

Teaching as Dwelling Between Two Worlds: Reflection of Being an Educator in the Post-Pandemic Era

Patricia Liu Baergen
Thompson Rivers University

This paper discusses the impact of COVID-19 on education, focusing on the rapid shift to online learning. It raises concerns about the ethical implications of AI-generated writing and critiques the dominance of technocratic rationality in education. Drawing from Ted Tetsuo Aoki and Martin Heidegger's works, it explores the notion of technology, poetic dwelling, and the educators' beingness in a post-pandemic era. This paper challenges instrumental views on curriculum, teaching, and technology through personal reflections and theoretical analysis, advocating for an existential and poetic understanding. This paper urges rethinking educational practices to embrace human complexity and foster genuine engagement with knowledge.

Keywords: curriculum, teaching, technology, post COVID-19, Martin Heidegger

INTRODUCTION

In late March 2020, schools closed in British Columbia due to the spread of COVID-19 in Canada and globally. Teachers began adopting online platforms to continue teaching for the last months of the school year. Unexpected by most of the world, this two-and-a-half-year-long pandemic had devastating health and economic consequences, with unprecedented disruption to people's lives, and its effect is still haunting us globally. In education, with the push of the pandemic, the phenomenon of demanding massive use of technology in teaching and learning reached its peak in educational institutions. Furthermore, the recent development of artificial intelligence as a technological writing tool caught the attention of many educators. The ethical concerns on the trustworthiness of AI-generated writing and the discussions about taming the beast of the AI-generated writing application had been brought to the meeting table of many educators. Despite the inequality issues embedded in the students' accessibility to technology and the ethical concerns of writing through the fabrication of artificial intelligence tools for academic purposes, some might argue that teaching through the massive use of technology may provide the students and teachers with the opportunity to continue teaching and learning without physical location restrictions, during the crisis of the pandemic and after that. However, a danger of this phenomenon resides in understanding technology and its application as a technical reproduction.

Cast in the technical power of science and technology, the scientific rationale has become the dominant, pervasive way of understanding teaching, learning, and educational experiences. Since the Industrial Revolution, the ideology of the supremacy of rationality has turned our world into a cage enframed by the obsessive pursuit of material and technological development. Influenced by this technocratic-laden rationality, curriculum, teaching, and learning pay little attention to the individual's inward trajectory of

educational experiences. In turn, the reciprocity between an individual's inward trajectory and the outward experience that constitutes, I believe, human knowledge is often overlooked. Instead, we, as educators, most often devote ourselves to teaching our students to become competent parts of a social machine. Also, in our spare time, we continue polishing ourselves to become more robust parts for this machine. This way, technocratic rationality has become "the way" – blind obedience to mainstream values – in understanding teaching, learning, and educational experiences.

Along with this concern, in this paper, I intend to engage with the question: *In what ways can we, as educators, draw from an existential-phenomenological tradition, especially the selected works of a Canadian curriculum scholar Ted Tetsuo Aoki and a Continental philosopher, Martin Heidegger's writings, in forming a critically reflective and poetic style of understanding teaching, technology and our beingness as educators in a post-pandemic era?* Through the juxtaposition of my own lived experiences as vignettes and the echo between selected Aoki and Heidegger's works, I intend to focus on the following themes: 1) questioning the notion of technology, 2) understanding technology through poetic dwelling, 3) teaching as poetic dwelling in-between, curriculum, technology and the beingness of an educator.

In questioning, provoking the instrumental rationality in thinking technology, teaching, and our beingness as educators, I intend to point out the conceptual assumptions and philosophical blind spot in wor(l)d of metaphysics. In turn, I suggest that teaching is a poetic indwelling that calls for educators to return to the ambivalent ground of humanness and a new understanding of our being in the world.

QUESTIONING THE NOTION OF TECHNOLOGY

How shall we understand "computer application?" I am provoked by what I see a partial blindness of high fashion in the world of curriculum, wherein I see bandied about, with almost popular abandon, expressions linked to the computer without a deep understanding of what they are saying. (Aoki, 1987/99/2004, p. 151)

For manifestly, you have long been aware of what you mean when you use the expression "being." However, we who used to think we understand it have now become perplexed. (Plato, sophist 244a, as cited in Heidegger, 1953/2010, p. xxix)

In February 2020, the Canadian government closed its borders, and soon after that, many countries worldwide were locked down due to the spread of COVID-19. During this lockdown, I soon realized that everyday life's mundane became impossible to sustain. It was difficult to imagine how life might be from that point on. Isolating in our house for days, extended to weeks and months. Confinement became a norm of everyday life. The world struggled to find its way to continue life as usual. To avoid human contact, moving to a virtual world seemed to be an inevitable way of living. Grocery shopping, meetings, teaching, and learning all went to the online platform.

Within a short period, I had to quickly create an online curriculum and move all my graduate classrooms into a 14-inch computer screen. Teaching graduate courses can often end up talking into a void space of black screen with only names and without knowing what is happening behind those square black holes. My pedagogical situation became a world of names without knowing the uniqueness of human beings. These names became meaningless and represent faceless people who become "generalized entities often defined in terms of performance roles" (Aoki, 1986/91/2004, p. 160). In this pedagogical situation, students struggled to be engaged while sitting through a three-hour intellectual talk and discussion. To create more dynamic classroom interaction, I encouraged students to switch their cameras on during the class so that we could at least see each other's facial expressions. With my best efforts, the virtual classroom discussions, without human interaction, often stayed at the artificial and superficial level. Furthermore, the large volume of requests for technical support from the faculty and students swamped the IT department at the university. Teaching and learning ultimately became a skillful mastery of technology.

The above experience of teaching and learning was not an isolated incident. Instead, the widespread effects of the COVID-19 pandemic that emerged from March 2020 to June 2022 have drastically increased

health, social and economic inequalities globally. For more than 900 million learners worldwide, the pandemic led to the closure of schools and universities. This exceptional situation forced teachers and students to quickly adapt to an educational context – online learning (Bambra et al., 2020). Technology has become a buzzword across the globe amongst policymakers, administrators, educators, researchers, and in everyday settings. The excessive use of technology may indicate a social aspiration to improve the quality of life across various areas in a pandemic crisis. However, the notion of technology is often embraced in an uncritical discourse that assumes a universal understanding of its certainty in improving and advancing social progress.

Some educational scholars already expressed this uncritical discourse in the late 1970s and 80s (Aoki, 1987/99/2004; Huebner, 1977/1999; Pinar, 1988). In 1987, Canadian curriculum scholar Ted Tetsuo Aoki raised his concern about understanding the notion of technology only through a “technical reproduction” (Aoki, 1987/99/2004, p. 154) view of “reproducing something general in a concrete situation” (Aoki, 1987/99/2004, p. 154). He further drew attention to how technology works in various discourses, such as computers, digital instruments, etc., and the notion of technology more broadly. That is, the way we, as human beings, are shaped by the assumptions of technological epistemology.

In turn, educational experiences are cast in the technical power of instrumental procedure to implement curricula in a “producer-consumer paradigm” (Aoki, 1983/2004, p. 112). This linear view of perceiving curriculum as the pre-chosen ends of goals speaks of education as a technical ends-means where instructing students “becomes in-structuring students in the image of the given” (Aoki, 1996a/2004, p. 418). This ends-means paradigm ignores the possibility of human potential, and this provision of universal education comes at a cost to humanity and its cultural diversity (Liu Baergen, 2021). The danger of this mono-vision of curriculum, as Aoki (1996a/2004) pointed out, is that “we seem to be caught up in a singular meaning of the word curriculum” (p. 417) and that such “instrumentalism reasoning based on scientism and technology” amounts to “a crisis in Western reasoning” (1983/2004, p. 113). This is “an internal crisis” (1983/2004, p. 114) in understanding curriculum and technology.

This crisis, as described by Aoki, is a “fundamental contradiction between ... [the] commitment to technological progress and ... [the] commitment to the improvement of personal and situational life” (1983/2004, pp. 113-114). In such an instrumentalist understanding of curriculum and technology, the role of teaching manifests itself as being technical – attending to the doing. The relationship between curriculum and teaching is caught up in the vertical linearity of theory/practice nuance. The problem with the singular, technological rationale in thinking curriculum and technology is “the fundamental separation of human and world, theory and practice” (Liu Baergen, 2021, p. 130).

Similarly, Heidegger shares his concern about a universal understanding of technology. To Heidegger (1977), “technology is not equivalent to the essence of technology” (p. 4) in modern times. In his 1953 essay, *The Question Concerning Technology*, Heidegger began with the everyday account of technology in modern times – the vast array of instruments, machines, artifacts, and devices that humans invent, build, and ultimately exploit. In so understanding, technology is merely a tool that humans control. Heidegger (1977) depicted this everyday account of technology as providing only a limited, over-exercised “instrumental and anthropological definition” (p. 44). He also explained that the “revealing [of technology] that holds sway throughout modern technology ... [is] challenging ... which puts to nature the unreasonable demand that it supplies energy which can be extracted and stored as such” (p. 14). In turn, modern technology reveals its essence, concealed in nature, by placing, ordering, and hunting – which, in one way or another, are all, in a sense, an order to reform, store, distribute, and redistribute. Through this mode of revealing, resources are exploited as a means to an end, instrumental, and a product of human activity. In his later writing, *What Are Poets For?* Heidegger (1971b) stated that “man becomes the subject and the world the object” (p. 110) and “life is supposed to yield itself to technical production” (p. 109).

Heidegger’s main concern was about the discernment of the essence of technology, anchored in an instrumentalist worldview deeply rooted in modern science. Moreover, revealing the essence only through the measurable and the manipulable mode ultimately reduces beings to no beings. For Heidegger (1977), the essence of technology defined and manipulated the modern way of life in the West as dangerous, a force humans could not control. Therefore, he warned that “as long as we represent technology as an instrument,

we remain held fast in the will to master it” (Heidegger, 1977, p. 32). Then, *how might we, as educators, understand technology differently?* becomes the question I turn next to.

UNDERSTANDING TECHNOLOGY THROUGH POETIC THINKING

The questions concerning application surface the hermeneutic problem of the relationship between the general and the particular. At the heart of this problem is the notion that the general must be understood differently in each new situation. Understanding is, then, a particular case of applying something general to a particular situation (Aoki, 1987/99/2004, p. 155).

In January 2023, NBC News reported that ChatGPT was banned from New York City public schools’ devices and networks. Jenna Lyle, a spokesperson for the public school department, said the decision to ban ChatGPT stemmed from concerns about the “negative impacts on student learning” (NBC News, 2023). “While the tool may be able to provide quick and easy answers to questions, it does not build critical-thinking and problem-solving skills, which are essential for academic and lifelong success,” Lyle said in an email statement. Shortly after this news report, a colleague at my department also brought up this controversial technological application at a faculty meeting, which discussed the implications of students using AI-generated text for their assignments. Reflecting on these events, I wonder how we, as educators, might understand the notion of technology differently and not fall into the same epistemological trap as Heidegger (1977) described.

In light of Aoki and Heidegger’s concerns about the uncritical embrace of understanding technology in modernity and educational experiences, a critical turn is not seeing it as a problem and seeking a particular solution, which falls into the trap of technical productional rationale. Rather, turning to a phenomenological-hermeneutic approach toward understanding the notion of technology and curriculum as possibilities of opening is how the works of Aoki and Heidegger inspire me. I realized that such perspectives help me, as an educator, to move away from focusing on the technical reproduction rationale. In turn, I ask: *What does it mean when discussing technology and curriculum? Moreover, how might technology be understood, experienced, and mobilized differently in different educational contexts?* To dwell on the first question, I am reminded by Aoki’s (1987/99/2004) provocation that understanding technology should not be through a “technical reproduction” view but as a “hermeneutic problem” (p. 154). Here, a hermeneutic problem, suggested by Aoki, is a “problem of the relationship between the general and the particular” (p. 155). Aoki pointed out that the shortcoming of understanding technology through a reproduction view is that the generality ignores the particularity of the situation. In turn, the general remains at a universal surface that is often meaningless and detached from the situation. The shadow of the pre-given generalized notion eclipses the authentic meaning from the situational. Heeding Heidegger’s ontological essentialism, Aoki reminded us that “ignoring the situational prevents the person in the situation from recognizing... [it]... is forgetful of the being in the situation” (p. 155). In turn, understanding technology as a hermeneutic act by attuning to the particular situation, reminding the person’s being in the situation is “a human being in his becoming” (Aoki, 1987/99/2004, p. 155). To move away from the generalizing reproduction approach, Aoki (1987/99/2004) attuned the educators to the particularity of the situation – a hermeneutic act in dwelling, listening to “what it is that a situation is asking” (p. 155). Such existential-phenomenological-hermeneutic dwelling in understanding technology allows one to attune to one’s beingness and interpret one’s particular hermeneutic situation. This understanding manifests from the reciprocity between an individual’s interpretation of the subjective inwardly trajectory and the objective outwardly experience in the situation. In turn, knowledge reveals itself in the lived situation and escapes the concealment from the epistemic nomo-vision, where the pre-determined language is spoken, and the image is given.

To further open up the foreclosing horizon in thinking technology and curriculum, Aoki (1991a/2004) metaphorically, phenomenologically and hermeneutically dwelt in the wor(l)d of poetry. Calling upon the metaphors of *sonare* (to hear) from the “sound of the beat and rhythm of the earth” in ancient Greek’s geo-

metron to dwell juxtaposed with *videre* (to see) in the Chinese character of poetry 詩 (p. 373), Aoki (1991a/2004) sought space for “a way of composing curriculum that allows for polyphony” (p. 375). Heeding what Heidegger (1971b) described as the “mirror-play of the simple onefold of earth and Sky, divinities and mortals” (p. 177), Aoki (1991a/2004) dwelled poetically in “an Occidental reading of an Oriental word” (p. 375) of poetry 詩 through “earth (土), measure (寸), temple (寺), mouth (言), echoes” (p. 375). Aoki’s poetic dwelling in between words and meanings as “a site of clearing in which earth, sky, mortals, and divine, in their longing to be together, belong together” (p. 316) explicated Heidegger’s cautioning about “a doubled forgetfulness of being that characterizes our historical present” (Liu Baergen, 2021, p. 28) in the educational context.

Thinking as dwelling with the polyphonic beingness of teachers and students, poetic wisdom emerges. This thinking through poetic dwelling echoes what Heidegger described as genuine thinking. For Heidegger, genuine thinking is never a pursuit achieved through the man-made assembling of abstraction from reality; it is humanity’s most essential manner of being human. Genuine thinking is rarely attained through demand. It manifests in the relation between humanity and being. For Heidegger, being and thinking are one when poetic thinking takes place. As Heidegger wrote in his 1959 essay *On the Way to Language*, “We might perhaps prepare a little for change in our relations to words. Perhaps this experience might awaken: all reflective thinking is poetic, and all poetry, in turn, is a kind of thinking” (Heidegger, 1971a, p. 136). Dwelling alongside Heidegger and Aoki to understand technology through poetic thinking, I ponder and ask, *how might technology be understood, experienced, and mobilized in different educational contexts?*

TEACHING AS POETIC DWELLING-IN-BETWEEN TECHNOLOGY AND BEINGNESS OF AN EDUCATOR

What shall I teach? How shall I teach (Aoki, 1986/1991/2004, p. 161)?

Teaching ... is understanding essentially both epistemologically and ontologically as a mode of being that dwells in the tensioned zone between two curriculum worlds (Liu Baergen, 2021, p. 82).

To dwell on the above question, I return to Heidegger in understanding the notion of technology. Ultimately, Heidegger (1971b) turned to the Ancient Greeks and brought *technē* into the presence:

There was a time when it was not technology alone that bore the name *technē*. Once that revealing that brings truth into the splendour of radiant appearing was also called *technē*. Once, there was a time when the bringing forth of the true into the beautiful was called *technē*. Moreover, the *poiesis* of the fine arts also was called *technē* (p. 34).

Ultimately, poetry was Heidegger’s inquiry into the essential being of language that carried layered cultural and historical influences, which has not “lost its magic potency by being used up and abused” (Heidegger, 1971b, p. xii). Thus, thinking through enframed language, like in metaphysics, has limitations. Poetry is the way to return to the nature of language, the house of Being, where the reciprocal relation between Being and human is fulfilled through language. Here, Heidegger’s (1971b) calling for “unconcealedness” (p. 51) is the calling for the isness of experience itself – a portal of opening in the process of making and creating. An opening invites us to dwell more profoundly in the relationship between poetry and thinking, especially in *poiesis* as ways of being, knowing, and understanding.

Heidegger’s 1947 essay, *The Thinker as Poet (Aus der Erfahrung des Denkens)*, which translates directly as “From the Experience of Thinking,” used a traditional cabinetmaker apprentice to illustrate *poiesis*. He wrote:

Suppose he is to become a true cabinetmaker. In that case, he makes himself answer and responds above all to the different kinds of wood and the shapes slumbering within wood – to wood as it enters into man’s dwelling with all the hidden riches of its essence. This relatedness to wood is what maintains the whole craft. Without that relatedness, the craft will never be anything but empty busywork; any occupation with it will be determined exclusively by business concerns. Every handicraft, all human dealings, is constantly in danger (Heidegger, 1977, p. 379).

It is this ancient attunement with the experience itself where the artist hears and feels the essence of nature. Heidegger (1977) suggested that we should not “push on blindly with technology” nor “curse it as the work of the devil” (p. 330). The way forward, as Heidegger suggested, is not to end technology but to dwell in it differently, poetically. More so, what is needed in the modern age is to transform a calculative way of thinking into poetic ways of being, being with, and being in the world.

To dwell poetically, for Aoki, is to move away from the rigidity of instrumentalism, the over-reification of curriculum, the notion of technology, and the binary of dualism. Dwelling poetically in the wor(l)d of curriculum, Aoki returned to the live(d) ground of students and teachers – the isness of curriculum. Aoki’s existential-phenomenological approach toward curriculum revealed the isness of curriculum-as-lived (Liu Baergen, 2021). To expound the isness of curriculum is to move away from the dominant instrumental understanding of the word curriculum-as-plan that is enframed in the whatness of curriculum and fundamentally separated human and world, theory and practice. By juxtaposing the lived moments inside/outside the classroom, professional/personal, tensional/open, Aoki (2004) spoke the wor(l)d curriculum in multiple poetic ways. Sharing his existential-phenomenological-hermeneutic understanding, Aoki suggested that the teachers’ and students’ lived experiences become part of a curriculum, interconnected and not separable, “a lived situation, pregnantly alive in the presence of people” (Aoki, 1986/1991/2004, p. 159), a pedagogic situation. Aoki revealed what has been concealed in the habitation of the scientific rationale – the privilege of ideology. The shift to the ontological-phenomenological-hermeneutic understanding disrupts the ideologies and dominant representations around us.

However, revealing the complexity of the isness of curriculum-as-lived from the privileged ideology of whatness of curriculum-as-plan that assumes learning with a fixed beginning and end is a “living tension” (Aoki, 1990/2004, p. 362). Encountering the tensionality of an in-between place provokes one’s beingness to recognize the particular rather than the general, and it opens up the possibilities of engaging with one’s unique utterance as one puts forth one’s own curricular paths. Aoki was particularly attuned to the tensionality of a place in-between, whether inside or outside the classroom, Western or Eastern knowledge. Instead of focusing on the “apparent” differences culturally and linguistically, Aoki pointed to the profound spaces in between. The space in between is not a third physical space per se. Rather, it is one’s mode of being and becoming (Liu Baergen, 2021). The encounter of the differences etymologically, conceptually and aesthetically allows oneself to see one’s own shadow and to dwell within the tensionality of lived experiences as a mode of being and becoming, which is knowledge-making and educational. In turn, Aoki suggested “indwelling in the zone between curriculum-as-plan and curriculum-as-lived” (1986/1991/2004, p. 163). To attune to the possibilities of the in-between place, Aoki (1996b/2004) heeded Heidegger’s “ontological essentialism,”

Aoki metaphorically built a bridge “as a site of being” (p. 317). Instead of rushing to cross the bridge to “overcome the tensionality,” Aoki imagined, pondered, dwelled, and lingered on the bridge, the space in between. Dwelling on the bridge amid the tensionality of differences and “dwelling aright within,” Aoki (1986/99/2004, p. 163) sagely suggested. Dwelling on the bridge, a space in-between, as a way of being and becoming, is how Aoki adds ontology to epistemology in understanding poetic dwelling as educational experiences – education is being (Liu Baergen, 2021).

Dwelling with the words of Aoki and Heidegger and dwelling aright within the tensionality between the instrumental notion of technology and the educational experiences during and after the COVID-19 pandemic ultimately becomes my refuge in returning to the sense of humanity in online classrooms. Instead of frantically seeking and adapting to more technology in teaching during the pandemic, I paused and asked

myself: *How might technology be understood, experienced, and mobilized in different educational contexts?* I asked my students to dwell on the bridge that Aoki built “to understand what it means to dwell together humanly” (Aoki, 1991b/2004, p. 438-439) in the situation we are already in.

In the online class, I brought forward a 30-minute existential reflective writing exercise. During this exercise, I asked students to sit quietly to temporarily seek refuge from the demands of technology on our bodies and minds. I then asked them to switch their cameras off and put their electronic devices aside. These few steps helped us to shift our minds back to ourselves. Then, students and I started writing in silence and reflected on my proposed questions, such as: *How might the particular experience of learning/teaching through an online platform situate/provoke/layer their understating of learning and teaching? How has this technologically embedded situation impacted their everyday life and classroom?* In particular, I encouraged students to be attuned to their feelings, challenges, dilemmas and struggles they faced in their own lived situations. After the time was up, we resumed the class and shared our thoughts.

From my reflective observation, many students responded positively to this exercise, especially how this free engagement of writing helped them reconnect with what they “really feel” about teaching and learning through an online platform. More so, I noticed that the writing in silence exercise and the temporary removal of electronic devices “shifted” students’ perceptions about technology in an educational context. This attunement to the lived ground of curriculum of teacher and students, I realize, allows both students and teacher to voice our own curricular utterances in the interminable dialogue. Such dwelling right within the midst of tentonality is generative and educational.

This experience of redirecting students and myself through dwelling on our own lived experiences of phenomena brings awareness of our situated beingness. Also, attuning to our own lived experiences and listening to each other’s stories lures us into lingering in the complexity and uncertainty of knowledge and the ways of knowing. This existential-phenomenological-hermeneutic dwelling in the situation affirms the core of my teaching philosophy. I believe in a curriculum realm where teachers and students live(d) experiences, intellectual traditions, and cultures interplay. Personhood and live(d) experiences of both educators and students are not just innocuous educational experiences but are crucial places of contact in engaging in complicated conversations about educational questions and intercultural relations.

In turn, it is essential for me, as an educator, to create a learning environment where students can critically reflect on their own situated intellectual and/or professional interests; more specifically, learning/research for students as an inquiry into the field of their studies through a critically reflective process to reflect on their situatedness in the world. A critically reflective process to reflect on students’ situatedness in the world is essential in educational experiences. My pedagogical approach draws from the existential-phenomenology traditions that build on the method of narrative inquiry, which, I believe, encourages students to ask critical questions, to reflect upon their live(d) experiences, (dis)beliefs and their practices to facilitate this. Through the phenomenological ethos, learning/research becomes a mode of inquiry that allows students to embrace the investigation and description of phenomena as experience(d). Learning/research, as putting forth an inquiry to question and reflect upon students’ own live(d) experiences, understandings, actions and practices, is a fundamental value of my being as an educator.

Teaching, I have realized, is not merely a skillful act of attending to doing but an embodiment of a moment in the classroom where teachers and students’ life experiences live in one sense of time. Teaching carries no notion of knowledge transmission but instead returns to an educator’s beingness. Teaching and curriculum become multiple intimate learnable moments that transcend the inner world (lived curriculum) and outer world (planned curriculum) and dwell in an in-between place, as a site of being, as a way of being and becoming. The place in-between can also contribute to students’ and teachers’ awareness of the tensions and dilemmas as a place of foreignness to provoke their thinking. Teaching as “letting learn,” as described by Heidegger (1968), becomes an inspired journey toward understanding through reflection on significant external events and turning inward to personal consciousness, to the isness of live(d) experiences, especially on/to the possibility of dwelling in-between the juxtaposition of the lived moments that happened inside/outside the classroom, professional/personal traditions and tensionality/openness.

Here, dwelling poetically in the twilight of technology, curriculum, and the beingness of educators through an existential-phenomenological-hermeneutic “thought style” and pedagogical approach allows the

teachers and students to speak the subject of study in multiple ways. More so, dwelling poetically in the tensionality of the place in between becomes a generative tensionality that merges teachers' and students' intellectual works that emanate from their life history. Tensionality also serves as a generative intellectual provocation for them. Ultimately, I hope that thinking/theorizing as poetic dwelling invites students to engage in learning/research that contributes to understanding their own field of studies in all its particularity.

CONCLUSION

In questioning and provoking the instrumental rationale in thinking, I draw from Ted Tetsuo Aoki and Martin Heidegger's critical position of constantly pointing out the conceptual assumptions and philosophical blind spots in wor(l)d of metaphysics in understanding the notion of curriculum, teaching, and technology. By returning to the ontological ground of humanness, articulating the particularity in the phenomenon, and dwelling poetically in the hermeneutic imagination, as an educator and curriculum researcher, I hope to reposit the question concerning curriculum, teaching and technology that appears to be not only an existential-phenomenological problem of understanding our being and becoming in the educational contexts, but it is also a hermeneutic problem of the relationship between the general uncritical assumption and the particularity of the individual situation.

There is no elevating moment toward the goal of a comprehensive rationale in understanding curriculum, teaching, and technology. Instead, I suggest embracing an existential-phenomenological-hermeneutic approach that might enable educators to navigate the complex interplay of technology, curriculum, and their being with poetic insight. I believe this approach can empower teachers and students to engage with the subject of study in diverse and meaningful ways. By dwelling poetically in the space between, educators can facilitate a dynamic exchange that merges their intellectual contributions with those of their students, drawing from their unique life experiences. In turn, this learning/teaching environment fosters intellectual growth and serves as a catalyst for creative exploration and critical reflection for teachers and students.

REFERENCES

- Aoki, T.T. (1983/2004). Curriculum implementation as instrumental action and as situational praxis. In W.F. Pinar, & R.L. Irwin (Eds.), *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki* (pp. 111–124). New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611390>
- Aoki, T.T. (1986/1991/2004). Teaching as indwelling between two curriculum worlds. In W.F. Pinar, & R.L. Irwin (Eds.), *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki* (pp. 159–165). New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611390>
- Aoki, T.T. (1987/1999/2004). Toward understanding computer applications. In W.F. Pinar, & R.L. Irwin (Eds.), *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki* (pp. 151–158). New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611390>
- Aoki, T.T. (1990/2004). Inspiring the curriculum. In W.F. Pinar, & R.L. Irwin (Eds.), *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki* (pp. 357–366). New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611390>
- Aoki, T.T. (1991a/2004). Sonare and videre: A story, three echoes and a lingering note. In W.F. Pinar, & R.L. Irwin (Eds.), *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki* (pp. 367–376). New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611390>
- Aoki, T.T. (1991b/2004). Bridges that rim the Pacific. In W.F. Pinar, & R.L. Irwin (Eds.), *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki* (pp. 437–440). New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611390>
- Aoki, T.T. (1996a/2004). Spinning inspired images in the midst of planned and live(d) curricula. In W.F. Pinar, & R.L. Irwin (Eds.), *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki* (pp. 413–423). New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611390>

- Aoki, T.T. (1996b/2004). Imaginaries of “East and West”: Slippery curricular signifiers in education. In W.F. Pinar, & R.L. Irwin (Eds.), *Curriculum in a new key: The collected works of Ted T. Aoki* (pp. 313–320). Routledge, New York. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611390>
- Bambra, C., Riordan, R., Ford, J., & Matthews, F. (2020). The COVID-19 pandemic and health inequalities. *The Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 74(11), 964–968. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2020-214401>
- Heidegger, M. (1953/2010). *Being and time*. (J. Stambauch, Trans.). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Heidegger, M. (1968). *What is called thinking?* (J.G. Gray, Trans.). New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Heidegger, M. (1971a). *On the way to language*. (P.D. Hertz, Trans.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Heidegger, M. (1971b). *Poetry, language, thought*. (A. Hofstadter, Trans.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Heidegger, M. (1977). *The question concerning technology and other essays*. (W. Lovitt, Trans.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Huebner, D.E. (1977/1999). Toward a political economy of curriculum and human development. In W.F. Pinar (Ed.), *The lure of the transcendent: Collected essays by Dwayne E. Huebner* (pp. 285–298). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203053706>
- Liu Baergen, P. (2021). *Tracing Ted T. Aoki’s Intellectual Formation: Understanding Historical, Societal, and Phenomenological Influences*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.