

Glocalised Learning Spaces, Knowledge flows and Changing Landscapes

GERTRUDE SHOTTE

Middlesex University, United Kingdom

Received 15 February 2019; received in revised form 23 April 2019; accepted 26 April 2019

ABSTRACT The twenty first century has ushered in an era where glocalisation has become as inevitable as change is. People's reasons for operating within glocalised spaces are as multifaceted as the motives for making changes, which is an age-old practice. This paper explores glocalised learning spaces, knowledge flows and changing landscapes. It looks at how societal changes, brought about predominantly by the inescapable forces of globalisation and its resultant knowledge flows, have inspired shifting didactic perspectives and related transformations across societal, and by extension, teaching and learning landscapes. A literature-based approach, which is a qualitative technique, is the methodology chosen for the paper. A demerit of this approach is its dependence on other published work. The reliance here however is not total because personal experiences are used as supporting evidence for the discussion. An analysis of the literature reviewed reveals that knowledge flows and changes in a globalised world are unavoidable. The paper therefore asserts that the changes made should focus on benefitting entire societies because of the implications there are for sustainable education, sustainability and national development. Together with this assertion, the paper contends that societal institutions should take care to give the needed attention to the value of indigenous knowledge, including cultural notions of *buen vivir* and *ubuntu*, relatively new concepts in educational discourses, regarding accommodating them in the bound-to-happen transformations that living in a globalised world brings.

Keywords: glocalisation, globalisation, knowledge flows, change, indigenous epistemologies, global 'scapes', educational landscapes

A problem with global reasons cannot effectively be met with local measures – Carl Grip.

Knowing what to change, when to change, how to change and why the change should be changed is the product of an educated mind and glocalised knowledge flows - Gertrude Shotte.

A carefully constructed structure of education is supposed to smoothen the pursuit of knowledge, instead of restricting the flow of knowledge – Abhijit Naskar.

Introduction

The spirit of this favourite Latin expression, *tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis* – (English) *times change and we change with them*, permeates the entire paper. It finds resonance in the multiplicity of changes that have taken place in the teaching and learning environment over the centuries. Obviously, no single paper possesses the ca-

capacity to fully explore issues as all-encompassing and wide-ranging as those linked to knowledge flows and change across educational landscapes since the beginning of civilisation. Considering that glocalisation is central to the discussion, and recognising that glocalisation was introduced in the latter half of the 1980s to make clear that globalisation does not only involve “cultural homogenisation” but also has “heterogenising aspects” (Robertson, 2012, p.191), the main discussion confines itself to post-1980 occurrences, with earlier references as supporting evidence. The paper explores glocalised learning spaces, knowledge flows and changing landscapes. A similar stance, as taken in this paper, was initially prepared for presentation of a keynote address for the 2019 Bulgaria Comparative Education Society (BCES) international annual conference.

The word *change* and all its derivatives are probable the most uttered words in discourses and everyday exchanges around the world. Societal changes in post-war twentieth century have continued to recast themselves in post-modernistic scenes on a global scale. During the first decade of the twenty first century, some of those very changes have been changed and/or expanded to accommodate the rapid advancement in technology. The tentacular arms of globalisation have grasped nations in such an ambiguous manner, forcibly and open, yet voluntarily and covert, that I dare myself to think in terms of a *post* post-modernism.

The paper attempts to explore the globalised situations that are largely responsible for an increased flow of knowledge and the numerous, varied changes that have brought about modified perceptions in glocalised learning spaces. It contends that the upshot of globalisation is the root cause of the changing educational landscapes. To support the discussion, it relies on authors and researchers’ understandings and insights of knowledge flows, change, changing landscapes, globalisation, glocalisation, internationalisation of Higher Education (HE), and indigenous epistemologies (including indigenous knowledge (IK), *buen vivir* and *Ubuntu*). The methodology used is a literature-based approach. This approach makes allowance for the identification of “the essential attribute of materials” (Lin, 2009, p.179), as well as for the reviewing of “previous research findings to gain a broad understanding of the field” (Travis, 2016). Personal experiences are used alongside these perceptions to support the discussion. The aforementioned concepts are explained and interpreted within specific contexts and situations. The paper concludes with the recognition that knowledge flows and change in a glocalised world are inevitable but asserts that change should not be made simply to ‘jump on a band wagon’, but rather to serve and benefit particular societal organisations according to individual community needs. Within this assertion is the call for recognising indigenous knowledge as deserving of occupying a rightful place in the knowledge flow arena, alongside its conjoined concepts, *buen vivir* and *ubuntu*. These should be accommodated in the unavoidable transformations that nations undergo. The paper begins by providing a conceptual framework for the discussion.

Conceptualising the Concepts

Knowledge flows, change, landscapes, globalisation, glocalisation, internationalisation of HE, indigenous epistemologies (with links to IK, *buen vivir* and *Ubuntu*), are the main theoretical concepts that underpin the discussion. A brief explanation of these concepts provides an appropriate backdrop for the discussion.

Knowledge flows: Knowledge has an ever-present, ubiquitous nature. It does not originate from a single source, but is rather multidimensional and unlimited in scope.

Zhuge (2002, p.23) sees knowledge as the most precious property of any academic institution. Simply put, the flow of knowledge entails sharing information between two or more people, teams, organisations and the like. This can be described as a sender-receiver situation (Tasselli, 2015; Leistner, 2012).

The rapid spread of information technologies (IT), has necessitated the scrutiny of knowledge flows within all educational institutions. Stale and Major (2009) emphasise that the major distinguishing trait of an educational system “is its organization which is controlled by knowledge flow within learning processes”. They further assert that despite the invisibility of knowledge flow, it “plays an important role in educational processes and can enhance creativity and competitiveness of knowledge-intensive business processes (ibid). Nsamenang (2005) takes a similar view regarding the significance of knowledge flow in educational affairs but interprets this position within an African context. Nsamenang contends that glocalised forces have disrupted Africa’s capability to “own, generate and share knowledge”, a problem that is fuelled by Western legacies. An added implication is the need for paying attention to Africa’s ‘hidden’ local knowledge generation and expansion, is as acute as the need to embrace new technologies and related competencies.

Clearly, IT plays a crucial role in educational processes, particularly because distance, time and space are no longer a hindrance to sharing knowledge. As IT advances, it becomes an imperative for education systems to change in order to facilitate learning outcomes, including knowledge acquisition, via knowledge flows.

Change: An online Oxford Dictionary defines change, when used as a verb, as: *make or become different*; as a noun it means: *an act or process through which something becomes different*. These simple, but powerful definitions set the right tone for all situations of change. However, in the teaching learning environment and in education circles, the synonymous renderings for change have firmer and expanded applications. This section draws attention to five examples – reform, redesigning, transformation, transition and rebranding.

The first example is about curriculum *reform*. This is about improving the quality of teacher professionalism, education and its outcomes (MCCulloch, 2005; Hopmann, 2003). The widely held perception is that school curriculum reform is “a key instrument of educational change” (Qoyyimah, 2018, p.571). But alongside curriculum *reform* travels policy *reform*, not least for the mismatch between policy and classroom practice and policy and social reality (Alexander, 2014; Tsushima, 2011). A second example is seen in the National Institute of Education’s (NIE) *Redesigning Pedagogy* biennial conferences. In the welcome remarks for the 2017 conference, the conference convenors recognise that we are living in an era of connectivity and “societal and global *transformations* that are unfolding at an unprecedented pace” (Hung, Kit and Poon, 2017). There is a consensus among educators and researchers that in light of these very global *transformations*, it is imperative for education systems to change how they operate (Watanabe-Crockett, 2018). Educational *transition* between the levels in the system (pre-primary, primary, secondary and tertiary), a third example, has been spoken of as been a challenging process (Hayes, 2013; O’Kane and Hayes, 2006). The *rebranding* of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) is yet another example of how change is manifested in the teaching learning environment. In order to gain a competitive advantage, Campbell (2013) notes that some HEIs have been utilising corporate rebranding practices to improve their image and position.

Landscapes: Education is the qualifier for landscape in this paper. In the context of change, educational landscape here symbolises the entire education system. But there are specific references made to literal aspects of the system, for example the HE landscape. So, while landscapes may be used representationally for certain areas of education such wealth and stability, knowledge and institutional diversification (Meek, Teichler and Kearney, 2009), it also has a non-symbolic link to on-going research and related activities (Terepyshchyi, 2018, p.375). The following are shown to be the research focus of educational landscapes: (1) Scale (global, regional, national); (2) Content (pre-modern, classical modern, futuristic); (3) Management style (democratic, authoritarian, liberal); and (4) Economic model (state, market, mixed) (pp.376-377). A study of these landscapes helps education authorities to determine future trends. But what does education landscape means? From a philosophical perspective, and in a broad sense, Terepyshchyi explains it as:

The educational landscape is a philosophical concept for denoting the totality of spatial, socio-economic, political, cultural and anthropological characteristics of education that varies within a particular region in the process of preservation, transfer and production of knowledge (2018, p.375).

The above confirms that educational landscapes are all-encompassing. Given that educational research powers local knowledge systems and considering that these systems have regional and international connections, it seems practical to examine changing landscapes in different learning contexts. In the interest of space, this paper selects these landscapes to be part of the discussion: knowledge, HE, learning, leadership and digital.

Globalisation: This concept has attracted debates a range of various angles – from questioning its historical beginning (O’Rourke and Williamson, 2012), to who benefit from its processes (Gurria, 2007), right through to the social impact it has on developing countries (Lee and Vivarelli, 2006). Although these aspects are related to the discussion in one way or another, I wish to make mention of Maringe, Foskett and Woodfield’s conceptualisation because of its direct link to change. They see globalisation as: “a term describing world-scale transformations taking place in the political and ideological, the technical and economic, and the social and cultural aspects of life” (2013, p.12). Of note, because of the power of its ‘flows’, whether developed or developing, all nations are exposed to its positive and negative consequences (Chirico, 2014; Steger, 2003).

Glocalisation: Glocalisation possesses a ubiquitous nature. It pervades every aspect of national and international spaces - socially, economically, politically and even academically. Yet, this concept has been under-theorised in the literature (Roudometof, 2016, p.1). Although Roudometof acknowledges that the word *glocalisation* was coined from a fusion of global and local, he asserts that as a concept, it should be “analytically distinct from globalisation”. It is therefore instructive that Roudometof utilises “a variety of real-life experiences and situations” to explain glocalisation (ibid). Using a more direct political and economic perspective from the angle of scaling and rescaling, Swyngedouw (2004, p.38) sees glocalisation as being shaped by global forces: “the ‘forces of globalisation’ and the ‘demands of global competitiveness’ prove powerful vehicles for the economic elites to shape local conditions...” These very forces have been influencing local governance and decisions.

From the preceding paragraph, it is clear that glocalisation is a very complex concept, which can be explained from a variety of perspectives. When Shaw (2011) titled her Financial Post article '*Globalisation Rules the World*', her thoughts were not misplaced. Linking glocalisation to hypertargeted marketing shows how very involved and widespread a concept it is, since marketing is a concern of every nation. Besides, it is directly linked to globalisation, which has many challenges and is itself a more contentious notion (Oseyomon and Ojeaga, 2010; Lee and Vivarelli, 2006). In reviewing Roudometof's '*Glocalization: A Critical Introduction*', Gobo (2016) opines: it is necessary "to add glocalisation to the social-scientific vocabulary, as an analytically autonomous concept, and not as a mere appendage to globalisation, cosmopolitanisation, or theories of global diffusion". Taking this position will undoubtedly provide authors and researchers with opportunities to examine glocalisation in its entirety with a view to filling the literature gaps concerning its conceptualisation.

Internationalisation of Higher Education: Internationalisation feeds and sustains HE teaching, research and service function activities and is a major goal for universities all over the world (Spencer-Oatey and Dauber, 2018). Little wonder that internationalisation has often been conceptualised within HE boundaries (Fielden, 2008; Qiang, 2003; Wang, 2002). Knight puts forward the notion that when universities make a deliberate effort to "integrate an international dimension" into their teaching learning and research activities and service functions, this gives then an international stance (2004, p.7). This implies that in the absence of an integration of international dimensions, the localisation of universities is inadequate to fully sustain all HE operations. This position sits well with Jibeen and Khan's conceptualisation. They see the internationalisation of HE as "the process of integrating an international or intercultural aspect into the teaching, research and service functions of internationalization" (2015, 196). It can be said that generally, research activities at universities do provide the scope for research to give attention to international or intercultural aspects. Kishun (2007, p.463) contends that national policies can offer "a broad framework within which a higher education sector can strategically develop to take advantage of opportunities to internationalise". This seems practical since, as noted by Jibeen and Khan, the internationalisation of HE "is no longer regarded as a goal in itself, but as a means to improve the quality of education" (ibid).

Indigenous Epistemologies: This section links three other 'big' concepts to indigenous epistemologies because of their interrelatedness on 'local knowledge' levels. IK, *buen vivir* and *ubuntu* operates well in the arena of indigenous epistemology for, put simply, indigenous epistemology has to do with new ways to construct knowledge. And because epistemology is firmly rooted in ontological beliefs (Bracken, 2010), knowledge construction is also framed within ontological interpretations. Therefore, the essence of epistemologies and ontologies extend beyond ethnic identity and the renewal of traditional cultures. They are manifested in face-to-face interactions and traditional discourses (Grincheva, 2013; Gegeo and Watson-Gegeo, 2001). Herein lies the link to two concepts – (1) *buen vivir* (good living), which originated from indigenous cultures in Latin America; and (2) *ubuntu*, an African concept that emphasises interconnectedness and giving attention to individual needs while highlighting the value of being part of a greater community (Brown and McCowan, 2018; Vanhulst and Beling, 2014). The common denominator here is IK, also called local knowledge, which is created from the sum total of varied lived experiences via *buen vivir* and *ubuntu*. The sets of knowledge that have characterised each indigenous group have

changed over the centuries and decades due to environmental conditions and other time-passing circumstances such as population movements, industrialisation and post-modern agriculture. Although successive generations have adapted to the changing times, IK has been utilised in helping traditional communities to hold on to their unique cultural features (Bamigboye and Kuponiyi, 2010; Odora Hoppers, 2005)

Global 'Scapes'

The not-too-obvious movements in seascapes and landscapes are the reference frames for Appadurai's 'scapes'. Globalisation flows trigger changes in countries and in people. Constant interaction via social media and the worldwide web have granted a degree of independence to people to roam the world from different home spaces. This is the backdrop that frames Appadurai's (1996) five 'scapes' - ethnoscape, technoscape, finanscape, mediascape and ideoscape. They are not static but continue to evolve to fit the various situations in which they operate. There is an inextricable relationship between the *scapes*. *Ethnoscape* has to do with global migratory patterns; *technoscapes* employ technology to link people of all cultures together; this second *scape* is closely tied to the economy that goes up and down at will, hence the *finanscapes*; *mediascapes* bring about information flows via media outlets such as television, radio and newspaper; and *ideoscapes* "centre on the ideologies of a government and those that oppose it and is highly dependent on the context of the spectator" (Hogan, 2010). The interplay between the five 'scapes, has helped to influence changes in the aforementioned educational landscape and inform perceptions that shift perspectives about global and local cultural orientations. This state of affairs has serious implications for teaching learning experiences in glocalised learning environments.

'Scapes' and Changing Landscapes

No educational landscape can get away from the influences of the 'scapes'. Obviously, countries are affected in different ways, some favourably and others in ways that have negative consequences because of the instability in global economy over the past decades (Williams, 2017). Besides, economic growth possibilities look bleak. Slater (2012) supplies this reason: "... the deteriorating financial and economic picture in the Eurozone". In another vein, the widespread use of social media, fuelled by the easy access to new communication technologies, has not only been building social capital, but also has been connecting people globally. Distance and geographical location is no longer a hindrance to communication flows. Ironically, it is in this very highly technologized interactive environment that 'friendship disconnection' is outplayed; the number of friends actually degenerates at the expense of a growing number of followers (Syarief and Genoveva, 2014; Huber man, Romero and Wu, 2009, in Chirico, 2014). Government interventions have failed to 'fix' the moral challenges that arise from social media use although they have, to some extent, constrained certain security issues (O'Keeffe, G. and Clarke-Pearson, 2011; Zyoud, 2006). Moreover, Government legislations and policies have not been able to fully control migration flows because of the political nature of the factors that regulate the same flows. The evidence shows that migration flows are on the increase (Shotte, 2011; Skeldon, 2007).

The foregoing situations are on-going challenges because globalisation flows touch and change every country as well as the people within them (Chirico, 2014, p.45). The rest of the paper briefly explores how global forces have changed these

education landscapes in local contexts: knowledge, HE, learning, leadership and digital landscapes have been changing over time.

Education Landscape: Knowledge

Knowledge abounds and grows at a rapid rate. Unfortunately, not all knowledge produced is relevant to all local contexts. This is primarily because education research, as a machine of knowledge production, “has been produced by researchers from the global North” (Thomas, 2018, p.282). And even when there are collaborative efforts with researchers from the global South, the knowledge production process, including the research design, is maintained and controlled by researchers and associations from the global North (Jeffery, 2014; Maclure, 2006). Let me hasten to explain that for this paper, the terms global North and global South represent “economically developed” and “economically backward” societies, respectively (Odeh, 2010). I recognise the contentious and complex nature of the terms, thus the difficulty in making a definitional statement. However, I have found Ode’s (2010) explanation to be the most appropriate for the tone of the discussion.

Knowledge production and control brings the question of knowledge ownership into sharp focus. Researchers and authors in the global South start with an economical advantage, but even more telling are the ingrained psychological rumblings that remain after years of colonial rule by particular countries in the global North. An example is found in the dependent, yet dialectic relationship between the United Kingdom and its Overseas Territories (OTs). It seems therefore that knowledge ownership within the global South remains an illusion for collaboration because even when the obvious challenges are addressed, positive outcomes still favour the global north (Jeffery, 2014; Maclure, 2006). Based on my past experiences working at different levels in the education system, and on informal conversations with colleagues currently working in the said system, I refer to the Montserrat situation to evidence this. Educators in the system are not ‘fully’ research active, and the ‘little’ education research that is happening does not seem to be involved and engaging, from a knowledge production perspective. In fact, research activities remain in the realms of the University of the West Indies (UWI), and less obvious, other regional and international universities. There seems to be no general appetite to demonstrate the source of knowledge production via research activities even in local contexts. It seems that the reality of an Overseas Territories (OTs) status, revealed within the dominance of the ‘Motherland’, has obscured the awareness that there are multiple ways of producing knowledge.

Theoretically, scholars in Montserrat are operating within landscapes viewed from post-colonial perspectives. Paradoxically, Montserrat is one of the remaining British OTs. Therefore, if research work is commissioned by the local government or by the British government, whether it is carried out in the ‘Motherland’ or in the local environment, it is obvious where knowledge ownership lies. In fact, any knowledge that is generated in a local context, no matter how relevant it may appear, has not managed to experience a level of significance in global audiences. Perhaps as Lillis and Curry (2010) has observed, it might be necessary for the generated knowledge to raise demands for a thorough rationalisation for international interest in the topic or the local context. Perhaps such a situation is responsible for the general dwindled interest in the spread of IK.

The global discourse of internationalisation has not been lost on education reform. An example to illustrate this in the Montserrat context is the teaching of science in the secondary school environment. Concept teaching is supported by experi-

ments carried out in well-equipped modern laboratories. The days of indigenous technology supported by natural local resources are no longer on curriculum developers and policy makers' agendas. The 'greener pasture' ideology coupled with the dominance of Global North academic literature sources, carry an on-going advantageous position over the local knowledge. So where does this leave the Caribbean's *buen vivir* and *ubuntu*?

The Latin American *buen vivir* (good living), very well represent how indigenous living in the Region was conceived before the forces of globalisation 'recolonized' the islands. The human and natural environment formed the nucleus of daily living and survival, where the emphasis was on harmonious living, rather than the quest to reach the top of an economic ladder – a traditional neighbourhood where each one was his 'brother's keeper'. For example, there was no reluctance to share information about health matters and agrarian techniques. These practices formed the basis for indigenous communities' sustainable development programmes. Fast forward to the twenty first century, changing knowledge landscapes have obscured, and in some cases have obliterated the *buen vivir*. I take sides with Brown and McEwen who asserts the time is ripe for educators to think about how *buen vivir* can be "conceptualised and interpreted in a way that remains faithful to these important dimensions of worldviews that underpin it, but also comprehensible to people for whom breaking out of the paradigm of European/Western ontology of modernity is not straightforward" (2018, p.319). Following through on this, can endorse *buen vivir* as a catalyst for promoting the sustainable development agenda. Similarly, the essence of *Ubuntu*, with its individualistic, yet interconnected and community-oriented character, can provide a springboard for discussions on to be a worldview that aids understanding on the attainment of sustainable development goals, without losing its indigenous substance.

Education Landscape: Higher Education

Research findings show that the landscape of HE is changing at a rapid rate. This section draws on Angel Calderon's 2018 paper '*The Higher Education Landscape Is Changing Fast*' to support the argument. Calderon uses data from the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) Institute for Statistics to show comparisons in student enrolment around the world and how on a global scale the HE landscape continues to shift. Between 1970 and 2000, student enrolment tripled, which represents an increase of 206%. Interestingly, it is believed that HE enrolments around the world are decreasing because of low fertility rates and a declining youth population (Gallagher, 2018). Still, Calderon notes that between 2015 and 2040, there will be a 281% increase over the 30 years from 2000 to 2030, a growth that is likely to exceed the one experienced between 1970 and 2000.

The enrolment rates are quite telling considering the impact that globalisation has on a nation's education agenda. Within this context of global forces and related discourses, it seems reasonable to conclude that it is impossible to divorce internationalisation from HE. The benefits of internationalisation of HE includes "sustaining and growing science and scholarship through dynamic academic exchanges; and building social and economic capacity in developing countries" (Jibeen and Khan, 2015, p.197). In this respect, the dominance of universities in the Global north is obvious. The use of technology and social media has made it possible for them to establish strong international networks that facilitate knowledge transfer and global research. The e-technology that the universities use has played a crucial role in "increasing pub-

lic access to relevant information for aiding talent recruitment and retention” (Edmonds, 2012). There are many countries (for example Montserrat), that are not in a position to meet the HE demands. Using e-technology and social media can help in the provision of access to HE in these countries (ibid).

Jibeen and Khan link the advantages of internationalization to national and international citizenship for students and staff from underdeveloped countries (ibid). Likewise, Edmonds notes that the international role of Canadian universities should be to “contribute to cultural, social, organizational and scientific innovations through knowledge translation and commercialization” (ibid). I posit that somewhere between these two observations, is a space for the inclusion of *buen vivir* in the function that Vanhulst and Beling propose. Deep appreciation of *buen vivir*, and according its rightful place in academic dialogues depends on the construction of “real spaces for citizenship participation and on the emergence of collective learning processes” (Vanhulst and Beling, 2014, p.60). Correspondingly, Ubuntu can be accorded a rightful place as well since as Shumba reminds, “Ubuntu provides much scope for intergenerational learning and at the same time valuable knowledge for intergenerational learning whereby current societies learn from one another, and in this case the West learning from Africa” (2011, p.84). The wholeness and oneness that Ubuntu represents is pivotal to personal and national development. This suggests that changes in the HE landscapes should accord it a place for the interplay it creates between internationalisation and the interdependence of world peoples.

Education Landscape: Learning

Over the decades, the learning landscape has shifted considerably. This is because the world is undergoing waves of dislocating changes that are due to escalate and intensify. The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) describe the situation this way:

The world is being dramatically reshaped by scientific and technological innovations, global interdependence, cross-cultural encounters, and changes in the balance of economic and political power. These waves of dislocating change will only intensify. The context in which today’s students will make choices and compose lives is one of disruption rather than certainty, and of interdependence rather than insularity (AACU, 2007).

The above of description places globalisation in a very menacing and hostile environment. The process and outcome of students’ learning seem quite bleak. Given the interlocking relationship between globalisation and glocalisation, it is not farfetched to conclude that learning in a glocalised environment is equally intimidating. A change in behaviour, although not the only indicator (De Houwer, Barnes-Holmes, and Moors, 2013), is an appropriate gauge to demonstrate that learning has occurred. This implies that in a glocalised environment, which is characterised by on-going changes, learning is taking place. Whichever the brand, and whether experienced in a calm or contentious environment, learning is pivotal to the advancement of students’ overall educational experience.

I refer to the political and economic perspectives and ideologies that dominated the 1960s and 1970s. Educational agendas made room for concepts such as “imperialism and neo-imperialism, neo-colonialism, uneven development, the new international division of labour” (Swyngedouw, 2004, p.27). During that period, learning was influenced by the narratives that were enveloped in these perspectives. A shift

in these perspectives came about in the 1980s/1990s “by a neoliberal discourse of market-led internationalism and globalisation” (ibid). Enter glocalisation. It was around this period that sociologist Roland Robertson introduced glocalisation as “the simultaneity – the co-presence — of both universalizing and particularizing tendencies” (Kenton, 2018). Shifting perspectives and changes in societal landscapes have been an on-going occurrence since then. Swyngedouw points out that the political economy of capitalism has been “a process of continuous transformation of the temporal and spatial horizons of its operation” (2004, p.31). He takes this notion further by mentioning that the fallout of the mediated and negotiated tensions brought about by political economic disputes are “ever-changing forms of territorial or geographical organisation and the emergence of territorially shifting forms of governance” (2004, p.32). Clearly, these shifts have serious implications for teaching and learning activities at all levels of the education system.

AACU (2007), perhaps in recognition of “the kinds of learning needed for a complex and volatile world”, appeals to policy makers to make significant investment “in active, hands-on, collaborative, and inquiry-based forms of teaching and learning—making full use of new educational technologies—to ensure that all students have rich opportunities to fully achieve the intended learning outcomes”. AACU aptly summarises the key to learners’ achievement and survival in a glocalised learning environment.

Box 1: A Summary – Developing Learners’ Abilities in a Glocalised Environment

- **In an economy where every industry**—from the trades to advanced technology enterprises—is challenged to innovate or be displaced, all students need the kind of intellectual skills and capacities that enable them to get things done in the world, at a high level of effectiveness.
- **In a democracy that is diverse, globally engaged, and dependent on citizen responsibility**, all students need an informed concern for the larger good because nothing less will renew our fractured and diminished commons.
- **In a world of daunting complexity**, all students need practice in integrating and applying their learning to challenging questions and real-world problems.
- **In a period of relentless change**, all students need the kind of education that leads them to ask not just “how do we get this done?” but also “what is most worth doing?” With organizations constantly reinventing their products and their processes, and with questions about public and life choices more complex than ever, the world itself is setting higher expectations for knowledge and skill. The essential learning outcomes respond to this reality.
- **In an era when knowledge is the key to the future**, all students need the scope and depth of learning that will enable them to understand and navigate the dramatic forces—physical, cultural, economic, technological—that directly affect the quality, character, and perils of the world in which they live (AACU, 2007).

Inevitably, the learning landscape continues to change in a glocalised world. As noted in Box 1, every learner matters. It is imperative therefore for education systems to structure teaching learning activities in a way that allows teachers to cater for every learner's educational needs, which includes overall personal development.

Education Landscape: Leadership

Leadership and its related theories have earned their places in the changing landscape debates. Leaders are at the helm of educational reform and have often been persuasive in getting “followers to adopt certain behaviours in order to bring about what the leaders regard as beneficial change” (Bush, 2018, p.883).

Space does not allow an in-depth discussion on the leadership theories. But I will make mention of transformational leadership that is considered to be a very popular leadership style in education and educational administration (Berkovich, 2018; Bush, 2018). To link transformational leadership in educational administration to the local discussion, I refer to two time periods: (1) the Western period – 1990 to mid-2000s; and (2) the global period – mid-2000 to present (Berkovich, 2018, p.891). Leithwood and Jantzi (2005) explain that during the first period, transformational leadership was a subject of research mainly in Western countries. It was not until the second period that interest in non-Western countries began to grow. Analogously, change processes in a New Zealand university, were done in three phases: (1) changing the governance structure, 1985 to early 1990s; (2) consolidation in the early 1990s to early 2000; and (3) changing tack in the early 2000s to 2010 (Chong, Geared and Willett, 2018, pp.932-936). The research focuses on issues of managerialism and collegiality. Bush describes managerialism as managerial leadership practised to excess (2018, p.883). Interestingly, at the New Zealand university, the three phases of change overlap the two time periods when Western and non-Western countries began to give attention to transformational leadership research.

Utilising a cross-cultural comparative lens in sixteen countries across five continents, Miller (2018, p.2) emphasises that school leadership is experienced in a dynamic educational environment that require leaders to lead change. Miller also notes that internally motivated leaders do not rely on policy to take action when required. The example of how transformational leadership took on a role of its own in education in emergency situations during the height of the volcanic crisis in Montserrat, does reiterate Miller's emphasis. Effective leadership is also shown to be advantageous to sustainable education and sustainable development (Shotte, 2013, pp. 34-37).

Clearly, leadership of whatever kind runs alongside changing landscapes and it is bolstered by shifting perspectives of policy makers and other involved individuals. The complexity of leadership is revealed in global as well as local contexts via shifting technological, cultural, socio-economic and socio-political factors.

Education Landscape: Digital Trends

It is a general acknowledgement that digital trends have transformed the field of education. Technologies are advancing at a rapid rate and emerging technologies are accommodating a self-taught learning environment that have put the traditional classroom in the shadows.

Technological innovations are used daily in just about every country in the world. Such remarkable frequency and astonishing spread prompt questions about what is driving technology's widespread pace. Aslam et al (2018) provides an answer

based on findings of their research work. Three of the six questions that guided their investigations are: (1) How has the technological innovation landscape evolved? (2) How strong is the diffusion of knowledge across countries? and (3) Has knowledge become more globalized? Their findings reveal: “the spread of knowledge and technology across borders has intensified because of globalization”.

The constant upgrading of new software and continuous announcement of new gadgets have become common occurrences in the almost every country in the world. These are the digital trends that are embedded in developed as well as developing societies. This implies that even in communities that have strong traditions, technologies are helping people to acclimatise to the changing landscapes in glocalised environments. Such a situation seems desirable although in some cases “digital parenting skills have not always kept pace” with the rapid changes in technology (Parmar, 2017). Teachers too in developed and developing countries need to keep up with the pace of the ever-changing advancements in technological advances. Education officials in Australia are recommending “regular, scaffolded and sustainable” professional development (Hyndman, 2018).

Undoubtedly, the digital landscape of teaching and learning resources is growing exponentially and this provides numerous possibilities for all groups of people to be part of the digital environment (Howell and O’Donnell, 2017). Still, the digital divide is likely to grow (Thomas, Wilson and Park, 2018), not just in an Australian context, but on a global scale. Nevertheless, the evidence shows that the digital landscape will continue to change in a glocalised environment.

Conclusion and Insights

The focus of the paper is on changing landscapes in a glocalised learning spaces. Using a literature-based approach, it puts the causes of the various shifts in perspectives, ensuing changes and issues ‘at the feet of globalisation’. Care was taken to present interpret the landscapes within an educational context. Knowledge flows, change, changing landscapes, globalisation, glocalisation, internationalisation of HE, and indigenous epistemologies are the main theories explored. Conceptions of IK, *buen vivir* and *Ubuntu* form part of the indigenous epistemologies notion. Personal experiences lend some support to the discussion.

Globally, there is a general recognition that effective school leadership has the potential to change the lives of learners as much as it does to transform entire communities. Based on personal experiences, I therefore contend that transformational leadership at all levels of the education system, together with related educational practices should be as engaging as they are meaningful. The productive results have the potential to spread to the wider national community. For countries that have an African-based heritage, *Ubuntu* should remain the moral and ethical framework within which education practices and teaching and learning activities co-habit and operate. *Buen vivir* too can germinate within the ‘interconnectedness’ soils of *Ubuntu* in order to allow communities to experience the ‘good living’ that move people to action to build a harmonious existence with the natural environment, in spite of the pressures that bear on them from global economic and political forces.

By and large, Western/European models of education have neglected taking into account the value of IK and the epistemologies and ontologies that have shaped the lived experiences of indigenous cultures and traditions. Orally transmitted inter-generational knowledge is not recognised by Western/European to be of an intellectual ilk, and therefore not counted as knowledge to be exchanged or transferred. Yet, the

very substance of indigenous knowledge can contribute much to the sustainable development debate and by extension the national development of the countries concerned. Change speaks to an audience as extensive as where there is human existence. This suggests that change in glocalised learning spaces, is inevitable. In spite of the global pressures that hold nations in their grip, as far as possible, nations should take care to ensure that the changes made are realistic ones that not only bring benefits to their subjects' individual advancement, but also to a national agenda that builds and support sustainable development. I assert that indigenous knowledge, together with its conjoined concepts *buen vivir* and *ubuntu*, have a pivotal role to play in these transformational activities. The discussion is prefaced by one of my favourite quotes. I am now postscripting it with another: *Like cream rises to the top, indigenous knowledge and its adjacent kindred buen vivir and ubuntu, will one day surface above the wordless clamour and deafening silences of the big-brotherlike bullies, to nestle within knowledge flows.*

Correspondence

Dr Gertrude Shotte
Grovebury Court
Chase Road, Southgate
London N14 4JR, UK
Email: g.shotte@mdx.ac.uk / sgrpidr@gmail.com

References

- AACU, (2007). *College Learning for the New Global Century*. Available at: <https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/GlobalCenturyfinal.pdf> [Accessed 27 January 2019].
- Alexander, R. (2014). Evidence, Policy and the Reform of Primary Education: A Cautionary Tale. *Forum*, 56(3), 349-375.
- Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Aslam, A., Eugster, J., Ho, G., Jaumotte, F., Osorio-Buitron, C. and Piazza, R. (2018). *Globalization Helps Spread Knowledge and Technology Across Borders*. Available at: <https://blogs.imf.org/2018/04/09/globalization-helps-spread-knowledge-and-technology-across-borders/> [Accessed 27 January 2019].
- Bamigboye, O. and Kuponiyi, F. (2010). The Characteristics of Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS) Influencing Their Use in Rice Production by Farmers in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *Agricultural Journal*, 5, 74-79.
- Berkovich, I. (2018) Will it Sink or Will it Float: Putting three Common Conceptions about Principals' Transformational Leadership to the Test. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 46(6), 888-907.
- Bracken, S. (2010). *Discussing the Importance of Ontology and Epistemology Awareness in Practitioner Research*. *Worcester Journal of Learning and Teaching* (4). ISSN 2024-8032. Available at: <https://eprints.worc.ac.uk/843/> [Accessed 01 February 2019].
- Brown, E. and McCowan, T. (2018). Buen Vivir: Reimagining Education and Shifting Paradigms. *Compare*, 48(2), 317-323.
- Bush, T. (2018) Transformational Leadership: Exploring Common Conceptions. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 46(6), 883-887.
- Calderon, A. (2018) *The Higher Education Landscape is Changing Fast*. Available at: <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=2018062208555853> [Accessed 01 February 2019].
- Campbell, K. (2013) *Rebranding a Higher Education Institution using Corporate Practices: A Case Study of Arizona State University*. Available at: <https://dra.american.edu/islandora/object/1213capstones%3A163/datastream/PDF/view> [Accessed 27 January 2019].
- Chirico, J. (2014) *Globalization: Prospects and Problems*. London: Sage.
- De Houwer, J., Barnes-Holmes, D. and Moors, A. (2013) *What is Learning? On the Nature and Merits of a Functional Definition of Learning*. Available at https://ppw.kuleuven.be/okp/_pdf/DeHouwer2013WILOT.pdf [Accessed 27 January 2019].

- Edmonds, J. (2012) *What Internationalization Should Really Be About*. Available at <https://www.universityaffairs.ca/opinion/in-my-opinion/what-internationalization-should-really-be-about/> [Accessed 27 January 2019].
- Fielden, J. (2008) *The Practice of Internationalisation: Managing International Activities in UK Universities*. London: UK Higher Education Unit.
- Gallagher, J. (2018) 'Remarkable' Decline in Fertility Rates. Online *BBC News*, 9th November 2018. Available at: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-46118103> [Accessed 09 January 2019].
- Gegeo, D. and Watson-Gegeo, K. (2001) How We Know: Kwara'ae Rural Villagers Doing Indigenous Epistemology. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 13(1).
- Gobo, G. (2016) Glocalisation: A Critical Introduction. *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology*, DOI:10.1080/23254823.2016.1209886. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305482800_Glocalization_a_critical_introduction [Accessed 09 January 2019].
- Grincheva, N. (2013) Scientific Epistemology versus Indigenous Epistemology: Meanings of 'Place' and 'Knowledge' in the Epistemic Cultures. *Logos and Episteme*, 4(2), 145-159.
- Gurria, A. (2007) *Reaping the Benefits of Globalisation: The Importance of Public Policies*. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/general/38144150.pdf> [Accessed 01 February 2019].
- Hayes, N. (2013) *Early Years Practice: Getting it Right from the Start*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan.
- Hopmann, S. (2003). On the Evaluation of Curriculum Reforms. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 35(4), 459-478.
- Howell, S. and O'Donnell, B. (2017) *Digital Trends and Initiatives in Education: The Changing Landscape for Canadian Content*. Available at: <http://www.omdc.on.ca/Assets/Research/Research+Reports/Digital+Trends+and+Initiatives+in+Education/Digital+Trends+and+Initiatives+in+Education.pdf> [Accessed 27 January 2019].
- Hung, D., Kit, L. and Poon, K. (2017) *Welcome to Redesigning Pedagogy International Conference 2017*. Available at: <https://conference.nie.edu.sg/2017/info/welcome.php> [Accessed 09 January 2019].
- Hyndman, B. (2018) *Ten Reasons Teachers Can Struggle to Use Technology in the Classroom*. Available at: <https://theconversation.com/ten-reasons-teachers-can-struggle-to-use-technology-in-the-classroom-101114> [Accessed 09 January 2019].
- Jeffery, R. (2014) Authorship in Multi-Disciplinary, Multi-National North-South Research Projects: Issues of Equity, Capacity and Accountability. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 44(2), 208-229.

GERTRUDE SHOTTE

Jibee, T. and Khan, M. (2015) Internationalization of Higher Education: Potential Benefits and Costs. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 4(4), 196-199.

Kenton, W. (2018) *Glocalisation*. Available at <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/g/glocalization.asp> [Accessed 09 January 2019].

Knight, J. (2004) Internationalization Remodelled: Definition, Approaches, and Rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8 (1), 5 - 31.

Lee, E. and Vivarelli, M. (2006) *The Social Impact of Globalization in the Developing Countries*. Available at <http://ftp.iza.org/dp1925.pdf> [Accessed 27 January 2019].

Leistner, F. (2012) *Connecting Organizational Silos: Taking Knowledge Flow Management to the Next Level with Social Media*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Leithwood, K. and Jantzi, D. (2005) A Review of Transformational School Leadership Research 1996-2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4, 177-199.

Lillis, T. and Curry, M. (2010) *Academic Writing in a Global Context: The Politics and Practices of Publishing in English*. London: Routledge.

Lin, G. (2009) Higher Education Research Methodology-Literature Method. *International Education Studies*, 2(4), 179-181.

Maclure, R. (2006) No Longer Overlooked and Undervalued? The Evolving Dynamics of Endogenous Educational Research in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Harvard Educational Review* 76(1), 80-109.

Maringe, F., Foskett, N. and Woodfield, S. (2013): Emerging Internationalisation Models in an Uneven Global Terrain: Findings from a Global Survey. *Compare*, 43 (1), pp.9 – 36.

McCulloch, G. (2005) Curriculum Reform, Educational Change and School Improvement. In D. Hopkins (Ed.) *The Practice and Theory of School Improvement, International Handbook of Educational Change*, Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 169 -181.

Meek, L., Teichler, U. and Kearney, M. (2009) (Eds.) *Higher Education, Research and Innovation: Changing Dynamics Report on the UNESCO Forum on Higher Education, Research and Knowledge 2001-2009*.

Miller, P. (2018). *The Nature of School Leadership: Global Practice Perspectives*, London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Nsamenang, A. (2005). Educational Development and Knowledge Flow: Local and Global Forces in Human Development in Africa. *Higher Education Policy* 18(3), Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/31946890_Educational_Development_and_Knowledge_Flow_Local_and_Global_Forces_in_Human_Development_in_Africa [Accessed 01 February 2019].

- Odeh, L. (2010). *A Comparative Analysis of Global North and Global South Economies*. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265425871_A_comparative_analysis_of_global_north_and_global_south_economies [Accessed 09 January 2019].
- O’Kane, M. and Hayes, N. (2006). The Transition to School in Ireland: Views of Pre-school and Primary School Teachers, *International Journal of Transitions in Childhood*, 2, 4-16.
- Odora Hoppers, C. (2005). *Culture, Indigenous Knowledge and Development: The Role of the University*. Centre for Education Policy Development, Occasional Paper No. 5.
- O’Keeffe, G. and Clarke-Pearson, K. (2011). The Impact of Social Media on Children, Adolescents, and Families. *Pediatrics*, 800-804.
- O’Rourke, K. and Williamson, J. (2012). When Did Globalisation Begin? *European Review of Economic History*, 6, 23-50.
- Oseyomon, E. and Ojeaga, J. (2010). Globalization and Management: Issues and Concepts. *African Research Review*, (Online) 4(4), 96-110.
- Parmar, N. (2017) *Empowering Parents in the Digital Landscape*. Available at: <https://edtechnology.co.uk/Blog/empowering-parents-in-the-digital-landscape/> [Accessed 09 January 2019].
- Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of Higher Education: Towards a Conceptual Framework. *Policy Futures in America* 1(2), 248 - 270.
- Robertson, R. (2012). Globalisation or Glocalisation? *The Journal of International Communication*, 18(2), 191-208, DOI: 10.1080/13216597.2012.709925 [Accessed 04 December 2018].
- Roudometof, V. (2016) *Glocalisation: A Critical Introduction*, London: Routledge.
- Shaw, H. (2011). ‘Glocalisation’ Rules the World. Available at: <https://business.financialpost.com/news/glocalization-rules-the-world> [Accessed 04 December 2018].
- Shotte, G. (2013). School Leadership for Sustainable Education: Reflections on Montserrat. In P. Miller (Ed.) *School Leadership in the Caribbean: Perceptions, Practices and Paradigms*, Didcot: Symposium Books.
- Shotte, G. (2011). ‘Pre and Post 1995 Trends and Patterns of Teacher Migration from Montserrat: Shifting and Competing Identities’. In S. Manik and A Singh (Eds.) *Global Mobility and Migration of Teachers: Issues, identities and Infringements*, 109-121. Delhi: Kamla-Raj Enterprises.

GERTRUDE SHOTTE

Shumba, O. (2011). Commons Thinking, Ecological Intelligence and the Ethical and Moral Framework of Ubuntu: An Imperative for Sustainable Development. *Journal of Media and Communication Studies*, 3(3), 84-96.

Slater, A. (2012). *The Global Economy*. Available at: <https://www.ifs.org.uk/budgets/gb2012/12chap1.pdf> [Accessed 04 December 2018].

Skeldon, R. (2007). *Working Paper T20 On Migration and the Policy Process*. Available at [Accessed 04 December 2018]. <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/57a08c08e5274a27b2000f2d/WP-T20.pdf>.

Spencer-Oatey, H. and Dauber, D. (2018). *The Internationalisation of Higher Education Developing Global Graduates*. Available at: https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/impact/policybriefings/4_internationalisation_of_higher_education.pdf [Accessed 04 December 2018].

Stale, G. and Majors, I. (2009). *The Application of EM for Knowledge Flow Analysis and the Development of an Educational IT Ecosystem*, Available from <http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-933/pap9.pdf> [Accessed 01 February 2019].

Steger, M. (2003) *Globalisation: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Syarief, S. and Genoveva, C. (2014). The Analysis of Communication between Friends on Social Media towards Purchase Intension. *Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 169, 31 – 42.

Swyngedouw, E. (2004) Globalisation or 'Glocalisation'? Networks, Territories and Rescaling. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 17(1), 25-48, DOI: 10.1080/0955757042000203632.

Tasselli, S. (2015). *How does Knowledge Flow in Organisations?* Available at: <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/businessreview/2015/12/03/how-does-knowledge-flow-in-organizations/> [Accessed 27 January 2019].

Terepyschchi, S. (2018) *Educational Landscape as a Concept of Philosophy of Education*. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324063565_Educational_Landscape_as_a_Concept_of_Philosophy_of_Education [Accessed 27 January 2019].

Thomas, M. (2018). Research Capacity and Dissemination among Academics in Tanzania: Examining Knowledge Production and the Perceived Binary of 'Local' and 'International' Journals. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 48(2), 281-298.

Thomas, J., Wilson, C. and Park, S. (2018). *Australia's Digital Divide Is Not Going Away*. Available at: <https://theconversation.com/australias-digital-divide-is-not-going-away-91834> [Accessed 27 January 2019].

Travis, D. (2016). *Desk Research: The What, Why and How*. Available at: <https://www.userfocus.co.uk/articles/desk-research-the-what-why-and-how.html> [Accessed 27 January 2019].

Tsushima, R. (2011). *The Mismatch between Educational Policy and Classroom Practice: EFL Teachers' Perspectives on Washback in Japan*. Available at: http://digitool.library.mcgill.ca/webclient/StreamGate?folder_id=0&dvs=1549579646995~564 [Accessed 27 January 2019].

Vanhulst, J. and Beling, A. (2014). Buen Vivir: Emergent Discourse within or beyond Sustainable Development? *Ecological Economics* 101, 54–63.

Wang, Y. (2002). *Massification, Internationalisation, networking and Corporatisation of Higher Education: International Comparative Perspective*. Beijing: Yunnan University Press.

Watanabe-Crockett, L. (2018). *The 6 Essential Things You Must Have for Transforming Education*. Available at: <https://globaldigitalcitizen.org/6-things-transforming-education> [Accessed 01 February 2019].

Williams, J. (2017). *The Global Growth Slump: Causes and Consequences*. Available at: <https://www.frbsf.org/economic-research/files/el2017-19.pdf> [Accessed 27 January 2019].

Zhugue, H. (2002). A Knowledge Flow Model for Peer-to-Peer Team Knowledge Sharing and Management. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 23, 23-30.

Zyoud, M. (2006). *Youth and Values in a Changing World*. Amman: Dar As-shoroq.