative intercultural practice (Rocha, 2015, p. 27), we may also find ourselves in "dialogue" with them, insofar as our experiences are already "shot through" with the "social" world in which we live together (Vagle, 2014, pp. 41-42). As

interpretive policy analysis, we are always asked to return to our policy problem definitions, keeping in mind that "our interpretations, growing understandings, theorizing, and debating are dialogic, that is, they are moving and shifting through the questions we pose, observations we make, assertions we proffer" (Vagle, 2014, p. 42). We can undertake this kind of interpretive policy analysis as an exploration of how such transformative Indigenization and internationalization policy is deliberated and enacted, for it is in its deliberation and enactment that we come to understand its lived meaning, not as a series of things we should do, but as a who we are and who we might become as transformative intercultural practitioners. I now turn to the methodology I have taken to explore transformative intercultural practice as policy embodiment, through the deliberation, enactment and co-creation of Indigenization and internationalization in higher education.

Chapter 4: Preparing

[P]ost-structural conceptions of knowing and understanding are fleeting, momentary, and dangerous and open up phenomenology more – it draws out phenomenology not only as a philosophy of lived experience, but also as a philosophy capable of being used toward political ends.
- Vagle, 2014, p. 114

Introduction

As an interpretive research analysis, I realize my own stake and bias in an exploration of transformative intercultural practice. Approaching the deliberation and enactment of Indigenization and internationalization as an intersubjective lived experience must, therefore, also admit that it is constantly changing, and is historically, culturally, socially and materially grounded, or in Gadamer's (2004/1975) terms, *prejudiced*. I recognize the inherent challenge in extricating collective meaning making from exploring the lived experiences of individual faculty, staff and students, including my own. The writing of these first chapters has meant to juxtapose these aspects of this research topic. I have done so in order to better locate the research methodology itself. I have attempted to move from lived experience to theory in order to develop a clearer comprehension of the contexts of transformative intercultural practice and to demonstrate the necessity of phenomenology in exploring deeper understandings of its lived meanings.

In this chapter, I explain the interpretive research approach that I have taken in this investigation of the pragmatic-ethical lived meaning of transformative intercultural practice. In the first section, I identify where my study lies in relation to its assumptions regarding knowledge (epistemology) and being (ontology), within an interpretive research framework. In the second section, I describe three main principles that underline the interpretive research methodology that I have taken. I then outline the methods I have applied at each stage of the

research. The third section provides a description of the research participants who were involved in the research. The third section relates how I observed relational and analytical criteria of qualitative research throughout the research process.

Foundations

Before explaining the methods for data collection, analysis and presentation that I applied for this study, it is important to locate the interpretive methodology upon which these methods are based. This includes identifying where my methodology fits within the spectrum of research approaches, including different variations of phenomenology. For interpretive research, the positioning of one's study within this spectrum requires a well thought out research design, whereby methodology and method are transparently and logically interconnected (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012). Thus, as a starting point, I first contrast positivist/essentialist and interpretivist orientations in research paradigms, then explain the phenomenological approach upon which I have framed the principles, methods and criteria for evaluation of this research study.

Positivism/essentialism and traditional policy analysis

As noted in Chapter 3, traditional policy analysis is rooted in a positivist paradigm, even when qualitative research is employed. It can therefore be helpful to contrast the main tenets of this research paradigm with more interpretivist approaches as way to comprehend the full spectrum of approaches to policy analysis in education.   At the core of this contrast is the way in which each perspective views reality, fact, truth and bias. As Schwartz-Shea and Yanow (2012) write, these differences in perspective underlie the epistemological and ontological "applied philosophy" of any proposed research design (p. 4). They write, "[m]ethodology commonly refers to the presuppositions concerning ontology – the reality status of the 'thing' being studied

– and epistemology – its 'know-ability' – which inform a set of methods" (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p. 4).   While a dualistic distinction between positivism and interpretivism is fraught with nuance and is increasingly challenged through the use of mixed methods research design (Creswell & Clark, 2011), the broadly stated epistemological and ontological philosophical variances that ground each approach can help orient towards the focus and intention of interpretive studies, especially those rooted in phenomenology.

In the positivist tradition, it is postulated that we can, as researchers, come to objectively generate knowledge about the world around us, including society and our own nature (Sarantakos, 2013). This objectivity is made possible through focusing on the gathering and analysis of empirical evidence. Through the scientific hypothesis-testing method, positivism is concerned with the critique, advancement or creation of new, generalizable, explanatory theories (Oliver, 2010). Knowledge is viewed as being out in the world for us to find, with the goal of research to make this discovery of knowledge possible. While knowledge gained through positivist, scientific method is considered a process of factual discovery based in a world that exists outside of our understanding of that world, such facts are always tentative. In this manner, positivism can be viewed as being deductive in its reasoning (Shwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012). Positivist research thus aims for the elimination of bias through creating research instruments and experimental conditions that are considered to be statistically reliable, valid and replicable (Soritrios, 2013). Quantifiable data is viewed as being more objective, with such data gathered through operationalizing categories of analysis. This analysis is to be undertaken through the objective stance of the researcher, who is to position him or herself as an outsider.   Where a qualitative data gathering method is used in a positivist paradigm, its purpose is, for example, to

help explain variations or gaps in research data, or to help in developing categories to operationalize in a quantitative study (Soritrios, 2013).

While the importance of research that can be generated through positivist methodologies is not disputed, in the social sciences, including education, there remain questions about the assumptions that underlie the truth and objectivity claims of positivist research. In an interpretive research paradigm, our subjectivity, inter-subjectivity and embodied engagement with materiality is always present in how we come to know the world, even with the rigors of scientific method. At the foundation of interpretivist differences with positivism is that the very instruments of scientific research can change how we see and describe the world around us (Husserl, 2002b/1970), that the highly stylized presentations of scientific research can impact how we see ourselves and the world around us (Latour, 2010) and that the scientific process itself, far from being logical and linear, has been shown to be fraught with multiple interpretations, intuitive understanding and the discovery based upon the recognition of previously disregarded or unseen phenomenon (Kuhn, 2014). Even the research tools employed by a researcher in qualitative studies, such as digital recorders and software programs, can influence how and what is remembered and focused upon, what we are able to do with data, and even how researchers relate to their human and nonhuman research participants (Adams & Thompson, 2014).

This cursory perspective on, and critique of positivism, as it relates to an interpretive approach to policy analysis, is important not because of a purported superiority or irreconcilability. Rather, by opening with this critique, we might also open to a constructive critique of interpretive research analysis as well, as both positivism and interpretivism intersect with the human sciences. As the foundation of phenomenology in the human sciences (van

Manen, 2015), Husserl's (2002b/1970) methodological critique was originally fixed on a rising

scientism and psychologism of his time that, in its ascendancy, was making tremendous

proclamations about objectivity and rationality. In response, Husserl (2002b/1970) initiated a

research program of his own, one based in a search for *essences* of human lived experience, an

attempt to explore pure consciousness, beyond the influence of abstract theorizations and pre-

given understandings of the world around us (Marder, 2014). This strand of phenomenology, as

an original critique of scientism, was challenged and extended over time, with new strands of

phenomenology emerging, each with their own critique and emphases (Marder, 2014; van

Manen, 2014). Verbeek (2006) provided a depiction of this line of critique of phenomenology,

> Phenomenology can be interpreted as a philosophical movement that aims to analyze the relations between human beings and reality. […] Classical phenomenology aimed to produce "authentic" descriptions of "the things themselves" to counterbalance the alleged alienation caused by the scientific and technological approach of reality. Against this romantic essentialism, postphenomenology holds that humans and reality constitute each other in their mutual relationships. To the classical-phenomenological view that humans and reality are always related to each other by the irresolvable directness of humans towards reality, postphenomenology adds the idea that in these relations both the subjectivity and the objectivity of reality are shaped. Humans are what they are on the basis of the ways in which they manifest themselves in reality, and reality is what it is on the basis of the way in which it can be experienced by human beings. (Verbeek, 2006, p. 122)

Whether we are speaking of positivism or essentialism, as they relate to either quantitative or

qualitative methods, or both, we are ultimately speaking of a positioning of the researcher in

context to an underlying philosophical critique, whether it be descriptive, ethical, ontological,

political and/or structural (Marder, 2014). In this sense, positivism and interpretivism are not

mutually exclusive in their claims to critique, but are in relation to their positioning of the

researcher in relation to that critique.

Interpretivism and policy sense-making

Interpretivist social and education researchers ultimately question the positioning of role of the researcher as an objective outsider. Such perceived objectivity can limit or bias data and, as a dominant, historical and contemporary practice of colonization, pose relational and ethical issues, especially in relation to Indigenous peoples (Smith, 2012). As Fischer (2003) explains, the claims of positivism can miss, and even subvert, the unique, contextual, political, intuitive and interpersonal aspects of policy analysis. In the context of this study, we could say that a positivist or essentialist approach to this research could miss these unique aspects in the ways in which we experience our teaching, helping and leading a diverse community of students, staff and faculty.

Alternatively, in an interpretive framework, our knowledge of the world around us is viewed as being gained through subjective and intersubjective experience within social contexts and mediated in and through the materiality of the world. This includes how we speak about the world around us and the tools that we use to sense and make sense of the world around us. This is a world which exists outside ourselves, but is only knowable through lived experience, including what knowledge we acquire about our world, through formal, informal, and non-formal, everyday educational and social interactions (Crotty, 1998). As such, interpretivism "looks for the culturally derived and historically situated interpretations of the social life-world" (Crotty, 1998, p. 67). In this manner, the constructivist predisposition of interpretive research can be said to be oriented towards inductive reasoning, based in empirical evidence. This empirical evidence constitutes a "bottom-up" emergence of "fact", understood as a process whereby "areas of lived experience that have produced widespread intersubjective agreement" become "crystallized concepts" (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p. 29). Facts, understood as

crystallized concepts, rather than as fixed knowledge, enables interpretivist researchers to engage more freely with positivist research and associated "conjectural" theories, and thus the value of deductive reasoning is not abandoned (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p. 29). As such, Schwartz-Shea & Yanow (2012) argue that interpretivist research aims for abduction, a process of moving back and forth from concrete experience to reflection upon theory and meaning, in a hermeneutic circle of interpretation. They write:

> In this puzzling-out process, the researcher tacks continually, constantly, back and forth in an iterative-recursive fashion between what is puzzling and possible explanations for it, whether in other field situations (e.g., other observations, other documents or visual representations, other participations, other interviews) or in research-relevant literature. The back and forth takes place less as a series of discrete steps than it does in the same moment: in some sense, the researcher is simultaneously puzzling over empirical materials and theoretical literatures. (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p. 27)

Abductive reasoning thus requires the researcher to be a research instrument. The researcher is an integral part of the research project and thereby must admit his or her bias, acknowledge his or her personal background knowledge, and through the process of abductive reasoning, "grapple with process of sense-making: of coming up with an interpretation that makes sense of the surprise, the tension, the anomaly" (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p. 28).

The goal of interpretive research is therefore not to test, advance or create a new generalizable theory, but to seek deeper understanding of particular social contexts, social issues, cultural and professional practices, lived experiences, processes, and related areas of study (Oliver, 2010). In interpretive research, theory is grounded by and guides methodological choices and acts as a means to help continually make sense of data without foreclosing analysis with pre-determined explanations and without seeking to make postulations about universal causalities (Crotty, 1998). Rather, understanding gained through interpretive research can help to sensitize practitioners to gaps in policy and give voice to marginalized populations (Fischer,

2009), to provide a means to develop grounded theory to understand and improve policy in particular contexts (Wagenaar, 2009), or to provide guidance for tactful practice (van Manen, 2015), among other applications. As the purpose of interpretive research is sense making, throughout his or her study the interpretive researcher must remain flexible to adopt the best methods to gather knowledge with his or her research participants about the phenomenon under investigation (Schartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012). This breadth of application within the interpretive research paradigm speaks to the broad array of theoretical foundations upon which interpretive research designs can be based, leading to variations in both methodologies and methods.

Positioning

Within the methodological spectrum of interpretive phenomenological research, I have grounded my study in Vagle's (2014) post-intentional phenomenological research design. Through my research and writing process, I have oriented this study toward a philosophical, hermeneutic exploration of the ethics of transformative intercultural practice, based upon experiences of Indigenization and internationalization policy deliberation and enactment in higher education "in its multiple, partial and varied contexts" (Vagle, 2014, p. 121). This post-intentional approach to phenomenology present insights into contemporary phenomenological writing and research, and as such, speak to van Manen's (2015) position that the field of phenomenology is dynamic and constantly evolving. Phenomenology is not dogmatic, its methods are "not merely mean procedural, technical, repeatable features of inquiry" (van Manen, 2015, p. 29). As van Manen (2015) writes:

> Phenomenological method is always a matter of attempts, bids and hopeful risks. Within a phenomenological context, method is never just an engine that will unerringly produce insightful outcomes. Phenomenology is primarily a philosophic *method for questioning*, not a method for answering or discovering or drawing determinate conclusions. (van Manen, 2015, p. 29)

As I have now come to phenomenology twice in my academic career, first in my Master of

Education and now in this doctoral study, I have come to understand van Manen's (2015)

position that phenomenological research includes multiple orientations and emphases grounded

in different professional and academic areas of study. In this manner, I ascribe to Crotty's (1998)

view that phenomenology is the 'first critique', and yet, it is not the "last" (Crotty, 1998, p. 85).

It is worth quoting Crotty (1998) at length in this regard:

> To refer to phenomenology as 'first critique' is already to acknowledge that it is not the
> only critique. Husserl often states that he is concerned with 'beginnings', and
> phenomenology may be viewed as essentially a starting point. One may wish to argue
> that it is a most valuable starting point – an essential starting point, even – but it is by no
> means the be-all and end-all of social inquiry. Nor is the initial attempt to contemplate
> the immediate phenomenon the last. The sociologist will lay the phenomenological
> mantle aside and move far afield but needs to return to the starting point time and again.
> What phenomenology offers social inquiry is not only a beginning root in immediate
> social experience but also a methodology that requires a return to experience at many
> points along the way. It is both starting point and touchstone. (Crotty, 1998, p. 85)

In the tradition of phenomenological research, as both starting point and touchstone, I feel

that I am engaged in a process that is hopeful and risky. Phenomenology is grounded in a

philosophical tradition that is extensive and evolving. In making sense of this breadth of the

tradition, I have attempted to outline what is most salient in this body of literature for the

purposes of framing the research methods I have applied in this study. For primarily

organizational purposes, I have synthesized these key points into a multi-layered, intersecting

conception of knowing as being embodied, dialogical, mediated and ethical in nature.

Embodied knowing and the phenomenological reduction

As noted above, interpretivist methodologies resist positivist and radical constructivist

leanings towards either empirically categorizing or fundamentally questioning the existence of

reality outside of human consciousness. For phenomenology, this resistance is enacted through a

dedicated focus upon concrete lived experience, upon returning to our experience with the world

around us. Husserl (2002c/1981), one of the founders of phenomenology, originally intended for

phenomenology to be a philosophically grounded mode of investigation that transcended what he

termed the *natural attitude*. Husserl (2002c/1981) described this natural attitude as being a

passively engaged composite of our sensations of the world around us with our

conceptualizations of what we apperceive through our senses, in such a manner that, without

intending to, we miss the significance of the objects of our experience. Alternatively, the

phenomenologically reflective attitude, according to Husserl (2002c/1981), makes "the currently

flowing consciousness" and "infinitely multiform world of phenomena at large" the focus of

"fixating observations, descriptions, theoretical investigations" (p. 128). As stated previously,

Husserl's (2002c/1981) argued that this transcendental phenomenology would lead towards an

understanding of the essences of our lived experiences as they are given to pure consciousness

(p. 129). Husserl (2002d/1983) wrote:

> In our transcendental phenomenological attitude we can and must raise the eidetic
> question: *what the "perceived as perceived" is, which eidetic moments it includes in itself
> as this perception-noema.* We receive the answer in the pure directedness to *something
> given* in its essence, and we can faithfully describe the "appearing as appearing" in
> complete evidence. (Husserl, 2002d/1983, p. 137, italics in original).

While Husserl's version of phenomenology met with much criticism and skepticism by

his contemporaries, many of the central concepts that he proposed arguably remain foundational

to interpretive research analysis. One of these concepts, as described in this quote, is that our

lived experiences are always experiences of something, and that the focus of phenomenological

investigation must be *eidetic* – grounded in the description of lived experience. For Husserl

(2002d/1983), in all phenomenological experience, there is both the object of perception as well

as the "concrete mental processes" associated with our perception of the objects themselves (p.

144).   The starting point of phenomenology, for Husserl, was to set aside our pre-conceptions

and theoretical understanding of phenomena under investigation before undertaking an exploration of such phenomena. Husserl termed this *epoché*, or the act of *bracketing*, all "objective actualities", including all scientific knowledge (2002c/1981, p. 130), such that the phenomenologist aimed at the "withholding of natural naïve validities and general validities in effect" (Husserl, 2002b/1970, p. 172). Husserl argued that the practice of bracketing would enable the phenomenologist to reveal the pure or essential nature of the phenomena under investigation (Husserl, 2002b/1970).

Husserl's original introduction of the phenomenological reduction, as *epoché*, has since developed alternative variations from his essentialist conception of the term. Rocha (2015) writes that, in the same manner in which we "simmer" a delicious, tasty "stock, sauce or gravy" (p. 32), phenomenological reduction can be described as the manner in which we:

> …go about knowing phenomena or things as best we can by taking them as they are and moving inward through a gentle caress (like evaporation) of the imagination to intensify them and render them more radically saturated than they are. […] The essence of a reduction may not be its taste or sound at all; it may simply be the thing fully evaporated that leaves behind an unquestionable aroma of itself, like the sacred moment of silence at the end of a music performance, just before the applause begins. (Rocha, 2015, p. 32).

This poetic depiction of the phenomenological reduction is a form of heuristic reduction in and of itself, meant to induce wonder and openness to phenomenology as a way of seeking, sensing and seeing the world (Rocha, 2015). As a criterion of analysis, the *epoché* and reduction are thus multiple and dynamic. For Vagle (2014), such a dynamic criterion is encapsulated in Dahlberg's (2006) move from bracketing to what she described as "bridling". Dahlberg (2006) explained that bridling includes:

> [T]he restraining of one's pre-understanding in the form of personal beliefs, theories, and other assumptions that otherwise would mislead the understanding of meaning and thus limit the researching openness. The term ''bridling'' moreover covers an understanding that not only takes care of the particular pre-understanding, but the understanding as a whole. We bridle the understanding so that we do not understand too quick, too

carelessly, or slovenly, or in other words, that we do not make definite what is indefinite. (Dahlberg, 2006, p. 16).

The notion of bridling in phenomenology associates with a "forward-looking" approach toward hermeneutic analysis, a sense of the ways in which we live with the phenomena as we explore it in the present (Vagle, 2014, p. 67).

Dahlberg's (2006) turn to the notion of bridling, at least partially, is based in Merleau-Ponty's (2004/1945) critique and elaboration of Husserl's notion of the phenomenological attitude and the reduction. Merleau-Ponty (2004/1945) sought a deeper understanding of how it is that we interact with the world around us, as individuals in different spatial and temporal locations, surrounded by different social and natural environments, endowed with different physical and mental abilities and disabilities. For Merleau-Ponty (2004/1945), a phenomenology of perception goes beyond a Husserlian search for pure consciousness by viewing consciousness as always being enabled and limited by, and through, the embodiment of our sense perception. Merleau-Ponty (2004/1945) proposed that the "diversity of the senses" and sense perception "appears as necessary to the world" (p. 256). It is through our embodied interaction with the world that consciousness is made possible, underlined by the premise of "sense experience as the assumption of a form of existence" (Merleau-Ponty, 2004/1945, p. 257). Merleau-Ponty (2004/1945) wrote:

> Sensation as it is brought to us by experience is no longer some inert substance or abstract moment, but one of our surfaces of contact with being, a structure of consciousness, and in place of one single space, as the universal condition of all qualities, we have with each one of the latter, a particular manner of being in space and, in a sense, of making space. (Merleau-Ponty, 2002/1962, p. 257).

From a sociological position, a key aspect of Merleau-Ponty's (2002/1962) conception of sense and embodied consciousness is that we cannot deny our "revealed subjectivity, revealed to itself and others" (p. 257). Through sense perception, we experience our embodied subjectivity,

not as an absolute singularity, but as inherent in our being with others. We each experience

embodied subjectivity in relation to another, as intersubjectivity (Merleau-Ponty, 2002/1962, p.

421). Our embodied sense perception necessitates a diversity of perceptions, as we each interact

with others and the world around us, not as objects of our perception, but through an

intersubjective consciousness. This intersubjectivity is experienced and expressed through the

body and sense perception, as gesture, emotion and speech, lived intersubjectively, as Gadamer

(2004/1975) writes, as a *fusion of horizons*.

Dialogical knowing and the *fusion of horizons*

The concept of *horizon* is another conceptual offering from Husserl that continues to

resonate in phenomenological research and writing. It is a versatile concept that has both

theoretical and practical significance and is intricately interwoven with Husserl's notion of the

lifeworld. In conceptual terms, Husserl equates his usage of the term horizon with the "world of

experience", understood as "the constant horizon of existing things, values, practical plans,

works" which "has meaning and validity to us" (Husserl, 2002b/1970, p. 161). In this sense, our

horizon of lived experience refers to the breadth and limits of intentional cognitive capacities in

relation to the "pregiven world" (Husserl, 2002b/1970, p. 163). We cannot intentionally attend

to everything within the field of our immediate surroundings and yet, it is within the entirety of

our surroundings that we are able to make sense of that which we are perceiving. It is, in this

way, that we engage in "practical life" (Husserl, 2002b/1970, p. 163). Similar to how we might

look at a horizon in the distance, our field of attention is always less than what we could fully

take in, and therefore "in this life-praxis, knowledge, as prescientific knowledge, plays a constant

role" (Husserl, 2002b/1970, p. 163). In a sense, the horizon of lived experience is a way to

explain how it is that, even though we cannot empirically know everything about what is before

us in a situation, we can still make sense of the experience we are in, we can still find meaning

from what we attend to in that experience. Like a piece of music that only makes sense to us in

relation to the notes which come before and after and in relation to music we may have heard in

the past, the horizon of time consciousness, for example, is always a consciousness that is more

than the present moment (Husserl, 2002a/1964).

From a hermeneutic perspective, when we interact with others, then, we might say that

we each interact from a different horizon of knowledge and experience. However, this is

significantly different than saying that we interact with one another through different

perspectives on the same horizon, as might be interpreted by Husserl's more essentialist position.

In phenomenological research and writing, Gadamer's (2004/1974) understanding of horizon is

closely related to the Husserlian (2002b/1970) notion of the *lifeworld* and yet also provides an

important elaboration that has significance to the methodological foundations of this study.

For Gadamer (2004/1974), the notion of horizon provided a heuristic to understand the

intrinsically interpretive aspect of understanding lived experience, not as a means to transcend

such interpretation, but as a necessity, or actuality of our lived experience. Gadamer

(2004/1974) explained,

> The concept of "horizon" suggests itself because it expresses the superior breadth of
> vision that the person who is trying to understand must have. To acquire a horizon
> means that one learns to look beyond what is close at hand – not in order to look away
> from it but to see it better, within a larger whole and in truer proportion. (Gadamer,
> 2004/1975, p 304).

For Gadamer, the concept of horizon is contextual, meaning that our lived experiences are not

only located spatially, temporally, and sensually in relation to ourselves, but, and perhaps most

importantly, textually, with and through language and discourse. This contextualization of the

notion of horizon could be seen to be in juxtaposition to Husserl's transcendental project. In

Gadamer's words (2004/1975),

> [T]he pure transcendental subjectivity of the ego is not really given as such but always
> given in the idealization of language; moreover, language is already present in any
> acquisition of experience, and in the individual ego comes to belong to a particular
> linguistic community. (Gadamer, 2004/1975, pp. 342-343)

For Gadamer (1977), what we know of the world we inhabit is what we can say about it,

how we can express it, in words, gestures and works of art, music, dance. Understanding is our

ability to comprehend one another's lived meanings, through our words and actions, shared

within our own and across different cultures. He explained:

> The phenomenon of understanding, then, shows the universality of human linguisticality
> as a limitless medium that carries *everything* within it – not only the "culture" that has
> been handed down to us through language, but absolutely everything – because
> everything (in the world and out of it) is included in the realm of "understandings" and
> understandability in which we move. (Gadamer, 1977, p. 25)

In intercultural, interpersonal situations, we each bring our context with us, our own

horizon of knowledge and understanding, and the language we use to impart that knowledge and

understanding. In that inter-contextual situation, there is a *fusion of horizons* that takes place, in

varying lesser or greater degrees. We come to (mis)understand one another, through shared

meaning, even where such shared meaning may lead to conflict. Gadamer (2004/1975) wrote:

> In fact, the horizon of the present is continually in the process of being formed because
> we are continually having to test all our prejudices. An important part of this testing
> occurs in encountering the past and in understanding the tradition from which we come.
> Hence the horizon of the present cannot be formed without the past. There is no more an
> isolated horizon of the present than there are historical horizons which have to be
> acquired. *Rather, understanding is always the fusion of these horizons supposedly
> existing by themselves.* (Gadamer, 2004/1975, p. 305).

The fusion of horizons is therefore, in Gadamer's conception, not a conditional

prescription, but a way of understanding how it is that, through written, verbal, gestural and

artistic "text", we come make meaning of the world around us, both as a form of linguistic and

cultural acquisition and as an ongoing fusion between the past and present and between

individuals and groups in particular environments.   Such an understanding is further

complicated when we consider the ways in which technologies are part of, and can alter our

sense of context of, the very horizons that we perceive, as embodied subjectivities.

Mediated knowing and the *lifeworld*

In a world saturated with technologies that affect our day-to-day lives in an almost

endless number of ways, from our birth to our death, our embodied and dialogical knowing must

also be considered from the perspective of mediated knowing. Such mediated knowing may be

so embedded in the ways in which we exist in our world as to become invisible to us and, thus, it

may be become part of how and what we perceive as beings-in-the-world. This integration of

mediated knowing into our lived experience thus opens to an important ethical consideration for

phenomenological research methodology. If material artifacts are viewed as always being part of

our lived, existential experience in the world, we may also view our creation and utilization of

these artifacts as having a direct effect upon the very realities that we can and do experience in

our day-to-day existence.

From a conceptual standpoint, technologically mediated knowing is well captured in the

concept of lifeworld, first introduced by Husserl (2002b/1970). In Husserl's original

signification, the lifeworld is that which is the source of the horizon(s) from which we

experience and interpret the world in which we live together with other people, with animals and

nature and with the tools of human endeavor that change how we theorize, as a praxis, in and of

itself. Following Husserl's (2002b/1970) logic, the lifeworld "[b]elongs to what is taken for

granted, prior to all scientific thought and all philosophical questioning" (Husserl, 2002b/1970,

p. 156), and thus researchers are also "among the components of the life-world which always

exists for us, ever pre-given" (Husserl, 2002b/1970, p. 169). The tools of scientific research, for Husserl, were not therefore, part of the lifeworld, but were rather part of the horizon from which we experienced, and made sense of, the lifeworld.

This conception of human scientific ingenuity as, in an essentialist sense, distorting our ability for taking on the phenomenological attitude resonated with Heidegger (1993/1977). However, Heidegger (1993/1977) determined to explore the technology, as form of phenomenological investigation in and of itself. In his analysis, Heidegger viewed technology as having an essential nature – as Technology rather than technologies. Technology, for Heidegger, was "a mode of revealing" and "unconcealment" and "where *alētheia*, truth, happens" (Heidegger, 1993/1977 p. 319). For Heidegger, Technology represented a potentiality that is always in "reserve", waiting to be accessed by those who understand how to access it. In this manner, as "standing reserve", technology is not immanently comprehended without an understanding of its potentiality and how it has been "ordered" through human ingenuity to be made practical use of (Heidegger, 1993/1977, p. 322).

Heidegger's hermeneutic insight into the phenomenology of technology opens to lived meaning of technologically mediated knowing and yet, in treating technology as one broad category of Being, he did not consider the layering of technologies and the differences in how technologies intersect with the lifeworld. From an integrative perspective, Ihde's (1990) conception of the technological lifeworld extends beyond direct sense perception and interactions with human and non-humans, to the ways in which our sense perception and interactions are affected by technological artifacts themselves and therefore the lifeworld itself. In Ihde's (1990) words, "*[F]or every revealing transformation there is simultaneously concealing transformation of the world, which is given through technological mediation.*

Technologies transform experience, however subtly, and that is one root of their non-neutrality. (p. 49, italics in original).

By bringing together notions of embodied, dialogical and mediated knowing, Ihde (1990) extended phenomenological conceptualization of technology. He argued that this conceptualization could be viewed as encompassing the "pluricultural" technological lifeworlds in which we inhabit and our very understandings of these lifeworlds. For Ihde (1990), while we do, in our modern age, sustain a partial continuity of "bodily and perceptual contact" with our natural environment, there is a danger in asserting that we can, through phenomenology, achieve an understanding of a "non-technological" existence (p. 18). As Ihde (1990) wrote, "care must be taken" in relation to any "imaginative variation" that seeks "to make the sharp contrast between a technological and a non-technological form of life" (p. 18). In this perspective, the fusion of horizons that we experience inter-subjectively are therefore not only embodied and formed through context and dialogue; these horizons are infused with the ways in which technologies mediate embodiment and discourse itself.

Understanding the lifeworld from this perspective is to relieve it of its conception as being pre-given, insofar as we are always, through and in our mediated knowing, changing the lifeworld itself. In this understanding of the lifeworld, a presumed, value-neutral philosophical position is not attainable. Along these lines, Verbeek speaks to a holistic, mediated view of lifeworld, by stating that "[h]umans are what they are on the basis of the ways in which they can manifest themselves in reality, and reality is what is it based on the ways in which it can be experienced by human beings" (Verbeek, 2006, p. 122). Taking this position further, Verbeek argued that this human co-construction of reality, including its material artifacts, engenders and is made possible through morally-suffused decision-making and action-taking:

The ability to co-shape human interpretations of reality puts the autonomy of the moral subject into perspective, just like the mediating role of artifacts in the actions of human beings does. Moral decisions and actions that result from these decisions come about in a relation between the moral subject and its reality. And this relation is mediated in many ways by material artifacts. (Verbeek, 2006, p. 124)

Verbeek's (2006) linking of mediated knowing with the moral subject speaks to a pragmatic-ethical application and purpose of phenomenology as practice, and thus to the practical relevance of phenomenology in the social sciences, including education.

Ethical knowing and pedagogical tactfulness

When we seek to make sense of the relation between ourselves as moral subjects and our reality, we seek to understand our lived experience within the co-shaped human lifeworld horizons in which we each enact our embodied, dialogical and mediated knowing. This enactment is a form of ethical knowing that is rooted in our existential being-with-others in the world. For Heidegger (2010/1953), this rootedness is related to the concept that, in our existential being-together-with others in the world, we are necessarily in a relation of care. In Grossman's (1984) words:

How am I related to the things which are at hand, which are there, which are with me? I care, I am concerned. Heidegger maintains that the relation between a person and world is one of *caring*. [...] The being of human beings, accordingly, is care. Existence and caring are equivalent forms of being. (Grossman, 1984, p. 158)

This concern and care of which Heidegger (2010/1953) wrote might be equated with moral subjectivity. However, such concern and care does not constitute theory nor praxis. Rather they form the base upon which theory and praxis are made possible "for a being whose being must be defined as care" (Grossman, 1984, p.187). Care and concern, as Being, do not inscribe particular ways of responding to situations. Rather, they open to the lived meaning of a situational, ethical knowing that may be viewed as grounded in the infinite potential intersubjective experiences that we can have as human beings with one another and the world (Levinas, 1969).

For van Manen (1997; 2007; 2014; 2015), such ethical knowing is oriented towards what

he terms *pedagogical tactfulness* and comes in the form of advice. As van Manen (2014) wrote,

there is a fundamentally, situationally ethical nature to education:

> On the one hand, pedagogical situations and relationship are ethical and cannot be
> approached or handled in a technical manner. On the other hand, the ability to reflect
> deliberatively about what one should say or do in the immediacy of an interactive event is
> limited in a temporal and relational sense. (van Manen, 2014, p. 189).

As situational context, the pedagogical tactfulness of phenomenological practice is a means of

orienting towards what van Manen (1997) called a *theory of the unique,* an interest "in what is

essentially not replaceable" (p. 7) and found in the "the particular case" (p. 150). In each

interaction with a student, a teacher, advisor or administrator is faced with the uniqueness of that

student and the particular situation in which the teacher, advisor or administrator finds him or

herself in, with that student. The teacher, advisor or administrator is called to respond to that

particular student and situation, and through phenomenology as an educational practice, must

remain attentive to the effects of his or her behaviours, the mannerism and demeanor of the

student, to the time of day, to the weather outside, and so many other lived, existential and even

mundane contextual aspects of the particular situation. As pragmatic-ethical practice, a theory of

the unique thus resists the tendency to generalize and impose prescriptive approaches to

categorization, modes of instruction or technical prescriptions. As such, this practice opens to

critical distinction between "moral reasoning, theorizing and moral judgement" and "ethical

experience, comportment, intuition, thoughtfulness and tact" (van Manen, 2015, p. 196).

Pedagogical tactfulness is thus, for van Manen (2015), a pragmatic-ethical responsibility

inherent to education that can be informed by and through an applied, phenomenological attitude

towards education that is integrative of embodied, dialogical, mediated and ethical knowing.

This attitude may be developed through, and be informed by, a phenomenological approach to

research and writing that is grounded in principles. These principles can direct evolving and distinctive methods and criteria of evaluation, within the qualitative research spectrum.

Principles

This positioning of the interpretive, post-intentional phenomenological approach that I have taken with this research has direct implications in relation to the research methods that I have employed for the study. These implications are best expressed as principles.

Reciprocity and critical, co-construction of meaning

The first, and most important principle underlying the methods of this study is the notion of reciprocity and respectful, co-construction of meaning through establishing clear and purposeful researcher-participant relations, grounded in communities of shared practice. From the interpretive, phenomenological perspective I have outlined above, reciprocity is an enactment of embodied, dialogical, mediated and ethical knowing, a means of engaging with research participants in a way that is related to an action-oriented, purposeful project of relevance to the community of transformative intercultural practice that I am working with (Wagenaar, 2011). In this lens, an interpretive research analysis also acknowledges the potentially transformational nature of policy enactment, insofar as it acknowledges that the sharing of knowledge and experience involves ontological, ethical and political critique (Marder, 2014).

Contextual, lived experience descriptions

This contextual, epistemological orientation frames the second principle upon which I have developed my methods for this proposed research project. In an interpretive research design, the researcher tries to remain grounded in lived experience as part of the heremeneutic, abductive reasoning cycle. This concrete experience, drawing upon a phenomenological emphasis, is rooted in the intent to "meet human beings – men, women, children – *there* where

they are naturally engaged in their worlds (van Manen, 1997, p. 18). Schwartz-Shea & Yanow (2012) explained that the "iterative, recursive and adaptive" nature of interpretive research is derived from the researcher's reflection upon the situated, contextual meaning-making of research participants (p. 55). They wrote:

> [T]his practice of searching for experience-near concepts derives from the conviction that participants possess valuable "local knowledge," concepts and their situated definitions that have grown out of their own daily practices and interactions, reflecting their own lived experiences of the setting, events in it, interactions, and so forth: that is what researchers want to understand. (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p. 50).

A principle focus of my research was to seek such "experience-near concepts" (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p. 50), through methods that brought me closer to the lived experiences of deliberating and enacting transformative approaches to Indigenization and internationalization. Following Vagle (2014), I gathered such data from interviews and observations, and yet also reflected on works of poetry, film and fiction, where they have related to the themes that emerged from analyzing and reflecting on my participants' shared lived experience descriptions.

Evocative, philosophical approach to writing

Such openness to multiple manifestations and ways of interpreting lived experience is central not only to the sharing of, and reflection on, lived experience, but to the ways in which, as a researcher, I impart my own interpretation and analysis. Writing is not an end, but a means to gain deeper understandings of the phenomena under investigation. Phenomenological research and writing should aim, through reduction, or as followed in this dissertation, through bridling, to evoke a strong sense of "wonder in the face of the world" whereby "one is overcome by awe or perplexity – such as when something familiar has turned profoundly unfamiliar, when our gaze has been drawn by the gaze of something that stares back at us" (van Manen, 2014, p. 360). In the research that led to, and in the writing of, the chapters that follow, I have tried to

sustain this sense of wonder both in my own analysis and reflection. Throughout, I have strived

to bring together and share the experiences offered to me by the participants. In doing so, I have

aimed not only "for the clarification of meaning" but for the "meaning" of the text that I have

created with my participants' sharing of their experiences "to become experienced as

meaningful" (van Manen, 2014, p. 373).

As this was an interpretive policy research project, it was important I remained open to

pluralism, temporality, spatiality, and complexity of transformative intercultural practice

(Wagenaar, 2011). As Vagle (2014) described, I have aimed to engage with evocative,

phenomenological writing in a manner that also incorporates a "habit of thinking contextually"

that "draws on philosophical conversation(s), is situated in the identified scholarly

conversation(s) within particular fields, and reflects [my] post-reflexive work" (p. 137). This

philosophical grounding in a post-structural positioning requires grounding of my own self as

researcher, acknowledging that I am "not outside that which is under study (Schwartz-Shea &

Yanow, 2012, p. 80). As such, in the words of Schwartz-Shea & Yanow (2012):

> Admitting the possibility (and legitimacy, from a scientific perspective) of local
> knowledge in the search for understanding contextualized concepts and actor meaning-
> making of events, etc. opens the door to knowledge generated by others than the scientist
> alone. Sense-making by the researcher depends, in this view, on sense-making by those
> actors, who are called upon to explain them to the researcher (whether literally, in
> interviews, or in the common conversations of everyday living, or less directly, in written
> or other records that constitute the material traces of acts, things, and words). (Schwartz-
> Shea & Yanow, 2012, p. 80)

Methods

These three overarching principles, grounded in the phenomenological foundations that I

have outlined in this chapter and aligned in mutuality and respect, to the best of my knowledge

and experience with Indigenous Research Methodologies, have formed the basis of the research

methods for this study. The principle research question that I have explored in this study,

following this methodology was, as shared previously in Chapter 1:

> *What is like to engage in transformative intercultural practice in higher education and how can a deeper understanding of this practice inform Indigenization and internationalization policy-making in the post-secondary sector?*

This principal research question oriented towards the interpretive, phenomenological

methodology outlined thus far, with an emphasis on interviews and focus groups as the primary

method for gathering lived experiential descriptions.

At the outset of my research, however, a further, secondary question underlined my study.

> *What is it like for faculty, staff and students to **enact** transformative Indigenization and internationalization policy, as transformative intercultural practice, in their role(s) on campus?*

In the iterative process of my research, this secondary question eventually led to two other

additional questions that surfaced as being inter-related and necessitating their own chapters of

analysis.

> *What is it like for faculty, staff and students to **deliberate** transformative Indigenization and internationalization policy, as transformative intercultural practice, in their role(s) on campus?*

> *What is it like for faculty, staff and students to **co-create** transformative Indigenization and internationalization policy, as transformative intercultural practice, in their role(s) on campus?*

In the following section, I explain the methods that I took to explore these questions. I provide

an overview of the interview and focus group protocols, including the sampling technique I

employed and the central role that reflective walks and journal writing have played throughout

my research process. I then provide a description of the participants who were part of this study

and the total number of interviews and focus groups, as well as transcript hours. In the final

sections, I explain how I approached the analysis of data from the interviews and focus groups

and the evaluative research criteria against which I have measured this analysis and my overall research methods, from start to finish.

Interviews and focus groups

Following the approach outlined by Vagle (2014), I aimed, where possible, to conduct two semi-structured interviews with each participant. All participants signed a consent form, interviews and focus groups were recorded, and all transcripts were sent to participants for their approval. The purpose of the first interview and focus group was to explore the participants' lived experiences associated with transformative Indigenization and internationalization on their campuses. The general flow of this first round of interviews and focus groups is captured in Chart 1.

In the second set of interviews and focus groups, where this was possible to arrange, I had prepared some initial analysis and themes from the first round of interviews and focus groups for further discussion with the participants. At that time, the broad themes that I had developed were oriented to what I had understood as the juxtaposed dispositions of ally/adversary, steward/bystander and kin/stranger. I explained how I came to these dispositions and what I was coming to understand as their lived meanings in their lived practice. I drew from their previous interview as a source of my interpretations and asked if my analysis resonated with them. Participants shared their thoughts on this initial analysis and through our conversational interview or focus group, offered further experiences or elaborated on those that they had previously shared.

As noted in Chart 1, my interview and focus group questions had an orientation towards exploring the ethical dimensions of my participants' descriptions of their work in transformative Indigenization and internationalization on their campuses. In my original and probing questions,

I delved into issues of racism and discrimination. I did not, however, pursue these questions without sensing it was safe to do so. More often than not, my participants broached issues of racism and discrimination of their own accord. Where I introduced such a question, it was in relation to an experience the participant had shared that either directly or indirectly noted such issues or behaviours as being prevalent. Importantly, in conducting all interviews and focus groups, I paid heed to Seidman's (2013) cautionary that "interviewers must try to avoid imposing their own interests on the experience of the participants" (Seidman, 2013, p. 94).

The guide that is outlined in Table 1 provides a general outline of the first interview and of the types of probing questions that I employed. However, as noted above, both the first and second interview and focus group protocols followed a conversational style. This style reflected Seidman's (2013) acknowledgement that "sometimes an important question will start out as an ill-defined instinct or hunch which takes time to develop and seems risky to ask" (p. 95). I often felt as Seidman described, that my questions reflected my own "groping for coherence about what is being said" (Seidman, 2013, p. 85). I relied on my "genuine interest" in my participants and in recognizing the inherent "worth" of their "stories", within and beyond the scope of my study (Seidman, 2013, p. 96).

It is important to note that, in my first and second interviews, policy was addressed in both direct and indirect ways. In the first interview, I did not specifically introduce a question on policy until near the end, especially where the participant did not bring in policy or strategy until that point. In the second interview, I spoke to policy in relation to the types of dispositions that I relayed back to the participants, as a means to invoke further reflection on lived experience. My intention in taking this approach was to allow space in my interview protocols for the role of policy and strategy to be revealed within the description of my participants' lived experiences.

Table 1: Conversational interview #1 questions

Research Question	Topic	Main interview question	Probing questions
What is it like to enact trans-formative Indigenization and internationalization policy, as critical intercultural practice, in their role(s) on campus?	General tour	What can you tell me about your role on campus?	• What are the responsibilities associated with your role? • How long have you been in this role? • Who do you work with mostly on a day-to-day basis? Faculty, students, staff? • What does a typical day look like for you in your role? • Are you involved in any committees, task forces, associations, etc. associated with internationalization or Indigenization, or matters of anti-racism, inclusion, social justice? • How do you see your role in relation to internationalization and/or Indigenization?
	Experiences of success / lack of success	What is it like to feel successful in your role?	• Can you think of the last time you felt success in your role? • What made that experience successful for you? What happened? • What do you remember about this moment or event? • Questions that delve into the experience further
		What is like to not feel successful in your role?	• Can you think of the last time you didn't feel success in your role? • What made that experience feel unsuccessful? What happened? • What do you remember about this moment or event? • Questions that delve into the experience further
	Experiences of exclusion / inclusion & social justice	What is it like to face racist or discriminatory behaviours and / or practice in your role on campus?	• Can you think of an experience you have had where you encountered racist or discriminatory behaviours and/or practices on campus? • What do you remember about this experience? • Questions that delve into the experience further
		What is it like for you to enact inclusive behaviours and/or practices in your role on campus?	• Can you think of a recent or particularly significant experience where you have felt included on campus? • What do you recall the most about the action that you took? • Questions that delve into the experience further

		What is like for you to engage in matters of (global) social justice on campus?	• Can you think of a recent or particularly significant experience where you enacted inclusive behaviours and/or practices? • What do you remember about this experience? • Questions that delve into the experience further
What is it like to discursively engage in transformative Indigenization and internationalization policy sense-making?	Experiences with committees, planning and task forces	What is it like for you to engage in committees, task forces or associations associated with your work on campus?	• Can you think of a recent or particularly significant experience where you engaged on a committee, task force or association related to your work on campus? • What do you remember about this experience? • Questions that delve into the experience further
		What is it like for you develop respectful relationships between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples in your work on campus?	• Can you think of a recent or particularly significant experience where you engaged in developing respectful relationships? • What do you remember about this experience? • Questions that delve into the experience further / may also ask for another example
	Ethics & policy	What can you tell me about your underlying ethical and policy approach to your work on campus?	• What are the policies that underlie your work and how do they relate to your day-to-day experience? • From what sources do you draw your ethical approach? • How does your ethical approach relate to that of your colleagues? Of your institution? • Can you think of a particular experience that you haven't shared in this interview that exemplifies your ethical approach or the policy foundation of your work?
Conclusion			• Before we conclude, is there anything you would like to add?

Sampling

In my recruitment of participants for this study, I took a purposeful sampling approach (Seidman, 2013). I aimed to achieve sufficiency of representation in my sampling such that I had an adequate mix of faculty, staff and senior leadership with a balanced representation of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal participants and that, among the non-Aboriginal participants,

there was diversity of cultural backgrounds, including international students, where possible. There were many exigencies that affected how well I was able to maintain this balance; however, through the recruitment tactics I employed, I was able to gain access to a diversity of participants in a straightforward, respectful and collegial manner. I did this my working through both formal and informal gatekeepers, and through tapping my own networks of friends and acquaintances who work in the field of Indigenization and internationalization (Seidman, 2013, pp. 45-49).

In this manner, I started by working through existing committees, groups or units on campus dedicated to inclusion and diversity, including reconciliation, anti-racism and intercultural learning. I also contacted individuals who I knew were involved in such work on their campus, inviting them to share this study with others or, if they were interested, to participate in the study. My introductory email included a Letter of Initial Contact and was shared with members or staff within these communities, groups or units and, in almost all cases, this resulted in successful recruitment of interviewees or focus groups. I then followed up directly with those who were interested in the study and provided further information, including a Letter of Consent for Release of Contact Information and a Letter of Participant Consent.

I considered this recruitment aspect of my study for a long time, given the importance of participant access in interpretive research. Access is critical because the "meaning-making of those studied is intimately linked with context" and thus "the relative power of individuals and groups, the possible kinds and degrees of participation, positionality" all "need attention from the very beginning in designing an interpretive research project" (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p. 71). By engaging in focus group and interview participation, and by incorporating an interpretive policy lens through a post-intentional phenomenological methodology, I was able to provide a variability in how I engaged research participants and approached the topic from a

researcher perspective. By this, I mean: first, I acknowledged, throughout my interviews and focus groups with my participants my own experiences in and perspectives of the work of transformative Indigenization and internationalization; and second, I ensured that I met in places that suited the participants. For example, for one focus group, I joined their regular meeting time and for another, we met in their board room during their workday, interrupted on two occasions to deal with emergent student issues. I also met individual participants in their offices, homes, and in one instance, while driving. An unexpected development in the recruitment of participants was that I had three groups of two to three participants who wanted to conduct their interviews together. Two of these pairs/triads were Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal colleagues who worked closely together.

At the outset, I did not fix an exact number of anticipated participants. In phenomenologically grounded study, the notions of sampling and saturation of data gathered from interviewing is a relevant factor; however, a far more important aspect is the manner in which interviewing takes place and what kind of data is gathered (van Manen, 1997; 2014). According to van Manen (2014), it is not necessarily the number of participants that determines the quality of a study that aims at gathering lived experience descriptions, but rather, it is the quality and uniqueness of the knowledge and experience shared by the participants involved in the research that matter more:

> [The] more important question to ask is "How many examples of concrete experiential descriptions would be appropriate for this study in order to explore the phenomenological meanings of this or that phenomenon? […] Phenomenology looks not for sameness or repetitive patters. Rather, phenomenology aims at what is singular and a singular theme or notion may only be seen once in experiential data. […] A phenomenologist actually looks for that instant when an insight arises that is totally unique to a certain example (sample) of a lived experience description. (van Manen, 2014, p. 353).

This guidance from van Manen (2014) was extremely helpful in proceeding in my research process. I knew early on that my participants were sharing important and meaningful experiences and reflections and that, in order to properly analyze what they shared, I needed to hold back. In a short timeframe, I had over 20 participants, which can become a fairly large sample when following the contextually rich, careful procedures of analysis and draft writing as outlined by Vagle (2014). It is to a description of my participants and the methods I used to analyze their reflections and experiences as they shared them with me in our interviews and focus groups that I now turn.

Participants

As noted, I was able to recruit a diverse group of 25 participants, 23 of which I included in this study. These participants came from a range of statuses and roles on their campus. I have given the participants pseudonyms and, in reviewing transcripts, I removed all references to identifiable locations, incidents, committees, and other such items. This was done, as much as possible, to protect the identities of the participants and to keep focus on the lived meanings of their experiences and reflections. In total, I had 2 focus group interviews, 3 pair-group interviews, and 7 individual interviews. I have laid out details for these different groups of interviewees in Table 2.

The diversity of representation of these 23 participants, aside from their status and role at their institution, was relatively broad, including age, gender, sex and cultural background. As I did not request demographic data of the participants, much of my knowledge of their particular backgrounds came through one-on-one interactions and interviews. My decision to not explicitly collect demographic data was intentional, given that I was not attempting, through my methodology, to make inferences between my participants' specific demographic characteristics

and their lived experiences. As a study drawing from post-intentional phenomenology, my focus

was on the lived experience descriptions provided by the participants and the thematic elements

that, through further research and reflection, may provide deeper insight into the lived meaning

of the phenomenon under investigation. Of the knowledge that I did gain through these

interactions, the following demographic data is, I believe, the most important to share in relation

to this study:

- Of the 23 participants in the study
  - 6 were Indigenous and 18 were non-Indigenous;
  - 10 were from visible minority groups and 14 were Caucasian;
  - 18 were female and 6 were male

With these 23 participants, I conducted 26 interviews for a total of approximately 28

hours of interview transcripts. As noted in Chart 2, I conducted 6 single interview sessions,

including 1 focus group, 3 paired interview groups and one individual interview. I also

conducted ten second interview sessions, including 1 focus group, 1 paired interview group, and

8 individual participants (including 1 person from a previously paired interview group). These

paired interview groups were not planned and emerged either by relation and convenience. By

this, I mean that the paired interviews included participants who worked closely together and, by

convenience and by their wish to be interviewed at the same time, I arranged with them a single

time for the interview. These paired interviews turned out to be quite effective and interesting,

as the participants in the interviews often interacted with each other in ways that led to new and

rich experiential recollections. In completing transcripts and continuing on with the first and

second round of interviews, I quickly began to realize the richness of experience and reflection

that was being shared. This emergent and iterative analysis began from the first interviews

themselves and through to the completion of the last chapter of this dissertation.

Table 2: Interview and focus group participants by status and role

Method	No. of participants	Pseudonym	Status	Role	No. of interviews
Focus Group A	6	Melanie	Staff	International education advisor / Student affairs	2
		Belen	Staff	International education advisor / Student affairs	
		Casandra	Staff	Education & Training	
		Sarina	Staff	Leadership (International education)	
		Iris	Staff	International education advisor / Student affairs	
		Lana	Staff	International education advisor / Student affairs	
Focus Group B	4	Aubrey	Staff	Human resources consultant	1
		Farah	Staff	Human resources consultant	
		Gordon	Student	Policy analyst	
		Kamal	Student	Policy analyst	
Individual interviews *	7	Maya	Faculty	Teaching, research & advising	2
		Melinda	Faculty	Leadership, teaching & research	2
		Chris	Staff	Leadership (International education)	2
		Dominic	Staff	Leadership (Human Resources)	2
		Daniela	Staff	Leadership (Human Resources)	2
		Sophie	Student	Human resources consultant, Lecturer	2
		Terrence	Student	Leadership (Student government)	2
Paired interviews **	6	Diane (A)	Faculty	Teaching, research & advising	2
		Nadine (A)	Faculty	Leadership, teaching & research	2
		Elsie (B)	Student	Lecturer	1
		Mary (B)	Student	Lecturer	2
		Leslie (C)	Staff	Aboriginal student advising / Student affairs	1
		Kendra (C)	Staff	Aboriginal student advising / Student affairs	1
Totals	23				26

* I conducted two additional interviews that I decided not to include in the research analysis. For one of these interviews, I determined that, after completion of, and in further analysis and review of the transcripts, the interviewee's connection to the topic of transformative intercultural practice was tenuous. For the second of these interviews, I determined that the interviewee's contribution was more oriented to guidance for the overall direction of my research project, particularly with reference to how I approached integration of Aboriginal scholarship.
** In the paired interview with Diane and Nadine, a third person was introduced in the second interview. This person consented to the interview, but she did not follow up afterwards. After repeated emails, I determined to exclude her sections of the transcript.

Analysis

My analysis of the interview transcripts was in four phases, "crossing boundaries" of prescriptive phenomenological methods of analysis, yet being grounded in what Vagle (2014) termed "commitments" (Vagle, 2014, p. 98). The first phase, involving the first set of interviews and focus groups, involved transcription with limited editing, focusing on removing identifiable references to committees, schools, other faculty or students and having the participants review the transcripts for approval. I then conducted a "holistic reading" of each text for broad themes, using a highlighter and pen to note striking examples on hard copies of the transcripts (Vagle,

2014, p. 2014). After this "holistic reading", I engaged in a "first line-by-line reading" where I undertook "careful notetaking and marking of excerpts" that I felt shed light on "initial meanings" (Vagle, 2014, p. 98). After this line-by-line reading of each text, I formulated follow up "questions to clarify intentional meanings" of my "early stages of analysis" with my participants (Vagle, 2014, p. 99). As noted previously, these "intentional meanings" from this first stage of analysis were juxtaposed dispositions of ally/adversary, steward/bystander, and kin/stranger. In reviewing these dispositions with the participants in the second interview, drawing from the transcripts, I was able to gather additional lived experience descriptions and reflections. Again, I completed transcription with limited editing and removal of identifiable references, and had the participants approve the edited transcripts.

After having completed both interviews, I compiled and printed all transcripts, by participant, with initial analysis. I then conducted a "second line-by-line reading", writing my analysis directly on the transcripts and marked participants' lived experience descriptions and critical reflections (Vagle, 2014, p. 99). I aimed to make connections within transcripts and across the two interviews for each participant, especially where participants returned to previous recollections, making connections and reflecting more deeply on the experiences shared by the participants. At this point, I entered into what I would say was the second phase of my analysis. I started to go deeper into my own exploratory writing on the topic. I also connected with my supervisory committee individually and reviewed how I was beginning to see the structure of the analysis chapters unfold. With this reflection and input, I determined that I would separate the analysis chapters by the lived experiences of policy framing and policy enactment and, importantly, I would not integrate connections I was seeing with Aboriginal cultural teachings until the final chapter, or conclusion. Around this time, I began to undertake a journal writing

practice, reflecting on my methodology and approach to analysis, especially with regard to managing data and organizing my ideas from analyses of the transcripts. This journaling was "an example of bridling", whereby I sough to "harness" what I was reading and thinking about such that I acknowledged, or took ownership of, my "presuppositions" and questioned "how they might influence the analysis" (Vagle, 2014, p. 99). I also began to further conduct research into fiction, film, theatre, poetry and art to expand sources of lived experience, based on my initial analysis.

A major shift at this point in my analysis involved a third line-by-line reading where I "articulated the analytic thoughts for each participants" and began re-organizing and editing transcripts into broader analytic categories, identifying the most detailed and evocative lived experience descriptions (Vagle, 2014, p. 99). At this point, I created a new document, in order to re-organize the lived experience descriptions and reflections by participant name and gave these "tentative manifestations preliminary titles" (Vagle, 2014, p. 99). I re-read and considered these manifestations of lived experience multiple times, often noticing "new things", requiring me to "add and delete analytic thoughts" (Vagle, 2014, p. 99).

My goal in this process of analysis and revision of the lived experience descriptions of my participants into anecdotal format was to increase their flow, comprehensibility and effect and connect different sections of transcripts where the participants described the same experience. While, in day-to-day life, we might view anecdotal evidence as lacking in substance, in phenomenology, anecdotes act as a form of "poetic truth" that can lay "bare the covered-over meanings" of our lifeworld through their "pragmatic thrust" as a "leveling device" that "humanizes" and democratizes" what is often otherwise highly technical, abstracted or "alienating discourse" of experts and the academy (van Manen, 1997, p. 119). For example, in

making these revisions, I switched the lived experience description to the present tense and separated out analytical or generalized statements. As I separated this information out, I retained the entirety of the transcript in a footnote for that lived experience descriptions so as not to lose the content itself, if needed, especially where this information might broaden or complicate understandings of the experiences and reflections shared by the participants.

I printed out all the anecdotes that I had developed from the participants' lived experience descriptions, each on their own sheet of paper, double-spaced, and organized them in a binder. At this point, I entered the third phase of my analysis, which was to begin writing my analysis chapters.

Throughout the draft writing process and into the conclusion, I found that I was shifting thematic analyses and seeing their interconnectedness between the division of the chapters. I found myself striving for what Vagle (2014) described as "noticings" (p. 118). Vagle (2014) drew from the concept of "lines of flight" developed by Deleueze and Guattari (1987, cited in Vagle, 2014) in explaining the following approach to phenomenological analysis,

> [T]he concept, lines of flight, does not assume that any thing, idea, belief, goal, phenomenon, person, animal, object, etc., can be thought of as stable, singular, and final. Instead, all things are connected and interconnected in all sorts of unstable, changing, partial and fleeting ways. This is important to post-intentional phenomenology as a political philosophy as the connective nature of social, ethical, and political relations does not lend itself to simplicities and essences. It does lend itself to complexities and tentative understandings. (Vagle, 2014, p. 118).

For Vagle (2014), the manner in which a researcher can engage with *lines of flight*, is through two types of "noticings": the first being to "actively looking for ways that knowledge 'takes off'" and the second being to "distinguish lines of flight from other lines operating on us and the phenomenon" (p. 135). Vagle's (2014) first "noticing" is also looking for "what doesn't seem to fit" based on an abductive reasoning process (p. 135). As I came to the end of my

analysis for each chapter and nearing the conclusion of my dissertation, I kept asking myself "If I

follow this 'mis-fit' notion, idea, insight, perspective, what might I learn about the phenomenon

that is not yet think-able?" (Vagle, 2014, p. 135). In this manner, I often shifted my analysis by

questioning myself:

1. Where might I have retreated into either/or thinking?
2. Where might I appear "certain" of what something means?
3. Where might I have extended to something creative and intriguing, but then backed
   off to something a bit more safe?
4. Where might I appear to be "uncertain" of what something means?
(Vagle, 2014, p. 135-136).

Oftentimes, in this reflective process, I found myself taking long walks, thinking through

the ideas that had been surfacing and re-organizing sections of my writing. The best writing of

my research occurred at times that I usually least expected, where often I found I was "still

writing when for a walk [I was] suddenly 'overcome,' as it were, by some new thought" (van

Manen, 2014, p. 346). In this organic process of research and writing, I also found early on that I

needed to journal quite extensively to allow for my questions and emerging ideas to flow more

freely. I found my journaling acted as a coach and critique, as I urged myself to continue

forward and at the same time took a critical, reflective view of the work I had completed to that

point. In phenomenology, I knew that the methods of analysis I employed were intricately linked

to criteria of evaluation that my study would be subject to.

Evaluative criteria

At the core of assessing the quality of this research is the manner in which I have applied

the principles and methods for this study that I have so far described. As noted in the earlier

sections of this chapter, unlike quantitative methods which aim for relevance, accuracy and

precision of data and its generalizability, qualitative research is oriented towards *coherence* in

"the extent to which methods meet research goals" (Sarantakos, 2013, p. 105). Where

quantitative research is evaluated based on validity, whereby the measure used for research and analysis "actually measures what the research says it is measuring", interpretive research "is evaluated on the extent to which it explores the complexity [of human experience] while recognizing the social nature of research itself" (Oliver, 2010, p. 79). Oliver (2010) explains that in this evaluative measure of interpretive research, it is *trustworthiness* that acts as "an underlying logic" that has no explicit "rule book" (p. 79).

While there might not be a rule book for trustworthiness in an interpretive research study, there are principles upon which such trustworthiness must rest. I have shared those principles earlier in this chapter, and following Schwartz-Shea & Yanow (2012), a primary criterion of assessment that I have grounded my research in is my "reflexivity" in how I engage these principles from start to finish. They wrote:

> "Reflexivity" refers to a researcher's active consideration of and engagement with the ways in which his own sense-making and the particular circumstance that might have affected it, throughout all aspects of the research process, relate to the knowledge claims he ultimately makes in written form. (Shwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p. 100).

Importantly, I have attempted, throughout the study to acknowledge "the fluidity, open-endedness, and complexity of lived experience" in a manner that "calls attention to the ambiguities and multi-facetdness of meaning-making" (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p. 102). I have aimed, throughout this study, to be fully transparent in sharing how I have gathered and analyzed data, of my own relationship to the work of transformative intercultural practice and in the attendant limitations of the research design choices that I have made. This *reflexivity* and *transparency* of the choices I have made in my research design and analysis should reveal the *systematicity* of the manner in which I have undertaken this study (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012. P. 104). Such systematicity includes ensuring, through enacting methods of questioning myself by "consciously search[ing] for evidence that will force a self-challenging reexamination

of initial impressions, pet theories or favoured explanations" (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p. 105). I have aimed to infuse the notion of "checking researcher sense-making" throughout my study, from its very inception by engaging with the "complexities and tentative understandings" of the deliberation and enactment of the multiple, intersecting and often conflictual policies and politics of Indigenization and internationalization in higher education (Vagle, 2014, p. 118).

One critical aspect of this process was the inclusion of "member checking" through going back to my research participants with my analysis, but also through other mechanisms, such as presenting my findings at conferences and in classes on the topic of Indigenization or internationalization and publishing two reviewed and edited academic book chapters based on my research (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p. 106). In undertaking these kinds of checks on my own analysis, I have also attempted to review, repeatedly, the "logic and explanatory coherence of the analysis" of my research design, including its style of writing (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p. 106). While I aim to conclude with guidance on how we can potentially improve how we co-create transformative Indigenization and internationalization on our campuses, I do so in context to this study, in its all its tentativeness, ambiguity and recursive analysis. I have tried to ensure that each chapter builds in some way on the other, that I draw from multiple perspectives and sources, and that I reflexively engage with conflicting notions. I have tried to create a text that is set up such that "[c]onflicting interpretations are engaged in such a way that the research puzzle is 'made sense of' – the 'plot' is 'resolved,' so to speak" (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p. 109). To do this, I have tried to engage a methodology that leads to a "denouement of entangled interpretations" through "authorial judgement and theorizing" (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p. 109).

These criteria underlying the trustworthiness of my study, namely reflexivity, transparency, systematicity and coherence have been central guides for the ways in which I have conducted my research study. Throughout the process, I have sought to hone my research and writing in a manner that I might "create a sense of resonance in the reader" such that "the reader recognizes the plausibility" of the experiences of transformative intercultural practice "even if he or she has never personally experienced the particular moment" or the kinds of interactions and events that surfaced in my study (van Manen, 2014, p. 240).   This notion of *resonance* corresponds to *relationality*, perhaps the most important criteria of interpretive educational policy research. As a measure of the quality of this study, relationality must be evaluated by the standards of the communities with and in which I have engaged (Lincoln, 1995; Smith, 2012). As a practitioner, I have developed some understanding of such standards as they relate to the communities I have worked with. In analyzing the lived experiences and reflections of my research participants, I have made new connections with my own lived experiences. In this manner, I have found that I have re-framed my own understandings. How I have shared what I have learned about transformative Indigenization and internationalization policy sense making has taken on a form of accountability, in and of itself (Wagenaar, 2011; Wilson, 2008). I have tried to remain attentive to what this research means to my participants, both as a means of sharing knowledge and experience and as a means of considering the lived meaning of that knowledge and experience as transformative intercultural practice. I tried to ensure that I attended to a diversity of voices and perspectives, through both the sampling of participants for this study and through the research that I explored as I analyzed my participants' transcripts and we further explored the meanings of those transcripts in more depth. Most importantly, I have

tried to write this study with the intention to ensure that it is inherently read-able and of value to

practitioners, including, but extending beyond those involved in this study.

Conclusion

In working through this interpretive design for this research study, I have come to

experience the intellectual and often times psychological and emotional demands of a post-

intentional phenomenological approach. I have found myself working against an inclination to

"binaries such as either-or thinking, right-wrong, normal-abnormal" and struggling to critically

contending with "rigid thinking" of "rigid decision-making, rigid perceptivity, and rigid

methodologies" of my own or others' approaches to the description and study of, and the

deliberation and/or enactment of, transformative Indigenization and internationalization (Vagle,

2014, p. 118).   I have recognized time and again that the scope of and approach to this research

study challenges my limits and opens me to a broad critique. In this, I have often taken solace in

a paraphrased quote from Heidegger on the intent and value of phenomenological research:

> Some argue that phenomenology has no practical value because "you cannot do anything
> with phenomenological knowledge". From the point of view of instrumental reason, it
> may be quite true to say that we cannot do anything with phenomenological knowledge.
> But to paraphrase Heidegger, the more important question is not "Can we do something
> with phenomenology?" Rather, we should wonder: "Can phenomenology, if we concern
> ourselves deeply with it, do something with us?" (van Manen, 1997, p. 45)

In opening to a phenomenological emphasis in this interpretive research policy analysis

of transformative Indigenization and internationalization, I have contended with self-questioning.

I have asked myself, over and over, if I have substantively made connections between

deliberation and enactment, between Indigenization and internationalization, between

transformation and co-creation. I have reconceptualized chapters, revisited lived experience

descriptions, and returned again and again to practice of reflexivity. In that process, I have come

to understand what Heidegger may have meant by his statement regarding the deeply personal,

transformative potential of phenomenology. I have also, however, come to better understand the

multiple formative aspects of phenomenology, as described by van Manen (2007):

> Phenomenology formatively informs, reforms, transforms, performs and preforms the relation between being and practice. In-formatively, phenomenological studies make possible thoughtful advice and consultation. Re-formatively, phenomenological texts make a demand on us, changing us in what we may become. Transformatively, phenomenology has practical value in that it reaches into the depth of our being, prompting a new becoming. Per-formatively, phenomenological reflection contributes to the practice of tact. And pre-formatively, phenomenological experience gives significance to the meanings that influence us before we are even aware of their formative value. (van Manen, 2007, p. 30).

The scope of this formative potential of phenomenology that van Manen (2007) described, as a

matter of both method and methodology, has mattered as deeply in my day-to-day practice as in

my research and writing. And yet, there has yet been more that I sought to grasp in this study

and in my day-to-day work, a transformative potential of phenomenology that has significance to

post-secondary education policy in the public domain. As I faced this challenge to the

application of phenomenology in policy studies, I realized that such social, political purpose was

"shot through" this research, in the lived experiences shared with me by my research

participants, in my own underlying values and biases associated with this research, and as a

matter of the "dialogic" nature of the more "post-intentional" approach I have taken with this

study (Vagle, 2014, p. 42).

At the outset of this chapter, I quoted from Vagle (2014), where he explained that a "post-

intentional phenomenology", being "post-structural" in nature, enables "old phenomenology" to

branch apart from being purely a "philosophy of lived experience" to also being "a philosophy

capable of being used toward political ends" (p. 114). I have found this call to a different

phenomenology compelling, insofar as it "does not assume than any thing, idea, belief, goal,

phenomenon, person, animal, object, etc. can be thought of as stable, singular, final" (Vagle,

2014, p. 118). As Vagle (2014) concluded,

Instead, all things are connected and interconnected in all sorts of unstable, changing, partial, fleeting ways. This is important to post-intentional phenomenology as a political philosophy is the connective nature of social, ethical, and political relations does not lend itself to simplicities and essences. It does lend itself to complexities and tentative understandings. (Vagle, 2014, p. 118).

What follows in these next chapters is an exploration of such "complexities and tentative understandings" in relation to the deliberation, enactment and co-creation of transformative Indigenization and internationalization, as a prescient "social, ethical and political" matter of our times (Vagle, 2014, p. 118). Considering how such a post-intentional approach to phenomenology relates to transformative intercultural practice, the ultimate evaluative criteria rests upon if and how what follows in these pages impacts you, as a reader and practitioner. What matters is if what follows in the next chapters speaks to your experience and opens you to new ways of looking at and engaging in the policy-making of Indigenization and internationalization. What matters is if is written in a fashion that invites you to "make new connections to new ideas" (Wilson, 2008, p. 94) through "noticing" not only what transformative intercultural practice is lived as, but also "what it might become" in the policy and strategy making contexts of our institutions (Vagle, 2014, p. 136).

Chapter 5: Deliberating

In assessing our lives, we have reason to be interested not only in the kind of lives we manage to lead, but also in the freedom that we actually have to choose between different styles and ways of living. Indeed, the freedom to determine the nature of our lives is one of the valued aspects of living that we have reason to treasure. The recognition that freedom is important and can also broaden the concerns and commitments we have.
- *Amartya Sen (2009), The Idea of Justice, p. 227*

Questioning

We don't need to be involved in formal politics, or be a social scientist, to experience the political or to be engaged in matters of policy. When we get into our car, take our bike, ride the bus, walk or use a mobility device to get to work, school or any other destination, we engage with the policies of our communities and, in our actions, we reveal much about ourselves. Every day, we make decisions that reflect how we choose to live in the world from the choices we think or know we are capable to choose from. This is not to say, in a different way, that the personal is political. It is to say that the parameters, rules and norms of our behaviour are integrated into our lives in ways that become, in some ways, invisible to us. The cars we drive, the roads we drive upon, the use of bike lanes (if we have them), the bus routes, the quality of the sidewalks, requirements to wear a helmet, a seatbelt, cross at a crosswalk, the cost of the bus fare, the cost of rent, the cost of gas, the way housing is zoned, availability of jobs, child care, the value we place upon sustainability, our (dis)belief in climate change, all of these different factors, and others, are interwoven into our decision as to how we will get from point A to point B on a daily basis. For most of the time, this decision is made without second thought, even if we struggle with the toll of our daily commute or have arguments about who should use the car. Sometimes, though, we ask ourselves why… Why don't I just get that expensive parking pass? Why am I spending so much of my life in traffic? Why am I choosing this particular mode of

transportation? As we ask these questions, we might find ourselves delving more deeply into other, more far-reaching questions. We might ask ourselves…Why am I living this way? Why is our society set up to live in this way? In asking these deeper questions, we might find we touch upon something that is significant in our lives, something that is demanding, revealing.

Arguably, universities are a place where we can critically discuss these types of questions, as they provide spaces to engage with the immanent concerns of uncertain times. This is the ideal image of the university, one that adorns university websites and brochures. And yet, in the lived workings of the institution, this social imaginary gives way to the necessity and requirements of funding, to the pressures of publishing and research, to student anxieties about debt and future career prospects, to interpersonal interactions and turf wars, and yes, even to frustrations with parking. When it comes to being on a university campus, one could say that, on a daily basis, faculty, student affairs professionals, administrators, Deans, Vice-Presidents, Presidents, student leaders and students themselves reinforce and confront a web of written and unwritten rules, often encoded in established policies, strategies and priorities, lived through their interactions with one another. In this interplay, we might assume there is a distinction between day-to-day engagement with institutional policies and strategies and their re-alignment, re-visioning and co-creation, as if these were two separate roles. This distinction may be well rehearsed in our memories, in the words of the university official who responded, "There is nothing I can do. I don't make the rules here", or the professor who exhorted, "Don't get your hopes up. That will never happen at this institution".

Student affairs professionals, faculty members, senior administrators, and student leaders on university campuses are not unfamiliar with a variation of this question: Why are we doing this [blank] – orientation event, admissions process, assessment, teaching method, research

initiative, academic hearing, clinical placement, etc. – in this way? It is also not uncommon to

hear said in response, "because that is how we have always done things". Such a response is not

necessarily a stated aversion to change, an inability to explain why, or a lack of interest in the

question. It may simply be that the reasons for "why" are so embedded in the lifeworld of the

university as to be almost impossible to explain without having to also explain why so many

other things are done the way they are done.   At the same time, these same individuals may also

then say, "but we know it could be done in a better way" and seek to undertake change. It may

be that the demand to rethink "how we have always done things here" is nowhere more evident

and necessary than in relation to the framing of Indigenization and internationalization policies

and strategies.   Yet, how is this framing of policy and strategy experienced? What is it like to

realize that the things you are doing may not be relevant or useful, or may even be detrimental to

the students you support, to your colleagues you work with, to the communities to whom you

feel responsible? What does it feel like to sense that you have been able to shift policy and

strategy to improve the experiences of international students, Indigenous students, staff and

faculty, to make the university a more equitable and just community? What is it like to grapple

with feeling like real, meaningful change may never truly happen? What is it like to step back

and wonder…Why am I working in this way? Why is this institution set up to work in this way?

(Un)speak-able

> *Housing is part of what I do for Aboriginal students. When I first started, I went into one of the family houses. I was thinking, "As long as I could see myself living here, then it's great for the student." The carpet was so gross, I didn't even want to take off my shoes. And so, my mission was, "That carpet has to get changed." Everyone was responding, "No. That's not going to happen." At that time, we also only had two family houses. But, I stayed on top of that situation. I was just, "We need more space. We need more space." At any meeting we were at, "We need more space." And yet, it didn't seem like there was much we could do besides protect the little space everyone was fighting for.*

When we think of what Indigenization and internationalization entail in a university

setting, it is possible that each of us would come up with similar ideas, but that we also would

produce quite different responses. Indigenization and internationalization as matters of

institutional policy and strategy are experienced variably, and as is presented in this research,

cross over into other policy areas, such as equity and human rights. In our field, the policies and

strategies that often matter extend beyond our purvey and may be rather mundane. For Kendra,

who works with Aboriginal students, it is residence policy and strategy that occupies her time,

requiring her to be persistent in her demands to improve the conditions, and increase the number,

of residences available to Aboriginal students. Yet, she meets resistance in an environment

where she is one voice among many in competition for limited resources. Like Kendra, our

deliberations over matters of immediate concern to the lives of students and co-workers can

present us with our most challenging and consequential interactions with our colleagues.

Known entities

> *The students come to us seeking help in having the tuition not raised. The staff*
> *are coming to me and saying, "What do we do? We're in a hard place. We're*
> *not going to destroy our relationships with students. But they're going to stop*
> *using our services because they think we don't care." So, I try to make the*
> *arguments to the university for grandfathering existing students. I make*
> *arguments that it's not about only addressing the institution's financial risk. It's*
> *about addressing the priorities that this institution says they want to have: a*
> *more integrated international student body. It's knowing that we have a*
> *legitimate perspective, but that the institution is not very open to it and is going*
> *to make a decision anyway. It's trying to be on the tuition committee to make a*
> *presentation and knowing that it's not an easy space to get. The meeting was*
> *supposed to be Tuesday, but it was cancelled. It's a bit of relief, because I am*
> *not ready for those conversations, yet.*

In the work of Indigenization and internationalization, situations can call for us to speak

to how a particular policy, such as tuition, will affect the students we support, the programs we

offer, or the enrolment demographics at our institution. By presenting alternative perspectives,

as Chris tries to do, we directly or indirectly acknowledge an established doctrine. Yet, we also strategically draw from alternatives that we know might be feasible. For Chris, the alternatives to an international student tuition increase are limited, but he feels he must take action. Like Kendra with her steadfast focus on housing quality and accessibility, Chris finds himself trying to get onto the agenda of an influential committee. He puts forward ideas that might alleviate the impact of a substantial increase in tuition, in order to show that he and his staff care about international students. He formulates what could be seen as a policy trade-off, he proposes minor adjustments, he prepares himself for the worst, and he is relieved when he has more time to prepare. He is doubtful, wary of having any real impact on the members of the tuition policy committee, knowing that, at the core of the issue, is revenue and resources, or, as Sarina says in context to international student differential tuition, the "Golden Goose".

Many of the participants share the kind of resolve, anxiety and hesitant cynicism that Chris expresses regarding policy deliberations at their campuses. In my interviews, the participants discuss the tangible affairs of our institution: housing, tuition, scholarships, access to study abroad opportunities, exam accommodations, integration of cultural practices. They share concerns about how budgetary issues dominate policy decisions, about how overarching socio-economic inequities are replicated within their institution and are resigned to what they see as the inherently exclusive nature of the university context. They worry about such things as the low participation of Aboriginal students in study abroad and the perception that wealthy international students are coming to Canada and taking up spots from, and resources that support, local students. In Daniela's case, she even feels embarrassed, hesitant and guilty when her unit is acknowledged, because other "units are shrinking" and her colleagues "don't really want to hear about how other areas are being the focus."

Perhaps we may experience this critical sense of clarity about what is at stake when it comes to equity and redistribution in relation to Indigenization and internationalization because redistribution has become such a dominant focus of social justice in the past two decades (Fraser, 2009). We may simply feel more certain of what constitutes fairness and equity because, as a central aspect of justice, it is so much more visible, nameable, and seemingly relevant across policies and strategies. And yet, participants also share experiences involving less identifiable, measurable policy issues, such as the lack of deep commitment to integrating Aboriginal cultural practices into the institution, and as Chris alludes to, about the realities faced by international students as they struggle to feel they are a meaningful part of their institution. In the framing of Indigenization and internationalization policies and strategies, we can find ourselves dealing with issues that stretch the limits of what we are accustomed to speaking and making decisions about.

Unknown entities

> *For this student, there is an ill family member and the student feels responsible to go home. Even though it doesn't meet the conditions for deferred exam, I have a conversation on the phone with the student's professor, who is particularly strict with deferred exams. I express to him that we have a relationship with the student. I tell him that we know the student's situation and that the student is not trying to get away with something. I explain that, as a staff member, I'm willing to go out on the line for this student and ask this. I explain the impact of not granting a deferred exam. That authenticity moves things along, much more than the student asking themselves, which is frustrating. It is a real-life situation to the professor when I make it personal. All the professor sees is the piece of paper. The professor doesn't have to look that student in the face and say "No, I don't believe you. This is not important enough to me."*

The practice of Indigenization and internationalization can, at times, almost imperceptibly move back and forth between what may seem to be policy framing and policy enactment. These moments of shifting can often come when dealing with what might be considered abnormal situations and, as such, are not captured within existing policy and practice. In this recollection from Leslie, she describes having to contact a professor to advocate for an

Aboriginal student who is seeking a deferred exam for a reason that is not an accepted policy-based condition. In speaking with the professor, she cannot draw from existing, traditionally accepted rationales for her explanation, but must rather inform the professor of why, for this student, and for Aboriginal students generally, this type of situation warrants consideration. While she expresses frustration and disdain at the manner in which the faculty is treating the student, she focuses on a logical, yet relational appeal to convince him of the "authenticity" of this student's request. Nadine, a faculty member, reflects on a similar situation involving one her staff who is Aboriginal and whose grandfather became ill. In her case, as someone who is deeply involved with Indigenization, Nadine assertively responds, "Of course. You go."

Policies that intersect with Indigenization and internationalization can thus be experienced as a barrier more than a support. As Melinda describes it, universities typically use policy "as punishment and as risk management" rather than to "create anything new or encourage innovation or disruption". As such, policies create perverse incentives (Stone, 2002) to "sneak around the policies". For a faculty member, a student's request, like that presented by Leslie, can be experienced, as Workman described (1992) like another "piece of paper" across his desk, concealing "a person with a particular, specific and individual need", the answer to which "can be readily access through the policy" (p. 217). As Workman (1992) reflects, "In this then policy, a mechanism to create order? To establish simplicity in complexity such that not all the individual facts are necessary? Policy becomes the collected response" (p. 217). Dealing with policy can require, like Kendra describes, patient, persistent questioning until something is finally done to make improvements. This persistence to overturn the order of our institutions can require, as Nadine states in granting her staff person time off to be with her grandfather, working "the system" to nurture kinship and spirit "outside the policies of the institution". For Diane, an

Aboriginal faculty member, institutional policy is experienced like a "massive machine that is not used to operating based on relationship" with "hierarchies and power and control from the top that's moving it".

While Diane asserts that this power structure, used well, can (and does) push for positive change, in practice, we also know that hierarchical structures can, in both familiar and unfamiliar territory, result in actions taken, or not taken, that, whether intended to or not, become the de-facto policy or policy revision. In one reflection, Sophie describes a tepid, almost imperceptible institutional reaction to what she describes as an egregious act of racism and then, soon after, an almost over-the-top reaction to another, unrelated act of racism. For Sophie, the question remains as to why there was such a different response and how this difference represents the institution's position. In my interviews, I noted that this high-profile event Sophie spoke of had spread through the institution, taking on a life of its own, becoming infused with interpretation, integrating into dominant and counter-narratives. In work that involves issues, such as racism, reconciliation, decolonization, international education, equity, and social justice, such narratives may seem always close at hand, interspersed into water cooler talk, embedded within emails between colleagues, brought up off-hand as a hot topic at a staff meeting. In the work of Indigenization and internationalization, we can find ourselves in situations that may have no precedent, that represent a set of issues that we are uncomfortable with, that we are uncertain about and that challenge dominant institutional knowledge in unexpected ways.

> *This bedbug issue has got leadership involved. It is ridiculous where this goes. A student asks for help. A parent weighs in, and now it's hovering up here. And it's about reputation. That's what's giving them the panic attacks. It's just, "Make it go away, so that we don't have anything bad happen". Sometimes, you can't just make things go away. It's how you handle the situations. How the student feels supported. How the mother feels like you've tried. If you want to make it go away, there's a cost. It's going to lead to other implications, if anyone finds out.*

Like budget, reputation can sideline or shift policy in ways that are unpredictable and, for the participants in this study, reputation is connected to navigating interests, risks, and personalities. Chris has to resist the temptation to dismiss the issue presented to him by his superiors. He makes every effort to stay with solving the problem, while trying hard to shape the institutional response, looking beyond this one instance to the larger policy-related issues. He tries to remain open to the different perspectives on the problem. As Terrence often speaks about in his work in student leadership, when we become the mediator to help resolve such situations, we must shift our viewpoint to try to better see competing interests. As Sarina describes, this feeling can be like "spinning in circles" trying to find meaning from various sources that can guide our work. Or, alternatively, as Dominic reflects, mediating issues involving potential human rights violations can involve trying to help people stop "spinning their wheels" by seeking guidance from those who understand the field.

In trying to make sense of policy issues we face at work and in our ongoing learning, we may seek, as Chris states regarding an immigration issue he had to deal with, to "solve a larger problem". In doing so, we may take into consideration the implications of making changes to particular policies, to weighing the risks of different options, determining what is and isn't "an easy fix", to letting the issues sit for a while so that we can think them through and perhaps see something we hadn't seen and find an alternative solution. Melinda, who, as Dean, leads the shaping of the vision for her Faculty, feels that the larger problems she must address in relation to Indigenization and internationalization require looking outward and inward, questioning core assumptions and researching emerging practices, critically reviewing demographic statistics and policy directions, regionally, nationally and internationally. Most importantly, she feels that she

must engage her colleagues meaningfully in the planning process so there is a shared ownership

of the deliberation process and ultimately, a sense of shared vision.

Using Gadamer's (1977) use of the term, we might say that policy framing in

Indigenization and internationalization brings us face-to-face with the "prejudices" of our

institutional policies and of our colleagues who uphold and interpret them.

> Prejudices are not necessarily unjustified and erroneous, so that they inevitably
> distort the truth. In fact, the historicity of our existence entails that prejudices,
> in the literal sense of the word, constitute the initial directedness of our whole
> ability to experience. Prejudices are biases of our openness to the world. They
> are simply conditions whereby we experience something – whereby what we
> encounter says something to us. (Gadamer, 1977, p. 9)

In seeing our prejudices as "the conditions whereby" we make sense of the world through

our experiences, we can perhaps appreciate how, in one instance, we may find ourselves having

to rationalize or defend something to a colleague that we think should be a straightforward issue

and, in another instance, may find that our interpretation of a situation, or strategic vision, is

easily accepted. In Indigenization and internationalization, we may find that prejudices and

biases surface much more quickly and vehemently than in other contexts and can develop into

"heated" or "lively" deliberations, using Terrence's words. We also may find ourselves in

situations where we are unclear about what it is we are actually talking about. In those

situations, we might find we have to attend more carefully to what is (and is not) being said and

work harder to find some semblance of shared understanding. As Gadamer (2004/1975) writes,

> The weight of things we encounter in understanding plays itself out in a linguistic event,
> a play of words playing around and about what is meant. *Language games* exist where
> we, as learners – and when do we cease to be that? – rise to the understanding of the
> world. (Gadamer, 2004/1975, pp. 482-483, *emphasis in original*)

Hidden entities

Following Gadamer's words (2004/1975), in *rising to the understanding* of what

Indigenization and internationalization signifies for our institutions, we could say that we enter

into a *language game* of policy deliberation. Over time, we learn the institutional rules of the

game, seeking to be on specific committees, engaging with colleagues to develop shared policy

intentions and analysis of specific issues, and carefully crafting documents or statements to

influence policy directions. We, like our colleague across our institution, work with known

entities: tuition, programs, services, student supports. And yet, as we are involved in fields that

stretch beyond the normative bounds of our institutions, we also find ourselves entering into

unfamiliar situations, demanding us to question and expand our knowledge of what is relevant to

the policy issues at stake. It is in this questioning and expansion of our knowledge, we may

discover things that are confusing, provoking, exciting, troubling. We may dig up knowledge

that contradicts institutional convictions and find that what we uncover is quickly buried back

beneath the surface. What knowledge we discover can be left out of "the game" completely.

> *My colleague showed our survey in its draft form to some key people. A person who had been in favor of this work said to my colleague, "I think you have to rephrase these questions." I feel deflated and frustrated. I think "This is why these things never change. Because people are afraid to ask hard questions. How are we going to do a survey about this topic and not use the word for it?" So, the project stalls and my passion goes out of it. We are asked to remove any direct reference to the topic of the survey, which we do. But, it still goes through this long approval process.*

In this recollection by Sophie, we see into the workings of developing a survey related to

equity and diversity, where there is dispute over what words can and cannot be included. She

becomes distanced, disappointed and despondent about her institution's lengthy approval

process, involving individuals who take a potentially too-cautious approach. She identifies fear, a retreat, a denial of what is dark and unflattering, like avoiding asking a question because you don't want to know the answer. She says at another point, the feeling is "like walking through a field of landmines". For Dominic, this aversion to speaking about racism on his campus is a form of silencing, a shutting down of dialogue. He recalls a meeting with a client:

> *If she doesn't want to identify as having been subjected to racism, I'm okay with that. I look at it as, "What's wrong with this system? Why can't we have these conversations?" This should be a simple conversation. What is it about our environment here that won't allow her to say that to me? What is it about her work environment that has basically damaged her to the point where she can't even say the words?*

We may have asked similar questions as Dominic does in our work. We might wonder what it is about our learning environment that makes it so that international students have the highest rate of faculty actions, including academic dishonesty. We might worry why Indigenous and non-Indigenous faculty and staff across departments and units are not fully engaging in institutional processes of reconciliation. We might look at first-year completion rates and shake our heads at the number of Indigenous students who drop out. We may ask what it is about our environment that perpetuates a study abroad approach that is geared to the privileged and well-connected. All of these questions were asked in some way or another in my interviews with the participants. In sharing these questions, they also spoke of feeling outside of policy influence, of being constantly on the receiving end of policy decisions, concerned about lack of transparency in how decisions are made. Surprisingly, this was even the case for those in higher levels of authority. I cannot help but ask, "What is it about our environment that makes us feel that we are not part of policy deliberation, even when, in our day-to-day work, we may be directly and indirectly engaged in shaping how we approach Indigenization and internationalization?"

In asking this question, I think back to an interaction I had with a senior leader as I was trying to recruit research participants. I recall her first question, "What do you want from me?" and after my explanation, her making a matter-of-fact statement that there are, and will be, no Indigenization and internationalization policies. Her tone was sharp as she told me that she could not be interviewed because, if she spoke with me, it could undermine or jeopardize her work. While I did not mention issues of racism or exclusion, I felt as if I had spoken of something that was, in and of itself, potentially contentious and by asking, I could become, if I was not careful, a potential source of contention. I think of Ahmed (2012), who wrote,

> Racism is treated as a breach in the happy image of diversity; racism is heard as an injury to the organization and its good will. To even use the work "racism" can mean to become the subject of ill will – to become what makes the organization ill, what compromises the health of the organizational body or what gets in the way of institutional happiness. Diversity can thus be mobilized is or as a response to the problem of racism. Describing the problem of racism can mean being treated as if you have created the problem, as if the very talk about divisions is what is divisive. (Ahmed, 2012, p. 152)

In the process of my research, I have found that the secret or contested spaces of our work are quite revealing. They are the spaces where an Indigenous faculty member pulls back from a research introduction meeting because he feels that most of what he would say would not be positive or well received. They are the spaces where a participant asks for line to be removed from a transcript, or for a particular point made during the interview to remain confidential. They are spaces that reflect respect and apprehension, a caring for others and caring for ourselves. In those moments, our reflections upon, and research into, our own work can be an opening to meaningful restitution, but also implication. We are not only speaking of our relationships to the tangible things and doings of our institution. We are speaking of our relationships to our students, our colleagues, our communities. We are speaking of ourselves.

(Being) spoken of

In David Mamet's (1992) play, *Oleanna*, Mamet explores power dynamics within the university context, focused on the interaction between a faculty member, John and his student, Carol. In the first lines of the opening scene (pp. 7-10), Carol approaches John to ask for assistance with her academic writing. Carol shares her sense of inferiority in the university setting by telling John that she "has problems" because she comes from a "different economic" class. The flow of dialogue between Carol and John, at first sounds like something that commonly occurs in professors' offices. We might feel compassion for both Carol and John's predicaments, as they contend with the "criteria" of assessment within the constraints of a university. However, the dialogue takes a turn when John makes the statement that, in helping Carol, "I'm not your *father*". Carol suddenly wonders what John is actually thinking about her request for assistance. Carol does a double-take, asking simply, "Why did you say that…?" When John says that he is not Carol's "father", he switches his and speaks "of" Carol, rather than "to" her, and Carol is taken aback. *Oleanna* provides an everyday representation of how issues of fairness conflate with biases, how prejudices shape judgements of others' actions, claims and, in the case of universities, performance. As an analogy, *Oleanna* provides an insightful glimpse into the subtleties and pervasiveness of *being spoken of* in Indigenization and internationalization policy deliberation in the university context.

Refusing

Melinda recounts an interaction she had at a leadership retreat where she feels compelled to counter one of her colleague's revealed biases. She and her colleagues were divided into groups to address different aspects of the institution's strategic planning and Melinda was not assigned to a group to which she felt she should have been. She recalls:

A member at the retreat reports from his group. He says, "We think community engagement is good, because we'll get more donors and we'll commercialise more stuff. Instead of ignoring community, we should ask them, 'Do you think this is a good thing?' But, you wouldn't want productive or new faculty members to do it." So, you can imagine my face. I cannot let that go. I get chills. My heart starts pounding. I briefly consider, "Just shut up". But I think, "No way I'm shutting up". So, I ask to speak. I get up, thank my colleague, and everyone beams at me. I say, "But, where to start?" Smiles drop. My voice rises. I'm talking fast and I feel heat in my face. Then my colleague says, "You know what we used to do with First Nations? We used to go in there and take their blood and never see them again. Now we're asking permission". We're asking permission? That's community engagement? I grind to a halt. I say thank you and sit down.

As Melinda hears her colleague's response regarding the way the institution should approach community engagement, it is as if she feels the coming on of an illness. She almost censors herself, almost loses the flow of her ideas. When her colleague responds to her appeal, the veneer of his statements is stripped away and he reveals what Melinda may have feared he was saying all along. He expresses an "epistemic ignorance" that represents "a systemic problem that involves the epistemic ignorance of the Academy", including, in the academic sense, of Indigenous research methods (Kuokkanen, 2007, p. 113). Melinda takes up a defensive posture, protecting a space of planning, speaking to an assigned role that has potential to become encoded in strategy. She knows that, "in the course of discussion", strategic planning "may generate new knowledge: new ideas and insights, new aims, and new rules to fulfill them" and that she must take advantage through "the speech acts and interactions that constitute the discursive work of the committee" in order to materialize "new embodiments and inscriptions" (Freeman & Sturdy, 2016, p. 12). In doing so, she surfaces an underlying agenda, and at first, feels defeated, needing time to recuperate, and she says, labelled, for better or worse, as a trouble-maker for the remainder of the strategic planning meeting. However, she also ends up, in the end, being shoulder-tapped to contribute to the institution's planning around community

engagement, something she is certain wouldn't have happened if she hadn't "taken her colleague out to the woodshed" as one of the senior leaders at the retreat described her intervention.

As Melinda describes, "being spoken of" in the university context can often be cloaked in academic or institutional jargon, where words employed refer to institutional practices or theories of practice that can, when spoken, create tensions in and of themselves. As with John's statement in Oleanna, "I am not your *father*", the words we use in our deliberations can stand in for our bias. Along these lines, for many of the participants, the discourses used in deliberating policy issues need to be attended to, as much as, or more than, the policies themselves. Daniela discusses the inherent biases in faculty hiring practices, where "you have in your mind's eye what the best person might look like" where presumed objective standards can be approached differently by different people. Iris expresses concern that the word "post-colonial" is being applied as an equivalent to efforts of reconciliation in Canada and to internationalization in relation to places like Vietnam. Our discourse belies our prejudices.

I recall a particular moment when one of my colleagues, an esteemed faculty member, came to my office to request a support letter for an international organization that he leads and is located on our campus. At the time, he was facing resistance from another faculty member from within the university who leveled accusations that his organization was a threat to academic freedom, drawing from recent negative, national media attention. This faculty member's accusation was based on a perception that undesirable, foreign government policies and practices were taking place within the organization. I had never seen my colleague so upset, his usually jovial voice subsumed by anger, as he kept repeated himself. He was facing an accusation that belied a negative prejudice, wrapped in the language of academic freedom. In being with him, face-to-face, I felt a reckoning. I needed to state to him where I stood on the issue. In a critical

sense, in these situations, we might sense how the words we use in deliberating policy entwines us into the history, legacies and contemporary manifestations of the politics and policies of settler colonization within Canada and neo-colonization on a global scale. As Simpson (2014) writes, the politics of colonization infiltrate our contemporary world, infused with "existent forms of philosophy, history and social life that Empire sought to speak of and for" (p. 97).

For Diane, who is an Aboriginal faculty member, these legacies of colonization persist in the university through misleading, misinformed biases towards Indigenous peoples and their worldviews. Diane has witnessed how the demand placed on Indigenous faculty to repeatedly "rationalize and justify" what they are doing affects their "mental, emotional, spiritual and physical wellness". University policies, as a matter of "being spoken of", allow certain actions to be taken, or not taken, allow what can and cannot be said. Diane asserts:

> *Policy stymied our growth, stymied change and stymied everything. I don't have time in my life to navigate and fight this system that says, "This privileged knowledge is better than Indigenous knowledge. There's no rigour. There's nothing in it". When this knowledge has been here for thousands of years.*

As Diane related, our lived relationship to Indigenization and, in a critical light, to internationalization, may be one of deeply held suspicion. Policy can be experienced as extending through time, a subterfuge that undermines Indigenous knowledges and self-determination, presumes universality and superiority, and remains unresponsive to, or ignorant of the lived experiences of Aboriginal and international faculty, staff and students. We might find that policy deliberation takes up our time, is something we feel needs to be challenged, yet do not sense fulfilment in doing so. We might experience policy framing as an imposition, degrading and demanding self-legitimation and assimilation, although perhaps more politely than in the past, by, as Melinda's colleague interjected, by "being asked first".

In the precarious spaces of Indigenous education in the university, we might both refuse to "navigate" and "fight" the system on its own terms. With this refusal "comes the requirement of having one's *political* sovereignty acknowledged and upheld, and raises the question of legitimacy for those who are usually in the position of recognizing: What is their authority to do so? Where does it come from? Who are they to do so?" (Simpson, 2014, p. 11). In university politics, legitimation of authority can divert discourse away from the people who are most affected by, and engaged in, what is at stake (Fraser, 2009). Nadine, a non-Indigenous colleague of Diane's, speaks to how the assignment of power and authority by position, from the top-down, undermines the relational foundations of working with and within Indigenous communities.

> *Even though we probably work more relationally than other places on campus, we're not the "go-to". We tend, in the university, to go to people by position. If you hold a certain seat in a Faculty, that's you're "go-to". We've brought in people who sit in Aboriginal academic leadership positions or on governance committees/councils who may not be Aboriginal, or may be Aboriginal who bring a lot of money and grants, but have no relationship to community. We make a lot of mistakes in falling back on a European hierarchical status framework instead of the relational framework.*

For Nadine, not being the "go-to" creates disconnection. She assumes a passive role, watching her institution fail, even while she works within it to help it succeed. Without being granted legitimacy through institutional channels of authority, it is as if Diane and Nadine are on the outside looking in, asking themselves the very questions that Simpson (2014) so distinctly poses. Diane's resolute impatience with tensions between Western and Indigenous knowledge systems and ways of being and doing is a lived experience that may reveal a significant aspect of the lifeworld of being an Indigenous faculty or staff on a typical Canadian university campus. These refusals that Diane lives in her day-to-day work, however, also open to a different shared experience: the acknowledging of that which is being refused. As I have reflected on the research and interviews in this study, I have found that acknowledgement figures into the lived

experiences of many of the participants and that, as an aspect of the lived meaning of our work, reveals a lived intermingling between the framing and enacting of Indigenization and internationalization. It is important, thus, to reflect upon the definitional meanings and etymological origins of these two words, refusal and acknowledgement, in order to explore more deeply the experiences to which they refer.

To refuse, by definition, is "to express oneself as unwilling to accept, to show or express unwillingness to do or comply with" or "to not allow someone to have or do (something)" (Refuse, 2017a). The word, *refusal*, comes from the Vulgar Latin word, *refusare*, which meant to "pour back, give back" and is related to the Old French *refus*, meaning "waste product, rubbish, denial, rejection" (Refuse, 2017b). The transitive nature of the verb requires that there be something or someone that is the subject or object that is not accepted, complied with, allowed or given, and in the etymological sense, there is also a sense of returning something back to where it came from. Acknowledgement, on the other hand, means to "recognize the rights, authority of status" of a person or group of people, yet also "to disclose knowledge of" something, to "make agreement with" others, to "express gratitude or obligation for" something or someone, to "take notice of, to make known" or to "recognize as genuine or valid" (Acknowledge, 2017). Etymologically, acknowledge comes from the Old English root -*cnawan*, meaning: to "perceive a thing to be identical with another"; to "be able to distinguish"; to "perceive or understand as a fact or truth"; and to "know how (to do something)" (Know, 2017).

In this sense, acknowledgement is not exactly synonymous with recognition, insofar as recognition does not necessarily imply agreement nor expression of gratitude or obligation, whereas acknowledgement does. One can recognize certain people in a crowd, but not acknowledge them. To acknowledge refusal can thus be thought of in multiple ways, from

recognizing (or refusing the recognition of) the authority of those who are (un)willing to accept

what is offered, to agreeing with the expression of non-compliance with that which is expected to

be done, to understanding the meaning of that which is returned, to expressing gratitude for the

disclosure of that which turns out to be rubbish or worth denial and rejection. These words, as

descriptions of experience, may combine together, reverse themselves, remain separate. Even

within a single event, we can experience more than one sense of acknowledgement and refusal.

Acknowledging

> *After the panel, two Indigenous women ask me how I feel about a Caucasian woman who had spoken in a demanding way that there had to be change. I am comfortable with what she did, because I've known her for a while and believe she is an ally. Maybe the Indigenous women's interpretation is coming out of the feeling that, "Here we go again. White people speaking for us". I interpret anger, but look at it from a relational base around partnerships, collaborations, teamwork, and Elder teachings. Interestingly, the Indigenous women also thank me. At a meeting before the panel, somebody stated there should be Indigenous people on the board. There is an Indigenous woman who is part of the association. The allies felt it would be disrespectful to have just have one Indigenous person on the board. After the presentation, the board asked the panel members, "What do you think?" I thought, "If our Elder was here, he would say, 'We take the one spot, even if they think it's disrespectful". So, I replied, "She should take the spot, because one is better than nothing". Those ladies thank me because they feel the same way.*

In this recollection, Diane describes being approached by her peers who want to make

sense of how they have witnessed the taking up of Indigenous issues and representation. She

thoughtfully responds to her peers' initial refusal of a Caucasian woman's interjections, drawing

upon a contextual awareness grounded in experience and Elder's teachings. She looks beyond

appearances, to initial reactions, into and through interpretations, considering always how her

actions may be guided by the wisdom of her Elders, based on an ethics of relationality. She says

simply at the end of this reflection, "It is complex work", to describe how, in one moment she

can be defending a white woman who speaks self-assuredly as an ally, and then defends the

assignment of what she describes as a "tokenistic" board position to the one Aboriginal person in

the association. The demonstration of ally-ship, for Diane, demands acknowledgement, a

reasoned response, based on one's knowledge of who is speaking. Acknowledgement does not

necessarily mean acceptance, however, and can be as disconcerting as it can be affirming.

> *Years ago, when I was an international student during the time of the Meech Lake Accord, there was an Aboriginal activist on campus giving a talk. Several of us went to her and said, "What could we, as newcomers, do?" I remember her looking at me and saying "You have negotiated with an illegal government for your place here. You don't have a right in this conversation".   I was frozen in the moment. I had to think about that. It came after years of processing. What she was saying, the way I chose to interpret it, is that you can't come into a situation and say that you want a position without doing your due diligence first. You have to take up your learning. You'd better learn something about the Aboriginal context in Canada before you think that there's a role for you.*

This recollection has sat with Sarina for many years, and now, in her role on campus in

international education, she wonders how she can be engaged in reconciliation. She recalls an

abrupt encounter, that led her inward, and in the years that have passed, she has interpreted the

experience as a call to self-education. In my interviews, the non-Indigenous participants shared

similar concerns and reluctance to engage in reconciliation without knowing whether or not what

they are doing (or not doing) is appropriate. For Melanie, reconciliation is "a relation of

understanding" achieved through "meeting, talking, discussing", rather than "jumping in and

doing something". Iris expresses concern about the lack of Aboriginal representation in the field

of international education on her campus and of the disparity in knowledge that she and her

colleagues have of First Nations in comparison to their knowledge of international affairs. Belen

describes her concern that, while is "aware of the things that have happened, of the things that

need to change", she is too "wrapped up" in her own life to "fix the world for everybody".

Melinda, Sophie and Daniela allude to the overwhelming extent of change that needs to occur

and the fear of not getting it right, deeply affected by their personal histories and understandings

of the injustices of residential schooling and colonization.   Terrence, as a new student leader,

speaks to his sense of being responsible to learning about and balancing what he sees as

different, yet related student advocacy interests between international and Aboriginal students.

Acknowledgement in these senses, is layered, involving stepping aside, relinquishing

established institutional or national narratives, but not necessarily denoting action. The act of

acknowledgement may result in questioning personal, professional narratives, rooted in being a

"doer" or "problem-solver", complicated by competing interests or a 'saviour' mentality. In

deepening our awareness of the issues at stake, in being open to the lived experiences of

Indigenous and international students, staff and faculty, it might feel, as it did for Sarina, and

continues to for Belen, like being frozen, immobilized, uncertain. This sense of injustice and

relinquishment may be tied to our identity, as we may "be discomforted in the process of

confronting how much and how profoundly our lives are structured by colonialism" (Lowman &

Barker, 2015, p. 90), including deeply personal histories that we bring with us into the present.

These lived relations can be encompassing, even including those who are Indigenous, yet

work at institutions far their home communities. Maya, who is Indigenous, but not from the

North American continent, shares a personal insight into how she experiences the tensions that

exist within her larger community of Indigenous scholars:

> *I choose not to go to certain conferences where 99% of Indigenous education scholars
> go, as well as everybody else, because I see inclusion and exclusion played out. It's quite
> painful. I feel as if it's in some way my fault, and I don't know how to fix it.   I withdraw.
> I exclude myself. An Indigenous friend that I haven't seen for a long time made the
> comment that I make myself a hermit, and I do. I move into other spaces or I move in the
> rear. I don't know what my role is.*

In a related reflection to this sense of retreat and self-blame, Maya describes an

experience where she offers to undertake a research project involving an Aboriginal community

and one of her colleagues says flatly, "Oh, not her!". In these situations, Maya realizes she may

be viewed as an interloper in work that she not only feels strongly about, but is deeply connected with as an Indigenous person herself. These experiences draw her inward, as she tries to make sense of what she feels as exclusion, and yet also acknowledges as being necessary, as she says, for Indigenous "communities endeavoring to recover and reclaim space".

For the participants in this study, this inward and outward movement of retreat and advance may reveal something about our day-to-day work that, under what can be experienced as strained, predisposed and ambiguous conditions of policy deliberation, enables us to persist in our search for a sense of accomplishment. As professionals dedicated to transformative intercultural practice, the limitations of Indigenization and internationalization, and related equity and human rights policies and strategies are starting points rather than end goals. We may experience refusals and acknowledgements, concurrently or separately, singly or multiply, and yet still be unsure what needs to be done. As is reflected in participants' experiences shared in this chapter, in doing our work we may not only confront and seek knowledges and practices that disrupt, challenge or expand our worldviews, but we also may invite these knowledges and practices into our work and lives and set intentions to engage with them in concrete and constructive ways. In Sophie's words:

> We identify Canada as a colonial project with a genocidal past whose affects continue to be felt in the present, and then say, "What are we supposed to do about it?" We talk about what it means to be an ally, but it's up to all of us to approach Indigenous people and say, "What is it you want? What does a decolonised Canada look like, feel like, act like for you?" Sometimes we feel like we can't speak, nor should we speak, about what reconciliation is. In the university, where everybody's a know-it-all, nobody wants to say, "What a mess. We don 't know what to do." So, let's start leading by setting intentions.

Inviting

In spaces of invitation, we may take a respite from trying to solve a specific policy problem, we might let down our guard and take a pause in defending our policy positions. We might slow down and partake in hospitality without feeling the need to advocate for resources.

> *We invite the people from the bookstore to a student event because they're dealing with our students with third party billing, but they don't know anything about our students. We invite international staff, registrars. They're sometimes really quick to say, "Oh, you're Aboriginal? Go over there. We can't help you." It's like a panic. So, we want to make staff comfortable to ask questions, to come into our space, to feel comfortable with and understand our students. We want to create an environment where we're all Treaty people. We're all in this relationship together.*

Leslie offers a space that invites possibility to consider different ways of working in her institution. In her recollection, invitation involves space, a physical location, yet also a mood, a purpose. For Leslie, the space is the centre she works in, but is also the signification of Treaty, of relationality and of excellence in student services. It is invitational space meant to alleviate panic, to impart to her colleagues the comfort and vulnerability to not have to know, to be able to ask questions and explore connections. In this sense, as with many other lived experiences in this chapter, Leslie's reflection blurs the line between policy framing and policy enactment. Is she enacting reconciliation and Indigenization or is she framing what they signify as policy? More importantly, though, would it matter either way? It may be that the blurring of lines is an aspect of the lived experience itself. Even with structured spaces for policy deliberation, even with well written policy, we may find ourselves relying on relationships to implement them.

> *I am at a forum on reconciliation and feel appalled and helpless. I am in a panic. The leader hosting the forum is challenged by students and Elders. He is challenged here and here and here. He's being asked, "Why aren't we…? And why aren't we…? And why*

aren't we…?" He keeps a smile on his face and says, "I have less power than people think". It's, "Okay. Speak. Everybody speak. Whether it's true or not. But we're not going to do anything with it. We're not going to do anything meaningful with it right now. We're not going to say 'Let's stop for a minute. Let's consider that. Let's talk about these things'". We're not going to do that. I can't imagine a less safe space for anybody.

Melinda speaks of entering into a deliberative policy space that, rather than decreasing panic, increases it. She is overwhelmed by what is shared, unable to determine what is most important, what should be taken away for further deliberation or action. In the invited spaces for deliberating Indigenization and internationalization policy, the boundaries of the space may matter, a structuring, delineating, an allowing of depth of discussion, an attending to the relationships that are or are not forming, including how hierarchy and power are invoked. In this sense, in Sophie's words, in relation to her involvement with a series of deliberative dialogues on global citizenship, the "nuance" and "sophistication" of intentional spaces of deliberation in our field may involve "dispassion" of observation and "fleshed out" ideas and ethics in facilitation. Invitation may also call us away from our institutions, opening ourselves and our communities to hosting in ways that are intimate, personally, culturally and spiritually.

> *I ask a university leader to come with me to an Aboriginal traditional ceremony. She has to break out her calendar, give meetings to somebody else or change the meetings to come into this space. And she does it. And I invite her on a road trip. "You need to come into a sweat. You need to understand why the invite that the Elders put out was critical to breaking those walls of the Academy down to invite this knowledge in in its space". She sees Indigenous professors who are engaged in that process. For these professors to invite her is a profound moment of trusting her. The Elders invite her into that space and, in that space, she converses with them, with me and others.*

In Diane's invitation to a university leader, she has a clear intent. There is ceremony. The road trip is symbolic. The invitation is an honour and there is expectation, protocol. The invitation is not an entitlement, it is an offering, an entry into a space that is profoundly sacred. In our field, we might say that invitation is extended, that it circulates through relationships, grounded in increasing our knowledge through learning from each other, in the earning and

sharing of trust. As Chris reflects, invitation demands that we think about how we integrate

dialogue and intercultural learning throughout the institution, not just within our own spaces.

> *I have had an Associate Dean say "It's not our job to help international students integrate. Our job is to give them their degree and to teach them our program". But is that really true? I should be having these conversations and pushing that discussion. But I'm not. I focus inward, and maybe that's just me, personally, with what I feel confident in doing. I can plant an idea, but I can't drive the change that would make the person responsible for facilitating a classroom experience also able to facilitate intercultural learning. How would that happen and wouldn't it be beautiful if it did?   If we said, "This is part of your role. It's not just to get students to learn the subject. It's to get students to learn how to work together to learn the subject together".*

Extending invitation cannot be demanded of others, and yet, we know that it is needed.

Invitation requires attention, time, effort. It is not about telling someone what they should do,

but making room for dialogue. Leslie knows that the success of Aboriginal students depends on

creating spaces that are inviting and welcoming, as demonstrated by the centre that she works in.

Diane brings a senior leader into a sacred ceremony to invite her to invite Indigenous

knowledges and practices into her life, into the lives of those she works with. Chris seeks to

influence his colleagues so that there might be a day when classrooms are spaces of invitation to

intercultural learning. We work with others to achieve our ultimate goals and, in this

interdependence, we may take on the role of intentionally creating spaces of hospitality, in hope

that hospitality will spread. As Kamal reflects on his experience writing policy related to equity,

"at the end of the day" the implementation of what is written policy "is not under my control",

yet depends on his and his colleagues' efforts at building strong relationships.

These experiences with invitation speak to the meaning and etymology of the word itself.

To invite means "to offer an incentive or inducement" or to "increase the likelihood of", as well

as to "request the presence or participant of", to "request formally" or to "urge politely" (Invite,

2017a). The root of the word is from Latin, *invitare*, which means "to invite" yet also "to

summon, challenge; to feast, to entertain" (Invite, 2017b). Our invitations are not only moments

of breaking bread, but of spaces where we are summoned to one another, where we are

challenged and where, by being together we might increase the likelihood of positive change.

Such spaces of invitation can reflect each our own broader and deeper "campus-wide

commitments" to Indigenization that Mihesua (2004, p. 199) speaks of, by enabling us to explore

shared intentions outside of formal processes. This invitational quality to deliberation was

central to the experiences of all participants in this study, from informal phone calls, to

discussions with students after class, to social interactions before, between and after meetings

with colleagues. Such interactions may be like the "participatory rituals" of Indigenization and

internationalization that provide us with the opportunity "to develop more familiar relationships

or to learn about one another before solving the problem" we are seeking to address through

more formal pathways of policy and strategy (Forester, 1999, 131). In this sense, invitation, as

well as refusal and acknowledgement, open to a living description of how we wish to speak and

act with one another. As Daniela reflects:

> *The thing with policy is that it's just an overarching set of expectations. You need the procedures. What are we going to do? The policy says that we're not going to discriminate. Well, actually, we do discriminate. Of course, we do. But sometimes it's not justifiable discrimination. What does it mean in day-to-day life? Policy is so removed for most people. So, I'm focusing in on, "How do you show up at work"? Rather than a policy on "You will not discriminate", it's a policy on "How do you engage in a respectful behaviour?" But, what would we value?*

Freedom

In deliberating Indigenization and internationalization policies and strategies, and those

which intersect and connect with them, we can find ourselves in the midst of a long conversation

rooted in sociohistorical traditions of Western universities (De Wit, 2002) and in ongoing,

afflicted negotiations between settlers and Indigenous peoples of the lands upon with our

institutions are located (Mackey, 2016; Simpson, 2014). In our work, we might find ourselves dropped into committees, where we strive, in the sociohistorical, colonial legacies of our institutions, to focus on a re-distribution of our institutional resources to better serve international and Indigenous students and faculty. We can be caught in the middle of a policy decision that may have long-term negative impacts on a student or colleague and that, in the deliberations leading to that decision, draw from deeply held, yet unacknowledged, cultural biases. We might interject a critical analysis into an informal debriefing with colleagues after work and find ourselves met with silence, a stiff rebuttal or thinly-veiled racism. It is at such moments that, as Daniela stated, we must think about "how we show up at work", how our values are revealed by our words and actions.

Viewed as public policy, higher education goals such as academic freedom, equity and access, research pre-eminence or increased student enrolment and improved student experience may be viewed as "aspirations" that serve to galvanize faculty, staff and student to work together (Stone, 2002, p. 383). As noted in Chapter 4, such aspirational goals demand policy instruments and/or strategic actions, such as increased community engagement and recruitment efforts, targeted scholarships or residence initiatives, curricular innovation and/or means of and for recognition of faculty and staff engagement. While such initiatives may be positively received in some or most quarters at our own or other institutions, in the deliberation of such policy instruments, we may, as explored in this chapter, also experience conflict or dissent among faculty, staff and students through "contradictory interpretations" of overarching strategy and policy-related matters (Stone, 2002, p. 383). As transformative intercultural practitioners, we might find ourselves "trying to imagine the meaning of a common goal" whereby we, our staff, faculty and students can fit our "own interpretation to that image" (Stone, 2002, p. 383).

As described by the participants in this study, in this competitive context for policy framing, we may at times feel underwhelmed, even deceived, by the deliberative processes, both formal and informal, that we experience on our campuses. We may enter or create spaces of deliberation assuming that our institutional deliberative processes should be based in "participation, rational deliberation, and an orientation to the common good" (Knowles & Clark, 2018, p. 15).   However, we might also, in the actualization of such spaces begin to question whether such a perceived common good exists on campuses, and is ultimately implementable, especially in the context of Indigenization and internationalization policy and strategy related matters (Knowles & Clark, 2018, p. 15). As Stone (2002) describes, reasoning in the political sphere of public institutional, strategic and policy-related, practical matters associated with complex issues, such as Indigenization and internationalization, must often "include some things and exclude others", including choosing to "view the world in a particular way when other visions are possible" (p. 378).

In the lived experience of deliberating Indigenization and internationalization, we can find ourselves facing these very inclusions and exclusions, these underlying variations on what "common good" we are aiming to achieve together.   Exploring the nature of these questions in relation to the deeply interwoven intersections of policy problems associated with Indigenization and internationalization, can requires us, as noted by many participants in this study, an engagement with "colonialism in its physical and intellectual contexts" (Turner, 2006, p. 113), both overt and subtle. As transformative intercultural policy practitioners, the act of deliberation itself can present both a challenge and opportunity "to overcome the colonial mindset in both Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities" (Turner, 2006, p. 113). In the midst of a housing committee meeting, a discussion with a faculty member on a student's wellbeing, or in the heat

of a strategic planning session, we may find ourselves, regardless of our position or role, seeking to ensure, like the participants in this study, that "Indigenous ways of knowing the world are not devalued, marginalized, or ridiculed in the marketplace of ideas" that constitute the strategy and policy related matters of our institutions (Turner, 2006, p. 113).

This notion of deliberation as contentious, deficient and biased contrasts its definition as being "characterized by, or resulting from, careful and thorough consideration or awareness of the consequences" of policy issues and strategies, or as being "slow, unhurried, and steady as though allowing time for decision on each individual action involved" (Deliberation, 2017a). This description of deliberation may be a source of solace, an explanatory counter-weight to and reason for the frustrations we may feel as we experience hasty, knee-jerk responses and resistance as we try to advance an agenda of transformative change on our campuses. In the midst of contention, predisposed outcomes, and inadequate resources, we might try to assuage ourselves by reminding ourselves that deliberation takes time. We might seek alternative opportunities, as Kendra and Diane do, and as Chris seeks, through invitation, for a "consciously unhurried" environment that allows us opportunities for resolution and determination, to "balance" and "weigh well" (Deliberate, 2017a) our options, as we attempt to "rise to [our] understanding" of the policy issues at stake (Gadamer, 2004/1975, 483). However, we may also find that, while certain decision-making processes indeed may take a long time, they are far from balanced. We may find ourselves in situations where the "scales" are tipped (Deliberation, 2017b), surfacing a dynamic that limits our capacity for, or scope of, our deliberations. It may be that in those moments, we experience ourselves as weighing down the scales, as if we are, in deliberation, attempting to exert a balance, a pressure that is our own selves, experienced through the uttering of words, the taking of actions.

It also may be that in such moments of (im)balance, we might also experience, or sense the possibility of experiencing, an interrelated, yet oppositional, aspect of deliberation, that of being (up)lifted, or unburdened by such self-exertion. Based upon its Latin, etymological roots of compounding *de-* (entirely) with *liberare* (altered or freed), we might feel, in moments of profound deliberation, "entirely freed" from what we know to be possible as the speak-able matters of deliberation, open to, and "altered" by possibilities of new ways of knowing and being (Deliberation, 2017b). We might, like Carol in *Oleanna*, find ourselves speaking a refusal of being spoken of, or of speaking for others, and in doing so, find ourselves able to speak of other matters entirely. In such refusals, and also in our acknowledgements and invitations, in the spaces of deliberation that we shape and engage in, we might, as transformative intercultural practitioners, bring ourselves closer to the limits, possibilities and actualities of freedom, for our colleagues, our students and ourselves.

If we think of deliberation of Indigenization and internationalization in terms related to freedom, we can come to better understand the meaning of Amartya Sen's (2009) quote at the outset of this chapter. We might say that in "assessing" policy and strategy related matters of Indigenization and internationalization "we have reason to be not only interested in the kind" of policy tools and strategic initiatives we "manage to lead, but also in the freedom that we actually have to choose between the different "styles and ways of" teaching, leading, helping and researching that we think, believe and, in actuality, have the knowledge and power to choose from (Sen, 2009, p. 227). Such freedom demands us to recognize the constraints in such ways of knowing and being in our institutions that we think and believe we can choose from. In pursuing alternatives to established approaches to policy and strategy, as transformative intercultural practitioners we may seek to "broaden the concerns and commitments we have" (Sen, 2009, p.

157

227). This broadening of concerns necessarily includes how we shape and engage in our spaces

of deliberation, especially where such spaces reveal what is hidden and take us into the

unknown. As Kuokkanen (2007) writes,

> If Indigenous ontologies and philosophies represent a radical epistemic challenge to the
> academy, how can we expect the academy to welcome them? What are the
> responsibilities of the participants of the established discourse individually – and of the
> academy as a collective – when it comes to listening to, responding to, and (most
> significantly) recognizing these epistemes? How can the academy, at individual and
> collective levels, prepare itself to respond to and reciprocate with these worldviews?
> (Kuokkanen, 2007, p. 8)

Kuokkanen (2007) issues a challenge to the academy that is at once instructively hopeful

and realistically cautionary. Taken from Sen's (2009) perspective on the constraints and

possibilities that our lived social, economic and cultural backgrounds and current realities have

upon our decision-making, Kuokkanen's (2007) reflection on the struggle for transformational

change in higher education is even more prescient. We might argue that we are not fully able to

change discourse about what we *should* do in relation to Indigenization and internationalization

if we do not ultimately change the fundamentals of what we are *able to do*, in *practice*. In

Greene's (1988) words, deliberations of Indigenization and internationalization, as and through

their enactments, may expose us to the "the relation between freedom and the consciousness of

possibility, between freedom and the imagination – the ability to make present what is absent, to

summon up the condition that is not yet" (Greene, 1988, p. 16). For Greene (1988), while

"reflectiveness" and "logical thinking" related to "abstract principles" are important to

"cognitive development", what is more important is "to interpret from as many vantage points as

possible a lived experience, the ways there are of being in the world" (p. 120). In doing this, "we

can ponder the opening of wider and wider spaces of dialogue" whereby we, in each of our roles

on our campuses are "empowered to speak in [our] own voices" and "reflect together" as we "try

to bring into being an in-between" (Greene, 1996, p.59). In opening to such "freedom to alter situations by reinterpreting them", through engaging in new ways of knowing and being together our campuses, we may, as Greene wrote (1996), begin to see ourselves as "person[s] in a new perspective" (p. 90).

Deliberation, as freedom, is arguably a cautiously optimistic understanding of our work as transformative intercultural practitioners. As faculty, staff and students, we are, in a sense, "citizens" of our institutional communities and, as such, are arguably capable of "participatory governance" through deliberative engagement with one another (Fischer, 2009, p. 75). And yet, in the shaping and implementation of such "participatory governance" at our institutions, we also may come to recognize that our deliberations and enactments of Indigenization and internationalization are "neither straightforward nor easy" and thereby have "to be carefully organized, facilitated – even cultivated and nurtured" (Fischer, 2009, p. 75). What is it like then to engage, as transformative intercultural practitioners, in such careful organization and facilitation, such cultivation and nurturing, of Indigenization and internationalization? It is to this question and its exploration that we now turn.

Chapter 6: Enacting

The planner [...] has to find ways of jarring community members away from destructive habits and beliefs; through the processes of catharsis and empathy they need to encourage participants to see and think about each other in a different light. There is, to be sure, little or nothing in contemporary planning or policy curricula that offers any sort of training or guidance that would be useful in helping prospective practitioners to think through and implement such a strategy.
- *Fischer, 2009, p. 292*

Initiating

The late afternoon sun casts long shadows as we cut a path through crowds of students, caught off-guard by the tinkling of jingle cones and the splendor of the dancers' regalia. We enter the student union building from the backdoor and squeeze down a stairwell. Moments later, they take to the stage before a rapt audience of mostly international students. I take in the students' excitement, when a disquieting uneasiness sweeps over me. My eyes become heavy with the discordance of watching a sacred healing dance performed in a campus pub, filled with incandescent light from cellphone cameras. An Aboriginal colleague who co-sponsored the event, speaks his thoughts, "International students are expecting this type of experience. I need to understand this better". I comment, "Not many Aboriginal students showed up". He replies, matter-of-factly, "This is too overwhelming for most first-year Aboriginal students". As he speaks, I look at the small group of Aboriginal students, glancing intently around them.

Creating and entering spaces of perceived reconciliation, intercultural learning or social justice on our campuses can lead to improved understanding, appreciation and contentment. At the same time, such initiatives can be anxiety-ridden, exhausting, and poorly implemented, can even be harmful. We might know this from personal experiences, such as hosting or attending extended family dinners, to engaging in social media. We can spend hours preparing for a dinner and then, in what seems like moments, we discover the food eaten and the dining room in an uncomfortable silence after a relative makes a racially-tinged remark or a friend moralizes on a recent political incorrectness. You might find yourself at a colleagues' or friends' home and, in experiencing the cultural differences between your ways of life, you might feel momentarily transported into their world. Or, feeling peaked by a recent online post, you might wade into a discussion thread and suddenly find yourself being labelled naïve, pandering, a "troll". You may

160

step back and wonder how you should respond, if you should venture further into discord or discomfort, if you should immerse yourself in shared hopes, or if you should just walk away.

On Canadian campuses, students, staff and faculty are creating and entering into these ambiguous and uncomfortable cross-cultural, diverse spaces on a regular basis. Whether in the classroom, the advising office, the Elder's room or in the campus gym, it is in the experiences of speaking to confused or anxious students, teaching difficult issues and troubling histories, or in making phone calls to incited or frustrated colleagues that we experience how our campus embodies often vague, contested notions of diversity and inclusion. We might not know why, but we may feel energized and committed, part of a strong, vibrant campus community, or we might feel disconnected, marginalized to the point of resignation or outrage. In critically engaging diversity and inclusion on our campuses, we can, at one moment, sense reciprocity in the genuine giving and receiving of our knowledges, skills, and understandings, and yet, at another moment, possibly even at the same event, sense underlying ethnocentric anxieties, pretenses and insularities.

In my reflection at the start of this chapter, I shared a personal experience in leading an orientation program for new international students. When I think of this experience, I wonder if the work I do in my institution engages me in creating spaces of interaction and learning for students that, while in their implementation can feel fulfilling and exhaustive can also sometimes be, at the same time, in their final presentation, superficial and, at worst, traitorous of my own values. As I try to bring my international student affairs work into alignment with my commitment to reconciliation, I come face-to-face with ways of doing things that don't fit neatly into institutional practices and that necessarily extend my relationships. When I work with my team and the Aboriginal Student Centre to incorporate traditional Aboriginal performances in our

orientation, I know I am not just entering into a transactional relationship with Eagle Sky

Productions. Rather, I am relying on my colleagues in the Aboriginal Student Centre for

assistance in respectfully hosting, in a mainstream Canadian context, talented Powwow dancers

and singers and their families in performing sacred and traditional dances and songs that have

survived a sustained attempt at cultural genocide (Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2015b).

When we endeavor to create spaces to enact what we understand to be, whether correctly

or not, Indigenization and internationalization, we could say that we are also, by role and/or by

acknowledgement, responsible, in some way, for gathering that which we understand to be

needed to make such spaces possible. Said simply, in bringing together international students

and the Eagle Sky Dancers for the International Student Welcome, many people, resources, and

materials, both sacred and mundane, were required. In bringing these people and resources

together, I took responsibility for respecting Indigenous knowledges, histories and ways of being,

and in the end, I sensed an elusive failure. I realized, at the moment the dancers were on the

stage, that I may have ultimately "perpetuate[d] the belief that different cultures have nothing to

offer but exotic food and dances or a shallow first chapter" in the welcoming of international

students to the lived meaning of Treaty relations at their new institution (Battiste, 2013, p. 168).

Enacting Indigenization and internationalization is, thus, not an abstraction. Our

enactments of Indigenization and internationalization, as transformative intercultural practice,

can, as my experience demonstrates, reveal, or expose our (un)successful attempts to "try to

bring into being an in-between" space (Greene, 1996, p. 59), a "trans-systemic" means "to create

fair and just educational systems so that all students can benefit from their education in multiple

ways" (Battiste, 2013, p. 103). In our enactments of what we understand to be transformative

Indigenization and internationalization, we may find ourselves, even in the most mundane of

situations, pressing against our own and others' material, spatial, temporal, corporeal, and relational senses of the "common good" of our institutions (Knowles & Clark, 2018, p. 15). We may find ourselves searching for "ways of jarring" ourselves, our colleagues and students "away from destructive habits and beliefs; through the processes of catharsis and empathy" in order that we might "see and think about each other in a different light" (Fischer, 2009, 292).

Meaning making, in and through our deliberations of Indigenization and internationalization policies and strategies can, as noted in Chapter 5, simultaneously reveal the known and unknown. Transformative intercultural practice, as lived space, as offering, or as an inter-subjective encountering, can be experienced in the ways and spaces where we hold meetings with one another, in the ways, each day, we greet one another in hallways, even in the midst of inter-personal or inter-departmental disagreements. It is as if our individual and collective senses of Indigenization and internationalization are woven into the tapestries of our planning and the textures of our day-to-day work, including those that shape the very initiations of international, Aboriginal and Indigenous students into our institutions.

Uprooting

To seek a deeper understanding of the lived meanings of enacting Indigenization and internationalization requires us to reflect and look upon our institutions as places of living, studying and working together. As we walk around our institution and pass buildings we have worked or studied in, we are interested in our sense of these buildings, beyond their stonework or architecture. The way light falls on an autumn day on a northern campus Commons can bring forth feelings associated with the return and arrival of new students. As I recall walking to my office on a spectacular September day, I come across newly arrived international students, luggage in hand and I remember their eagerness and exhaustion. They, like many Aboriginal

students, have been uprooted from their families, friends and comforts. In these situations, we might recognize that the institutions where we work are not just places where our students may study for months or years. Our institutions become a locus of our students' new friendships and communities, their new home and a source of a hopeful future. In that new home, we, as staff, faculty and student leaders, become part of the students' lives in ways that can have tangible significance in the present and lasting impact into the future.

Vulnerable spaces

> *In a class of 600 people, I sit down beside somebody, start up a conversation, and then next time, I'm sitting somewhere else. One day, after that class, I sit underneath a stairwell where someone had set up a table and a chair. As I am going through the hallways, my heart starts beating, I start sweating and get short of breath. It feels like I'm not part of the university. I hate being here. It feels like my world is falling apart.*

Terrence shares a dark moment in his early student life before becoming a student leader. This moment is marked by anxiety, a reaction to the relative anonymity of being a student in his Faculty. We may read this reflection and feel concerned. We may know this experience, possibly from our own university years, or from our experience advising or teaching. We may be reminded of the ever-increasing class sizes in larger universities, of how overwhelming university life may feel for new international students, or of how difficult it can be for Indigenous students to find their footing in North American universities. The images we project of our institutions do not include a table and chair hidden under a stairwell. And yet, we may find ourselves trying to help our students emerge from under that stairwell and make sense of their experiences. In those moments, we may wonder about the environment in which we work.

> *A professor makes an Islamophobic comment. I am sitting next to a friend who wears a hijab. She looks at me and I am thinking, "She can't speak. She's much more vulnerable than I am. She's not born here." I say, "What you just said was very essentializing and smacks of Islamophobia, and I really don't appreciate you speaking that way about my community". I have a lot of good friends in the class, but no one acts as an ally. The professor responds, "I'm just telling the truth and it makes you uncomfortable."*

164

Sophie reflects upon an interaction from her university studies that has shaped her understanding of how racist behaviour can be enacted within a university context. Sophie's experience reveals the impact of inappropriate faculty-student interaction and opens to tensions that may be just beneath the surface of the institutions in which we work. If and when we face such tensions, we may wonder if there is enough shared sense of purpose in Indigenization and internationalization to create the spaces of intercultural learning, reconciliation and social justice we seek for our students, colleagues and ourselves. We may find ourselves becoming attuned to what is and is not being done to develop and enact such shared purposes, including how we support our Aboriginal and international students and colleagues. We may become hyper-attentive to how our institution shapes our students' experiences, and to what is or is not being seen or sensed as concerns by our colleagues.

> *I have this anxiety that some staff may not understand what they're doing. When I see their work, I think, "You can do that? What's your background to do that?" I want to be able to say, "There is a difference in how we think about what students should be able to do and need support in. In that place where students seek support or guidance to make meaning out of their experience". No one owns that space with the student.*

In Chris' experience, the university environment can squeeze out space, both literally and figuratively, for understanding and responding to the needs of international students. He is anxious that his staff be sufficiently trained, yet also that there be requisite campus-wide understanding of the need for adequate student supports. It is not that Chris, or any of the other participants in this research, want to assume the mantle of all supports for the students, faculty and staff they serve. As Chris describes, even though we may feel that "no one owns" the space of supports for helping, teaching and leading our students or colleagues, we also may be concerned that such space could be taken away or eroded by inattention.

165

At the same time, we, or our colleagues, as a group of professionals, come from different First Nations, Indigenous, international or diverse cultural communities, from both within and beyond our continent. We can forget that some of us, including potentially ourselves, may also be experiencing feeling uprooted and may, at times, seek the "table and chair" beneath the stairs. As a new faculty, Maya left behind family, bonds of trust and cultural and spiritual connection of her home and had to find her own place in contested space. She recalls "finding the situation so distressing that I closed the door". She felt painfully uprooted yet wanted to ensure her students felt secure. For many participants, this sense of seeking spaces of trust, safety, and connection plays a critical role, for better or worse, in their work. Elsie and Mary describe moving from "a ceremonial space, a sacred space, a safe place" of "freedom" in their classroom to a planning space of "power relationships" that is "segregated, oppressive, manicured, micromanaged". Sophie recalls being in a consultation session on racism, including a diverse, experienced group of participants, where a white, female facilitator "was bossing everyone around, clutching her felt pen to her like the mace of power". Sophie describes the participants trying to respectfully re-direct the session to meet their needs, evoking a mutual, variable vulnerability.

In their own words, participants describe juxtapositions where they are working on anti-racist or reconciliation-related projects and yet, find themselves in situations that are oppressive. In the switching contexts, the participants describe feeling their hearts beating faster, an internal discomfort, stomach aches or changes in body temperature, knowing that they are entering a hostile, inflexible, or dangerous space, or suddenly realizing that, after a long day's work, they may have missed something that could be affecting a student or colleague's wellbeing.

> *I'm watching a television show where I see someone being victimized and it triggers me. I am triggered by guilt and anxiety that this system I'm trying to serve a student's needs within, is, in fact, harming him. I met with him that day and he seemed okay. But I don't*

know what he went home like. It breaks my heart to think that he might have gone home for supper and been in tears with his spouse.

Dominic describes what it can feel like to be triggered after a busy day, suddenly thinking about a client. He is attuned to the foreignness and insecurity that an international student and his family are facing in dealing with a potential issue of discrimination. He sees himself, like many participants, as playing a role, directly or indirectly, in his clients' search for place and rootedness in institutional spaces that are not, in and of themselves, safe and welcoming.

We enter the boardroom that I've booked for the hour. I close the door and go to the windows. I say to her, "I'm closing these blinds. Are you comfortable with that?" As I close the blinds, I'm still not sure our sterile office environment is exactly right for her.

In this reflection, Dominic describes creating a space of privacy. He is uncertain, yet direct, aware that the room may be too cold, institutional. Yet, he knows that, once the door is closed and the blinds drawn, a different space may open, where a student or colleague may reveal sadness, frustration, anger, confusion. Leslie also speaks to this search for privacy, reflecting that "it's going to be a real doozy of a problem" if a student "comes in and closes the door and blinds".   In working one-on-one in advising situations, we open to our students' and colleagues' emotional, personal experiences, with some of us, like the participants in this study, keeping Kleenex boxes and make-up mirrors close at hand.

While we may take steps to ensure that this sharing takes place in "a sacred space, a safe space", we may also experience our own vulnerability in such spaces that are, essentially, meant to open to vulnerability. As a non-Indigenous scholar, Nadine shared how her decision to focus her research and life work on Indigenous issues has led to her face difficult emotions, including uncertainty about her place and role. She recalls feeling unable to explain why she took that path, of feeling isolated and muted, and yet also acutely aware that she had to persevere. Like stepping on to an airplane or choosing a path in the forest, we can suddenly, or gradually, realize

167

that the choices we make in our helping, teaching and leading may forever change how we and

our students and colleagues see and experience the worlds we inhabit together, and apart.

> *I am ready to break down and cry. Should I do that? Break down and cry? I could. I just can't get over how much it is moving me to tears. I ask myself "Why am I so emotional? Why, in the years that I've been here, I could just walk in like a turtle with a hard shell?". When I listen to that short clip, that's my pride. My Dad and what they went through. I went and saw a play recently and I cried quite a bit. It's okay because it's theatre. You go for that. But when I'm teaching a class…Put on the video. Push "Start".*

In Mary's reflection on teaching a seminar on residential schools, she speaks of

presenting a video of a survivor whose story reminds her of her father's. She has seen this video

before and yet, this time, feels as if she is shedding of self-protection, claiming "pride" in what

her father and other relatives went through. The "short clip" acts as a catalyst, a way into

grieving, an opening to the history of colonization and its enduring impacts. She knows that

once she pushes "start", there is no going back. To enter, rather than avoid spaces of

vulnerability, we must be prepared for and acknowledge the desires, tensions, fears, uncertainties

and possibilities that such spaces can reveal to us and within us. I think of the first lines of Lee

Maracle's (2015) poem, *Labyrinth*: "Canada is a labyrinth / Full of dark passageways /

Gatekeepers block entry / I enter cautiously / Sneak past guards / My Latin is weary".

Imminent/Immanent spaces

Maracle's (2015) poem reflects spaces where history, memory, identity, language and

authority interweave and collide and where we seek deeper meanings, the words to name what is

blocked and, in a sense, to overcome its naming. As Maracle (2015) writes in the final verse,

such a task is inherently sorrowful, yet self-possessing: "My mouth slurs / words of endearment /

to the mouths of others / echoing rejection of the assault". We might say that, in some sense, our

work reflects such embodied juxtapositions of vulnerability, resilience, empowerment.

There is a six-minute video clip of missing and murdered women: the seven-months pregnant woman stabbed 17 times, her name is such and such. This one here x, y and z. This one here x, y and z. The violence, the brutality, the horror. You feel the energy in the room is just, like…You want to vomit. Students are almost in tears or are in tears. It's dark. It's dense. It's heavy. It's despair. And then, you pack your bag and go home.

Elsie's reflection opens to the spaces of potency in our work that can be sought or constructed in ways we may, or may not, intend. She is in a darkened classroom, watching a video that introduces a contemporary violence and injustice that seeks to force difficult questions. The clock figures along with a video, like an experiment with a variable that can substantially change intended catalysis. The course schedule demands the video be stopped and that students move on to their next course. The students lift their backpacks, like burdens, onto their shoulders. All the while, Elsie thinks of her students' reactions, sees herself as part of something greater than her own experience, and wonders what that greater something is. Elsie, like other participants in this research, speaks of a self-awareness that she is but one of many actors, at times sensing that she is somehow both embedded in and extracted from the moment she experiences. In her recollection of presenting a video on missing and murdered women to a group of future teachers, Elsie finds herself in a difficult, limiting situation, in an organization that is trying, in some meaningful way, to move beyond its own limiting tendencies.

Along these lines, Sophie describes at one point, that she has "such a limited amount of time" with undergraduate students, in "big classes" that she "can't intimately know" who her students are. For Sophie, as it is for all participants in this study, knowing who she is working with is a critical part of being effective in her work. Conversations are the learning itself. And yet, sometimes, as Sophie describes, we can "get caught in a cul-de-sac of conversations not going anywhere". It is always possible that a desired shift in discourse might never occur.

The student talks to me after class. She says, "When I was up North, I didn't have any prejudice against Native people. I thought they were just like you and I. I don't know

why they're so angry all the time." And then she starts talking about another course she has taken on Aboriginal education. I say, "Can we understand, given the history you know about, why there might be anger?" She responds, "I understand. But my point is being mad isn't going to…" This conversation goes on in a similar vein for about ten minutes. It is a weird moment, between classes with people coming and going. I feel like I am alienating her. I think, "I wish I had twelve or sixteen weeks. Maybe we could journey a little further together. Maybe I could learn what her story is."

Sophie's reflection opens to how her student carries her feelings and thoughts from one lecture to the next, making sense of differing worldviews and issues she is being presented. Her student carries anger and confusion, and Sophie tries to find some form of resolution. For Sophie, her course is about travelling together with her students through difficult content. Yet, she is limited by how far she can go. The world outside presses on, with students coming and going, course scheduling looming, and an always impending final exam. In a moment of potential learning, Sophie experiences a lack of potency.

The sense of potential and constraint we can feel in our work can co-exist in ways that may require us, and those we work with, including our students, to hold multiple positions at a time. As Melinda describes, the "cracking open" of such "disorienting dilemmas" may be central to the experiences that take place in our work, including in our advising. Our students often face multiple stressors, having to make decisions that can have life-impacting implications.

> *A student is in my office, trying to decide whether to stay in Canada or go back to her country. Her boyfriend here asked her to marry him. I'm very much, "Follow your heart. If you fall in love, that's one of the greatest things on Earth." But I also know what the consequences would be for her. I have to have a professional relationship. I look at her and I feel so sad she is restricted by her culture and parents. Just her sitting in front of me, and her face, and the fact she is resigned to going back home.*

In this reflection, Belen recalls sitting with a student who she senses is fraught. And yet, Belen suspends or curtails her intervention and bias. She acknowledges a professional relation, even in such an intimate space. Many participants describe visceral, emotional, vital moments such as this depicted by Belen. Participants depict situations where tensions surface, arise or

simmer almost like summer storms, predictable in some cases, unpredictable in others. And yet, they also concede that our work may be saturated with conditions for such perfect storms. Chris describes a situation where an international student misled her supervisor to get a co-op permit. The meeting he has with staff from his office and the student's Faculty is charged and tense, he says, "because of the urgency" and the implications of potentially illegal behaviour. And yet, he sees the context itself as that which creates tension, feeling that "staff are of the mind that, 'I get the bigger picture, but this is what I was asked to do. You didn't ask me to solve the larger problem'."

The spaces of our work are often teeming with significance. Our choices are consequential, for the spaces we are in with our students and colleagues present situations and decisions that will potentially have long-term impacts. Such moments may be experienced in "timeless time", symbolized in the Greek myth of Kairos (van Manen, 2015, p. 52). According to van Manen (2015), Kairos moments are "pure, perfect, unpredictable, and uncontrollable moments" that "may yield insights and clarity but are often brought on by pain, agony and feelings of frustration and desperation" by forcing us "to be absolutely present to ourselves and the meaning and significance of what we are facing" (p. 52). van Manen (2015) writes:

> Kairos may spontaneously jolt us into a moment of wonder and awe at something we thought we knew. But Kairos also demands of us the right thing at the right time – one right action at the right time will do. If you hesitate, then the Kairic moment has passed, and all you will be left with is regret. (van Manen, 2015, p. 53)

We might say that Kairos time brings together the immanence and imminence of our work, where we are conscious of the matters of which we speak. Purpose, as purposeful space may call us to purpose, inspire in us a sense of purposefulness. We might also seek to infuse space with purpose, inspiring purposefulness in others. Or we may experience such spaces as a

locus of questioning intended purposes, of exposing cross-purposes. Such spaces may reveal and

demand an entirely other sense of purposefulness that we have yet to discover.

Purposeful spaces

> *A department has a student say, "I'm being treated in a racist manner". They take her*
> *allegation as an attack. I say, "A student can make an allegation of racism. You have to*
> *take her seriously". They perceive the student as the problem and kick her out. I think,*
> *"You are about to make a huge mess." I know they're going to get into trouble and I take*
> *some glee in that, to be honest. Showing them the cost of not listening to me. And then*
> *the real concern comes to me. Their actions are causing harm to the student.*

While we may seek to imbue a deep and clear sense of purpose in our work, there may be

moments when we feel we cannot always achieve our purposes in ways we think are the most

collegial, effective or impactful in the ways we intend.   For Dominic, watching his colleagues

make unwise decisions makes him concerned and resentful. His advice is unheeded and he is

sidelined. And yet, Dominic acknowledges that, in letting things take their course, there will be a

reckoning. In the background are the human rights policy, legislation and procedures that

underscore his work. By stepping aside, buffering is removed, and, while it pains him to see it

happen, he must let his colleagues learn for themselves. He must focus on limiting potential

harm to the student. In such moments of stepping aside, it may also be that we, like Dominic,

find ourselves stepping alongside at the same time. Even if we step aside to let our colleagues

enter into a "mess" of their own making, we know we will likely be brought in at some point.

We will not remain impervious to the suffering of those affected by the situation. In so doing, it

may seem as if policy and strategy subsumes or envelopes our roles and sense of purpose,

eclipsing or entwining our relationships with our students and colleagues.

> *There's a story on the university webpage about one of our graduates. One of our staff,*
> *who's not mentioned at all in the article, has had a lot of interaction with that student.*
> *The student wouldn't be there if it wasn't for the staff person that got them to finish their*
> *degree. That is a silent part of the story.*

Chris is aware of how much his staff, behind the scenes, invest in student advising. Yet, his staff do not often hear that their work is valued. For Chris, this is because "the work and the outcome of the work is not well understood". Many participants share this sense of working, often intentionally, in understated or unacknowledged contexts, even in senior leadership roles. And yet, invariably, participants also speak of the fulfilment they experience through, and alongside, the learning and achievements of their students and colleagues.

> *I interview an applicant for admission. I say "Everything looks good. Welcome to our institution!" I shake her hand and give her a piece of paper. She's the first in her family, the first in her community to go to the university, so, it's a big deal. She says, "I walked in here not thinking this was going to happen and now it's happening!" Then, she runs out and tells her family member "I'm in!" Her mom is snapping pictures and crying.*

In admitting a new student, Leslie experiences the sense of achievement of an Aboriginal student and her family. This moment may crystalize a relationship that may extend for the student's entire experience at her institution, through what Leslie knows will include highs and lows. Leslie's role may be pre-determined, yet her sense of purposefulness is in joy and potential that comes with uttering the phrase "Welcome to our institution!"

> *I get the most gratification from the experience that students have in going abroad. Seeing them go through the process and then coming back and saying, "It changed my life and broadened my degree". I know how different they're going to be when they come back, I guess. Maybe not with every single one of them, but just about all of them. I know all these stages, but I look forward most to the last stage.*

Like Leslie, for Lana, much of her work is spent helping students persist through various bureaucratic, financial, personal and academic hurdles. In her case, this goal is to study abroad. Lana sees students go through various stages of inquiry, excitement and anxiety, and takes pleasure in knowing that many of her students who go abroad will return having matured in significant ways. While she can count all her student appointments and the number of students who have participated in her programs, she revels in the uncountable, deeply personal,

173

cumulative effect that studying abroad has on her students. Her sense of purpose is embedded, postponed.   Kendra and Leslie also reflect on the suspended, temporal sense of purposefulness in relation to being with Elders on the Convocation stage and witnessing the granting of degrees to the students they serve. Besides their joy in being part of Convocation, they feel most grateful for the years of being with their students as they matured and persevered. For Kendra and Leslie, student success and failure are relative to their students' own sense of achievement. In our work, we might say that purposefulness is experienced vicariously.

> *A girl talks about Islamic students in my class. She shares everything. You can hear a pin drop. I'm listening, taking notes. She ends her presentation with an Aboriginal phrase on her last slide. It is in my language. It means "thank you".*

Elsie, like many participants in this study, comes face-to-face with ignorant and racist attitudes of students and colleagues. What can be forgotten when we become overly focused on own work and intended goals is that overcoming ignorance and racism relies on shared intentions and purposes. For Elsie, sitting at the back of class and watching a student she has mentored speak of her experience with racism and Islamophobia, makes Elsie "feel enriched and rewarded". Witnessing her students' "personal growth" and "success" is "humbling", not just to Elsie, but she senses, to all her students, to the point of bringing silence to a room. It is no small matter for Elsie to create the trust and sharing amongst students that she describes. It is no small matter that a student presents her final slide in Elsie's mother tongue. Such success, for Elsie, is grounded in a pragmatic confidence in the young people she instructs.

> *I don't hate the guy because he's racist. I love the guy even if he is a racist. I just know he's ignorant and doesn't know any better. But when he learns the history and he experiences the critical reflection he will end up in that space and that place. He might not go 150 percent, but even if he goes 60 percent, he's 60 percent further ahead than he was before. And, thank God for the kid that's going to be in his classroom.*

In facing racism and ignorance, Elsie tries not disengage or lose the thread of her purpose. Rather, she describes setting realizable expectations that align with where her students are at. Elise's reasoning is similar to Sophie's, who states that, "a student could be sexist or racist, but I'm still their teacher". This is a position Sophie takes "fairly seriously" because she teaches "about attending to relations of power". She senses a "responsibility" to engage her students in a "conversation" that is "productive, daring, creative". This pragmatic, conscientious approach to role, power, and relationships permeates the participants' descriptions of their experiences in enacting Indigenization and internationalization. Such an approach may be one of the most critical aspects of our work on our campuses, where, for example, we might be witness to both the perseverance and success of our students, and yet also to the systemic barriers that our colleagues, knowingly or unknowingly, erect or reinforce and limit our students' success. In that vein, Elsie does not blame her students for their ignorance, as, for her it is not only a "question of [her students] not knowing" about residential schooling or Islamophobia but rather is "a systemic problem that involves the epistemic foundations of the academy" (Kuokannen, 2007, p. 113). To be purposeful, Elsie thinks incrementally, within and beyond her seminar, to the spaces of teaching, helping or leading that her students will one day assume. In taking this approach, Elsie exposes her students to the perpetuation of "self-deception" as the "suppressing" of "doubts" regarding dominant narratives, eschewing "pure ignorance", for "one cannot ignore something without having recognized it, even if non-consciously" (Hamrick, 2002, p. 183).

When I reflect on the experiences and approaches that the participants describe in relation to the enactment of their work, I think of Dale Turner's (2009) affirmation of his sense of purpose as a "word warrior" who "must critically engage" dominant "legal, political, historical and philosophical discourses" in "accordance with Indigenous ways of knowing the world" (p.

75). For Turner (2009), this word warrior-ship is a dialogical process that involves Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples, especially younger generations, in forging new ways of being and understandings between each other. Turner's (2009) hope does not lie in his "own work", but rather "in the intellectual work of our future Indigenous intellectuals" (p. 117). Understanding this work as a form ally-ship, and intergenerational mentorship, can be daunting, decentering, and for some, possibly emotionally and psychologically draining.

Opening ourselves, students and colleagues to "hear" (and speak) non-Western epistemes (Kuokkanen, 2007, p. 152) and to forge new ways of being and understandings across difference extends as much into the enactment of Indigenization as it does, in many cases, with internationalization. In some manner, we might say that, each day, we enter into our institutions, attempting to do these very things, in ways that may reflect the unique, at times almost inexplicable, types of work that we do. Attempting to make sense of the enigmatic aspect of her work, Sophie employs a metaphor of sprinkling "fairy dust" on the "invisible" structures behind the visible "things" of our world "so that for a second" she can "reveal the hidden structures and discourses that shape the way society works". She reflects that this process requires "wallowing in the beauty of time to slowly unfold things".   Sophie's metaphor recalls Willie Ermine's (2007) contention that the "schismatic ambience" of encounters between "Indigenous and Western worlds" can, even with some form of acknowledgement, suffer a "lack of substance or depth" (p. 195) if underlying structures and discourses remain unspoken. Ermine (2007) writes,

> What remains hidden and enfolded are the deeper level thoughts, interests and assumptions that will inevitably influence and animate the kind of relationship the two can have. It is this deeper level force, the underflow-become-influential, the enfolded dimension that needs to be acknowledged and brought to bear in the complex situation produced by confronting knowledge and legal systems. (Ermine, 2007, p. 195)

In this sense, through our work in Indigenization and internationalization, we may sense our purposefulness in how we do, or don't, make sense together of what we intend to achieve. Purposefulness is relational, experienced, for example, in how others receive or take on something we have offered to them, or vice versa, including facing and overcoming ignorance. Participants speak of organizing events, teaching courses or meeting with colleagues in ways that open to Indigenous ways of knowing or improved intercultural understanding, and that reveal discourses of social justice, equity and critical notions of inclusion. In those moments, they describe feeling humbled, stretched in their knowledge, inspired by the resulting commitment of their students and colleagues to extend their own knowledge and shift their practices. It may be that, in the transgressing of traditional structures of authoritative knowledge and their enactments, of being generous in our understandings of who is taught and who is teaching, who is following and who is leading, who is seeking and who is giving help, that we may, in our work, find our greatest sense of shared purposes. These are ways of interacting that require contextual sensitivity, self-awareness and consideration of the impacts of actions, presently and over time. They are interactions we cannot take for granted, interactions that are intrinsic and exigent, sought for and cultivated.

Cultivating

In his autobiography, Nelson Mandela (1995) recalls a critical moment in his life, where, in a rite of passage, he sat through a speech about the bleak prospects for young men in South Africa. Mandela (1995) recalls his chief's indignant address, where he proclaimed the ritual's "promise" of "manhood" as "empty, illusory" and not able to be "fulfilled" for, as a "conquered people", his people were "slaves" and "tenants" in their "own country" (pp. 20-30). As the chief detailed injustices, Mandela (1995) describes becoming "cross", dismissing his chief's address

177

"as the abusive comments of an ignorant man" (p. 30).   Later in life, however, Mandela realized his chief risked his relationship with his people by speaking what was necessary.

> Without exactly understanding why, his words soon began to work in me. He had planted a seed, and though I let that seed lie dormant for a long season, it eventually began to grow. Later, I realized that the ignorant man that day was not the chief but myself. (Mandela, 1995, pp. 30-31)

As a political leader and lawyer, Mandela soon found himself speaking and fighting against apartheid and acting in ways that challenged cultural and societal norms. Even in the face of imprisonment, Mandela defended the "human decency" of three, white South African judges who, dissenting from their colleagues, "rose above their prejudices, their education, and their background" by acknowledging the injustices committed by the Apartheid regime (Mandela, 1995, p. 260). In *Invictus* (Eastwood, 2009), a film dramatization of Mandela's leadership as President of South Africa, there is a striking scene, where the captain of his presidential body guard asks Mandela why members of the previous apartheid-era president had joined his corps.

> Mandela: You asked for more men, didn't you?
> Jason: Yes. I asked her…
> Mandela: When people see me in public, they see my bodyguards. You represent me directly. The "Rainbow Nation" starts here. Reconciliation starts here.
> Jason: Reconciliation, sir?
> Mandela: Yes, reconciliation, Jason.
> Jason: Comrade, President, not long ago, these guys tried to kill us. Maybe, even these four guys in my office tried and often succeeded.
> (Eastwood, 2006)

Mandela's reflections on his life and the dramatizations of his rise to the presidency of his country can present us with an almost inimitable figure. And yet, we might also find ourselves in situations where, like Mandela, we might face backlash for choosing a path that conflicts with institutional, cultural or social norms. We might, like Mandela, find ourselves sensing our own or others' struggles in overcoming vulnerability, fear, anger or retribution. We

178

might also, like Mandela, enter into spaces of uncertainty and imminence and find ourselves purposefully seeking, speaking and acting with kindness and resolution. While there are innumerable aspects to Mandela's life that are beyond the realm of our day-to-day work, we cannot dismiss the relevance and determination of the simple, yet prescient, pointed phrase, "reconciliation starts here". We cannot deny that cultivating spaces of transformative Indigenization and internationalization begins with us.

(At)tending

> *A person scares the bejesus out of our receptionist and is transferred to me. He rants on the phone, "Why are you holding this panel? Why do you care about refugees? I support ISIS." I basically say, "This is my role and what I can tell you. If you have other concerns, these are your options." He hangs up. I'm in shock. I tell my supervisor and he calls the police. They come, take a statement, and undercover police attend the event.*

Cassandra reflects on a moment, when in the midst of her day, she finds herself speaking with a man who proclaims his support for a terrorist organization, demanding a ticket to a sold-out panel on the Syrian refugee crisis. Cassandra reacts resolutely, and yet, once she has time to reflect, realizes just how serious the situation is, not just for her, but for her colleagues and for her institution as a whole. Maya also shares a moment of protectiveness, albeit at a completely different scale. She recalls having a student set out demands, including expressing her preference for argumentative debates that would prepare her for her intended career in law. Maya recalls responding "bluntly" in response to her student's bluntness. For Maya, her student's demands would likely undermine her commitment to creating learning environments where students "don't talk over people". For both Cassandra and Maya, as for all participants, not everything belongs in the spaces of learning and sharing that they develop, lead and experience with their students and colleagues. At times, we may feel we must attend to the limits of what we determine, individually, institutionally or, even legally, as reasonable.

To attend can connotate different things and is related to other cognates, such as the words *to tend*, and *to be tender*. We may think of the verb *to attend* and first think of its meaning associated with being "present at", or "with" someone at, an event (Attend, 2017a). And yet, we also know, in our typical use of the word, that attending can also mean "to look after", "to stay with as a companion", or "to pay attention to" (Attend, 2017a). In this sense, we can say that we can, physically, attend a class, an advising session or a meeting, but not attend it, mentally. In our work, we might say that attending is as much physical presence as it is "to apply oneself, to be ready for service" or to "to apply the mind" (Attend, 2017a). And yet, we also know that "attending" in our work is not just intellectual, as our interactions with our students and colleagues require developing relationships, in the moment and over time. Drawing from the Latin, etymological root *tendere,* we can, in these interactions feel that we, or the situations we experience with our students and colleagues, "stretch, extend, make tense" these relations, including the epistemological and ontological foundations of those relations (Attend, 2017b). In our "aim" to "hold a course" of Indigenization and internationalization (Attend, 2017b), we may also find that we enter "tender" spaces where certain topics are "delicate" and, if we are not careful, our students and colleagues may be "easily injured" (Tender, 2017). In those spaces, we may find ourselves *attending* by acting *tenderly*, in a "kind, affectionate, loving" manner (Tender, 2017).

The meanings of the verbs *to attend* and *to tend* and their descriptive adjectives *to be attentive* and *to be tender*, open to extending and extensive lived meanings of our work. In the day-to-day of enacting what we sense to be Indigenization and internationalization, we may be attentive to detail, such as when Iris recalls being inquisitive about the origin of a student's name and taking time to learn about his Indigenous roots. At the same time, we can sense the

importance of not becoming wrapped up in details, by not picking out problems with what a

colleague is saying, but rather pose questions to nudge the dialogue in a different direction. In

that sense, to attend in our work is to sensitively direct others' attention, without straining it such

that it breaks, or as Melinda describes, is cognitively overloaded. To do this, we may assume a

disposition of care, of protecting our colleagues and students, and ourselves, from excess harm,

acknowledging that such harm is indeed possible, from internal and external forces.

> *Someone starts up about bullying by certain people in their unit. People's shoulders'*
> *shrug and hands come together. I notice eye contact between two or three people at the*
> *back. Others are looking to me to referee. There's a deadening of the space. It is as if the*
> *lighting changes. Someone looks as if they are getting up to leave. I think, "This can go*
> *crazy. You've got to be more active." I look at the person who spoke and say, "It sounds*
> *like we're getting into the weeds of something specific. Why don't you come talk to me*
> *after the session?" I create an off-ramp, drop the presentation and switch my approach.*

In his recollection, Dominic senses, as soon as he begins his training session, a distrust

within the group that diminishes dialogue to the point of affecting the way Dominic experiences

the lighting in the room. Dominic makes an intentional shift in his focus of attention. He no

longer facilitates his presentation on a particular topic, but rather, manages an underlying

conflict. He watches his colleagues' body language, follows their eye contact, and when he can

sense that someone in the room may leave, he acts by "dropping the presentation". Dominic's

switch in facilitation approach is like a switch in disposition, where, as he says in another

reflection, he ceases his facilitative-observational approach and steps in to "draw the line".

Taking this approach is Dominic's way of "living leadership" in "demonstrating the

expectations" of policy and "bringing safe space" with him into his day-to-day work. He is the

"decision-maker" at critical moments, "responsible for ensuring the people in the room are not

harmed".   In this vein, Cassandra reflects on a moment, when, during a powerful, reconciliation-

oriented "Blanket Exercise" she has organized, an Aboriginal student suddenly ceases

participation. As the student begins to leave the session, Cassandra recollects being concerned

that she had "stepped into something deeper" than she could "handle". Yet, she does not stand

aside. Rather, she acts quickly, breaking away from the session to see if the student is alright.

Alternatively, as Sophie recalls, we can find ourselves in situations where a colleague or

student is of concern, not because they are needing debriefing, nor because they are crossing a

line of civility, but because they are dominating space, focusing attention on themselves.

> *I find myself containing a man who claims to be an ally for all oppressed people and*
> *mobilizes his sense of authority to do so. I say, "When you get out of line, I'll be giving*
> *you a cookie to chew on." Everybody kind of laughs, even him. I look at him when he's*
> *talking so he knows I am focussed on him. But, I'm also looking to see if anyone is*
> *interested in what he's saying. Are people rolling their eyes or checking their watches?*
> *It is exhausting. At the break, one of the staff makes a beeline for me and says, "We're*
> *applauding you back there. He's on the board and he drives us crazy."*

In our work, both on and off campus, we may become entangled, intentionally or not, in

misunderstandings, conflicts and power relationships. When a participant in Sophie's session

"gets out of line", she makes efforts to re-focus on the group. She uses humour, cautiously

choosing her words. She seeks to model equanimity, yet also, like Maya, seeks to remain true to

principles of inclusive dialogue. In such situations, power can affect how we intervene, where,

for example, Sophie is aware that the man taking up air time holds clout in his community.   In

that vein, Terrence describes a complicated intervention with international interns who, led by

one "ring leader", complain of their mistreatment in relation to their employer. At the outset, he

recalls feeling "shocked" by their allegations, and needing "to side with them", to "make sure

they are alright" and "protected".   Over time, however, he discovers, through patient

investigation, that the underlying issues had more to do with culture shock than anything else.

> *This student doesn't feel comfortable challenging the professor. But he knows that what's*
> *been said and the position he's been put in in that class is inappropriate. So, we'll*
> *address it. We don't let it go. We do it in a respectful way. I talk to the student to see what*
> *he's comfortable with. "Do you feel comfortable sitting around and having a chat with*

this instructor and letting them know how you feel? Can we invite this instructor to our space and share a meal and come for a cultural event?"

Like Leslie, in the work of Indigenization and internationalization, we can be tasked with identifying issues, behaviours or statements that contradict policy in situations involving our colleagues. We are placed in positions of tension, where our embodied presence, in and of itself, can represent potential conflict, disagreement. Our presence may be mandated, and yet, we know that, to be effective, we cannot wield our mandate over others. Leslie speaks of helping a student advocate for himself in a way that seeks to establish dialogue and improve relationships and understanding. Seeking such understanding, we may rely on what van Manen (2015) terms, "tactfulness", which involves a "listening attentiveness to things" that is, in itself, "an interpretive act of meaning" (van Manen, 2015, p. 134). It would seem that, in being "tactful" in our work, we may come to "accept that every act of interpretation is a relational act of attentiveness and caring" and in so doing we "admit to a surprising conclusion: we should be just as accountable for what we *know* as for what we *do*" (van Manen, 2015, p. 134).

> *I'm dealing with a supervisor, and I have to tell her, "You're endangering the university. There are consequences to the way you're thinking and acting. We can have a human rights violation that involves legal issues." I listen and then say, "I hear what you're saying." She wants to be heard. I don't agree, but I have to respect what she's saying.*

For Farah, it is not easy to engage with a colleague who seems to be hiding "behind qualifications" in her hiring decision. Farah knows she must let her colleague's biases surface without judgement in a respectful, "open conversation". As Farah's experience reveals, our work brings us into such spaces of vulnerability, imminence and purposefulness with our students and colleagues, wherein the "attentiveness and caring" of our interactions takes on particularly immanent, shared meanings (van Manen, 2015, p. 134). Our relations with our students and colleagues are not just "connection[s] that exist *between*" us but are also

experiences that "encapsulate and surround" us (van Manen, 2015, p. 121). In our interactions

with one another, we are not just "in each other's sphere[s]", but rather, we "travel in each

other's landscape[s]" (van Manen, 2015, p. 121).

In the language of the participants, it is as if we must be constantly aware of when we

should we "step in", "step back" or "step aside". In making our move, we pay attention and

attend to our colleagues' and students' perceptions and experiences of the spaces we find

ourselves in together. Attentiveness, as it relates to perception, is perhaps a foundational aspect

of our work. As Merleau-Ponty (1945/2004) wrote, attention is not a passive engagement with

the world around us but is rather an "active constitution" of our perception of the actions,

persons and objects in the world around us (p. 35). In focusing our attention on specific

language, body language, or offers of assistance, we make "explicit and articulate" what, without

our attention to it, might have been "presented as nor more than an indeterminate horizon"

(Merleau Ponty, 1945/2004, p. 35). In this sense, attentiveness is not a "cause" but a "motive",

for the "act of attention is rooted in the life of consciousness" and as such, it "transforms" our

interactions with the world around us, as it "emerges" from "indifference" to become "thought

itself" (Merleau Ponty, 1945/2004, p. 36).

For all participants, their role in their institution places them, in van Manen's (2015)

words, *between* students and colleagues in ways that demand attentiveness to multiple potential

outcomes. In this sense, it may not be surprising to hear Kamal speak of "making peace" with

the possibility that he might not have the desired impact on his colleagues, knowing that he

"can't push the person too much or there will be backlash". Dominic speaks of a situation

where a training participant kept referring to trans-identified people as "not normal" and, instead

of calling out such "normative language", he "kept using typical and atypical, or statistically

average". Dominic didn't "shut down" or "shame" the faculty member, but rather sought to help

the faculty member attend to his own language. Dominic's intent is not to "change other

people's ethics" but is rather to "ensure" that his colleagues "behaviours are in line" with the

expectations of institutional policy.   As Daniela reflects, this conciliatory, yet protective

vigilance can be an exacting disposition to sustain.

> *I am at a meeting a white male colleague keeps referring to himself as a visible minority.*
> *A couple of times I ignore it and just go on. Finally, I say, "You're not a visible*
> *minority." He replies, "In this area, actually, I am." His colleague says, "One, he's*
> *male. Two, he's white. In that work group, he's a visible minority". Anyway, I just got*
> *angry. I state, "Clearly you don't understand what I'm talking about". Unfortunately,*
> *then I'm labeled as emotional or irrational and have to go back and talk to them about it.*

Daniela relies on a persistent, reflective courage to deal with the precariousness of being

in a position that, by its nature, challenges her colleagues' perceptions.   She knows that, in

responding with exasperation or anger, in tone or body language, she can lose what limited

authority she holds in the hierarchical context of her institution. In such moments, we can sense

resistance as a potential "battle", using Sophie's language, suddenly aware of the risks we face.

We might be labelled a "paid agitator" as Dominic states, or become burnt out by "being an

activist 24-hours a day", as Melinda ruminates. Even with our mandates for institutional change,

we may desire to be seen as "reliable", as Daniela describes, reflected in how we balance

perspectives and handle difficult, potentially charged interpersonal situations. Sophie describes

such experiences as having to keep her immediate reactions of consternation, frustration,

impatience or irritation in her "silent, compartmentalized part of her brain" so that she can open

up to what the situation demands of her as an instructor. Many participants describe such

moments of sensing incredulity at what a student or colleague says or does, and at the same time,

keeping their shock or disappointment from being evident in their choice of words or body

language, in order to sustain their connection with their students or colleagues. For if, at

moments of tension with our students and colleagues, "we are unconscious of our feelings, our emotions may leak out in our paralanguage, facial expressions, or movements and send messages that contradict the verbal content of what we are saying" (Nagata, 2006, p. 46).

This desire we may feel, or pressure we may sense, to "not be too radical" in how we exert the "courage to step up", using Daniela words, and as all participants express in some manner, may be because our work is experienced primarily through relational dialogue. In our interactions, we may depend on "a keen sense of what to do or say in order to maintain good relations with others or avoid offense" (van Manen, 2015, p. 102). And yet, our work "does not inhere in the simple desire or ability to get on well with others or establish good social relations" (van Manen, 2015, p. 102). Indeed, as the participants describe, in our work it is not only sufficient to have the "sensitivity" and "grace" be able to "act quickly, surely, confidently, and in an appropriate manner with quite delicate or complex circumstances" (van Manen, 2015, p. 102). We must also "be strong", avoiding "acquiescent sensitivity" in situations that "call for" us to engage with "frankness, directness and candor" (van Manen, 2015, p. 102).

As we "co-exist through a common world" of our institutions, we may find that, in our interactions with our students and colleagues, our "perspectives merge into each other" in ways that challenge us to listen more deeply and connectedly (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2004, p. 413). Through our interactions, it may be that "there is constituted between" ourselves and our students and colleagues "a common ground", however circumscribed, where our thoughts are "inter-woven into a single fabric" and our words are "called forth by the state of the discussion" in "a shared operation of which neither of us are the creator" (Merleau-Ponty, 1945/2004, p. 413). In this sense, when we act attentively, when we engage dialogically, we are attending to our colleagues and students' language, facial expressions, movement and body language, as well

as our own. To attend, in our work, may be an acknowledgement and embodiment of what we will and will not allow into our classrooms, offices, and our meeting spaces, as professionals and as an institution. As van Manen (2015) writes, these enactments cannot depend solely on a "rational process", as, in our work, we may draw as much (or less) from policy and strategy as from "insight" (p. 101). In those moments, we may rely as much (or less) on thought as we do "on feeling" (van Manen, 2015, p. 101). To attend well in our work, we also must therefore know what it means to allow.

Allowing

To allow can denote many actions, including permission, admission, provision, consideration, allocation or concession (Allow, 2017). Allowing is perhaps a way to describe how it is that we can remain open to what we might otherwise miss in what we sense of the world around us. We could say that, when we allow in our work, we suspend our immediate reactions and seek to let others develop their understanding and abilities to sense, for themselves, knowledge and practices that orient towards reconciliation, inclusion, equity, or social justice.

> *It is our first day in the course and I throw the students in the deep end. I introduce them to a topic that includes Indigenous spirituality. One student reads the text in the most scathing tone imaginable. Several students agree, cautiously signalling approval. Some are watching me, as they do. Some are looking puzzled, agitated. But I just allow it. That is how she sees it, how she reads it. How can I turn around and say, "No. You're wrong"? It unfolds the way it does. My sense is, "We'll see where this goes." The class is an hour and a half, and it's not enough. We don't get a resolution. It's disappointing, but I also have to allow that. Otherwise, I'm pushing something and it creates resistance.*

Maya's reflection on an experience of her students' response to her inclusion of a text on Indigenous spirituality in an environmental education course brings us into a space of cognitive dissonance that Melinda speaks of. Maya sets up a context where she knows her students may react with puzzlement, anticipation, even contemptuousness. She observes her students' behaviours, letting discussion take its course. She knows she cannot come to a resolution within

the time constraints of the class, yet, as she states, she "allows" this limitation as part of the

experience itself. For Maya, this way of allowing opens her to adapting how she responds to the

emotion, energy and intellectual engagement of her students in her class. She reflected:

> *When I walk into the room, I sense an exhausted tiredness, which is common at this time. I decide to have a sharing circle. I say, "What I like about this process is that it is a safe space, because we deeply listen. What you say is said to the center of the room and it stays there. It is not about right or wrong, or judgement." It is brief and they don't have a lot of say initially, but they start to talk more as they relax into safety.*

Like Maya, for Dominic, allowing is not passive, but intentional, a means of opening to

"safe space" where colleagues and students feel they can develop their knowledge in a non-

judgement environment.

> *I am training a group of staff and I say to them, "If you have always wanted to know how to refer to Aboriginal people, ask. This is your chance". I see some of them thinking, "He's going to put me on a list of racists if I ask that question". But, it's the opposite. I want them to be engaged in this topic. I say, "You've got someone in front of you now who you can ask the uncomfortable question. Why can't I use the word Indian anymore? Good question. Why do I hear people self-refer as Indian but I was told not to do that?"*

To acknowledge one's ignorance is not easy. As Dominic reflects in this anecdote,

acknowledgement of ignorance demands, in some sense, a degree of "symmetrical esteem"

between ourselves and our students and colleagues (Honneth, 1995, p. 129). Dominic speaks to

the stereotypes and possible tensions that are just beneath the surface, not to call them out, but to

let them be discussed, with generosity, sincerity.   To acknowledge, enter into, and open spaces of

vulnerability, we may find that we must "view one another in light of values that allow the

abilities and traits of the other to appear for shared praxis" (Honneth, 1995, p. 130). As Honneth

(1995) writes, this type of relationship with our students and colleagues may involve "felt

concern for what is individual and particular about the other person" whereby we may "actively

care about the development of the other's characteristics" even if those characteristics may

"seem foreign" to us (Honneth, 1995, p. 130).

I provide the opportunity that allows for the student to come forward and say, "I grew up in a racist household. I only know negative stereotypes or I know nothing at all. I grew up in a household where people said bad things about Aboriginal people". I facilitate an environment that allows for students to explore and discover that for themselves.

As a seminar leader, Elsie describes the freedom she has being outside of the influence of a formal, structured curriculum. In that space, she senses she has more opportunity to allow students to express themselves, to grapple with their learning in a way that acknowledges who they are and where they come from. She finds, in her students, spaces of commonality to explore issues of oppression, such as when she supported a female student "from a city that is considered one of the safest communities in Canada" through her realization of the lack of gender equity in professional sports opportunities. Through Elsie's course, the student becomes upset at the fact that her brother can continue in minor hockey, and she cannot go any further. Elsie does not judge her student who comes from a highly privileged background. Rather, Elsie determines to help her student name what she has experienced, what she has come to understand about the world that she lives in, and how that learning may be applied to her own life and work as an educator. Elsie nurtures an "emancipatory biographical praxis" which, in being "usefully explored and enhanced", she feels could help her student transform her understanding of issues facing Aboriginal peoples (Hoggan, Mälkki & Finnegan, 2017, p. 58). Our work may require of us to remember, at times when we could step in pre-emptively and do something that could single someone out or curtail dialogue, that our students and colleagues may bring forward their own understandings in ways that could be far more impactful than if we were to impart our own.

In the discussion around who is going to be nominated for an award, someone states, "I don't know if that person fits". I'm waiting for them to talk about what fit means, because I've alerted them to that language and what it produces. I'm thinking "OK. Pretty soon I will be stepping in". But the external member of the committee is appalled. She says, "I can't believe you're talking about personalities". She looks at me and darts off. I want to say to her "Too bad you have to leave. We are going to get to that point". But, I am waiting to see if the leader will step in, to see what is going to unfold.

To let our colleagues and students demonstrate for themselves their (lack of) knowledge and (mis)understanding(s), we may find ourselves holding our tongue. Instead of making statements or pointing out problems, we may find ourselves posing questions, interjecting contrasting ideas, or checking for underlying comprehension of the issues being discussed, including their own. Daniela describes a situation that many of us may recall experiencing in some manner. Instead of pointing out a colleague's potential prejudicial attitude towards an award nominee, she waits to allow her colleagues to reflect and respond. In not speaking immediately, she risks seeming to be in agreement. In speaking too quickly, she risks appearing domineering. For Daniela, knowing when to keep silent and when to speak is important. In what might seem paradoxical, Daniela senses that she will have done her work if, as the process unfolds, it is her colleagues, and not her, who speaks to the critical issues at stake.

> *Some students are thinking, "Why do we have to watch this? It happened. Okay. Whatever." But, then this student speaks and I know he isn't coming from a place of disassociation or complacency. I let it sit, because when he talks about the Holocaust and Rwanda, I guess that 60% know what he's referring to. I can't race into this conversation. There's an exact moment when there's enough silence to go on.*

For Mary, resistance is what creates the very spaces for her students to break from disassociation or complacency. To let the process of learning unfold, she makes space for silences, sometimes two or three in one class, extending for two or three minutes, until, as she says, "there is enough silence to go on". She seeks opportunities for her students to share their ways of connecting to the material that she is presenting. As the clock ticks forward, Mary slows down, letting students listen to their own thoughts, reflect, consider carefully what they might share. Allowing, as silence, can be intimate, disconcerting. Bringing silence to a room, as a "committed act of caring" may let "students know that the purpose" of our teaching, helping and leading "is not to dominate" but to "create the conditions of freedom" by "allowing" our students

and colleagues "to embrace a world of knowing that is always subject to change and challenge" (hooks, 2003, p. 92), including our own.

In reflecting on these experiences, we could say that our day-to-day enactments of Indigenization and internationalization do not follow prescription. We cannot predict what each day will bring, how each interaction is going to proceed, the way that our course or a town hall meeting is going to be received. And yet, in allowing things to unfold, we do not stop attending.

> *I am with a leader who is quite new to the role. He's making inappropriate jokes around diversity and women in non-traditional occupations. I think, "he believes this is about not hiring the best person and that it's just trivial". I need to correct that. I start talking a little bit about what it's like for someone who's very isolated, what it's like if you're the only Indigenous faculty member in your area. It takes time. We don't get down to the selection process right away. I leave and think, "I wonder how that went?" The next time we meet I ask a few questions and follow up. I notice a shift during the meeting around the depth and breadth of disclosure. I wonder, "Is he opening about his own worries or thoughts or attitudes? Is he revealing something about his discipline or his faculty?"*

When Daniela's colleague starts making inappropriate jokes, she takes pause and determines that she will need to address something deeper. She does not reprimand or rebuke her colleague, but rather presents ideas that might shift his perspective. She lets go of her initial agenda, thinking over how successful the conversation was, and then, when returning to speak with her colleague, tries to pick up on his possible shift in thinking and attitude. In her reflection, it is as if allowing and attending interweave in ways that require her to let go of her agenda, so to speak, similar to how Dominic spoke of "dropping the presentation" and how Maya determines, upon her sense of her students' state of mind and well-being upon entering her class, to hold a sharing circle instead of immediately proceeding with her previous teaching plan.

To allow, in this sense, can be difficult in relation to the culture of higher education. In overarching expectations to achieve institutional objectives, in the scheduled and marketized demands of teaching, or in the competitive forums of faculty advancement and academic

research, we may always seem to be setting up or being set up against our own and others' agendas. It is not necessarily profitable to hold back. And yet, for all participants, withholding judgement, patient observation and listening are of central importance. Cassandra speaks of listening to someone tell their story for their Human Library © and suspend her analysis, to try to let the person speaking discover for themselves if they are ready to share their life experiences with others in potentially vulnerable contexts. Kendra speaks of helping students step back, release their anxieties in a non-judgemental space, and realize, for example, that "it isn't the end of the world" if they fail a course. And Sarina describes herself as "a navigator, a streetlight, a lighthouse", helping students through how a certain "emotion unfolds", acknowledging that her advising "window tends to be longer than most people", extending an "hour and a half, whereas most people might go 20 minutes."

When we sense vulnerability and imminence and take purposeful action, we share such immanent spaces with whom we teach, assist or lead. In those moments, we are not the only ones experiencing Kairos time. We share those moments, often creating the conditions for them to occur. We may have realized, as many of the participants describe, that the Kairos time of such moments can involve sensing our students', colleagues' and our own changes in emotions and perceptions. It is a time in which we come to see how our knowledges, experiences and our environments interweave in our lives, as a gradual unfolding of understandings and, potential misunderstandings. As Maya reflects, enacting our work in this way can feel like a "warmth" emerges from within us and, conversely, we may sense the "warmth" of students and colleagues returned in kind. If we think of warmth as the feeling experienced through mutual compassion and caring, we might consider how such feelings act upon, and are enacted through us, as a matter of transformative Indigenization and internationalization.

Gathering

In these moments of enacting what we understand to be a transformative approach Indigenization and internationalization policy and strategy related matters, it is as if the participants describe not only what they sense from their experiences, but also touch upon what eludes description. Words such as "warmth" and "unfold", and phrases such as "[t]here is an exact moment when there is enough silence to go on", are not easily translated into specific practices. These moments demand the context in which they are experienced and rely upon "a keen sense of what to do or say in order to maintain good relations with others or avoid offense" (van Manen, 2015, p. 102). In that sense, the participants seem to acknowledge the difficulty, if not the impossibility of "the work" they "would have had to undertake to capture the dimensions, spatial relations, temporal relations, and rhythms of the set of beings gathered together" in their lived experiences related to their transformative intercultural practices (Latour, 2013, p. 120). As the participants reflected upon the impacts of their enactments of Indigenization and internationalization, they seemed to speak to the "multiplicity and complexity of the dimensions that are simultaneously accessible to the most minimal experience of common sense" (Latour, 2013, p. 120). For our work in Indigenization and internationalization, the common sense of our colleagues and students, and of ourselves, is laden with meanings and intentions that may override any theoretical abstractions on diversity, reconciliation or notions of inclusion. Borrowing Latour's (2005) words, it may be that the spaces of the enactments of the work of transformative Indigenization and internationalization, as described by the participants, demands an "unrestricted" perspective wherein we cannot "take it upon [ourselves] to limit the number of possible social aggregates, to limit the number of agencies that make actors do things, to exclude

as many objects as possible" (p. 160). In a different manner of speaking, we cannot blithely

assume success in our work when we might be, as the saying goes, speaking to the choir.

As Latour (2013) writes, while we might sense at any given time that we have

accomplished our goals in internationalization or Indigenization, we may hear ourselves at the

same time saying, "Hold on, we're still not done, for the Circle can *include* more, or *exclude*

more, depending on the number of people it manages to represent faithfully" p. 342). Latour

(2013) goes on to say:

> The same movement of enveloping, encircling, embracing, gathering in can thus serve,
> according to the rapidity with which it turns, either to fabricate inclusion – those who say
> "We" leave outside only a few "They" – or else to fabricate exclusion – those who say
> "We" find themselves surrounded by ever more numerous Barbarians who threaten their
> existence and whom they treat as enemies. And nothing in this movement ensures its
> duration; here is the source of all its hardness, all its terrible exigency, since it can at any
> moment grow larger by multiplying inclusions, or shrink by multiplying exclusions.
> Everything depends on its renewal, on the courage of those who, all along the chain,
> agree to behave in such a way that their behaviour *leads* to the next part on the curve.
> (Latour, 2013, p. 342)

Latour's (2013) depiction of inclusion and exclusion as metamorphosis, a constantly

"enveloping, encircling, embracing, gathering in" reflects well the experiences of the participants

in this study. Theirs is not a world with clear delineation and finality, where all those affected or

implicated have been engaged or where one intervention can be said to be enough. As Mary

states, she has to "press start" with each new class of students, each term, year after year. In our

enactments of Indigenization and internationalization, in our classrooms, advising offices and

meeting spaces, we experience the "heterogeneity of things being assembled" again and again,

with each gathering, whether as a formal class, a planning session or an informal one-on-one call

with a professor (Letour, 2013, p. 296). We might say that when we enact transformative

Indigenization and internationalization, we are "gathering in" (Letour, 2013, p. 296) known,

unknown and hidden entities through refusal, acknowledgement and invitation in spaces of

vulnerability, imminence/immanence and purposefulness that require us to attend to and allow

for our freedom "to choose between different styles" of teaching, helping, advising, researching,

learning and leading together (Sen, 2009, p. 227).

Diane describes such an experience of "gathering in", recollecting in more detail the

sacred ceremony that she brought a senior administrator to be part of, on the invitation of Elders:

> *The Elder offered me a branch of the ceremonial space. He had a helper bring that branch to me. I think it was a Caucasian woman, one of his professor's colleagues. I know what that branch means when I fast. I wasn't sure of it in this ceremony. So, when the Elder and a faculty member came together, I asked. I offered tobacco to the Elder and I said, "This is what I know about this branch when it's in our fast. Tell me about it in this ceremony." The significance of the branch is that there are special leaves that come off, out of that ceremony. You keep the leaves and use them when you need extra help. What he did is he shared the gift of the kindness of that tree – the tree being about teaching us honesty. He gave part of his branches and he shared them with all of us, because he gave it to me. I, in turn, took those branches and equally distributed them amongst the four of us who went. And then we all knew what that teaching was. I said, "When you have times of challenges, remember these leaves. Use them." I shared them with others. I didn't keep them to myself and say, "I'm blessed that I got this". No. I shared it, equally…Gave it to each one of those people.*

For Diane, to make spaces for Indigenous knowledges and practices within her institution, she

feels she must, in extending invitation, also accompany and be present with her university

colleagues in partaking in a traditional ceremony and exploring the lived meaning of Elder

teachings. In that gathering, Diane is reminded of the teachings of kindness, as a relation with

nature, as a relation with one another, a sharing out of blessings. The temptation might be, from

a Western perspective, to perceive such a ceremony peripherally, almost anthropologically

(Simpson, 2014), to approach the gift as an expectation of a specific trade (Bourdieu, 1997), or to

subsume the ceremony into an existing, Western conceptual framework, leaving out its

epistemological foundations, rooted in the land and Indigenous culture from which the ceremony

originated (Kovach, 2009; Kuokkanen, 2007). In this offering of ceremony, what is shared with

her colleagues transcends transactional, commodified understandings of gifting (Sahlins, 1997).

What Diane offers to her non-Aboriginal colleagues is the opportunity to accept a gift that might help them come closer to understanding a different, Indigenous way of knowing and being.

If we think of this offering to participate in an Indigenous ceremony as an enactment of transformative Indigenization policy or strategy, we might come to expand our own understandings of what how enactment is equated with the gatherings we create together with our colleagues and students. These gatherings happen each time we enter into a room together to learn, each time we go for lunch with colleagues, each time we sit around a board room table, or in an open circle, to meet. As expressed by the participants in this chapter, in their lived experiences enacting transformative Indigenization and internationalization, it greatly matters how we approach such gatherings, from beginning to the next beginning. As with an annual welcoming of new students to campus, who and what we decide to include, or exclude, shapes our own, our colleagues and our students' understandings of where and how we undertake our work together. We might stop and reflect and ask ourselves what teachings we impart at such moments, what dominant narratives we might intentionally or unintentionally propagate, whether we have attended to the spaces of vulnerability, immanency and purpose that our students, faculty and staff bring with them as we gather, again, together to start a new term.

In sharing my reflection at the outset of this chapter on an orientation I led for international students, I did not include important details about how the evening ended. When I arrived at the campus pub with the dancers and singers, moments before the start of their performance, I realized that there wasn't any food to offer the troupe after they left the stage. While I knew it was not a requirement to provide food, I knew that it mattered that we do so. I recall this experience vividly, as the performers, their families and my colleague at the Aboriginal Student Centre waited almost an hour for me while I raced around the neighborhood

to gather food and refreshments for them.   When I finally arrived at the Aboriginal Student Centre, the families were sitting together at different tables, the troupe leader and one of the singers at another. As soon as the food was laid out, there was relief, a sense of completion, festiveness.   The dinner only lasted about twenty minutes and, as one family rose to leave, I looked at the food remaining on the table. I realized it was meant to be shared out. One by one, each of the dancers and singers and their families took home something from the table and we exchanged parting words. Nothing was remaining when I was standing with the leader of the group, who stood before me and thanked me for inviting them to be part of the event and hosting them for dinner. We shook hands and as he departed, my colleague asked me if there is anything more that she could do. I sensed she was tired, having stayed much longer than expected.

What I realized then and continue to reflect upon now is that, through myself being hosted in that same Aboriginal Student Centre space so many times by Aboriginal Knowledge Keepers and Elders, with food and gifts shared out to everyone in attendance, I had come to understand what it can mean, in the traditions of the Aboriginal people of the land upon which I live and work, to gather together in welcome and hospitality. In the gathering of a new international student welcome event, what mattered most was that I, my colleague from the Aboriginal Student Centre and the dancers and singers with Eagle Sky Productions spent time together through food and refreshment and acknowledged the gift of reciprocity and mutuality. What mattered most was that, even if the idea of the performance did not exactly unfold as we had intended, it had been conceived, enacted, reflected upon together, and as a commitment to Indigenization and transformative intercultural practice, might be improved upon over time.

Such a commitment is not, as expressed by the participants in this study, an act, in word or deed, that is done independently from others. Our deliberations and enactments of

197

transformative Indigenization and internationalization are the co-creations of our shared work and intentions. In engaging with one another in the co-creation of transformative Indigenization and internationalization we may experience bringing into presence the conditions of what we hope our institutions to be, and to become: places of meaningful inclusion, equity, reconciliation and social justice on our campuses and beyond. What can we learn from further exploring the lived meanings of our experiences in the co-creation of such spaces of transformative Indigenization and internationalization policy and strategy deliberations and enactments?

Chapter 7: Co-creating

When we create beloved community, environments that are anti-racist and inclusive, it need not matter whether those spaces are diverse. What matters is that, should difference enter the world of beloved community, it can find a place of welcome, a place to belong.
- *bell hooks, 2009, Belonging: A culture of place, p. 183*

Public personhoods

I am with one of my friends at a restaurant downtown. Two guys walk by and one calls me the "N-word". They walk away, then loop back. We're standing in a circle talking. There is tension, as if they are thinking, "What are you going to do?" I am thinking, "It's one in the morning. I'm tired. Some guy just called me the 'N-word'. I might try to fight him, but that's not something that will reflect good on anything I'm doing." So instead, I decide, "If they have a conversation with me, I'll try to speak to them like a person."

In the past two chapters, we have explored faculty, staff and student experiences in *teaching, helping or leading individuals or groups of students, staff or faculty in a manner that assumes shared responsibility for creating the conditions for meaningful inclusion, equity, reconciliation and social justice on campus and beyond*. Analysis has led to a discussion on what it can be like to experience *refusing, acknowledging and inviting what and who is (being) spoken of* in relation to *(un)speak-able known, unknown and hidden entities* in spaces of deliberation on Indigenization and internationalization. From this perspective, enactments of Indigenization and internationalization have been shown to involve *(at)tending to* and *allowing for* the experiences of one's own and others' sense of *vulnerability, imminence/immanence* and *purposefulness* in *spaces* of *(up)rooting* that come with *initiating* and *cultivating* transformative intercultural practices. At the foundation of these explorations are the experiences of faculty, advisors, lecturers, administrators, student leaders, and consultants. In this sense, the research has focused on the *persons* involved in Indigenization and internationalization, or, as interpretive policy analysis, the *personification* of policy and strategy.

Terrence's recollection speaks to this personification. He recalls an encounter with two strangers who seek to rattle him by issuing a racial slur and then provocatively joining him in a circle of friends. Terrence feels aggressed, taunted. Yet, this wasn't the first time Terrence experienced racism in this manner. The difference for him was at that moment in which he faced this act of aggression, Terrence was a student leader. He sensed his responsibility to his role and peers. He considers context, his state of mind and restrains himself. He redirects his thoughts, seeking to avoid a potentially violent situation, drawing upon what he describes, in other recollections, as his sense of "humanity". He determines to face the strangers "like a person". In sharing this story, Terrence offers a depiction of the embodiment of racism.

We may hear stories, such as Terrence's, and compartmentalize them as happening off-campus, as if such a distinction denoted a firm boundary of what can be let in and kept out. However, we could say that Terrence brings racism into the institutional spaces he inhabits, not from a "private understanding of personhood" but from the perspective of a "human personhood that also begins as a public" (Rocha, 2015, p. 100). Terrence experiences the racism of the society in which he, and we, live together. He can resist being reactive in the face of, or choose to counteract, racism, and yet he cannot extricate himself from the public in which he lives and which includes racism.

In this sense, Terrence's encounter is not only his own, but is also each of ours, within each of our public personhoods. We may not be able to fully comprehend Terrence's experiences with racism, yet we can comprehend, as human persons, what defines this particular act as racist. We may also recall or imagine how we have responded, or would respond, in words and/or actions, to such an act of bigotry. To ask ourselves what we would do or say if we were the

object of such racism or were to witness such racism on our campus opens to ethical spaces that are not interchangeable, nor individualistic. Kendra speaks to this plurality:

> *I want to serve my people. That's why I took my degree. That's why I'm here. I want to serve my people the best way I can. Because, maybe somewhere else on campus, the students might not get that kind of service. Maybe they will. I'm hoping they would. The only thing that keeps me going is that I want my people to succeed.*

In our work on our campuses, we might find that we are encouraged to think of ourselves in individualistic terms, with success equating to grades, salary, titles, or awards. However, as Kendra reminds us, such individualistic attributions can severely miss the mark. Our sense of personhood is entwined with our interactions with, and understandings of and between, the people on our campuses with whom we identify and work and for whom we serve. In the words of Hannah Arendt (1958), our uniqueness cannot be minimized to our "physical identities" which "appear without any activity in of their own" (Arendt, 1958, p. 179). Rather, as Terrence and Kendra describe, we reveal who we are through the actions we take "in the unique shape of [our] body" and through the words we speak in the "[unique] sound of [our] voice" that "make their appearance in the human world" (p. 179). As Arendt asserts, it is the revealing or concealing of our "qualities, gifts, talents and short-comings", including our levels of education and positions in our institutional hierarchies, "implicit in everything" we say and do, that we experience, publicly, the "disclosure of 'who' in contradistinction to 'what'" we are (1958, p. 179).

In this manner, we can also say that in the co-creation of ethical spaces of deliberating and enacting Indigenization and internationalization, our personhoods as they are revealed publicly may also become how we see ourselves, in our institutions, as a people, or as peoples. In deliberating and enacting Indigenization and internationalization in our roles, on and off our campuses, we may sense this public nature of our personhoods far more than we might anticipate or intend, extending into evenings with friends at a restaurant. This leads to a critical question

201

that has emerged from analyzing and writing about my participants' reflections on deliberating and enacting Indigenization and internationalization in their day-to-day lives: *What is it like to experience the co-creation of spaces of transformative intercultural practice in our day-to-day work and life?* Exploring this public, inter-subjective aspect of transformative intercultural practice requires weaving reflections with previous chapters in order to seek "noticings" through "lines of flight" that may bring further perspective to our work in Indigenization and internationalization in post-secondary education (Vagle, 2014, p. 118).

Evolving certainty

> *When an adversary is belligerent in order to have the outcome they want, I'm not good at staying in the conversation. I get angry and shut down. I go red, my headache starts to throb and I stew on it. I think, "This is this individual's interpretation because of where they interact in the institution. They may or may not have got that right". It's my struggle to find spaces of interaction that counter that perspective, that allow me to develop my own understanding of, "Is that threat based on just a pattern of how you get things done? Is that a true reading of the politic and the environment at the level you operate in?"*

One thing of which we can be certain in our work is that we will, at times, experience tension with our colleagues in deliberating and enacting policy- and strategy-related issues. In my interviews, participants describe such tensions, often rooted in (un)certainty as to whether or not what they are speaking of with their colleagues is representative of institutional policies and strategies. In the anecdote above, Chris describes a situation where he grapples with his colleague's interpretation of the politics of his institution. In our own worst-case encounters, we may relate to Chris' feelings of anger, uncertainty and/or withdrawal in the "throbbing headache" of adversarial spaces where his colleague's assumed certainties are expressed through perceived manipulation or intimidation. We may also relate to Chris' "struggle" to seek out spaces that enable him to challenge his colleague's perspectives and broaden his own. Like Cassandra, at such moments, we may even question how we determine our priorities in the first place.

If we think this is what justice should look like or what inclusion should look like or what respect should be about – We're reaching to pull it out. You have to be aware of your power, because we have power to create that shared space for students. To some extent it's our own agendas, the things that are important to us, that lead us into prioritizing.

As Cassandra reflects, and as was explored in Chapter 5, our agendas can be driven as much by what we know as by what we don't know and may be further clouded by what is hidden, explicitly or implicitly. In her reflection, Cassandra reminds herself of the inherent power that shapes the agenda of what she seeks to be spoken of and enacted upon. She finds herself checking her influence, concerned that if she is not critically reflecting upon how she plans her workshops, her approach might be "no different from settler practices of the past – a new colonial tool of oppression" (Regan, 2010, 0. 66). In co-creating spaces where we are attempting, like Cassandra, to "[peel] back" the "layers of myth" (Regan, 2010, p. 66) associated with issues such as equity, reconciliation, inclusion and social justice, we are often, as was explored in Chapter 6, creating spaces of purposefulness, immanence/imminence and vulnerability. We may recognize that, as a matter of policy analysis and implementation, there are limits to the effectiveness of such spaces, a point at which the unravelling of (un)truths can leave us further apart than when we had started. Arendt (1958) describes this predicament as an aspect of the modern, mass societal context in which our institutions are embedded.

> The public realm as a common world, gathers us together and yet prevents our falling over each other, so to speak. What makes mass society so difficult to bear is not the number of people involved, or at least not primarily, but the fact that the world has lost its powers to gather them together, to relate and to separate them. The weirdness of this situation resembles a spiritualistic séance where a number of people gathered around a table might suddenly, through some magic trick, see the table vanish from their midst, so that two persons sitting opposite each other were no longer separated but also would be entirely unrelated to each other by anything tangible. (Arendt, 1958, pp. 52-53).

Fiddling with hard drives

As transformative intercultural practitioners, Arendt's (1958) metaphorical depiction of

the "common as a table" is a cautionary reminder of the relational fragility of the public nature of

our work. It is as if we must act to redirect the impetus of mass society to reduce commonality

and difference to triviality or irrelevance. At the same time, through questioning what we may

take for granted as the "common world", we can risk enacting a "disappearing" of the "common

table" around which we gather. Elsie describes this risk of unhinging relations through

questioning the certainties of assumed common knowledge in similarly rich metaphorical terms:

> *We're fiddling with their hard drives. Attitudinal shifts are the most difficult. You have values and behaviour and it's digging deep to the core. Facilitating accelerated growth in a short period of time. We all go to a dark space. There are times every term when that space is so dense. It's like a ribbon. You anticipate it. I tell the students, "We're going to go to a very dark space but don't worry, we're going to be back in the light in the end."*

In this recollection, Elsie describes how she attends to her seminar's intended course goal

of shifting student attitudes towards greater understanding, appreciation and acknowledgement

of Treaty responsibilities, legacies of colonization and Indigenous rights. Echoing the analogy of

the labyrinth, as explored in Chapter 1, Elsie's depiction of the "ribbon" in her course is like her

'Ariadne's thread' that she offers to each of her students as they enter into "a very dark space" of

the transformative learning that is the basis of the course. She senses that this dark space will dig

"deep to the core" of her students' beliefs and worldviews they may have held since childhood,

passed down through generations, permeating their public personhoods, saturated in legacies of

colonization. She understands that "on the path of development" her students take in their

"knowing and meaning-making", "there seems to exist a point" that her students may "cross a

threshold" in which their "old way of knowing is no longer 'tenable'" (Timmermans, 2010, p.

13). Elsie is aware that there is a "threat of *dis-integration*" her students face in questioning such

certainties and "disentangling" themselves from the ways of knowing that they are "embedded" (Timmermans, 2010, p. 8).

In her approach to her course, it is as if "in foregrounding one end of the position (e.g., uncertainty)" Elsie "allows for the backgrounding of the other (e.g., certainty) to be drawn into attention" (Pillay, 2016, p. 96). For herself and her students, her "mediation may be seen as a centering process, the thread that runs between" certainty and uncertainty (Pillay, 2016, p. 96), or in Elsie's words, through the "dark space" and back into the "light". In this manner, Elsie seeks to help her students "negotiate transformation" by opening them to "alternative ideologies" other than those "ideological positions that have historically dominated higher education" in relation to Aboriginal cultures, histories and contemporary issues (Pillay, 2016, p. 96). For Pillay (2016), this "student-academic relationship (like any other) engages a form of communication" based upon "*critical conversations*" that "overtly challenge the social, political and cultural nature of knowledge/practice" (pp. 97-99). It may be our "joint, collective behaviour" of our "labour" in pursuing this challenge that we are able to co-create "both conceptual and practical/material tools for transformation" (pp. 103-104).

Going beyond the facts

In undertaking such *critical conversations*, our "conceptual tools" may be more related to process than content. Terrence's recalls an interaction he has as a student leader with a fellow student regarding Aboriginal student financial aid.

> *This student says, "Aboriginal students are a drain on society. They are given things with Treaties that have passed. Why should we be paying for them to go to post-secondary?" I ask, "Have you taken into account the cost of living? What if the family doesn't have enough money to send their child to school? A scholarship and bursary can only go so far." Then he says something racist. I feel my heart beating faster. I get to the point where this is really pissing me off. I don't want to raise my voice. But the other person starts yelling. So, I speak a little bit slower. I listen to his points until his temper*

flares down. He has strong point of view. I'm not going to change it. But I might find out
a bit more about why he thinks the way he does.

In this recollection, Terrence describes speaking with a student who opposes what could be

described as the "*communicative* collaboration" of Terrence's Student Union Executive's

"advocacy" of Indigenous "students' rights in various social institutions", including his own

(Pillay, 104-105). In engaging with his peer, Terrence tries to negotiate a semblance of a

"common world" (Arendt, 1958, pp. 52), even though he recognizes the gap between positions

that he and his peer hold. As the situation morphs into potential outright conflict, Terrence shifts

his demeanor, seeking to deepen his own understanding of the ideological position of his peer.

He realizes when the conversation "becomes heated", that his aim cannot be to simply to

"counter" his own "facts" with the "facts" of his peer. He must, in this sense, "(iteratively) work

through" the 'affinity' of certainties", of avoiding what might be considered acquiescence or,

alternatively, aggressiveness, in favour of moving "toward the usefulness of uncertainties" (p.

100). Terrence appears to do this through questioning the "stability" of his and his peer's

understandings of Aboriginal issues (Pillay, 2016), while "being conscientized to the moral

nature" of their "relationship" (p. 95).

This conscientization of the morality, or ethics, of our work is, arguably, at the heart of its

co-creation. Melinda also describes an experience of such conscientization, as she hears what

she considers to be a re-enforcing what Pillay (2016) might describe as the *stability* of

underlying *certainties* about international students, lacking *critical conversation* that might

conflict with the dominant institutional narrative.

> *This woman, sitting in front me, says her class is made up of all Chinese students and*
> *then people in the room get going on how international students can't speak English. I*
> *look to see if someone else is going to take this on. I'm not letting it go unchallenged.*
> *Honour has been disparaged. It annoys me that I am in a meeting with academics who*
> *would never let their students get away with an assertion without evidence. That pisses*

me off. [...] My heart starts to pound. I start speaking and then I'm mad at myself because I'm not putting it in an eloquent way. I'm just sounding mad and adversarial. I don't want to feel adversarial, but it feels adversarial.

In raising her voice to speak in defense of international students, Melinda describes overcoming her sense of "indignance". Indignation, or the "anger" we might feel from experiencing what we perceived to be actions or words that are "unjust, unworthy or mean" (Indignation, 2018) can indicate to us that we must, in some manner, as Terrence describes, "counter" such words and actions. In taking such counter measures, as Melinda describes, we might feel the anger and physical sensations of indignation, yet also ensure that we remain focused on the "evidence" in manner that is non-adversarial. We may find ourselves in situations where we question the certainties of those we teach, help or lead, and yet we know that by simply asserting a different certainty we do not advance the moral or ethical nature of transformative Indigenization and internationalization. In this sense, transformative intercultural practice is not so much about challenging or refuting certainties, but about evolving them, through grounding ourselves and our "labour" in our "affinities" to and for one another in our pursuit of socially just, inclusive and de-colonized knowledges and practices (Pillay, 2016).

Dominic speaks to such an affinity, in a term that is used often in our work and repeated by many of the participants in this study. It is a term that comes with its own detractors and challenges in its lived practice, a term that speaks to the risk of evolving certainties: safe space.

> *When I bring a safe space, I see that as setting an example, as taking the words and the policies, taking the concepts that we're stewarding and implementing them in practice. It would be one thing for me to say, "Here's the expectations." It's another thing for me to demonstrate the expectations. I see moments like that as lived leadership, as actualizing policy. I'm hopefully creating space where allies in the room can come forward. And, yes it doesn't always go well.*

Enduring liminality

We often hear the words, "safe space" used in relation to protection from external threats. As transformative intercultural practitioners, the challenge we may confront with this notion is that, as Dominic explains in relation to his use of this phrase, "safe space" can become a code word for meaning that faculty, staff and students "can never disagree on a topic" or "be in conflict" in case anyone should "feel attacked" or have their "feelings hurt". For Dominic, as with all of the participants in this study, when the term "safe space" is used it not meant in this sense of avoidance of conflict or deflection from difficult emotions or contentious issues. Rather, the term is used in relation to the provision of places where faculty, staff and students, who are in real or potentially unsafe situations, or who have been hurt, emotionally, psychologically, sexually or physically, can express themselves with safe disclosure and be provided appropriate, necessary supports. The term "safe space" is also often used in context to the creation of transformative learning experiences, grounded in respectful relations. As Dominic describes, such respectful relations require of him to be a role model, to project a demeanor that promotes open, "critical conversations" Pillay (2016). Dominic recollects a particular training session where he enacts what he describes, similarly, as "positive space".

> *I go into the training and say, "In a perfect world, I will change your heart and your worldview. In a realistic world, I can't expect to influence you beyond what you do after 4:30. As a human being, I'm here to talk to you about the principles we adhere to, the values we have and how you can actualize them." Someone responds, "My core values are my core values. You're not going to tell me that First Nations people have been systemically disadvantaged because I fundamentally don't believe it." There is an economics professor in that group. I say to him, "Let's talk about the economic model then, even if you don't believe there is systemic racism." I am aware of who that individual is and where I might need to meet him, so I tailor my message.*

Dominic's approach to "tailor" his "message" by being "aware" of who he is working with so that he can better understand where to "meet him" is a strong depiction of what it can

mean to evolve the certainties of those he works with. Dominic provides parameters to the scope

of his intervention: He is asking his colleagues to learn and adhere to the principles, in their day-

to-day work, of the organization within which they work together. This approach that Dominic

takes is quite practical, recalling Daniela's comment, shared in Chapter 5, that she has

determined to focus her attention away from the abstractions of policy so that she can put

emphasis on how faculty and staff can "show up at work [and] engage in a respectful manner".

All participants in this study shared in some manner this kind of sensible, sensitive and reasoned

approach to their work. It seems that, in our work, "[d]espite the stabilizing effect of existing

meaning structures" at our institutions, in the day-to-day, our colleagues and students are always

having to "modify and adjust" their projected "assumptions onto" their institution "in order to

make sense of" their experiences in what are increasingly internationalized and Indigenized

contexts and situations, even if only experienced vicariously (Hoggan, Mälkki & Finnegan,

2017, p. 51). For Elsie, in the classroom, this kind of attention to lived experience of her

students attunes her to "the complexity of the bigger picture" and demands a cautionary approach

to what she describes as the "red herring" of "racism and antiracism theory". She muses:

> When you focus on racism and antiracism then the students are walking away thinking,
> "We have to teach everybody about antiracism and the way that you do that is to tell
> white people that they're racist." And you just how far you going to go with that, I
> wonder? I don't think you're going to go very far at all. When you're young and you're
> coming up, you get angry and you want to fight. You want to resist, right? Some of us
> have already been through all of these things.

What I have found most striking in this reflection from Elsie are her sense of the

lifeworld of the students with whom she works and her recognition that the transformative nature

of her course could, if not undertaken appropriately, result in a potentially problematic outcome.

As has been explored in previous chapters, Elsie acknowledges that in challenging her students'

"meaning perspectives" they will likely feel "hurt, shame, frustration, depression, anger, or fear"

in a manner that, if not approached effectively, might threaten their sense of comfort and security to the point of resistance (Hoggan, Mälkki & Finnegan, 2017, p. 55). What Elsie and Dominic, and many of the participants, share from these experiences is that, in "taking the risk to challenge the status quo" they also accept "the responsibility for the consequences", which include "discomfort, tension, and conflict" (Ford, 1999, 208).   Elsie, and all the participants in this study, acknowledge this risk of their work, not as an abstraction, but as being lived, embodied and endured, together. As Dominic reflects, "as an ally, it doesn't matter what" we "understand or know", but rather that we are "hearing" each other and are willing to act as a "bridge" to co-creating spaces of equity, reconciliation, and social justice.

Our bodies as pedagogy

> *I begin a conversation about Islamophobia and introduce a critique around discourse, its presence and what it looks like. I offer my own body as a site of study. I can do that with my students because that's what I'm there for. I'm not there to be in battle.*

Sophie speaks of the "offering of her body" to engage her students in exploring their prejudices, ignorance, concerns and questions in a manner that is not combative. She makes a decision to bring the abstract into presence through her 'embodied self'. In so doing, she enacts what it means to be "spoken of", demanding her students to try to see her more clearly in their (mis)understandings of Islam and what it means to be Muslim. Sophie takes up with her students how it is that, in the context of post-secondary education and the broader society in which they live, "bodies that signify religiosity" can often be "suspected of being biased" (Douglass, 2016, p. 111). In recounting the racism that she experiences, it is as if Sophie becomes a "liminal pathway" for her students' evolving certainties about Muslim women (Sehdev, 2010, p. 117). Sehdev (2010) poetically and forcefully depicts such embodied liminality, using an analogy of "bridging" for the difficult work of intercultural learning (p. 117):

210

The bridge is liminal because the crosser is surrounded with its absence, and with the knowledge of that liminality is necessary for any sort of political or cultural connection. The subjectivities of women of colour comprise the anchoring posts of the bridge, and their stretching bodies, the planks. This is not an apparently warm embrace or a chokehold, though it is bodily, dangerous and often painful. The bridge is a gruesome structure dependent on the labour of those stretching to create the passageway *upon the backs* of those who are liminal and so implicates the crosses in the threat of the pain of those who are crossed upon. (Sehdev, 2010, pp. 117)

When a colleague offers herself, like Sophie, to bridge differences, increase understanding or address inequity and prejudice, there is a risk taken that not all of us might be able to comprehend. Sehdev's (2010) analogy evokes the physical, emotional and inter-subjective, lived meaning of critical thinking (Ahmed, 2012; hooks, 2010). For hooks (2010), critical thinking is a relational, public offering of our personhood in spaces that, in the act of offering, help our students and colleagues, as fellow and sister persons, to develop "empathy for others, an understanding of the circumstances that influence and inform their thoughts and behaviours" (hooks, 2010, p. 186). As Sophie demonstrates, this offering, or "labour", of "bridging" (Sehdev, 2010, p.117) as a teacher and trainer requires her to "anchor her subjectivity" such that her students and colleagues can "cross" her own "body" as a site of resilience, wisdom, courage and compassion (Sehdev, 2010, p. 117).

Many participants in this study express in their own ways how they experience the liminality of this "bodily, dangerous and often painful" aspect of their "labour" as women of colour engaged in transformative intercultural practice (Sehdev, 2010, p. 117). At the same time, participants also expressed their awareness of the liminality experienced by their students and colleagues who "cross" the bridges and travel the "liminal pathways" of understanding that they, as transformative intercultural practitioners, lead them to (Sehdev, 2010, p. 117). Cassandra reflects on an experience of entering such a "liminal pathway" (Sehdev, 2010, p. 117) through

her work in organizing a "HumanLibrary[TM]"[2], "anchored" (Sehdev, 2010, p. 117) in her own subjectivity as a "middleclass white, educated woman".

> *We have one "Book" who is speaking about his experience as a child soldier. As the person who's vetting the books, it's just, "Oh, my gosh. I'm going to lose it right here in front of this person." I am a middleclass white, educated woman. I have no idea what that experience is like for this person. I probably will never be able to empathize appropriately. I try to show I recognize the enormity of his experience and at the same time, I acknowledge that "I'll never be able to fully understand what you're saying".*

In this recollection, Cassandra expresses her awareness that, from her own subjectivity, she could never fully understand the experience of someone forced into being a child soldier. At the same time, she knows this young man's story must be shared in a space of transformative intercultural learning that might enable students, staff and faculty, including herself, to press against their "comfort zones" through embracing "unpleasant edge emotions" that can lead to transformative learning (Hoggan, Mälkki & Finnegan, 2017, p. 55). The story her student shares with her stretches to the point that she struggles to not be become so overwhelmed that she herself requires consoling. There is, for Cassandra, an important line that could be crossed. She could be disrespectful of the dignity of this person, who, like Sophie, offers himself "as a site of pedagogy". Cassandra's self-respect as a person is intertwined with the self-respect of other persons, a notion of self-esteem that opens to relations that transcend the self and enter into the realm of solidarity (Honneth, 1995). As Sehdev (2010) wrote, such embodied relations "make it impossible to speak casually about solidarity politics as natural or spontaneously self-generative" (p. 118). Such solidarity, as a matter of policy enactment is, in this sense, a liminal state that not only endures in the embodied present, but endures into every future present, experienced by both "crossers and bridgers" (Sehdev, 2010, p. 118). We must with each crossing and bridging face

---

[2] The Human Library[TM] is the name of a methodology for creating "a positive framework for conversations that can challenge stereotypes and prejudices through dialogue" whereby "real people are on loan to readers" (Human Library, 2018). The method was developed in Denmark in 2000 and has become a worldwide movement.

the "facts and fears" of the "ongoing work involved in the constancy of stretching and grasping, the threat of slipping or crossing" (Sehdev, 2010, p. 118).

Seeing over the fence

Understanding our work as involving an enduring liminality of evolving certainties may help us better understand such experiences as Chris' "struggle" in seeking clarity in the deliberative inter-personal spaces of engagement with his colleagues. We might also understand Dominic's efforts to protect such spaces of deliberation into the future through the very policies that may make such spaces possible. What is certain for Dominic in that his policy work will always be under scrutiny and potentially "clawed back" by a regressive politics within and connected with his institution. He is not certain what might be attacked, so he, like Kamal also describes in his policy writing, takes as an almost "defensive" strategy, seeking longevity in language and principles. For Kamal, in "developing an educational framework and policy" he thinks "about how this could contribute to good for future generations" and, at the same time, "about how it's going to be used, if it is something that people are going to abuse". Our work, as policy actors, seems to requires us to look into the horizon of the policies and strategies that we are deliberating or enacting. Melinda describes getting on her "tiptoes" to "get enough over the fence to see a little bit further than everyone else". In trying to see beyond the present context of her Faculty, Melinda reads about future trends and studies demographics of her students and the communities her Faculty serves. She studies provincial, national and international policy directions and, with her colleagues, develops a "story" to share with others in the positioning and framing of strategy.

> It is important to choose allies and say, "You are the leaders – I've got a few years left. This is your vision. You lead this." And I say to everybody, "Here's my role – I will find the resources you need. I will say we are doing this. I will shut down dangerous

obstruction. I will incent cooperation. I will get barriers out of the way." I will keep sending them things I come across and ask "Could this fit?" I'm stewarding it.

Pushing into the visible and invisible milestones and landmarks of the policy and strategy horizons that we identify from each our own positionalities lead us, as explored in Chapter 5, to the co-creation of spaces that require imagination, creativity, and collaboration. As Melinda describes, she finds that she must think beyond her own direct impact as a person. In aligning the vision of her team and her faculty, she must ensure that there is sufficient engagement of allies, whose vision is also set on a similar point in the horizon. She must ensure there are adequate resources to "steward" the journey. She must be prepared to help her team overcome impediments along the way. She must keep her team open to adjusting the plan as they approach their destination and new information is learned, and new horizons made visible. Such a journey past the thresholds of our long-established policy and strategy horizons demands trust, a reliance on emergent knowing and the strengths of our relations with others. For Terrence, this type of leadership responsibility in his work requires him to seek feedback in order to be sure that he doesn't "go too far" and develop something that isn't "feasible".   In our work, we may share this sense of the boundedness of the temporal and embodied, liminal endurance of those we work with. Our good ideas, can, as Chris recounts at one point, become stalled through a kind of stable, comfortable uncertainty that our colleagues cling to.

Such studied skepticism, adapting Kuokkanen's (2007) words, or relational indifference and/or analytic tentativeness (Tannis, 2012), can require our resilience to deliberate and create change proposals that can endure past the tenure of studied skeptics who hold decision-making power, past even our own involvement in the enactment of the very proposals we create. As Stein (2017) wrote, these "liminal critiques" that we experience in our field often require us to "recognize the contradictions and even impossibilities of dismantling existing systems,

214

institutions, and conceptual frames" as "we are ultimately "embedded and complicit in these same architectures" (p. 18). It may be difficult to endure this temporal liminality, and yet we also may recognize that while it might be "easier to talk about perspective transformation as if there are finite beginnings and endings of the learning, from a temporal perspective it is more accurate to talk about overlapping trajectories of transformation" (Hoggan, Mälkki & Finnegan, 2017, pp. 51).   We may have to accept, in our day-to-day co-creation of transformative Indigenization and internationalization, that it is in the "small instances of disorientation" whereby we "may begin a slow, cumulative yet strong process of change" at our institutions (Hoggan, Mälkki & Finnegan, 2017, pp. 52). As Shaap (2005) wrote,

> The promise of action is the possibility of a new beginning, the generation of relationships and the disclosure of a world in common. Yet, this promise entails a risk because action also initiates boundless, unpredictable and irreversible processes that threaten to overwhelm the fragile web of human relationships. (Schaap, 2005, p. 63)

Following Schaap (2005), when we engage in the political, public aspects of our work in transformative Indigenization and internationalization, we must recognize that our deliberations and enactments in their evolving certainty and enduring liminality can "overwhelm" our institution's "web of human relationships" (p. 63). Our acknowledgement of this potential threat posed through endeavors we believe to be positive in their transformative intent, "imposes a responsibility of care that is, to some extent, at odds with the agonism of action" that we may tend towards (Schaap, 2005, pp. 68). In this sense, in our "willingness to politicise" we may also find ourselves sensing our responsibility to "reconcile (care-for-the-world)" so that we can make "space for politics" and co-create "an ethical context that mitigates against the risk of politics" (Schaap, 2005, p. 74). In this context, we cannot force "closure", for the "agonistic striving" of the political spaces of transformative Indigenization and internationalization is always created a-new, with each person or group of people on and off our campuses, with each interaction. We

must, as transformative intercultural practitioners, endure the liminality of our work together. As Daniela reflected:

> *Is it Indigenization or is it decolonization? And can the institution really decolonize? How can we start disrupting spaces that are rigid and longstanding and not hospitable? Are there other ways to approach our educational system that's not Western-based? And then, you're no longer in power. That brings me back to my belief in courage and bravery. Maybe it's self-confidence or just blind trust, I don't know. When you shift everything and maybe the ground is uneven or maybe there's some holes in it, trusting that, "I have to take this leap and if I fall through it, I'll manage. But I probably won't."*

Revealing kindness

 In the hopeful pursuit of a transformative approach to Indigenization and internationalization, we may find ourselves, like Daniela expresses, facing our own fears of instability, uncertainty, of "leaping" into liminality. The more we work in our field, the more we may come to realize that we cannot expect to arrive at a final destination, that there may always some "holes" and "uneven" ground. As we reach milestones in our policy and strategy horizons, we may realize that we can, and must, travel further. As Sophie describes in a reflection on being challenged by a younger academic at a conference on decolonization, we can find ourselves facing our own limits of stability and certainty:

> *These two amazing young scholars are giving a panel and I have a question about the appropriation by white middle-class Americans of hip hop. I am emotional because I am thinking of Palestinian hip hop and how important it is to them. This young scholar gives me a respectful but fierce little lecture. She says, "I hope that wasn't too harsh." I say, "No, it is very clear and I appreciate it." That young woman feels the urgency. "I'm going to say this, and you need to listen, and you need to respect this, if we're going to fix this problem." I feel thrilled, but not comfortable. I am decentered by this knowledge and I have never been so excited.*

This de-centering of knowledge that Daniela and Sophie speak of, and the thrill, fear, self-doubt, excitement and bouts of courage that ensue, offer them openings to new possibilities and insights. There is a sense of urgency and potency, in the "much harsher light of the public realm" (Arendt, 1958, p. 51). The potential to resist or retreat is possible. In such moments of

216

de-centering liminality in our work, we may realize how much is left unknown and hidden from us. We may question again whether to acknowledge or refuse what we hear and see. We can, as Melinda describes in bringing on board a new, well respected Indigenous faculty member, find ourselves at once lost for words and unclear about what to do next.

> *It's thrilling. And scary. I don't know what to say. I'm always worried that I'm going to say the wrong thing. I'm going to be too effusive. I'm not going to hit the right note. I only have one chance to make an impression and then she's going to write me off as a stupid white woman. All of these fears and guilt and everything else.*

It may seem odd for Melinda to be so uncertain of what to say and do in relation to such a normal part of her work. And yet, it seems that, in our deliberations and enactments of Indigenization and internationalization, we often "find ourselves *being* things that we do not *know*" for "to be a human person is, in a very real sense, to not know what or who one is" (Rocha, 2015, p. 4, *emphasis* in original). In recognizing the tension of their own positionalities, Melinda, Daniela and Sophie describe how it is that they can be things to others around them in ways that they don't fully understand. At the same time, they recognize that they must embrace this underlying sense of 'self as stranger'. For, to be "things that we do now know" (Rocha, 2015, p. 4) may be a fundamental aspect of the enduring liminality of our work. As we find ourselves pushing against the limits of the certainties we hold in the "bright light of the public realm" of our institutions in what we do and say, we cannot escape the judgement of others (Arendt, 1958, p. 51). In the words of Ahmed (2012):

> The body who is "going the wrong way" is the one experienced as "in the way" of a will that is acquired as momentum. For some, mere persistence, "to continue steadfastly," requires great effort, an effort that might appear to others as stubbornness, willfulness, or obstinacy. […] Diversity work thus requires insistence. You have to become insistent to go against the flow, and you are judged to be going against the flow because you are insistent. A life paradox: you have to become what you are judged as being. (Ahmed, 2012, p. 186)

217

Saying

Drawing upon Ahmed's (2012) quote, we could say that, in our established, functional roles in relation to the deliberation and enactment of Indigenization and internationalization, we sometimes "have to become" a person who must endure a great deal of conflict, confusion, and emotionally and psychologically draining situations (Ahmed, 2012, p. 186). We can find ourselves in such situations where, because of our roles in our institutions, we sense that we are automatically "judged as being" a threat or troublemaker, as having an (in)significant voice on Indigenization and internationalization policy and strategy related matters, or as being the token (or key) representative in all matters related to diversity (Ahmed, 2012, p. 186). To acknowledge, in such situations, that as "public personhoods" we are "things we do not know" (Rocha, 2015, p. 4) is to recognize that what we say and do as transformative intercultural practitioners cannot be separable from the public contexts in which we speak and act.

The final scene of *Oleanna*, Mamet (1992, pp. 77-80) depicts, in a powerful way, how this "life paradox" (Ahmed, 2012, p. 186) of our public personhoods can place us in potentially dangerous situations that reflect the microcosm of the racism, sexism, and injustices of our "common world" (Arendt, 1958, p. 52). In the final scene, Carol comes to her professor's office on his request. Up to that point, her professor, John, had not taken Carol's questions and accusations seriously, even as his interactions with Carol pressed against boundaries of appropriate conduct. Carol took her complaints to the university, and John's tenure had been denied. Carol is thus emboldened by her success and John is in disbelief. She dismisses his request to rescind her accusations and brandishes a new charge of attempted rape. In their increasingly tense exchange, John and Carol are interrupted by a call from John's wife. As he hangs up, John calls his wife "Baby." Carol protests, saying "Don't call your wife baby", at

218

which point, John assaults her, issuing vulgar insults and saying "You think you can come in here with your political correctness and destroy my life?" He "knocks her to the floor", "picks up a chair, raises it above his head, and advances on her", and says, mockingly, "I wouldn't touch you with a ten-foot pole" (Mamet, 1992, pp. 79). The play ends with Carol cowering on the floor, while John returns to his desk and arranges papers on it. Carol says to herself, head lowered, "Yes. That's right." (Mamet, 1992, pp. 80). The intrinsic power that John wielded to this point was subtle: a dismissive tone, a paternalistic demeanor, an escalation of demands. Realizing he has lost this tacit power, he resorts to violence. In his rejection of "political correctness", he hurts Carol. She embodies his resentment, his rejection of policies that infringe upon his sense of entitlement. Carol, for her part, wields her own burgeoning power, through defiance and retaliation. A violence erupts, where it had been bubbling beneath the surface: Repression, rage and contempt that now, in hindsight, evident from their first meeting.

While we likely do not experience this level of violence in our day-to-day work, there are times, as expressed in many of the participants' reflections in this and the previous two chapters, wherein we might experience its latency. At such moments, the voices of our colleagues and students (or ourselves) can become more tense, aggressive. We can sense impatience, coercion, resentment or anger just below, or rising to, the surface. Daniela speaks to such an experience:

> *Lately, I have heard push-back about the TRC. People saying some really mean-spirited things. I ask point blank, "So, we have a societal issue. What do you propose? What are you going to do?" It's just so difficult. I feel like a knife cuts right through me. How are we ever going to make any difference? How are we ever going to change anything?*

In this reflection, Daniela recounts speaking with a faculty member who acknowledged biases in their hiring processes, yet who say that they prefer these biases. In saying so, Daniela knows that the faculty are effectively pushing back against initiatives to hire more Aboriginal faculty. She is incredulous, insistent, despairing. She calls her colleagues to account, and she feels their

resistance cut through her. In a similar way, Aubrey experiences resistance as a kind of rejection, not of the policy issues related to equity and inclusion, but of herself.

> *When I get nothing back, when I'm not convincing them, I'm not gaining any ground, it becomes more than frustrating. It's like a rejection of self, in a way.*

For Aubrey, and for many of the participants in this study, the work they do is part of who they are. Aubrey feels excitement and passion in her work, even if the concepts of equity that she might be relaying are abstract. And yet, she doesn't feel enjoyment unless she connects with her colleagues and senses she is expanding the spaces of equity with them, in tangible ways. When she is not making progress, she is not just frustrated, or exasperated, or even angry; rather, she feels superseded, unnecessary, lacking purpose. In a similar, yet different vein, Melanie and Iris speak of their sense of feeling "dirty" and "gross" when, in their work in study abroad, they see university staff travelling abroad with generous allowances and the university reducing travel subsidies for students, or they see power being questionably yielded to assure certain students are allocated funds. Underlying reflections such as these, there is a question of judgement, of asking ourselves in relation to our work, "What kind of person am I?" and of asking of those with whom we are interacting, "What kind of person are you?".

We enter into interactions with our students and colleagues, some of whom we have little knowledge of and background with and must quickly consider how to react to provocation, desperation, exuberance, confusion. Dominic shares an experience that opens to a kind of internal dialogue, a means to remain focused and sustain connections with his colleagues as they share stories that are potentially deeply problematic:

> *Someone comes in and says, "I've been sleeping with my supervisor in his minivan in the parking lot every day for the last six years." I sit here like that's the most normal thing I've ever heard. I don't care less about that person, but they need to think that I've heard that six times today.*

For Dominic, suppressing his immediate, possibly indignant reaction is a matter of caring, of

compassion. He knows if he responds with alarm, his colleague might retreat. We must, it

seems, also be attentive to the potential conflation of the question "What kind of person are

you/people are we?" with "What kind of person/people are you/we interacting with?" We may,

at times, find ourselves struggling to suspend our judgement, in order that we can focus on the

"issues" or "ideas" and "not the person" as Dominic and Sophie like to say. We may struggle

because our policy and strategy related deliberations and enactments in Indigenization and

internationalization are often lived as a speaking about what is, and what we make, speak-able,

and in being speak-able, do-able, and vice-versa. This speak-ability and do-ability of our work

may extend beyond the prescriptive limits of the *language game* of our institutions, as intimated

by Terrence's reflection at the outset of this chapter (Gadamer, 2004/1975, pp. 482-483).

Following Levinas (1998/1974), in such liminal spaces of evolving the certainties of our

deliberations and enactments, we experience more than what is and isn't "said" (Levinas,

1998/1974, p. 5). We may experience a signifying beyond what is said, and in that sense, in the

lived relationality of our policy deliberations in our field, "saying is not a game" (Levinas,

1998/1974, p. 5). Levinas (1998/1974) writes,

> Responsibility for the other, in its antecedence to my freedom, its antecedence to the
> present and to representation, is a passivity more passive than all passivity, an exposure
> to the other without this exposure being assumed, an exposure without holding back,
> exposure of exposedness, expression, saying. This exposure is the frankness, sincerity,
> veracity of saying. Not saying dissimulating itself and protecting itself in the said, just
> giving out words in the face of the other, but saying uncovering itself, that is, denuding
> itself of its skin, sensibility on the surface of the skin, at the edge of the nerves, offering
> itself even in suffering – and thus wholly sign, signifiying itself. (Levinas, 1998/1974, p.
> 15)

In our day-to-day work, we may indeed sense that we are involved in some kind of game,

navigating the politics and demands of our institution, where we "protect" ourselves, by "giving

out words in the face of the other" (Levinas, 1998/1974, p. 15) in the "said" that "unfolds in stated propositions, copulas, and virtually written, united anew into structures" (Levinas, 1998/1974, p. 44). And yet also, at the same and at other moments in time, we may be involved in work that, in taking us beyond our zones of comfort and into unknown horizons, "uncovers" who we are in communion with others, that opens us to the sensibility of saying itself, to the "vulnerability, exposure to outrage, wounding" in the exposure of our "saying" in the polis of our institutions (Levinas, 1998/1974, p. 15).

We may find ourselves in such situations challenging or trying to explain aspects of our institution that delve into its historical roots, its corporate status, or provincial and national policies that affect the bounds of our decision-making. We may experience complicity in a system that, at its basis, may not represent our experience, knowledge and values, and in the case of Indigenous epistemologies, may be anathema to Indigenous knowledge and ways of being. Our early and late entrances into policy deliberations and enactments possess such latency, signifying potentialities, alternatives for challenging established, and integrating new, thinking and ways of doing. In the context of a resource-competitive institutional environment, our interpretations of policy can become associative with how policy issues are framed, not as a matter of emphasis, but as a matter of divergent perspectives of the very policy horizons themselves. As colleagues, we can, in a sense, lose sight of, or in adversarial situations, attempt to block the visibility of alternative policy horizons. We can find ourselves in meetings and in conversations with colleagues and students and, underneath dialogue is a struggle for, or joint effort at sustaining, oversight, for what is and is not acknowledged, who represents what and how we distribute and redistribute resources. Sometimes, in the liminal spaces of our deliberations and enactments of Indigenization and internationalization, we say or do something,

or have something said or done to us, and it touches a nerve. We react. A facial expression. Redness in the face. Tensed shoulders. Sometimes we already know what will cause a reaction in another person or group of people. We know what will likely hit a nerve. And yet, hitting a nerve, the right nerve, may be the very point.

Doing

I think of Daniela's reflection that the spaces of our work are "going to be messy" because "we have to put all those attitudes and beliefs on the table that are not conducive to being inclusive, welcoming, and respectful environments". At the same time, however, she reflects that we also need to be attentive to our colleague's and student's needs and ask ourselves, as much as we ask others, "How should we be treating people?". In our institutional discourse, this type of question can often surface in how we speak of our institutional identity. We may hear and debate questions such as "What kind of institution are we?" or "What kind of institution do we want to be?" When we switch "institution" for "people", of which the institution is made, that same question becomes more discerning, even controversial: "What kind of people are we, or do we want to be?" And yet, it is this very question that is at the heart of the interpersonal deliberations and enactments of Indigenization and internationalization, of the tensions between what we aspire to be as an institution and what we may experience as persons within our institutions.

Leslie and Kendra reflect about how they approach their interactions with Aboriginal students facing personal, financial, and academic challenges:

> *Leslie: The students can yell, swear, be mad at a professor, disparage the university, be mad at me. And, I'm quiet. I don't hurry them or look at my watch. I'm trying to say, "I'm here for you. I understand what you're feeling."*

> *Kendra: Sometimes, we are the last resort. The student has tried to talk to people in their faculty and they aren't listening or they don't care. Sometimes we're the only people the*

> *students have. We have to help them. It's just being human. To care about somebody.*
> *To want the best for that person. I feel it's just a human connection.*

These quotes from Leslie and Kendra encapsulate the dispositional, ethical quality, or demand, of kindness and care in our work in transformative practices of Indigenization and internationalization. Kendra and Leslie do not react with anger or defensiveness to the resentment and frustration directed at them by their students, as they recognize their connection with the source of some students' frustrations, fears, or sense of desperation. For both of them, it is simple: they must help their students feel cared for and listened to, in order that they might persevere.

In my interview with Maya, she made a comment on kindness almost as an aside, and then, as I listened to and re-read the transcripts, I began to see the lived practice of kindness as a thread throughout all my interviews.

> *It always jars with me a little bit, but I've heard it said lately in the recent years.*
> *Kindness. I guess I think of myself as probably deeply compassionate. Is it kindness? I*
> *don't know. What is kindness? I'm not sure what kindness is.*

Kindness is a word that, as Maya states, and as many participants also name, seems to fit, however awkwardly or incompletely, as a possible description of how we enact our work. Kindness, in the sense that is being employed here, may be viewed as a dialectic "instantiated" through moral decision-making over time, an embodied practice that eventually grounds "beliefs about [our] own capabilities for kind interventions in the lives of others" (Hamrick, 2002, p. 197). Will Hamrick (2002) provides a depiction that captures the significance of kindness in transformative deliberation and enactment of Indigenization and internationalization:

> The totalizer, the colonizer, and the officious do-gooder all provide clear and familiar
> examples of an inappropriate presence of self, and the uninvolved, coldhearted egoist
> illustrates the inappropriate absence of self. In contrast, the truly kind person offers us a
> model of intervening into the lives of others while at the same time refusing to transfer
> her own mental baggage. Kindness is a way of knowing the other as other, because it

requires both closeness and distance, proximity and tactful differentiation, compassionate intervention and appropriate withdrawal (Hamrick, 2002, pp. 68-69).

Kindness, as portrayed by Hamrick, is a learned disposition. He warns, however, that kindness can be misconstrued with niceness, or obligation, subservience or manipulation, and that its veneer can mask superficiality or oppressive, self-serving intentions. As depicted in the escalating interactions between John and Carol in *Oleanna*, when the "strength of the kind agent" is lost to lack of self-control or self-limitation, the "enticement of an enhanced self-image of director or controller of other people's lives" can manifest. Hamrick (2002) states:

> [W]hen the agent gives in to the temptation of power over the other, a double sense of failure attaches to the results. The agent has failed both the object of her kindness as well as herself in not developing, or continuing to develop, a life of virtue. This is the case of whether the "power over" takes form of outright domination or control by gaining ingratiating influence through establishing a dependency relationship. (Hamrick, 2002, pp. 196-197)

In this sense, kindness may be viewed as a commitment to developing our capacities to engage in the difficult, often strained inter-personal situations of deliberating and enacting transformative Indigenization and internationalization on our campuses. Such kindness is not random, nor superficial, but is rather deliberate and deep, a long-term commitment to developing one's capacity to deliberately and thoughtfully embody kindness in our practice. Kindness, "while 'out of place' in talk about higher education" fits with an approach to deliberating reconciliation as transformative learning (Clegg & Rowland, 2010, p. 722). Kindness in our deliberations could be considered both "interaction to which" we "bring an intention to critically explore avenues of thinking and action" (Bedinger, 2011, p. 60) as well "communicative" deliberation that acts as "deference and conciliatory caring" in the face of our own and others' "disagreement, anger, counterargument, and criticism" (Young, 1996, pp. 129-130). As Hamrick (2002) writes, "a life of *effective* kindness […] requires not just the capability of the body to mobilize its forces to

come to the aid of others, but the continuing ability to give this commitment the temporal

thickness of duration that the habitual body provides" (Hamrick, 2002, p. 197).

Diane reflects on this "temporal thickness" of kindness. Hers is a temporality that

includes her lived experiences dealing with racism and indifference, a temporality that extends to

Elder teachings and to her own commitment to overcoming oppression, in all its forms:

> *Having experienced oppression, I know how that feels. How do we do our work without oppressing somebody else? We nurture that person. We nurture them to become a part of a bigger system of people who have good relationships. People who have relationships based on what we would consider natural law around kindness, and caring, and sharing and strength and determination as the foundational laws that the Elders have passed onto us. How we work together comes from that space and place.*

For Diane, as it is for many of the participants in this study, kindness requires focusing our

attention on the needs of our students and colleagues. Kindness may ground our actions in our

sense of purpose, our connection to our values, beliefs and the teachings that guide our work,

demanding, as Diane states, our "strength and determination". In this sense, kindness may

reflect van Manen's (2014) notion of *pedagogical tactfulness*, introduced in previous chapters.

> Tact is defined as a keen sense of what to do or say in order to maintain good relations with others or avoid offense. But the essence of tact does not inhere in the simple desire to get on well with others […] We speak of tact as an instant knowing what to do, an improvisational skill in dealing with others. Someone who shows tact somehow seems to have the Kairos gift or ability to act quickly, surely, confidently, and in an appropriate manner with quite complex or delicate circumstances. It is important to state at the outset that tact does not necessarily connote a soft, meek or acquiescent sensitivity. One can be sensitive and strong. A tactful person must be strong, as tact may require frankness, directness, and candor when the situation calls for it. (van Manen, 2014, p. 104)

This understanding of tactfulness, as an aspect of lived kindness in the doing of our work,

may also be at the heart of the "saying" of our transformative intercultural practice (Levinas,

1998/1974, p. 15). This doing and saying of our practice may originate, as Diane describes,

through and from "a bigger system" of "good relationships" that, in order to be sustained, must

be nurtured. In this sense, allowing, as described in Chapter 6, and as an expression of kindness,

226

is not equivalent to tolerance, as it is "clear" in our work "that toleration by itself is not enough for a minimum increase of communal kindness and the struggle against marginalization and exclusivity" for "[t]oleration is always *only* toleration; it is never approbation (Hamrick, 2002, p. 158)". When we allow, we might say that we "appreciate the value of" others and approach our work by "taking into account" the immanence of the spaces of helping, teaching and leading that we create together (Allow, 2017b). Allowing may involve nurturing strengths and positive relations in and with others, developing appreciation for the constraints and possibilities of the situations we create and find ourselves in together, demanding of us to let spaces open for others to learn and grow, and persevering, in moments of conflict and tension, to reveal spaces and places of kindness, where we can experience truth-telling, shared strength, and belonging.

Horizons of belonging

> *I have been helping a graduate student that has been through everything from starting off with losing her passport to a series of things over the course of two years. Walking alongside her through dealing with bureaucratic things to challenging things around health to some pieces around relationship with a supervisor to a situation that happened with her boyfriend. I felt love toward her, I guess. I don't know if she would describe it as love. I think it would because of our age difference. It was probably more like a parental space. But in that parental space there's love.*

As explored in this and previous chapters, the co-creation of spaces of deliberation and enactment of Indigenization and internationalization engages us in the lives of our colleagues and students in ways that can be deeply personal. In the evolving certainties and enduring liminality of our work, the demands of kindness can often intercede, revealing our inherent responsibility for one another, through the sharing of difficult life events and traumatic histories, in dealing with highly charged situations with serious implications, in seeking to overcome what would seem to be irreconcilable differences. In the vulnerability, purposefulness, and imminence/immanence of our interactions, we can find ourselves sensing more than is directly

shared, perceiving multiple interpretations of the same situation. This might be called empathy, reasonableness, understanding. For Sarina, who reflects on her advising of an international graduate student, this relational connection can feel almost parental. In the revealing kindness of her work, she finds herself experiencing threads of kinship.

Many of the participants spoke of their interaction with students and colleagues in a similar language of kinship and friendship. We might say that the work of Indigenization and internationalization, as co-creation, depends upon having and gaining a great depth of respect and trust in and from others, including our students and colleagues. This trust and respect can be culturally grounded in, or evolve into a form or understanding of kinship, borne out of shared experience and "mutuality of being" over time (Sahlins, 2013). Kindness, in this manner, may be attributed to how we direct our own and our students' and colleagues' attention without breaking what Diane and Nadine describe as the "circle" where we "teach together […] as human beings in a relationship." This circle presents us with what Mackey (2017) describes, in relation to reconciliation, as the making of "treaty" together, whereby we experience "seeing, listening, and responding creatively to an 'other' who is autonomous and also connected to us" (p. 141). When "we treaty together" (Mackey, 2016, p. 141) and engage in transformative intercultural practice together, we may, as the participants in this study describe, form bonds associated with kinship (mother, sister, grandmother), collegiality (teamwork, collaboration, trust), and friendship or solidarity ("holding each other up", support, care). Such bonds may form a strong foundation upon which we can enter into the more politicized deliberations of Indigenization and internationalization on our campuses.

Relationships based in mutuality, respect, and care, demand us to shift our sense of hierarchies and associated, normative patterns of behaviour. Developing such relations can help

us pull back from hastily judging or taking positions on issues, or siding with a particular person in the often complex, emotional, ethical and political matters associated with deliberating and enacting transformative Indigenization and internationalization. Taking a strong stand on critical issues may, at times, be necessary. At the same time, however, if the manner in which we take this stand closes off deliberation, we can find that we limit the potential extent of our relational connections and ultimately limit the horizon of our own potential knowledge, experience and perspective. As Diane and Nadine describe, in order to avoid restricting our horizons of belonging, we must at times "consciously" take steps to "remove" the "barriers of power" that come with the "hierarchical-positional-power" of our institution. While such barriers might provide us with a falsely reassuring protection from sensing things we might not want to, they also can stifle the depth and richness of experiences and knowledge, confusion and desire that our students and colleagues bring to the co-creation of transformative Indigenization and internationalization.

Creating and entering this circle together, as students, staff and faculty, on a more level relation, however, is not something we can undertake without effort or risk, nor take for granted. Throughout my interviews, I heard about and witnessed trusting, respectful collegial and interpersonal relationships that intertwined with my participants' reflections on and experiences with deliberating and enacting transformative Indigenization and internationalization. Daniela speaks of the "gift of trust" she has received as an ally of her Aboriginal colleagues and how she always "checks back" to make sure she is not overstepping. Diane and Nadine often spoke of the integrity and interconnectedness of their relationship as professionals and as Indigenous and non-Indigenous persons working in partnership. As Nadine states regarding her collegial relationship with Diane, "It doesn't feel like we have separate work." She shares a personal reflection:

I am awaiting test results. I don't know how they are going to go. At that moment I realize Diane is my go-to. No one would ask us now how that came to be, because we're tied at the hip. I know very well that "you like your friend's friends, and you don't like your friend's enemies", however that saying goes. I know I come with the same.

Nadine describes her relationship with Diane as being tightly connected, extending beyond day-to-day work into the realm of friendship. For all participants, it is their shared work with their colleagues in supporting students and their reliance on and trust in one another that surfaces as being their shared strength, often underscored by dealing with difficult, interpersonal issues of power, privilege and ignorance. This interaction between Iris, Lana, Belen and Sarina depicts how this shared strength can help with persevering in deliberating and enacting Indigenization and internationalization within the institutional spaces in which we work:

> *Iris: I come up against roadblocks every minute. I'm losing interest in the battle. I'm starting to think, "Well, that's the way it is. That's the way it's going to be."*
> *Lana: It's a university. There are so many levels of bureaucracy you have to go through. To a certain point, though, we enjoy what we do. That's why we're still here doing it. It's determination, really.*
> *Belen: It's a choose-your-battle situation.*
> *Iris: It's real teamwork. "I can't speak to that student today, I think I'm going to pass this one on to you". Even though it's my student, "Can you please help?" And she'll say "Yeah. I got this."*
> *Lana: Because you notice that there are some things that bother certain people more than others.*
> *Sarina: One thing I appreciate here is that we open up a space for authentic self. We have opportunities to work together, see each other in a workshop, discuss issues beyond the day-to-day. When we have that training space, when we have that shared project, we get the opportunities to trust each other.*

Iris, Lana, Belen and Sarina speak to a shared sense of purposefulness in relation to their deliberations and enactments of policy and strategy. The contradictions and even, at times, perceived hypocrisies in such (lack of) deliberations and enactments in our institutions can, as noted in previous chapters, lead to our own or others' sense of complicity and ineffectuality, to the point where some of us can feel like we do not belong, even in spaces where supposedly we are meant to feel a sense of belonging. To persevere in such a context, many of the participants

in this study describe, as Lana, Belen, Sarina and Iris do, a situated practice of "choose-your-battle", a teamwork based in supporting students and colleagues and each other in dealing with complicated situations. Such teamwork does not, however, come without disagreement. What seems to be common amongst the participants in this study, as spoken to by Sarina, is the experience of seeking to incorporate their differences through deliberating as a team and building trust through such things as workshops and shared projects. At another point, Iris describes such shared experiences as allowing herself and her colleagues to "sit in the room and even though we're all very different and have diverse backgrounds, we can have informed conversations or disagreements about a plethora of things where other workplaces may not offer that same level of respect". Sarina describes these types of opportunities as opening "a space for authentic self". This is not to insinuate a self-centeredness, but rather speaks to the inherent demands of self-awareness in our work, especially where we are trying to work across the boundaries of Indigenization and internationalization in our day-to-day interactions with one another.

Forester (1999) provided a strong depiction of this underlying aspect of friendship in deliberative practice in contentious policy spaces:

> Less then, like experts, judges, or implausibly neutral bureaucrats, mediators of public disputes should be seen as new, civic friends in the making: new friends of a diverse public; new friends who hope to seek out those affected and will attend to their inclusion; new, civic friends who can create a space for speaking and listening, for difference and respect, for the joint search for new possibilities, and ultimately for newly fashioned agreements about how we shall live together. (Forester, 1999, p. 197).

Speaking of "civic" friendship in this manner which Forester (1999) outlined, expands upon the notion of how, as transformative intercultural practitioners, we are public personhoods within our institutions. To be a "human person" in our roles may not only passively entail "*being* things we do not *know*", but also actively desiring to *know* what we could *be* (Rocha, 2015, p. 4, italics in original). As our work engages us in matters of developing "newly fashioned agreements about

how we shall" (Forester, 1999, p. 197) work and study together, our level of collegiality must extend beyond superficiality, and open us to a spectrum of what bell hooks (2009), quoted at the outset of this chapter, described as "beloved community" (p. 183).

For hooks (2009), the measure for being inclusive is how, regardless of how diverse we think we are, we continually strive to ensure our campus communities are places of "welcome" and belonging, even in the face of what might seem to be incommensurable differences (hooks, 2009, p. 183). hooks (2009) describes a kind of belongingness that is highly relevant to higher education. Our campuses must always remain open to difference, through welcoming new students each year who arrive on our campuses and new colleagues as they take new positions in teaching, administration or student affairs. We must always ask ourselves how it is that we extend our welcome in our roles, including what we will attend to, what we will allow. We must be prepared to say and do what our students and colleagues may not wish to hear or be asked to do themselves. In that sense, our belonging to our institutional "beloved community" is enacted each time each time we gather to discuss the matters of our institutions, from admissions criteria, to making changes to curriculum, to addressing financial shortfalls, to planning how we wish to welcome new international and Indigenous students.

In one of Terrence's reflections, he recalled a critical moment when he determined to break from his sense of isolation and aimlessness and become more purposeful in his personal search for such a sense of belonging, or "beloved community" at his institution.

> *We'd drive around until four or five in the morning, in the country, weaving through back roads. We hit a point where we were, "This first year was terrible. We're at rock bottom. Let's do something about this." You know, just taking steps in the dark and see if we can get somewhere. That was the turning point. The year I joined a student association.*

In this recollection, belonging is not something Terrence passively receives. He chooses it. In our work as transformative intercultural practitioners, we may know this necessary choosing, or

discernment, quite intimately, through our own periods of "weaving" through "back roads" of policy and strategy, and moments of hitting "rock bottom" or experiencing "turning points". It may be that this entire dissertation is about such discernment as it relates to our own learning through our transformative intercultural practices. To make such discernment explicit, must then, finally, ask, like Terrence, what the point is of all this weaving. We must ask: *What can we learn from this exploration of transformative intercultural practice that can inform a pragmatic-ethical approach to the deliberation, enactment and co-creation of transformation Indigenization and internationalization policy and strategy in higher education?*

Chapter 8: Discerning

*How can we disarm and de-center ourselves and displace our desires and
cognitive obsessions to wake up and grow up to face a plural, undefined, wonderful and
terrifying world which inevitably brings both pain and joy, without turning our back to
the violences we have so far inflicted upon it?*
- *Vanessa Andreotti, 2015, p. 227*

(Up/Down)river

In Chapter 1, I drew upon an analogy to my research and writing that Vanessa Andreotti

(2015) described in her paper, *Global citizenship education otherwise: Pedagogical and*

theoretical insights. That analogy was that of "going up the river work" to seek the roots to the

complex problems we face in taking a transformative, de-colonizing approach to education

(Andreotti, 2015, p. 226). Andreotti described this "visual narrative" in detail:

> The visual narrative involves a group of people who see many young children drowning
> in a river with a strong current. Their first impulse would probably be to try to save them
> or to call for help. But what if they looked up the river and saw many boats throwing the
> children in the water and these boats were multiplying by the minute? How many
> different tasks would be necessary to stop the boats and prevent this from happening
> again? There are at least four inter-related tasks: (1) rescuing the children in the water, (2)
> stopping the boats from throwing the children in the water, (3) going to the villages of the
> boat crew to understand why this is happening in the first place, and (4) collecting the
> bodies of those who have died to grieve and raise awareness of what has happened. In
> deciding what to do, people would need to remember that some rescuing techniques may
> not work in the conditions of the river, and that some strategies to stop the boats may
> invite or fuel even more boats to join the fleet. They may even realize that they are
> actually in one of the boats, throwing children in the river with one hand and trying to
> rescue some of them back with the other hand. (pp. 226-227)

This is an analogy that I have heard of and applied in my work in higher education, as I have

tried to address the sources of the challenges faced by students and improve students' overall

experiences in their studies. In the past years of completing this dissertation, this analogy has

also reminded me of the importance of self-awareness and critical reflection in my research and

writing. In remaining committed to "going up the river work", I have tried to keep asking

"essential, difficult and often disturbing begged questions" and question my own "social imaginary" of what I think "is possible to think and identify with", including being critical of "the range of questions" I formulate and "the appropriateness" of my responses (Andreotti, 2015, p. 227). In "going up river", I have tried to remain committed to seek an understanding of experience in deliberating of "the roots of the [policy] problem[s]" transformative Indigenization and internationalization, such that our enacted "strategies down the river" in our day-to-day practice involving our colleagues and students "can be better informed" (Andreotti, 2015, p. 224-227).

The writing in this dissertation, to this point, provides a record of this *going up river work*. At times, I have circled back, repeated steps, gotten lost, and come upon what felt like impenetrable terrain. I have also had moments of sudden revelation, reaching a point in the river that suggested origins. At each of these moments, I sensed I could follow that possible origin and find yet another, and another. Staying with the river was to remain grounded in the reflections of my participants, to listen to them carefully, again and again, like listening the river itself. At a certain point, however, I realized that I had travelled as far up river with my participants as they had taken me, through their interviews and focus groups. Even as I started back downriver, I found myself circling back, wanting to return, wanting to follow spring-fed streams that joined the river, or follow the fork in the river, or dive deeper into one its depths.

At times, I also could hardly decipher between what it was I was researching and writing and how it was that my research and writing was affecting how I engaged with my own work and life. As I have been writing, I found myself reflecting on and changing my own approaches to transformative Indigenization and internationalization. As an interpretive study, grounded in post-intentional phenomenology, I have sensed how the action-sensitive, pragmatical-ethical

nature of my research intertwines with my work and life, gradually becoming part of how I do what I do. In saying this, I am not stating that I have come to definitive answers to the "essential, difficult and often disturbing begged questions" that underlie what it is like to deliberate and enact transformative Indigenization and internationalization (Andreotti, 2015, p. 227). I have, however, come to what I believe is a clearer understanding of what our work in our fields demands of us. I have come to consider ways we might be better prepare ourselves as colleagues and students, in teaching, helping and leading roles, for the intersecting, often conflicting and controversial goals and aspirations associated with transformative Indigenization and internationalization, from meaningful inclusion to actualizing de-colonization, from equity and human rights to social justice and global citizenship education.

Much has already been shared in these past three chapters regarding these learnings. Following the post-intentional phenomenological interpretive methodology of this dissertation, I have shared my learnings descriptively and reflectively, weaving a thematic analysis of participants' and personal anecdotes with fiction, poetry and academic literature. Each chapter has looked at a different aspect of the lived experience of transformative intercultural practice, including deliberating, enacting and co-creating Indigenization and internationalization policy and strategy-related matters. In this chapter, I turn back downriver and pick up on three aspects from each of the conclusions of each analysis chapter. These aspects are belonging, gathering and freedom. I develop each of these aspects further in relation to pragmatic-ethical considerations for how we engage in the framing, implementation and evaluation of Indigenization and internationalization at our institutions. These considerations are written "in-formatively" as "thoughtful advice", framed as lenses from which to "re-formatively" approach

how do what we do and "become" together, as peers, teachers, advisors, leaders, and helpers

(van Manen, 2007, p. 30).

I begin by summarizing the chapters leading to this conclusion, drawing the threads that

hold them together. I then explore the themes of belonging, gathering and freedom, focusing on

their significance for the deliberation, enactment and co-creation of Indigenization and

internationalization policy and strategy. I then briefly describe further, potential areas of

research and interpretive policy analysis, as they relate to the general topic of my dissertation and

discuss the limitations of this study. Finally, I conclude this chapter with a discussion on the

necessary choosing that each of us face in our day-to-day interactions with our students and

colleagues to continue on our personal and shared paths towards co-creating transformative

Indigenization and internationalization at our campuses.

(Re)tracing

It can seem that our work is far-reaching when we look at the scope of what we do in

Indigenization and internationalization, including the number of those involved, what professions

we represent, our backgrounds, the types of activities we engage in, the outcomes of our efforts,

and the breadth of relationships and types of authority that we hold, both within and outside of

our campuses. In the first half of this dissertation, I explored this comprehensive nature of the

work that comprises the focus of this study and proposed a method to explore the lived

experience of transformative approaches to its deliberation and enactment.

I began, in Chapter 1, by locating myself, personally and professionally, in relation to

both Indigenization and internationalization. In my positionality as a male settler, of mixed

Lebanese-Syrian and Irish-Scottish descent, I recognized that I bring a privileged worldview to

this research project and, in this last chapter, I reiterate this acknowledgement. I also reiterate

my commitment to rectifying broken Treaty relations and seeking reconciliation. In the Chapter 1, I spoke of how this commitment to Indigenous issues reaches back into my early adulthood, reflected in one of my earliest university assignments. As I have progressed through researching and writing this dissertation, I have come to see this dissertation as a continuation and further deepening of my commitment to de-colonization, through reconciliation, and to meaningful inclusion, grounded in tenets of social justice. A critical aspect of Chapter 1 was to express how both of these commitments intersect within higher education, where, as practitioners, we are often both engaged in transformative approaches Indigenization and internationalization, in various ways, to various extents.

Chapter 2 served as a means to explore how this commitment may be embodied, and reveal a richness of lived meaning, within a single interaction with an international student facing a charge of academic misconduct. In reflecting upon a personal experienced I had with an international student, I employed an analogy of the labyrinth. I based this analogy upon a comment that the student had shared with me one evening on a bench overlooking a green space on campus. My intent in that chapter was to write in a tone that opened to the philosophical, practice-oriented nature of this dissertation. In this manner, I grounded the overarching questions for this thesis in a lived experience that might resonate for those engaged in the work of Indigenization and internationalization on their campuses. Through that exploration of my interaction with that international student, I came to a discussion on the lived meanings of reasonableness, risk and responsibility. I concluded that chapter by extending the analogy of the labyrinth to both the lived experience of working and studying in higher education and research and writing that draws from phenomenological philosophy and methodology.

In Chapter 3, I described how transformative approaches to Indigenization and internationalization share commonalities in their lived practice that could be more deeply understood if explored through an interpretive policy analysis lens. I provided a brief overview of the historical and legal contexts for the increasing roles of Indigenization and internationalization in higher education. I contrasted symbolic and transformative responses to these policy and strategy emphases in higher education, drawing from research in both fields of Indigenization and internationalization. In making this contrast, I meant to open to the ways in which transformative approaches can take on intersecting functions in our work in ways that can be potentially complementary. It is in this sense that I introduced *transformative intercultural practice*, as a descriptive term for the types of engagement that a number of faculty, staff and students are involved in, across different departments, at different levels of authority, and with quite different roles in the institution. I postulated that, similar to theoretical depictions of transformative approaches to Indigenization and internationalization, there may be lived, existential commonalities in the experiences of faculty, staff and students involved in what could be contained under the term *transformative intercultural practice*.

In making this assertion, I emphasized the embodied sensemaking and action-sensitivity of policy-making, drawing from literature in interpretive policy analysis and phenomenological research methodology. In Chapter 4, I outlined these methodological foundations and the specific methods for such an interpretive policy analysis of the deliberation and enactment of transformative Indigenization and internationalization in higher education. I asserted my adoption of a post-intentional approach to phenomenological research and analysis as outlined by Vagle (2014), while also acknowledging a connection with aspects of the phenomenological of practice tradition of van Manen (2014). I presented this approach as engaging embodied,

dialogical, mediated and ethical knowing, for both researcher and participant. To fully realize

this research project as an interpretive study, I made a commitment to principles of reciprocity

and the co-construction of meaning, to grounding my analysis in the contextual lived experiences

of my participants, and to presenting my analysis through evocative, philosophical writing.

I understand that this project goes against certain tendencies in international and

Indigenization research and writing. It is uncommon, perhaps unheard of, for research to involve

both Indigenization and internationalization and to incorporate multiple roles, spanning teaching,

advising, leading, and helping, inclusive of the lived experiences of faculty, staff and student. By

taking a interpretive research approach, I have trusted, that in speaking with my participants, I

might, in some measure, begin to see the lived meanings that we might share in our experiences

deliberating, enacting and co-creating what we believe to be transformative approaches

Indigenization and internationalization. I sought experiential accounts from people involved in a

broad range of work, knowing how Indigenization and internationalization reach into the work

and lives of colleagues and students, from teaching, research and human resources to student

affairs, student government and institutional governance.

What I found, in my interviews and focus groups, was that this supposition of relatedness

of lived experience was largely accurate. Participants often spoke of their experiences of

resistance, conflict or confusion related to the work that they were involved in. They also spoke

of moments where they felt were making progress. In almost all instances, the participants, upon

deeper questioning, were open to sharing their recollections of what they said and did, what they

recall about how others acted and spoke, of the environments in which such moments took place,

of their sense of time and their physical sensations in situations that represent some of the best

and worst of their experiences. As I read and re-read my participants anecdotes and reflections, I

started to see lived, existential connections. Such connections were not necessarily always

similar, but rather, in an almost dialogical manner, acknowledged their intersections. By this, I

mean that participants often spoke of their own and their colleagues' experiences as intersecting,

through overarching notions of ally-ship, stewardship/leadership and kinship.

My analysis of the interviews and focus groups eventually resulted in the three chapters,

each focused on a different aspect of this interpretive policy analysis of transformative

Indigenization and internationalization. I began with the intention of writing two analysis

chapters, one focused on deliberating related policy and strategy and the other on enacting

related policy and strategy. As I wrote and reflected on the participants' and my own

experiences, and introduced other lived experience materials from poetry, film, theatre and

fiction and insights from academic literature, I found that I was weaving in and out of

deliberation and enactment and moving ideas from one chapter to the next. I found that I was

having to resist early closure, noticing certain themes that could be further explored in other

anecdotes and reflections from my participants.

As I came to the close of the second analysis chapter on enactment, I had collected a

number of anecdotes and reflections in what I thought was to be the conclusion. I had moved

ideas from the first chapter on deliberation into that conclusion chapter as well. It became clear

to me that there was an additional aspect to what was being revealed by my participants. As I

began to work through that chapter, I realized it wasn't a conclusion, but rather was the third

analysis chapter, focused on the co-creation of transformative Indigenization and

internationalization. This realization enabled me to further revise the first two chapters and

provide, as much as possible, a distinctive focus for each. Even with this effort at distinguishing

between each chapter, there is no question that each of the three chapters intersects with the

other, building upon ideas and moving them in different directions, towards different interpretive insights.

Within each chapter, drawing from phenomenology, I intentionally spoke to the relevance to the day-to-day work of transformative intercultural practices associated with Indigenization and internationalization. As I revised each chapter and brought each to a conclusion, I started to see in each, a "line of flight" of something "incomprehensible" about the lived meaning of transformative intercultural practice across deliberation, enactment and co-creation (Vagle, 2014, p. 136). In this chapter, I aim to "not back away" from these insights, as they may provide an "opening up of what" transformative intercultural practice "might become" (Vagle, 2014, p. 136). These insights were the aspects of freedom, gathering and belonging. I will further elaborate on these aspects in this next section. I thus present these three themes in statements of advice that can be taken or not taken, in whole or in part. I do not presume that these are the only relevant pieces of advice that could be proffered with regard to the types of work that we are engaged in, in each our roles related to Indigenization and internationalization. I do, however, hope that, as Wilson (2008) advised, by speaking as my true self, and declaring my unique perspective drawn from my research, reflection and writing on this topic, that I will have been able to "make new connections to ideas" in such a way that "[i]t is incumbent upon the other person to come to their own decisions on the shape that the new ideas will take and to make their own conclusions" (Wilson, 2008, p. 94). It is to this last offering to "make new connections to ideas", borne out of this dissertation, that I now turn.

Begin with belonging

In our work in transformative intercultural practice, we may often be working with students, faculty and staff who do not sense belongingness, as a lived relation to one another, or

in relation to the policy and strategy directions of our institutions. From what I have learned

from this dissertation, addressing this potential lack of belongingness is at the core of our work

as transformative intercultural practitioners. We must ask ourselves how it is that we strengthen

our students' and colleagues' sense of belonging in the present such that they might see

themselves working together towards transformative Indigenization and internationalization

policy and strategy horizons into the future. Such a practice demands of us to remain welcoming

not only of those who share common values and intentions, but those who present difference and

dissent.

As policy making, to be welcoming is to seek to include and take seriously colleagues

and students who propose improvements or alternative approaches to, or variations in

understandings of, the values, form, function and material matters and implications of

Indigenization and internationalization policy and strategy making process, at all stages, from

inception to evaluation. As transformative intercultural practitioners, we must consider what

knowledges, understandings and worldviews that our students and colleagues bring with them

into our institutions. We must acknowledge that our colleagues and students, as persons, bring

with them their own belongings that extend beyond the traditions, cultures and knowledges of

the institution. To be welcoming of such belongings that our colleagues and students bring with

them, we must be prepared to look beyond our institution's traditional approaches to many

aspects of our institution, from governance and strategy planning to teaching methods and

advising approaches.

In this sense, to be welcoming is not a simple matter of hospitality but is rather a

welcoming of liminality itself. We exchange hospitality, rather than offer it. Each extension of

our welcome is an opportunity for us to expand, as persons and peoples, the very horizons of

belonging(s) of our institutions. Our invitations to learn about one another and develop deeper connections are recurring, with and without formality. Being welcoming is to extend and reciprocate invitation multiply, across different groups and organizations on campus, between individuals across different roles and levels of authority, between difficult cultural groups, and with each new group of students, staff and faculty who join our institutions. Such invitations, as opportunities for transformative policy and strategy learning, can help us to develop understanding of Indigenous knowledges and legacies of colonization, of meaningful and critically informed inclusion, of what it means to engage in reconciliation and de-colonization. In welcoming difference, we may be able to open spaces wherein we can deepen our understanding of the needs of international and Indigenous students, of the experiences and perspectives of Indigenous staff and faculty on not only Indigenization, but also internationalization, as an intersecting policy and strategy.

In this sense, our senses of belongings are embodied, material and relational, experienced in the saying and doing of policy and strategy. To say this is to acknowledge that who we welcome into our institutions, through our hiring and admissions practices, reflect and expand the horizons of belonging that we project and that we make possible into the future. It is to acknowledge that there are non-material and material things and experiences that people need to have to feel they belong and that there are material resources that may need to be shared differently. We need to ask ourselves what resources are needed for our students, faculty and staff, including ourselves, to feel as though we belong. To begin with belonging is to acknowledge that we need to understand better what resources we already have or are missing and how and why we are distributing or excluding resources in the way that we are. We also need to attend to the ways in which we discuss such practical matters, understanding that there

might be different values, cultural meaning and significance attributed to such material and conceptual issues as housing and academic integrity. For it is not the things themselves that we are necessarily speaking of when we are engaging in transformative Indigenization and internationalization. We are also exploring that which belongs to such material and non-material matters, in the sense of the certainties we ascribe to them.

In this sense, we must look to such practices as mentoring and training for faculty and staff and to co-creating spaces of purposeful action, regardless of scale, as cross-functional, non-hierarchical teams engaged in transformative intercultural practice. We need to provide opportunities for ourselves, our student and colleagues to discuss, develop and express habits of kindness, in all spaces of Indigenization and internationalization policy and strategy deliberation and enactment that we co-create or enter into, both within and outside of our campuses.   We must recognize that such habits of kindness can help us form and transform relationships in a manner that can endure conflict, the stresses of change, and spaces of uncertainty. Embodying kindness, not ascribed by title or role, but in how we interact with one another on campus, extends learning and belonging beyond classrooms and into the boardrooms of our institution, giving renewed meaning to the notion of campus spirit. If we understand ourselves as all seeking belonging, all being welcomed and welcoming, we extend our understandings of kindness beyond spaces of authority to spaces of collegiality, responsibility, possibly even to relations of kinship.

Gather with intention/attention

To begin with belonging in the welcoming of our multiple belongings, we also must attend to our well-being and safety.   We must, in our work as transformative intercultural practitioners, both allow for difference and potential conflict and yet also attend to the potential

impacts of such conflict. We must always be attending to what our students and colleagues are sharing from their experiences and we must be prepared to step in, when needed. As a practice of kindness, it may be said that, in co-creating spaces of belonging, we commit to gathering with intention, in a manner that, from a transformative intercultural practice, is both expectant and observant.

As explored in the conclusion of Chapter 7, each day on our campuses we engage in multiple, formal and informal gatherings, from chance hallway discussions to scheduled advising sessions to weekly staff meetings and day-long planning retreats. These gatherings may intertwine with previous and future gatherings, involving a mix of the same or different people, including students, staff and/or faculty. As transformative intercultural practitioners, such gatherings are the basis of our work. In our roles on our campuses, we are often the co-creators or the hosts of the gatherings that we are part of, whether through classroom teaching, a soup and bannock lunch and learn, or a human rights disclosure intake session. When we begin our practice with belonging, we recognize that, in each of these gatherings, regardless of scale and impact, we must be self-aware of our expectations and be prepared to question and state them clearly.

To be expectant is to speak of what is hoped for, what is anticipated. When we expect something to occur, it is as though we see into a possible, imminent or distant future, a point on the horizon. In being expectant in our work we may both allow for liminality and vulnerability, yet also attend to purposefulness and evolving certainty. When we share our expectations explicitly, beginning with belonging, we may be able to potentially reduce our students' and colleagues', and even our own, apprehensions and awaken or nurture habits of kindness that can help us co-create transformative Indigenization and internationalization. Being expectant is

therefore not to say that we should seek to be in control. Rather, it is to say that when we gather with intention, we deliberate our intentions as content. In this sense, being expectant is to allow for and attend to transformative processes of Indigenization and internationalization policy and strategy deliberation and enactment, as much as, or more than their form and content.

As process, transformative Indigenization and internationalization requires skills in observation. We must be able to listen attentively, to watch carefully, to be cognizant of emotional and physiological shifts, the way a word is spoken, a gesture is made, and reacted to. Being observant in our work requires of us to know what we are looking for, and thus to be critically aware of what we expect to see. If we enter into our gatherings, expecting traces of racism in the words and actions of our students and colleagues, we might not be surprised then, taken aback or offended. We might rather be more prepared to focus on creating spaces of welcome and belonging in how we introduce degrees of uncertainty into deliberation.

Being observant in our work in transformative intercultural practice is to also pay heed to the gatherings of our students and colleagues and look to them for cues as to how to proceed with policy and strategy. As explored in this dissertation, policy, as an embodied practice, is considered as being undertaken through its deliberation and enactment. The co-creation of transformative approaches to Indigenization and internationalization may likely be happening on our campuses, each day, in gatherings that, if we are not observing, may not become known to us. Being observant also, however, requires us to look for and explore the policy and strategy horizons of those who do not share commitments to transformative Indigenization and internationalization. Our role is not to avoid such contrasting worldviews, but rather to seek ways to move opposing or disparate visions closer together, even if only slightly, in order to develop and enact shared intentions.

Honour freedom

Belonging and gathering with intention are not necessarily co-extensive with the politics of Indigenization and internationalization. We do not have to agree, politically, on all matters related to Indigenization and internationalization in order for us to engage with them, as transformative intercultural practice. Infusing our gatherings with habits of kindness does not guarantee, nor necessitate consensus. If that is our expectation, then we might not be attentive to and learn from the matters of our disagreements, from what underlies our conflicts on material and conceptual matters of policy and strategy. We also might co-create spaces that do not allow for and attend to the acknowledgement of refusal, treating refusal as resistance. As policy actors, we can, in such spaces, inflict, or be inflicted by harm, by pitting certainties against certainties.

As enduring liminality, transformative approaches Indigenization and internationalization resists this sense of inevitable conflict or political closure. As the words suggest, a transformative approach to co-creating transformative Indigenization and internationalization is not an end goal. Rather, it is interrelated set of policy and strategy emphases that, in their deliberation and enactment, push us towards re-shaping the how and why of what we do at our institutions. As transformative intercultural practitioners, our ethics and sense of morality underlies our roles as policy actors, even in the context of our students' and colleagues' opposing political ideologies. Our role, we find, is not to exacerbate such oppositions, but to seek to bridge them. In doing so, we must honour freedom, both as a matter of our public personhood and as a matter of legitimate political expression.

To say this is not to say that we should accept expressions of violence, hatefulness, or to be passive in the face of injustice. Rather, it is to say that, in our deliberations and enactments of transformative approaches to Indigenization and internationalization, our work is not to suppress

or negate racism or untruth, but rather to unravel them in manner that evolves the certainties of those who hold such racist or unfounded beliefs. While many of us may hold strong political stances on issues related to social injustice, de-colonization, inclusion and globalization, we cannot impose such stances on our students and colleagues. The enduring liminality that we co-create in our work and its attendant spaces of vulnerability to which we are exposed form what might be our most challenging task and workplace hazard.

What this means for us, in our day-to-day work, is that, when something does not seem to be working in the way in which we intend, we must be prepared to change course. We must also be prepared to let our students and colleagues provide us their own ideas as to how we might proceed, whether explicitly or implicitly. We cannot become rigid in how we approach our transformative intercultural practice, as we are always orienting ourselves towards a state that does not entirely exist in the present. We engage our own, our students' and colleagues' imagination, as a means to look beyond the current horizon, creating expectancy in our students and colleagues for something otherwise. By modeling and nurturing habits of kindness, we open ourselves, our students and colleagues to a creativity in our thinking that can potentially engage conflicting political ideologies without seeking closure.

Such creativity in our thinking, as policy actors, may also require us to consider what potentiality our policies and strategies offer to us that we do not already have. In this sense, we must ask ourselves, for example, if our policies and strategies related to Indigenization and internationalization lead us to outcomes and metrics that are different from what we are used to. It is not enough for us to unravel practices that hinder transformative Indigenization and internationalization if the end result is that we just take those same threads and tie them all back together again, just in a different pattern. We must at times discard threads, find and add new

ones, and seek together a process of entwining them that is a co-creation, engaging with people with whom we are, and are not, in agreement. We also must be prepared to unravel and entwine the policy and strategy again and again, knowing that it is our role, as transformative intercultural practitioners to ensure that our students and colleagues do not, in the process, become unraveled themselves.

To undertake such creativity in our work, and to ask our students and colleagues to do so in the gatherings that we co-create together, requires of us a certain degree of courage. To allow for such courage to be expressed, we must be prepared also to sense the pain and suffering that some of our students and colleagues may have survived. We must be prepared to engage and question the privilege of those whose courage is worn as entitlement. We must have courage to question and delve deeply into the freedom that allows us to explore new horizons of shared intention. We must ensure that our frameworks for policy and strategy provide for such courage, in the expression of freedom, to be deliberated and enacted.

As transformative intercultural practitioners, it is in this inter-personal ethics that we are held together as professionals, across roles and functions within our and across our institutions. Our lived, ethical relations with one another, grounded in the ways in which we seek belonging, gathering and freedom, must be expressed in related Indigenization and internationalization policy and strategy in ways that are and are not necessarily complementary. In our roles, we must be comfortable with the co-existence of these tensions and intersections, even as our work may reduce and increase them, equally and simultaneously. While we often and should celebrate our successes, we also cannot cease our sense of expectancy, as we recognize that there is always more to learn, always ways to creatively improve how we do what do we and there is always more work done, if we observe closely and courageously enough.

(Re)turnings

As I come to the close of this dissertation, I am struck by the overwhelming sense that there is always so much more reflection, research and writing to be done. Such incompleteness is, however, a symptom of a phenomenological methodology. As Rocha (2015) wrote, "[e]ven if we begin and end knowing-about" transformative Indigenization and internationalization, its exploration through "phenomenology must remain restless for knowing and understanding, gazing again and again into the lens" of *Being, subsistence and existence* "to find the impossible things we seek, sense, and see" (p. 31). As we have journeyed back down river and I have shared these *lines of flight* (Vagle, 2014), we have passed many tributaries and forks in the river, places where I could sense an origin, variation, or a completely different pathway related to the questions of my dissertation.

One of these untaken *lines of flight* is the manner in which Indigenization and internationalization policy and strategy documents are written, as experiential material. By this, I mean that such documents, when placed in comparison and contrast to one another reflect quite different policy horizons. I originally began such an analysis of related policy and strategy documents as part of this research project. I selected policies and strategies from four universities that had current documents for both Indigenization and internationalization, and began a textual analysis. I struggled, however, to integrate this analysis into this research, as I found the experiential material shared by my participants to require a great deal of interpretive analysis and reflection, in and of themselves. Nonetheless, I could see in my initial analysis of these policy and strategy documents that such a research project would be worthwhile, insofar as they open to the critical nature of discourse in relation to policy enactment (Fischer, 2003).

Another potential area of research that I observed in my interviews revealed itself in the number of paired interviews that I undertook. In these paired interviews, the participants interacted with one another in ways that signaled a unique relationality of transformative intercultural practice. These pairings included Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal colleagues who worked closely together, in deliberating and enacting Indigenization-related matters of policy and strategy. Even if not interviewed in pairs, however, many participants also spoke of such similar pairings in their interviews, sustained across cultural and/or organizational differences, including role and function. I began to wonder, as I reflected upon their interviews, if there was not more to learn from these pairings of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal, as well as international and non-international faculty, staff and students, in their co-creation of transformative Indigenization and internationalization.

On the other hand, I also could see, in many instances, significant differences between how participants described their deliberations and enactments of Indigenization and internationalization. I bridled my reflections on my own day-to-day work and focused my analysis upon the lived experience of transformative intercultural practice across Indigenization and internationalization, and thus, I did not fully examine the distinctions between them. This approach was intentional, as I aimed to find what was common to our lived experiences as transformative intercultural practitioners. Nonetheless, there are fundamental divergences, especially with regards to the work of de-colonization, that cannot and should not be ignored. De-colonization, while expressed as a fundamental goal of many participants, remained aspirational, enacted incrementally. Such a gradual, inter-connected, pragmatic approach to the de-colonization of higher education is something that I could sense infused the expectant persistence and of many participants. While there are pervasive structural barriers to de-

colonization in higher education, after completing this research, I believe there is potential for a cautiously optimistic research agenda that focuses on incremental de-colonizing practices.

Over the course of the past year, I did find myself travelling up a tributary related to this notion of incremental Indigenization. I began to see threads of experience related to the deliberation and enactment of reconciliation in higher education. As I pulled these strands together, I began to form ideas that eventually resulted in a separate book chapter on the topic of the deliberation of reconciliation, soon to be published. This writing project drew me away from my dissertation, extending my process by at least three months, all told. However, this project also introduced me to new perspectives on my research and writing, holding up my analysis to peer review and requiring me to delve deeper into notions of kindness and deliberative democracy as they relate to reconciliation. From my research and writing of this book chapter, I have come to believe there is much work to be done in exploring the work of reconciliation from looking specifically at established reconciliation experiential learning programs, such as the KAIROS Blanket Exercise[3], to exploring the lived experiences of faculty, students and staff involved in reconciliation education programs such those offered by Canadian Roots Exchange[4].

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, throughout my research and writing, I came to see potential connections with Indigenous philosophies, traditional knowledges, and cultural practices. Throughout their interviews, the Indigenous participants involved in this study shared how their rootedness in Elder teachings and cultural knowledge and practices informs their work and relations with non-Indigenous students and colleagues. At one point in my writing, I

---

[3] The KAIROS Blanket Exercise™ is an experiential reconciliation education activity that traces the history of colonization in the Canadian context. For more information, please see: https://www.kairosblanketexercise.org/

[4] The Canadian Roots Exchange is a non-profit organization that develops and organizes reconciliation-based exchanges and experiential learning opportunities for and by youth. For more information, please see: http://canadianroots.ca/

considered trying to integrate what I saw as connections with such concepts as the Cree notion of miyo-wîcêhtowin, translated as "the principle of getting along well with others" or "good relations" (Cardinal & Hildebrandt, 2000). In my discussions with Indigenous mentors, I realized that making such connections would contradict my positionality as a settler-ally. I have not written this dissertation with a presumption that my analysis represents lived meanings of Aboriginal teachings and cultural knowledges, nor of their potential inter-relation with the work of co-creating spaces for transformative approaches to Indigenization and internationalization on our campuses. I have, rather, tried to focus on the work of transformative intercultural practice, as it is experienced across role and function at institutions of higher education. Nonetheless, I feel there is a strong rationale for considering carefully, with mutuality and respect, how Aboriginal philosophical concepts can shape our institutional policy and strategy, both for Indigenization and internationalization. I believe that such research, grounded in Indigenous Research Methodologies, could serve as a means to reform and strengthen the foundations of higher education institutional governance, including how related policy and strategy are deliberated and enacted.

In sharing these potential, further pathways of research, I also acknowledge the limitations of this particular study. What could be further researched, could also be seen as a gap in my methodology and analysis. What I have come to learn through this study is provisional. I have only interviewed a small sample of faculty, staff and students, within a particular context. Along the way, I lost potential participants who felt that they couldn't share their experiences, out of concern that they would be identifiable due to their particularly strong positions or due to their roles as leaders, whether that be students, staff or faculty. I also did not explore the voices of those who may approach Indigenization and internationalization in more dominant,

established perspectives that reinforce the status-quo. My utilization of an interpretive research methodology grounded in post-intentional phenomenology is also open to the kinds of critique that I outlined in Chapter 3, especially considering this lack of involvement of those with more dominant, and more radical, or outsider viewpoints.

While this delimitation was intentional for the purposes of this study, it is visible throughout this dissertation. This (in)visibility may be predicated upon what is and isn't included in such a potentially controversial concept of transformative intercultural practice, a term that has evolved over the course of this research. I have, nonetheless, used this in a manner that remains open to signification, insofar as it reflects what is being done, with creativity and courage, in relation to transformative Indigenization and internationalization. As such, what is an underlying limitation of this study may also serve as its uniqueness and potential value. While the breadth and diversity of participants and inclusion of what constitutes transformative intercultural practice may have almost stretched the bounds of a single interpretive policy analysis, that same breadth and diversity opened to what I sensed as being a possible "common world" of belonging within the policy horizons of our institutions (Arendt, 1958).

Necessary choosing

This stretching of the boundaries of this interpretive research study, as in the tensions of the saying and doing of transformative intercultural practice, has required, and continues to require making choices about what to include and exclude. To partake in a study of this nature is to recognize that in writing this study, I am "involved in a community" of practitioners whose "speech acts" are, in their own ways, rule bound and "shaped by conventions" that enable us "to convey meanings" which create "pointers that allow" us "to do things or get things done" (Ahmed, 2012, p. 81). As Ahmed (2012) concluded,

A community can take shape through the circulation of diversity. Diversity does not refer us to something (a shared object that exists outside of speech) or even necessarily create something that can be shared. But in being spoken and repeated in different contexts a world takes shape around diversity. To speak a language of diversity is to participate in the creation of a world. (Ahmed, 2012, p. 81)

Ahmed's (2012) articulation of the how it is that, in the saying of diversity, we participate in its co-creation returns us back to the second chapter in this dissertation. In that chapter, I explored, in much detail, the seemingly mundane act of sitting with an international student each Friday on a bench. Walking past me and the student on that late summer day, a passerby might not have any clue what it is we were discussing. And yet, in the moment that the student tells me she feels as if she is a silver ball on a wooden labyrinth, her experience signifies what it can feel like to live in the common world of our institution, lived uniquely, or (un)commonly. In that space of immanent vulnerability with the student, I cannot avoid making choices in how to act and react, and in doing so, in co-creating with her, and all persons involved in her situation, a common world in which we make choices together. In the words of Nancy (2007),

To create the world means: immediately, without delay, re-opening each possible struggle for a world, that is, for what must form the contrary of a global injustice against the background of general equivalence. But this means to conduct this struggle precisely in the name of the fact that this world is coming out of nothing, that there is nothing before it and it is without models, without principle and without given end, and it is precisely what forms the justice and the meaning of the world. (Nancy, 2007, pp. 54-55).

Transformative Indigenization and internationalization, lived through our day-to-day transformative intercultural practices, demands of us the constancy of our ongoing engagement in forming and re-forming "models" and "principle[s]" that underlie "the justice and meaning of" our institutional policy and strategy (Nancy, 2007, p. 54-55). If we accept this perspective, we must admit that there is no differentiation of the necessity of choice by levels of authority. As transformative intercultural practitioners, we are each responsible in our roles to make choices

that require of us both a sense of this reasonableness of a "common world" (Arendt, 1958, p. 52)

and a certain degree of risk in "each possible struggle for a world" (Nancy, 2007, p. 55). We

cannot just copy others in the choices we make, as each of our choices is contextual, is drawn

from our experience and knowledge, and impacts our future choices. And yet, in making our

choices, we must also consider the ways in which our policies and strategies pre-determine what

we think we can choose from, like a weathered map that may not have all trails marked.

In the context of "political polarization, growing diversity, and fragmentation" in our

society and within our organizations, Indigenization and internationalization certainly present us

with difficult, necessary choices to be made (Hackworth, 2014, p. 8). As a response to this

context, Hackworth (2014) argues that "the labyrinth, as a mandala, suggests a refocusing on re-

centering and discerning a common path" that can be taken by leaders and administrators within

their organizational contexts (p. 8). As metaphor for our organizational structures, Kociatkewicz

& Kostera (2015) argue that while we may "emphasize the size, majesty or ingenuity of the

presented labyrinth" of our institutions, the labyrinth "builder" perspective can take on a sense

that our institutions are "structure[s]" which "[do] not affect [our] identit[ies]" (Kociatkewicz &

Kostera, 2015, p. 65) If we take this perspective, we ultimately reject aspects of our institutional

structures and cultures that are deemed "not sufficiently rational, straightforward or, indeed,

reasonable" (Kociatkewicz & Kostera, 2015, p. 66). Alternatively, as transformative intercultural

practitioners who must navigate these labyrinths of our institutions, we are akin to "the

wanderer[s] who can expect to experience the labyrinth, and to be affected (perhaps even

transformed) by the encounter" (p. 65).

Ultimately, we may more often than not find that delineations between builder/wanderer,

teacher/student, faculty/administrator fall apart when we consider the day-today lived meaning of

our work in transformative Indigenization and internationalization. As explored in Chapter 2, in the context of an intercultural community of academic life, the lived, seemingly (ir)rational, (non)-linear and (un)reasonable experience of the *being with of Being* in the *making sense of sense* cannot be ignored (Nancy, 2003). As explored in this dissertation, such policy and strategy sense-making needs to "be acknowledged, considered and, finally, integrated, as simply ignoring the labyrinthine will not make its presence disappear" (Kociatkewicz & Kostera, 2015, p. 66).

As explored in this dissertation, embodying such acknowledgement is not as easy as it is to name it. To do so, we must consider how it is that we walk the labyrinths of transformative Indigenization and internationalization, as both a single, winding path and as a maze of multiple corridors. Ingold (2013) differentiated between these two types of journeying, as follows:

> In walking the labyrinth, […] choice is not an issue. The path leads, and the walker is under an imperative to go where it takes him. […] The maze puts all the emphasis on the traveller's intentions. He has an aim in mind, a projected destination or horizon of expectations, a perspective to obtain, and is determined to reach it. (p. 9)

For Ingold (2013), both the labyrinth and the maze necessitate choices that we must make. Following this analogy, when we experience our work as evolving our certainties, it is as if we seek to reflectively follow a single path together. In taking this path, we must contend with the "attentional" demand to not lose the path by becoming distracted, by getting drawn into heated conflict or becoming caught up in tangential, superficial initiatives (Ingold, 2013, p. 9). As Ingold (2013) wrote, when walking a single path, "[s]imply put, you have to watch your step, and to listen and feel as well" (p. 9). At the same time, when we experience our work as enduring liminality, it is as if we enter into a landscape with limitless possible pathways. We can find ourselves "wrapped up in the space of [our] own deliberations" to "decide which way to go" (Ingold, 2013, p. 9) in relation to the enactment of transformative Indigenization and internationalization policy and strategy.

In our work as transformative intercultural practitioners, it seems as if we must walk both the labyrinth and the maze with our colleagues and students. In each instance, we experience a necessary *intentional* or *attentional* choosing (Ingold, 2013), in a manner that demands *discernment*. Artress (2006) noted that discernment is "an important element of the labyrinth experience that cannot be overlooked" for the labyrinth, as a meditative practice can also be "a safe territory for many who feel they are unraveling at the seams: it is a place to order chaos and calm the frightened heart" (p. 165). Co-creating spaces of deliberating and enacting transformative Indigenization and internationalization in higher education opens to and demands that we attend to such a sense and space of discernment. As Andreotti (2015) wrote, cited at the outset of this chapter, our work demands of us to "disarm and de-center ourselves and displace our desires and cognitive obsessions to wake up and grow up to face a plural, undefined, wonderful and terrifying world which inevitably brings both pain and joy" (p. 227). To undertake this challenge "without turning our back to violences we have inflicted upon" our world requires of us, in our day-today work, that we have co-created such spaces of discernment, beginning with belonging, where we, our colleagues and students feel welcomed and supported (Andreotti, 2015, p. 227).

The participants in this research, I believe, speak to the lived experience of undertaking of this critical challenge that Andreotti (2015) described of our current age. Returning to the stories and reflections of my participants over the past months has been, for me, a unique, personal and valued space of discernment and belonging, in and of itself. In a real sense, this dissertation is a culmination of an extensive exploration of the lived experience of transformative intercultural practitioners who wish to seek, are themselves seeking, or have sought, such discernment and spaces of belonging themselves. Most importantly, it is my hope that what I

have written in these pages has somehow resonated with practitioners in higher education who share similar intention and attention to the co-creation of transformative Indigenization and internationalization on their campuses, and, as transformative intercultural practice, extending into their broader communities.

References

Abdi, A. (2009). De-Monoculturalizing global citizenship education: The need for multicentric intentions and practices. In *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: Theories, practices, policies,* L. Shultz, A. Abdi, and G. Richardson (Eds.), 25-39. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Acknowledgement. (2017). *Merriam-Webster.* Retrieved at: https://www.merriam-webster.com/

Adams, C. & Thompson, T. (2014). Speaking with things: Encoded researchers, social data, and other posthuman concoctions. *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory, 14*(3), 342-361. DOI: 10.1080/1600910X.2013.838182.

Ahern, K. (1999). Pearls, pith, and provocation: Ten tips for reflexive bracketing. *Qualitative Health Research, 9*(3), 407-411.

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ahnee-Benham M. & Napier, L. (2002). An alternative perspective on educational leadership for change: Reflections on Native/Indigenous ways of knowing. In K. Leithwood & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Second international handbook of educational leadership and administration,* 133-166. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Alfred, T. (2004). Warrior scholarship: Seeing the university as a ground of contention. In D. Mihesuah & A. Wilson (Eds.), *Indigenizing the academy: Transforming scholarship and empowering communities*, 88-99. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska.

Allen, R. & Rossatto, C. (2009). Does critical pedagogy work with privileged students? *Teacher Education Quarterly, Winter,* 163-180.

Allow. (2017). *Merriam-Webster.* Retrieved at: https://www.merriam-webster.com/

Altbach, P. & de Wit, H. (2015). Internationalization and global tension: Lessons from history. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 19*(1), 4-10.

Alvesson, M. & Sköldberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Andreotti, V. (2011). *Actionable postcolonial theory in education.* New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Andreotti, V. (2013a). Renegotiating epistemic privilege and enchantments with modernity: the gain in the loss of the entitlement to control and define everything. *Social Policy, Education and Curriculum Research Unit.* North Dartmouth: Centre for Policy Analyses/UMass Dartmouth, pp. b-s. Retrieved December 21, 2014 at:

http://www.umassd.edu/media/umassdartmouth/seppce/edleadership/Vanessa_Oliveira_Andreotti_Paper.pdf

Andreotti, V. (2013b, November). *Hospicing Western modernity in global citizenship education.* Keynote presentation at the Centre for Global Citizenship and Education Research Conference, Edmonton, Alberta.

Andreotti, V. (2015). Global citizenship education otherwise. In A. Abdi, L. Shultz & T. Pillay (Eds.), *Decolonizing global citizenship education,* 221-236. Boston, MA: Sense Publishers.

Andreotti, V., Stein, S., Ahenakew, C. & Hunt, D. (2015). Mapping interpretations of decolonization in the context of higher education. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 4*(1), 21-40.

Association of Canadian Deans of Education. (2010). *Accord on Indigenous Education.*

Delta, BC: Association of Canadian Deans of Education. Retrieved at: http://csse-

scee.ca/acde/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2017/08/Accord-on-Indigenous-Education.pdf

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) (2013). *Creating*

opportunities in education for Aboriginal students. Ottawa, ON: AUCC. Retrieved at:

https://www.univcan.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/aboriginal-students-report-2013.pdf

Appadurai, A. (2000). Grassroots globalization and the research imagination. *Public*

Culture, 12(1), 1-19.

Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Artress, L. (2006). *Walking a sacred path: Rediscovering the labyrinth as a spiritual*

practice. New York, NY: The Berkeley Publishing Group.

Assailly, K. (2012). *Evolution of Saskatchewan's recruitment, employment and*

immigration policies for international students within the context of Canadian federalism. M.A.

Thesis, Department of Political Studies, University of Saskatchewan.

Attend. (2017a). *Merriam-Webster.* Retrieved at: https://www.merriam-webster.com/

Attend. (2017b). *Etymology Online.* Retrieved at: http://www.etymonline.com/

Bakhtin, M. (1993). *Toward a philosophy of the act.* V. Liapunov & M. Holquist (Eds.).

V. Liapunov (Trans.). Austin, TX: University Texas Press.

Bates, R. (2006). Educational administration and social justice. *Education, citizenship*

and social justice,1 (2), 141-156.

Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit.* Saskatoon,

SK: Purich Publishing.

Beck, K. (2013). Making sense of internationalization. In Y. Hébert & A. Abdi (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on Higher Education,* 43-59. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Bedinger, Lisa. (2011). Let's Talk: Dialogue and Deliberation in Higher Education. In R. Lohmann & J. Van Til (Eds.), *Resolving Community Conflicts and Problems: Public Deliberation and Sustained Dialogue*, 59-76. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2011.

Bhandari, R. & Blumenthal, P. (2011). Global student mobility and the twenty-first century silk road: National trends and new directions. In *International students and global mobility in higher education,* R. Bhandari & P. Blumenthal (Eds.), 1-23. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Biesta, G. (2013). *The beautiful risk of education.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Bess, J. & Dee, J. (2008). *Understanding college and university education: Theories for effective policy and practice.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Press.

Blackmore, J. (2006). Deconstructive diversity discourses in the field of educational \ management and leadership. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership, 34*(2), 181-199.

Bogden, R. & Biklen, S. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods.* (4th Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Brandenburg, U. & De Wit, H. (2011). The end of internationalization. *International Higher Education, 62*, 15-17.

Borges, J. (1964). *Labyrinths: Selected stories and other writings.* D. Yates and J. Irby, (Eds.) New York, NY: New Directions Publishing Company.

Bourdieu, P. (1997). Selections from the logic of practice. In A. Schrift (Ed.), *The logic of the gift: Toward an ethic of generosity*, 190-230. New York, NY: Routledge.

Brewer, E. & Cunningham, K. (2009a). Capturing study abroad's transformative

potential. In E. Brewer & K. Cunningham (Eds.), *Integrating study abroad into the curriculum:*

Theory and practice across the disciplines, 1-20. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Brewer, E. & Cunningham, K. (2009b). Capacity building for study abroad integration.

In *Integrating study abroad into the curriculum: Theory and practice across the disciplines,* E.

Brewer & K. Cunningham (Eds.), 209-221. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Brown, B. & Baker, S. (2007). *Rethinking universities: The social functions of higher*

education. Continuum: New York, NY.

Canadian Bureau of International Education. (2015). *A world of learning: Canada's*

performance and potential in international education. Ottawa, ON: CBIE. Retrieved at:

https://cbie.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/A-World-of-Learning-HI-RES-2016.pdf

Cardinal, H. & Hildrebrandt, W. (2000). *Treaty elders of Saskatchewan: Our dream is*

that one day our peoples will one day be clearly recognized as nations. Calgary, AB: University

of Calgary Press.

Care, N. (2000). *Decent People.* New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Castañeda, C. (2004). *Teaching and learning in diverse classrooms: Faculty reflections*

on their experiences and pedagogical practices of teaching diverse populations. New York, NY:

RoutledgeFarmer.

Chickering, A. & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity.* (2nd ed.)*.* San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass.

Clark, I. & Norrie, K. (2013). Research and reluctance in improving higher education.

In P. Axelrod, R. Trilokekar, T. Shanahan & R. Wellen (Eds.), *Making policy in turbulent times:*

Challenges and prospects for higher education, pp. 189-217. Kingston, ON: Queen's University Press.

Clegg, S. & Rowland, R. (2010). Kindness in pedagogical practice and academic life. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 31*(6), 719-735.

Council of Standards Australia & New Zealand. (2009). *Risk management: Principles and guidelines.* SAI Global.

Cox, H. & Strange, C. (2010). (Eds.) *Achieving student success: Effective student services in Canadian higher education.* Montreal, QC: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Cranton, P. (2006). *Understanding and promoting transformative learning: A guide for educators of adults,* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Creswell, J. & Clark, V. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Crosby, A. (2010). The International Student Experience in Canadian Post-secondary Education: Democratic racism, anti-racism education, and internationalization at home. *Our Schools, Our Selves, 19*(3), 399-413.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Dahlberg, K. (2006). The essence of essences – The search for meaning structures in phenomenological analysis of lifeworld phenomena. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Wellbeing, 1,* 11 – 19.

Dallafar, A., Kingston-Mann, E. & Sieber, T. (Eds.) (2011). Transforming classroom culture: Inclusive pedagogical practices. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Day, R. (2000). *Multiculturalism and the history of Canadian diversity.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Day, R. (2010). Angry Indians, settler guilt, and the challenges of decolonization and resurgence. In L. Simpson & K. Ladner (Eds.), *This is an honour song: Twenty years since the blockades,* pp. 261-270. Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Deardorff, D. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 10*, 241-266.

Deliberate. (2017). *Etymology online.* Retrieved at: http://www.etymonline.com/

Deliberation. (2017a). *Merriam-Webster.* Retrieved at: https://www.merriam-webster.com/

Deliberation. (2017b). Invite. (2017b). *Etymology online.* Retrieved at: http://www.etymonline.com/

Douglass, L. (2016). Embodying Authenticity in Higher Education. In J. Cohen, J. Gammel & A. Riley (Eds.), *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *147*, 107 – 115.

Dua, K. (2009). On the effectiveness of anti-racist policies in Canadian universities: Issues of implementation of policies by senior administration. In F. Henry & C. Tator (Eds.), *Racism in the Canadian university: Demanding social justice, inclusion, and equity*, 160-196. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Dwyer, M. (2004). More is better: The impact of study abroad program duration. *Frontiers: interdisciplinary journal of study abroad, 10,* 151-163.

Eason, C. (2004). *The complete guide to labyrinths: Using the sacred spiritual for power, protection, transformation and healing.* Toronto, ON: The Crossing Press.

Eastwood, C. (2009). *Invictus.* United States: Spyglass Entertainment.

Ehrich, L. (2003). Phenomenology: The quest for meaning. In T. O'Donoghue & K. Punch (Eds.), *Qualitative educational research in action: Doing and reflecting*. 42-69. New York, NY: Routledge Farmer.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 59*(3), 297-324.

Erman, E. (2007). Conflict and universal moral theory: From reasonableness to reason-giving. *Political Theory, 35 (5),* 598-623.

Ermine, W. (2007). The ethical space of engagement. *Indigenous Law Journal, 6(1),* 193-203.

Evans, J. & Davies, B. (2012). Embodying policy concepts. *Discourse: Studies in Cultural Politics of Education, 33*(5), 617-634.

Farrington, D. & Palfreyman, D. (2006). *The law of higher education.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Ferrer, J., Romero, M., Albareda, R. (2010). Integral transformative education: A participatory proposal. In S. Esborn-Hargens, J. Reams & O. Gunnlausen, (Eds.), *Integral education: New directions for higher education,* 79-104. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Fischer, F. (2003). *Reframing public policy: Discursive politics and deliberative practices.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Fischer, F. (2009). *Democracy & expertise: Reorienting policy inquiry.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

FitzMaurice, K. (2011). Transgressing the boundaries of Native Studies: Traces of 'White Paper' policy in academic patterns of Indigenization. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies, 31*(2), 63-77.

Ford, Terry. (1999). *Becoming multicultural: Personal and social construction through critical teaching.* New York, NY: Palmer Press.

Forester, John. (1999). *The deliberative practitioner: Encouraging participatory planning processes.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Fraser, N. (2009). *Scales of justice: Reimagining political space in a globalized world.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Freeman, R. & Sturdy, S. (2016). Introduction: Knowledge in policy – embodied, inscribed, enacted. In R. Freeman & S. Sturdy (Eds.), *Knowledge in policy: Embodied, inscribed, enacted,* 1-18. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Gadamer, H.-G. (1977). *Philosophical hermeneutics.* Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Gadamer, H.-G. (2004/1975). *Truth and method* (J. Weinsheimer & D. Marshall, Trans.). New York, NY: Continuum. (Original work published in 1975).

Gadja, A. (2009). *The trials of academe: The new era of campus litigation.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gaudry, A. & Lorenz, D. (2018). Indigenization as inclusion, reconciliation, and decolonization: Navigating the different visions for indigenizing the Canadian Academy. *AlterNative, 14*(3), 218-227.

Gornitzka, Å. Kyvik, S. & Stensaker, B. (2005). Implementation analysis in higher education. In Å. Gornitzka, M. Kogan & A. Amaral (Eds.). *Reform and change in higher education: Analysing policy implementation,* 35-56. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Government of Saskatchewan. (2012). *Plan for growth: Vision 2020 and beyond.* Regina, SK: Government of Saskatchewan. Retrieved at:

http://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/budget-planning-and-reporting/plan-for-growth

Government of Saskatchewan. (2014). *International Education Strategy.* Regina, SK: Government of Saskatchewan. Retrieved at: http://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/news-and-media/2014/november/24/international-education-strategy

Greene, M. (1996). *Releasing the imagination.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Greene, M. (1988). The *dialectic of freedom.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Grossman, R. (1984). *Phenomenology & existentialism: An introduction.* New York, NY: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Guerrero, L. (Ed.) (2008). *Teaching race in the 21st century: College teachers talk about their fears, risks, and rewards.* New York: NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Halfe, L. (1998). *Blue Marrow: Poems.* Toronto, ON: McClelland & Stewart.

Hamrick, W. (2002). *Kindness and the Good Society: Connections of the Heart.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hamrick, F., Evans, N. & Shuh, J. (2002). *Foundations of student affairs practice: How philosophy, theory and research strengthen educational outcomes.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Harper, D. (n.d.). *Etymology Online Dictionary.* Retrieved at:

http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?allowed_in_frame=0&search=understand

Heidegger, M. (1993). The question concerning technology. In D. Krell (Ed.), *Basic*

writings. San Francisco, CA: Harper San Francisco. Reprinted from *The question concerning*

technology and other essays, W. Lovitt, Trans., 1977, New York: Harper & Row.

Heidegger, M. (2000). *Introduction to metaphysics,* (G. Fried & R. Polt, Trans.). New

Haven,

CT: Yale University Press. (Original work published in 1935).

Hoggan, C. (2016). Transformative learning as a metatheory: Definition, criteria, and

typology. *Adult Education Quarterly, 66,* 57-75.

Hoggan, C. Mälkki, K & Finnegan, F. (2017). Developing the theory of perspective

transformation: Continuity, intersubectivity, and emancipatory praxis. *Adult Education*

Quarterly, 67(1), 48-64.

HumanLibrary[TM]. (2018). *Human Library.* HumanLibrary.org. Retrieved at:

www.humanlibrary.org.

Hudzik, J. (2015*). Comprehensive internationalization: Institutional pathways to*

success. New York, NY: Routledge.

Heidegger, M. (2010). *Being and time.* Albany, NY: State University of New York

Press. (Original work published in 1953).

Henry, F. & Tator, C. (2009). Theoretical perspectives and manifestations of racism in

the academy. In F. Henry & C. Tator (Eds.), *Racism in the Canadian university: Demanding*

social justice, inclusion, and equity, 22-59. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope.* New York, NY: Routledge.

hooks, b. (2009). *Belonging: A culture of place.* New York, NY: Routledge.

hooks, b. (2010). *Teaching critical thinking: Practical wisdom.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Honneth, A. (1995). *The struggle for recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Hughes, A. (1984). *Religious imagery in the theatre of Tirso de Molina.* Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.

Husserl, E. (2002a). The phenomenology of time consciousness. In D. Morgan & T. Mooney (Eds.), *The Phenomenology Reader*, 109-123. New York, NY: Routledge. (Reprinted from *The phenomenology of time consciousness,* 50-80, 1964, Bloomington, IN: Indian University Press.

Husserl, E. (2002b). The way into phenomenological transcendental philosophy by inquiring back from the pregiven lifeworld (D. Carr, Trans.). In D. Morgan & T. Mooney (Eds.), *The Phenomenology Reader*, 151-174. New York, NY: Routledge. (Reprinted from *The crisis of European sciences and transcendental philosophy: An introduction to phenomenological inquiry*, 103-137, 1970, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Husserl, E. (2002c). Pure phenomenology, its method, and its field of investigation (R. Jordan, Trans.). In D. Morgan & T. Mooney (Eds.), *The Phenomenology Reader*, 124-133. New York, NY: Routledge. (Reprinted from *Husserl: Shorter works,* 10-17, by P. McCormick & F. Elliston, Eds., 1981, Notre Dame, IN/Brighton: University of Notre Dame/Harvester Press.)

Husserl, E. (2002d). Noesis and Noema (F. Kersten, Trans.) In D. Morgan & T. Mooney (Eds.), *The Phenomenology Reader*, 134-150. New York, NY: Routledge. (Reprinted from *Ideas*

pertaining to a pure phenomenology and to a phenomenological philosophy: First book, 211-235, 1983, The Hague: Nijhoff.)

Ihde, D. (1990). *Technology and the lifeworld: From garden to earth.* Bloomington, IA: Indiana University Press.

Indignation. (2018). *Merriam-Webster.* Retrieved at: https://www.merriam-webster.com/

Ingold, T. (2013). The maze and the labyrinth: walking and the education of attention. In *Walk-on: From Richard Long to Janet Cardiff*, 7-11. University of Sunderland: Art Editions North. Retrieved at: https://issuu.com/stereographic/docs/walkon_for_issuu

Invite. (2017a). *Merriam-Webster.* Retrieved at: https://www.merriam-webster.com/

Invite. (2017b). *Etymology online.* Retrieved at: http://www.etymonline.com/

Jacket may be clue in missing student case. (2012, February 9). CBC News. Retrieved Dec. 7, 2013 at:

http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatchewan/jacket-may-be-clue-in-missing-student-case-1.1166990

Jefferess, D. (2008). Global citizenship and the cultural politics of benevolence. *Critical literacy: Theories and practices, 2(1),* 27-36.

Jones, E. (Ed.) (2010). *Internationalisation and the student voice.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Jorgensen, S. (2011). Negotiating the complexity within: Tensions, issues and possibilities of education for global citizenship abroad.   In *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: Theories, practices, policies,* L. Shultz, A. Abdi, and G. Richardson (Eds), 184-196. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Kaplin, W. & Lee, B. (2009). *A legal guide for student affairs professionals* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Keating, A. (2007). *Teaching transformation: Transcultural classroom dialogues.* New York NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Killick, D. (2015). *Developing the global student: Higher education in an era of globalization.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Kim, R. (2008). Teaching race at Anti-Berkeley and beyond. In L. Guerrero (Ed.), *Teaching race in the 21st century: College teachers talk about their fears, risks, and rewards*, 71-82. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 8*(5), 5-31.

Knight, J. (2007). Internationalization: Concepts, complexities and challenges. In *International handbook of higher education,* J. Forest & P. Altbach, (Eds.), 207-227. Dortrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Knight, J. (2008). *Higher education in turmoil: The changing world of internationalization.* Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Know. (2017). *Etymology online.* Retrieved at: http://www.etymonline.com/

Knowles, Ryan. & Clark, Christopher. (2018). How common is the common good? Moving beyond idealistic notions of deliberative democracy in education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 71,* 12-23.

Knutson, S. (2018). Internationalization and indigenization: Transforming Canadian higher education. In D. Proctor & L. E. Rumbley (Eds.), *the Future Agenda for Internationalization in Higher Education,* 52-61. London: Routledge.

Kociatkiewicz, J. & Kostera, M. (2015). Into the labyrinth: Tales of organizational nomadism. *Organizational Studies, 36 (1),* 55-71. DOI: 10.1177/0170840614546154

Konstan, D. & Russell, D. (2005). Introduction. In *Heraclitus; Homeric problems,* D. Konstan, & D. Russell (Eds. & Trans.). Atlanta, GA: The Society of Biblical Literature.

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

Kuh, G., Kinzie, J., Shuh, J., Whitt, E., & Associates. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter.* San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kuhn, T. (2014). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (4th Ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Kunin, R. & Associates. (2016). *Economic impact of international education in Canada – An update.* Vancouver, BC: RKA, Inc. Retrieved at:

http://www.international.gc.ca/education/report-rapport/impact-2016/index.aspx?lang=eng

Kuokkanen, R. (2007). *Reshaping the university: Responsibility, indigenous epistemes, and the logic of the gift.* Toronto, ON: UBC Press.

Ladner, K. & Simpson, L. (2010). This is an honour song. In L. Simpson & K. Ladner (Eds.), *This is an honour song: Twenty years since the blockade,* 1-10. Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Lambert, J. and Usher, A. (2013). *Internationalization and the domestic student experience.* Toronto, ON: Higher Education Strategy Associates.

Langlois, L. (2011). *The anatomy of ethical leadership: To lead our organizations in a conscientious and authentic manner* (D. Marcus, Trans.). Edmonton, AB: AU Press.

Lao Tzu. (2009). U. Leguin, (Trans.). *Lao Tzu: Tao Te Ching.* Boston, MA: Shambala.

Lasanowski, V. (2011). Can speak, will travel: The influence of language. In

International students and global mobility in higher education, R. Bhandari & P. Blumenthal

(Eds.), 193-210. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Latour, B. (2010). *On the modern cult of factish Gods.* Durham, NC: Duke University

Press.

Latour, B. (2013). *An inquiry into modes of existence: An anthropology of the moderns.*

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lee, J., & Rice, C. (2007). Welcome to America? International student perceptions of

discrimination. *Higher Education, 53,* 381-409.

Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity: Essays on exteriority* (A. Lingis, Trans.).

Pittsburg, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Levinas, E. (1998/1974). *Otherwise than being or beyond essence.* A. Lingis (Trans.).

Pittsburg, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Publications.

Lincoln, Y. (1995). Emerging criteria for quality qualitative and interpretative research.

Qualitative Inquiry, 1(3), 275-289.

Lopez, K., & Willis, D. (2004). Descriptive versus interpretative phenomenology: Their

contributions to nursing knowledge. *Qualitative Health Research, 14*(5), 726-735.

Lowman, E. & Barker, A. (2015). *Settler identity and colonialism in 21st century*

Canada. Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing.

Lu, Y. & Hou, F. (2015). *Insights on Canadian society: International students who become permanent residents.* Statistics Canada. Retrieved at: http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75-006-x/2015001/article/14299-eng.pdf

Mackey, E. (2016). *Unsettled expectations: Uncertainty, land and settler decolonization.* Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing.

MacKay, W. (2010). The lighthouse of equality: A 'guide' to inclusive schooling. In Manley-Casimir, M., and Manley-Casimir, K. (Eds.), *The Courts, the Charter, and the Schools: The Impact of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms on Educational Policy and Practice, 1982-2007*, 39-63. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Mamet, D. (1992). *Oleanna.* New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Mandela, N. (1995). *The long walk to freedom.* New York, NY: Little, Brown and Company.

Manley-Casimir, M. & Manley-Casimir, K. (2009). Change and stability: Assessing the impact of the *Charter* on educational policy and practice. In Manley-Casimir, M., and Manley-Casimir, K. (Eds.), *The Courts, the Charter, and the Schools: The Impact of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms on Educational Policy and Practice, 1982-2007*, 3-13. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Manning, K. Kinzie, J. & Shuh, J. (2006). *One size does not fit all: Traditional and innovative models of student affairs practice.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Maracle, L. (2015). *Talking to the diaspora.* Winnipeg, MB: ARP Books.

Marder, M. (2014). *Phenomena-critique-logos: The project of critical phenomenology.* New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield International.

Marginson, S., Nyland, C., Sawir, E. & Forbes-Mewett, H. (2010). *International student security.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Margison, S. & Sawir, E. (2011). *Ideas for intercultural education.* New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Mayberry, K. (Ed.) (1996). *Teaching what you're not: Identity politics in higher education.* New York, NY: New York University Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (2004). *Phenomenology of perception* (C. Smith, Trans.). New York, NY: Routledge. (Original work published 1945).

Mezirow J. (2000). Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformation theory. In J. Mezirow & Associates (Eds.), *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress*, 3-34. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mihesua, Joshua. (2004). Graduating Indigenous students by confronting the academic environment. In D. Mihesua & A. Wilson (Eds.), *Indigenizing the academy: Transforming scholarship and empowering communities,* 191 – 199. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press.

Mihesuah, D. & Wilson, A. (Eds.) (2004). *Indigenizing the academy: Transforming scholarship and empowering communities.* Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska.

Mintzberg, H. (1988). Crafting strategy. *The McKinsey Quarterly,* 71-90. Retrieved at: http://www.iuc-edu.eu/group/sem1_L3/2011%20STRATMAN/3R%20crafting%20strategy.pdf

Mintzberg, H. (2009). *Managing.* San Francisco, CA: Brent-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Missing student concerns Saudi Arabia. (2012, January 18). CBC News. Retrieved at: http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatchewan/missing-student-concerns-saudi-arabia-1.1141330

Missing U of S student "vanished" but search continues. (2012, January 12). CTV Saskatoon. Retrieved Dec. 7, 2013 from http://saskatoon.ctvnews.ca/missing-u-of-s-student-quot-vanished-quot-but-search-continues-1.752861

Montgomery, C. (2010). *Understanding the international student experience.* New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Morgan, M. (2016). *Levinas's ethical politics.* Bloomington, IA: Indiana University Press.

Morris, A. (2000). *The Treaties of Canada and with the Indians of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, including the negotiations on which they were based, and other information relating hereto.* Toronto, ON: Prospero.

Morse, J. & Richards, L. (2012). *Readme First: For a user's guide to qualitative methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Nagata, A. (2006). Transformative learning in intercultural education. *Rikkyo Intercultural Communication Review, 4,* pp. 39-60.

Nancy, J. L. (1997). *The sense of the world.* J. Librett, (Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: Minneapolis University Press.

Nancy, J.L. (2000). *Being singular plural.* R. Richardson & A. O'Byrne (Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Nancy, J. L. (2003). *A finite thinking.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press

Nancy, J. L. (2007). *The creation of the world or globalization* (F. Raffoul & D. Pettigrew, Trans.). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Nancy, J.-L. and Barrau, A. (2015). *What's these worlds coming to?* T. Holloway & F. Méchain (Trans.). New York, NY: Fordham University Press.

Northedge, A. (2003). Rethinking teaching in the context of diversity. *Teaching in Higher Education, 8* (1), 17-32.

Ocasio, W. (2015). Situated attention, loose and tight coupling, and the garbage can model. In *The Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice: Looking Forward at Forty, Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 36,* 293-317.

Oliver, P. (2010). *Understanding the research process.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Ottman, J. (2013). Indigenizing the academy: Confronting "contentious ground". *The Morning Watch: Indigenizing the Academy, 403*(3-4), 8-24. Retrieved at:

http://www.mun.ca/educ/faculty/mwatch/vol40/winter2013/indigenizingAcademy.pdf

Ovid. (1958). *The metamorphoses.* H. Gregory, Trans. New York, NY: Mentor Classic

Pal, L. (2014). *Beyond policy making: Public issue management in turbulent times.* Toronto, ON: Nelson Education.

Palfreyman, D. & McBride, D. (Eds.) (2007). *Learning and teaching across cultures in higher education.* New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Pidgeon, M. (2016). More than a checklist: Meaningful Indigenous inclusion in higher education. *Social Inclusion, 4*(1), 77-91.

Pillay, M. (2016). De-pathologising higher education curriculum. In M. Samuel, R. Dhunpath & N. Amin (Eds.) *Disrupting higher education curriculum: Undoing cognitive damage*, pp. 93-97. Boston, MA: Sense Publishers.

Pope, R. Reynolds, A. & Mueller, J. (2004). *Multicultural competence in student affairs.*

San Franscisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pope, R., Reynolds, A. & Mueller, J. (2014). *Creating multicultural change on campus.* San Franscisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rawls, J. (1999). *The law of peoples.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Refuse. (2017a). *Merriam-Webster.* Retrieved at: https://www.merriam-webster.com/

Refuse. (2017b). *Etymology online.* Retrieved at: http://www.etymonline.com/

Regan, P. (2010). *Unsettling the settler within: Indian residential schools, truth telling, and reconciliation in Canada.* Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.

Restoule, J.-P., Mashford-Pringle, A., Chacaby, M., Smillie, C. & Brunette, C. (2013). Supporting transitions to post-secondary education for Indigenous students: Lessons from an institutional ethnography in Ontario, Canada. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal, 4*(4), 1-12.

Rocha, S. (2015). *Folk phenomenology: Education, study and the human person.* Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications.

Rourke, L. & Kanuka, H. (2012). Student engagement and study abroad. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education, 38*(1), 1-12.

Rhoads, R. & Szeléni, K. (2011). *Global citizenship and the university: Advancing social life and relations in an interdependent world.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Rocha, S. (2014). *A primer for philosophy and education.* Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Rocha, S. (2015). *Folk phenomenology: Education, study and the human person.* Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications.

Sabatier, P. (2005). From policy implementation to policy change: A personal journey. Implementation analysis in higher education. In Å. Gornitzka, M. Kogan & A. Amaral (Eds.). *Reform and change in higher education: Analysing policy implementation,* 17-34. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Sahlins, M. (1997). The spirit of the gift. In A. Schrift (Ed.), *The logic of the gift: Toward an ethic of generosity*, 70-99. New York, NY: Routledge.

Sahlins, M. (2013). *What kinship is – and is not*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Samier, E. (2008). The problem of passive evil in educational administration: Moral implications of doing nothing. *International Studies in Educational Administration. Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management, 36* (1), 2-21.

Sanderson, G. (2004). Existentialism, globalization and the cultural other. *International Education Journal, 4*(4), 1-20.

Santos, B. S. (2007). *Beyond abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of knowledges.* Eurozine. Retreived at: www.eurozine.com/articles/2007-06-29-santos-en.html.

Saul, J.-R. (2008). *A fair country.* Toronto, ON: Viking Canada.

Saevi, T. (2011). Lived relationality as fulcrum for pedagogical-ethical practice. *Studies in Philosophy of Education, 30*, 455-461.

Scenters-Zapico, N. (2013). Crossing. *Prairie Schooner*, *87*(3), 59.

Schaap, A. (2005). *Political Reconciliation.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Schwartz-Shea, P. & Yanow, D. (2012). *Interpretive research design: Concepts and processes.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Scutt, C. & Hobson, J. (2013). The stories we need: Anthropology, philosophy, narrative and higher education research. *Higher Education Research and Development, 32*(1), 17-29.

Sehdev, R. (2010). Lessons from the bridge: On the possibilities of anti-racist feminist alliances in Indigenous spaces. In L. Simpson & K. Ladner (Eds.), *This is an honour song: Twenty years since the blockades,* 105 – 124. Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences.* New York, NY: The Teachers' College Press.

Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York, NY: Random House.

Shultz, L. (2011). Engaging the multiple discourse of global citizenship education within a Canadian university: Deliberation, contestation and social justice possibilities. In *Global citizenship education in post-secondary institutions: Theories, practices, policies,* L. Shultz, A. Abdi, and G. Richardson (Eds), 13-24. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Shultz, L. (2013). Exploring partnership principles and ethical guidelines for internationalizing post-secondary education. In Y. Hébert & A. Abdi (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on Higher Education,* pp. 75-87. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Silverman, D. (2005). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Siedman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Silverstein, S. (1964/1997). *The giving tree.* New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers. (Original publication in 1964).

Simpson, L. (2008). Oshkimaadiziig, the New People. In L. Simpson (Ed.), *Lighting the Eighth Fire: The liberation, resurgence, and protection of Indigenous nations,* 13-22. Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Simpson, A. (2014). *Mohawk Interruptus: Political life across the borders of settler states.* London, UK: Duke University Press.

Simpson, L. & Ladner, K. (Eds.) (2010). *This is an honour song: Twenty years since the blockades*. Winnipeg, MB: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

Smith, J., Flowers, P. & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretive phenomenological analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Smith, L. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples.* New York, NY: Zed Books.

Smith, W. & Foster, W. (2010). Equality in the schoolhouse: Has the Charter made a difference? In Manley-Casimir, M., and Manley-Casimir, K. (Eds.), *The Courts, the Charter, and the Schools: The Impact of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms on Educational Policy and Practice, 1982-2007*, 14-38. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Sobchak, V. (2006). Simple grounds: At home in experience. In E. Sellinger (Ed.), *Postphenomenology: A critical companion to Ihde*, 13-21. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Sarantakos, S. (2013). *Social research,* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Starratt, R. (2012). *Cultivating an ethical school.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Stein, S. (2017). Internationalization for an uncertain future: Tensions, paradoxes, and possibilities. *The Review of Higher Education, 41*(1), 3 – 32.

Steinhauer, E. (2002). Thoughts on an Indigenous research methodology. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 26*(2), 69-81.

Stone, Deborah. (2002). *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making.* New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Stonechild, B. (2006). *The new buffalo: The struggle for Aboriginal post-secondary education in Canada.* Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba Press.

Tannis, D. (2012). Reviving reasonableness: Expansive reason-giving and receiving for global social justice education. *Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry, 4*(2), 4 – 20.

Tender. (2017). *Merriam-Webster.* Retrieved at: https://www.merriam-webster.com/

Theohani, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance; Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(2), 221-258.

Timmermans, J. (2010). Changing our minds: The developmental potential of threshold concepts. In J. Meyer, R. Land & C. Baille (Eds.), *Threshold concepts and transformational learning,* 3-9. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission. (2012). *Canada, Aboriginal peoples and residential schools: They came for my children.* Winnipeg, MA: The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. Retrieved at:

http://www.myrobust.com/websites/trcinstitution/File/2039_T&R_eng_web%5B1%5D.pdf

Truth and Reconciliation Commission. (2015a). *The survivors speak: A report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.* Winnipeg, MA: The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. Retrieved at:

http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/Findings/Survivors_Speak_2015_05_30_web _o.pdf

Truth and Reconciliation Commission. (2015b). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to action.* Winnipeg, MA: Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Retrieved at: http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/Findings/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf

Turner, D. (2006). *This is not a Peace Pipe: Towards a critical indigenous philosophy.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Turner, Y. & Robson, S. (2008). *Internationalizing the university.* New York, NY: Continuum.

University of Saskatchewan. (2013). *Promise and potential: The third integrated plan, 2012-2016.* Saskatoon, SK: University of Saskatchewan.

University of Saskatchewan. (2018). Student headcount and demographics. Retrieved from: http://www.usask.ca/isa/statistics/students/headcount-demographics.php

Unterhalter, E. & Carpentier, V. (2010). *Global inequalities in higher education: Whose interests are we serving?* Palgrave MacMillan: London, UK.

Vagle, M. (2014). *Crafting phenomenological research.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

van Manen, M. (1991). *The tact of teaching: The meaning of pedagogical thoughtfulness.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

van Manen, M. (1997). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy.* London, ON: The Althouse Press.

van Manen, M. (2007). Phenomenology of practice. *Phenomenology & Practice, 1*(1), 11 – 30.

van Manen, M. (2014). *Phenomenology of practice: Meaning giving methods in phenomenological research and writing.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

van Manen, M. (2015). *Pedagogical tact: What to do when you don't know what to do.* Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Verbeek, P. (2006). The morality of things: A postphenomenological inquiry. In E. Sellinger (Ed.), *Postphenomenology: A critical companion to Ihde*, 117-130. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Vermette, D'Arcy. (2012). Inclusion is killing us. *Teaching Perspective, 17*, 18-20.

Wagenaar, H. (2011). *Meaning in action: Interpretation and dialogue in policy analysis.* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Waiser, B. (2005). *Saskatchewan: A new history.* Calgary, AB: Fifth House Ltd.

Washington, S. (2004). Bringing traditional teaching to leadership. *American Indian Quarterly, 28*(3/4), 583-603.

Watts, V. (2013). Indigenous place-thought & agency amongst humans and non-humans (First Woman and Sky Woman go on a European world tour!). *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 2*(1), 20 – 34.

Weick, K. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, *21,* 1-19.

Weingarten, H. (2013). How do governments really make higher education policy, and how can universities influence the policies governments make? An experience-based analysis. In P. Axelrod, R. Trilokekar, T. Shanahan & R. Wellen (Eds), *Making policy in turbulent times: Challenges and prospects for higher education,* 85-94. Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Wheatley, M. and Frieze, D. (2011). *Walk out walk on: A learning journey into communities daring to live the future.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Whitechurch, C. (2008a). Shifting identities and blurring boundaries: The emergence of *Third Space* professionals in UK higher education. *Higher Education Quareterly, 62*(4), 377-396.

Whitechurch, C. (2008b). Beyond administration and management: Changing professional identities in UK higher education. In R. Barnett & R. Di Napoli (Eds.), *Changing identities in higher education: Voicing perspectives,* 69-93. Routledge: New York, NY.

Whitechurch, C. (2013). *Reconstructing identities in higher education: The rise of third space professionals.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Wildavsky, B. (2010). *The great brain race: How global universities are reshaping the world.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Wison, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods.* Winnipeg, MB: Fernwood Publishing.

Wit, H. de (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States and Europe: Historical, comparative and conceptual analysis.* Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Wit,, H. de (2015). Quality assurance and internationalization: Trends, challenges and opportunities. Paper presented at International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education 2015 Biennial Conference, Chicago, ILL. Retrieved at: http://www.inqaahe.org/admin/files/assets/subsites/1/documenten/1430223517_tmfoi-keynote-dewit.pdf

Workman, L. (1992). The experience of policy. *Phenomenology + Pedagogy, 10,* 215 – 223.

Young, I. (1996). Communication and the other: Beyond deliberative democracy. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), *Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political*, 121-135. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Young, I. (2013). *Responsibility for justice.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.