

Critical and Postcolonial Approaches to Educational Administration Curriculum and Pedagogy

Eugenie A. Samier, University of Strathclyde, Scotland
Eugenie.samier@gmail.com

Abstract

This chapter provides an overview of the postcolonial literatures and their critiques relevant to internationalising curriculum in the educational administration and leadership field. The aim is to both examine the problems culturally and institutionally with primarily Anglo-American globalised curriculum that still holds a hegemonic position internationally as well as identify proposals in diversifying the field to reflect context, policy requirements and practices, and cultural values and principles. Discussed also are a number of initiatives that have been taken that provide a foundation for furthering this kind of curricular development, and a set of principles for internationalising the field that indicate the various levels and factors involved.

Introduction

One of the major problems in educational administration and leadership, as a number of scholars have pointed out for a couple of decades now, is that concepts, theories and practices in the field are not necessarily transferable, due to education, administration and leadership being 'culturally bound' or contextualised phenomena (Goh, 2009). Many transfers over centuries have intentionally and non-intentionally had colonising effects. Several like Cheng (1995), Bajunid (1996) Dimmock and Walker (2005), and Collard (2007) have argued that some curriculum is damaging to traditional and indigenous cultures as well as those modernising in diverse ways constituting a cultural security problem (e.g., Samier, 2015, 2019). For example, Khelifa's (2010) study of undergraduate Emirati women's Westernisation in a university that largely uses Western curriculum, taught by Western instructors, found a shift in behaviours, attitudes and values from the traditional. The impact of international schools through globalisation has also come under scrutiny, not only for the positive transfer of knowledge and pedagogy, but also for negative impacts associated with Westernisation such as in Bates' (2011) exploration of tensions and problems associated with the rapidly expanding number of such schools (Hammad & Shah, 2018).

Decolonising curriculum has become politicised through student protests as well, such as in the UK where demand for redesigning reading lists has been made in order to represent black and minority group experience to correct for an academic culture of denial and exclusion (Muldoon, 2019). The reaction has been variable across the sector, but also includes bullying of student activists who have complained about a colonising curriculum and advocated the inclusion of postcolonial studies (Swain, 2019). This also implicates internationalisation, which for a number of decades has been viewed as providing a high quality curriculum to foreign students, particularly in 'developing' countries, followed by the neoliberal market model in which revenue generation is a strong motivation in recruiting foreign students, but which is being revised to mean decolonising the curriculum to reflect others' needs, experiences and knowledge traditions, requiring a deeper change than adding to reading lists, implicating all aspects of curriculum and pedagogy (Naqvi, 2019). Unterhalter and Carpentier (2010) approach this problem through a critical policy lens inquiring whose interests have

been served by the globalisation of Western universities' role in generating revenue and related international influence agendas in foreign relations, but at the same time contributing to an increasing inequality globally. Education, in many historical colonisations, including that in the contemporary world, is used as an instrument to advance economic interests of colonisers, creating dependency in the colonised, and establishing a hierarchy of value (Rothermund, 2006), in identity terms creating the subaltern identity in the colonised that continues well past independence (Spivak, 1987). These factors produce what Unterhalter and Carpentier (2010) call a 'tetralemma' of higher education problems that issue from educational policies and practices that serve countries unequally: 1) economic growth; 2) equity; 3) democracy; and 4) sustainability. These problems also reflect, from a postcolonial perspective, a recolonisation period designed to benefit Western universities and nations.

The field of educational administration and leadership, while studied in many countries with local models and practices reported in the literature, still remains relatively 'impoverished' theoretically and methodologically reducing it to a lack of rigour (Normore & Lahera, 2019), and underrepresenting internationalisation developments in disciplines foundational to the field. Lumby and Morrison (2010) argue that theorists had remained uninterested, leading to a lack of depth contextually, inability to embed diversity issues like social justice authentically and pragmatically internationally, and a lack of multi-disciplinarity in using knowledge in foundational disciplines.

This underdevelopment applies to not only diversity in cognate fields like public administration, management and leadership studies, but also to foundational disciplines like psychology and sociology, cultural studies, political science, international relations and history. Lumby and Morrison (2010) recommend three proposals for a stronger theoretical and methodological foundation: a stronger use of multi- and inter-disciplinarity, a broader use of the many research methodologies from the cross-disciplinary research methods literature, and placing diversity issues more centrally in scholarship to overcome power imbalances. Roofe and Bezzina's (2018) approach reforms in curriculum as an intercultural practice, requiring an examination of philosophical and ideological foundations as well as approaches to practical application.

Even though the calls for greater international diversity in the field have been made for at least twenty-five years (e.g., Dimmock & Walker, 2000; Greenfield, 1995; Nee-Benham, 1997; Paige & Mestenhauser, 1999), the field still has a long way to go in research and teaching in Western countries that are multicultural and have many foreign students who need to return home with more relevant and transferable knowledge and skills (Leask, 2009). The field also needs to be developed in much greater depth in non-Western countries reflecting contextual factors, cultural and religious norms, political and economic systems, and traditional social institutions with theoretical or conceptual frameworks and research methods that are contextualised and culturally sensitive (e.g., Smith, 1999). An additional factor is the heavily globalised educational administration curriculum and teaching that is largely expatriate, the impact of which is seen in the common practice of policy borrowing of foreign curriculum and pedagogy that is ethnocentric and Western-oriented (Dimmock & Walker, 2000).

This chapter explores the implications for educational administration and leadership curriculum through internationalisation based on a broad range of postcolonial perspectives from outside the Anglo-American knowledge traditions where many of the 'Western' (but most commonly Anglo-American) views of the field are either not adequate for other

countries (Shilliam, 2011) or which can be culturally damaging. Western discussions of internationalisation and comparison have tended to produce models that still privilege a primarily Anglo-American foundational knowledge supplemented by material from other countries (Galligan, 2008), although some have advanced more contextually constituted models (e.g., Dimmock & Walker, 2005), policy transfer (Dolowitz & March, 2000), and equality of cultures (Lumby & Foskett, 2016). The nature and range of postcolonial critiques that provide guidance in how the field needs to be internationalised through the approaches taken and definitions used are examined, indicating the disciplines and schools of thought that need to be used. This is followed by a discussion of a number of internationalisation initiatives taken that serve as an initial foundation upon which to build. The third section proposes principles for internationalising the field that indicate the various levels and factors involved. The main aim is to explore how postcolonialism as a well-established major critical discourse (Gandhi, 1998) can inform the internationalisation of curriculum in educational administration and leadership.

Postcolonial Critiques

Criteria for internationalisation of the field can be constructed from postcolonial critiques that have been critical of some parts of Western knowledge, beginning with 'orientalism' by Said (1978, 1994) who used critical theories of Gramsci and Foucault to construct a postcolonial critique of imperial geopolitics and stereotypes of other peoples, particularly Arabs. Critiques have multiplied into a broad range of approaches reflecting knowledge traditions and conditions in many countries that allow for establishing principles by which more country-relevant curricular development can be made. Some of the most prominent are imperialism (Satterthwaite & Atkinson, 2005); neo-imperialism (e.g., Quist, 2001); colonisation of indigenous peoples (Stewart-Harawira, 2018), neo-colonisation (Memmi, 2003; Nkrumah, 1965; Quist, 2001), colonisation of mind (Thiong'o, 1986), epistemicide (Hall & Tandon, 2017), and the construction of subaltern identities (Spivak, 1987, 1992). They are mostly aimed at constructing a culturally more sustainable education in their countries and regions tending towards viewing administration and leadership as intangible cultural constructions (Arizpe & Amescua, 2013; Ruggles & Silverman, 2009). These have included topics such as critiques of globalised education as imperialism (Bush, 2006), especially cultural imperialism (Hamm & Smandych, 2005; Tomlinson, 1991), re-colonisation (e.g., Brock-Utne, 2000), and policy transfer (Harris, Jones & Adams, 2016).

Even earlier, Bourdieu's (1959) work as an anthropologist examined critically the colonising influences of France in Algeria that had a destructive effect on culture, social, psychological, moral and ideological levels as well as family, social, political and economic structures producing a permanent social liminality and dispossession, a use of his entire interconnected theory that is not often reflected in educational administration and leadership literature (see also Goodman & Silverstein, 2009). An additional insight from Bourdieu, Wacquant and Farage (1994) is that changes in education are very difficult to make because of resistance from those individuals and groups who are embedded in a state structure of social institution design, culture and values, social divisions, and hierarchies, whether existing locally, or imported through globalisation, that appear as natural and normal. Slethaug (2015) attributes some of this in Western universities to an overconcentration on admitting large numbers of international students before curriculum and pedagogy have become internationalised to accommodate student knowledge traditions and learning cultures.

An additional critique that is particularly relevant for education, which has been argued to be part of the cultural sector (e.g., Weber, 1968) rather than the economic sector which neoliberalism has been promoting, is the problem of cultural imperialism. Tomlinson (1991), reviewing a number of definitions, settles on a shared aspect of those from a number of sources: that it exists as a control of discourse production, either directly through expatriate teaching, or more indirectly through international accreditation (Noori & Anderson, 2013). In this way, the way one conceptualises and expresses the values, knowledge, identity and norms of a society produces an imperialism of a foreign society replacing these in a society in a recipient role. This is the currency also of education; for educational administration and leadership it means the rewriting of the values, roles, structures and practices of educational organisations through a foreign curriculum and pedagogy. Without resistance, this can lead, theoretically to an assimilation, in other words, (re-)colonisation. The importance of cultural and religious identity became more important for many countries as decolonisation developed through the twentieth century, and the post-Cold War roles changed with the decline of Marxism and Soviet colonies as an identifying characteristic, creating circumstances in which education plays a critical re-construction of society and nation-building role (Milligan, 2005).

These and other writings take multi- and interdisciplinary approaches that draw from disciplines associated with administration and leadership studies such as psychology, sociology, cultural studies, and political analyses. But they also draw on linguistics through critical discourse analysis often focusing on the impact of English on identity, knowledge, values and culture as well as on subjectified experience (Higgins, 2009; Tam, 2019), all of which affect the practice of education and the construction of administration and leadership roles. To a much larger extent with globalisation activities, International Relations is also a field that affects educational administration in a number of ways by providing the jurisdictional arrangements for branch campuses, international schools to operate, and research provisions cross-nationally. Embedded in inter-state relations and agreements are the problems of imperialism and colonialism where some states exercise much more power to their benefit with others either subject to power or are dependent on foreign countries for economic, political and cultural development in asymmetric ways (Shilliam, 2011). In these situations, the educational sector can be dependent in a way that International Relations is attempting to redefine: ‘to find a way of engaging with – rather than ignoring – non-Western political thought in a manner that is not beholden to colonial ideologies that drain the non-Western world of all significant content for the study of modernity’ (p. 3). For all fields and sectors the main challenge is to represent non-Western countries in terms that are authentic and are not simply a Western conceptualisation that serves the latter’s interests while subjugating the non-Western state to foreign values. What is required, as Gandhi (1998) argues, is a decentering – regarding other traditions as central to their perspectives on the world rather than continuing to be viewed as ‘marginal’ approaches that require attention.

There is also literature in other disciplines not often associated with the field (but used in primary disciplines) such as the arts in examining conceptions formed through literature such as Thiong’o’s (1986) work, film studies on how non-Westerners are portrayed in stereotypic ways such as Shaheen’s *Reel Bad Arabs* and Ponzanesi and Waller’s (2011) *Postcolonial Cinema Studies*, painting and architecture that aesthetically represent and shape power and authority (Hess, 2006; Kusno, 2014), and a broad range of representational media in Hallam and Street’s (2000) *Cultural Encounters*. All of these play a role in shaping our conceptions of knowledge, authority, identity, role models, styles of social interaction, values and social institutional arrangements that contribute to reconstructing a curriculum that is more diverse and inclusive.

In the primary disciplines there are changes in approach that demonstrate a greater international representation and critique of dominating perspectives and a cultivation of postcolonial critiques as part of that process. These have not yet been incorporated into updating educational administration and leadership, which to a large extent still rests on these foundations as they were in dominant form in the 1960s, 70s, and 80s. For example, in psychology cultural factors need to be taken into consideration (Keith, 2019) that affect all aspects and constructions of psychological experience and dynamics (Kitayama & Cohen, 2007), and conversely how feeling, thinking and acting can reflect cultural values and norms (Valsiner, 2006), including analysing the trauma of being colonised (Ward, 2007). Some apply postcolonial and decolonising critiques to change the discipline in a deeper way to become more inclusive. Oliver (2004), for example, examines colonisation of ‘psychic space’ using a psychoanalytic social theory to examine how subjectivity – our sense of self, individuality and constructs of mind – are embedded in social relationship and cultural norms, similar to the work of Anderson, Jenson and Keller (2011) on psychoanalytic critiques of colonisation internationally. In colonisation, psycho-social forces shape our social positions through subjugation and oppression through various types of symbolic, verbal and physical violence, undermining our psychological processes and disrupting creative and constructive forms of sublimation that allow us to create meaning, producing alienation. The learning, teaching and administering activities of colonising education serve as instruments for shaping what knowledge is valuable, what roles are suitable, and whose authority is valued.

Sociology is another primary discipline upon which educational administration and leadership is based that has also decolonised, allowing for greater applicability to other countries. For example, Rodriguez, Boatcă and Costa (2010) reconceptualise basic concepts to both reflect the conditions of other cultures and countries, and suggest ways of decolonising the discipline to allow for much greater diversity. Bhambra (2014) reconstructs sociology for global use based on a broad conception of cosmopolitanism that rests on multiple modernities, multiple systems of societies, and reconstructions guided by postcolonial and decolonising principles. A similar approach was taken by Ahmed (1986) in reconstructing anthropology from an Islamic perspective in correcting errors and shortcomings as well as critiquing research methodologies that are inadequate within an Islamic context that are largely a consequence of colonised approaches.

Aman (2018) examines not only how indigenous knowledge is important for local people, but that other knowledges are worth Westerners learning for the value they hold, in effect reversing some of the direction in which knowledge flows. Manthalu and Waghid’s (2019) collection discusses not only the importance of using indigenous philosophies of education (see also Grosfuguel, Hernández & Velásquez, 2016), but also examining the civic role of education in its own societal context, the need and nature of decolonised higher education policies, changing pedagogy in higher education to remove hierarchies of privilege, and constructing more equitable interfaces between secondary and higher education organisations. A more critical collection edited by Manthalu (2018) views hegemonic Western education as toxic and a contributing cause to the destruction of cultures, identities and societal character that can only be fixed by reconstructing and advancing indigenous knowledges in dialogue with other traditions.

De Sousa Santos (2016) proposes three fundamental elements in the decolonising critique: that other epistemologies exist beyond the Western; global justice does not exist unless

cognitive justice is achieved; and there are other emancipatory theories beyond the Western critical traditions. The search for non-Western paradigms of knowledge was also the main aim of Alvares and Faruqi's (2012) collection on *Decolonising the University*, in response to the destruction of indigenous cultures, and Ndlovu-Gatsheni and Zondi's (2016) leading a liberatory discussion from imperialising knowledge practices in African states in knowledge, methodologies and the ways that disciplines are defined, as well as the role research methods play in colonisation (Patel, 2016). Battiste (2013) presents internationalisation of curriculum as a social justice and legal right requiring that indigenous knowledge be located centrally in a curriculum. However, some have paradoxically used colonisers' concepts, arguments, and disciplines to internationalise while attempting to create a new language in which to reflect other traditions of thought (Hiddleston, 2014). For Smith, Tuck and Yang (2019), a major impediment is the subsumption of indigenous and decolonising work in multiculturalism and critical race theory effectively reducing their value and impact.

Education, itself, has to be decolonised, in both deconstructing how knowledge and pedagogy are understood and what roles are played in administration and governance while providing for students in non-Western countries ways to overcome the 'subaltern' identity they assume in globalised education, and means for them to do so as foreign students in Western universities. The postcolonial types of critique have covered all levels of educational system including early childhood education that instils colonising values, attitudes and conceptions (Nxumalo, 2019), and how pedagogy can effectively teach anti-racist and justice-based curriculum (Trinder, 2020). Some of the literature has focussed on multicultural societies like the UK where a more intercultural and inclusive curriculum can aide in achieving a civil society where inclusive and diverse notions of identity, culture and knowledge can be accommodated, with developments led by government, political leadership and those in the educational sector itself can play leading roles (Gundara, 2000). Decolonising the university is a topic that has received attention in many countries, including student activism in pursuing social justice and equality internationally in the academy, causing a number of initiatives in Western and non-Western countries through changes in curriculum and pedagogy to remove coloniality through the strategies of promoting an anti-colonial critique and by offering new curriculum and teaching (Bhambra, Gebrial & Nişancıoğlu, 2018). However, the depth of achievement in many cases is superficial - De Sousa Santos (2017) argues that the challenge to universities is a much deeper one than many involved in the discussion represent, especially from the Western perspective, since it requires a paradigmatic re-evaluation and change where sub-paradigmatic discussions assume the university's ongoing future with minor changes, noting that the institution as a public good has been under threat for some time.

Rodriguez's (2019) work focusses more on the violent impact on those whose minority status makes them subject to systems of racist oppression and silencing that produce devaluing, a critique that can be extended internationally through globalised education in the non-Western world. Cupples and Grosfoguel (2019) discuss some of the resistance met attributing part of the problem to a belief that Eurocentric epistemologies assume a false objectivity and universalism where other knowledges are marginalised or entirely dismissed. Doing so constitutes for them a racism and epistemic violence, aided by neoliberalism that is not compatible with decolonisation.

The critique of globalisation can be more fundamental than simply marginalising and neglecting additional sources in curriculum. Bilgin (2018) argues that even the conceptions of globalisation and the international are colonising constructions that reflect dominant Western

values and perspectives and predetermine the subjectivity of others such as those in the Middle East. Her focus is on those colonising hierarchies and structures that still perpetuate in so-called postcolonial states and subjectivities methods and approaches taken to be general or universal when they are the consequence of colonising forces. One form of this is the assumption that what works or fails in a Western country would necessarily apply elsewhere (Bailey et al., 2019). The result is that not only are non-Westerners still encased in colonialism, but the 'Western' is created as a consequence of colonisation and dominating conceptions of modernity. One important development for any administration and leadership is the challenge to dominating conceptions of modernity or modernising by Eisenstadt and others (Sachsenmeier, Riedel & Eisenstadt, 2002) in their formulation of 'multiple modernities'. To adopt this variable approach, it is necessary to engage in others' conceptions of the international, which in this chapter turns to the postcolonial critiques to construct principles of curricular design in educational administration and leadership that are necessary to achieve social justice in education by ensuring that others' knowledge traditions and practices are represented equally, contributing, as Bilgin argues, to ontological security.

The history of European colonisation predates many of the references that locate it in the nineteenth century, when it originated in the fifteenth century more deeply influencing systems of thought and perspective and how binary conceptions embedded themselves in 'modernity' and 'nativism', that are being challenged by conceptions of indigenous, multiple and alternative modernities proposed as ways of decolonising knowledge in the 1990s and overcoming epistemic violence (Saffari, Abdolmaleki & Akhbari, 2017).

Part of the critique involves the administrative practices of policy transfer that inadequately evaluate and modify foreign curriculum and teaching practices often adopted in order to achieve foreign accreditation systems that do not recognise or value other knowledge systems and to achieve higher international rankings that are determined by assessments that assume Western criteria, and within a neoliberalised framework that represents knowledge as a commodity (Donn and Al Manthri, 2013). For some like Pirbhai-Illich, Pete and Martin (2017), decolonising pedagogy requires a critical theory framework that allows for a significant and meaningful transformation, de-centring the dominant pedagogical narratives that use education as a subjugating instrument. This perspective does not see an end to colonisation in former periods, but a continuation in a different form, drawing on Grosfoguel's (2011) argument that colonisation is ongoing in many social spheres, including that of education, in a global power matrix.

Internationalisation Initiatives

Internationalisation has been successful to some degree by producing broader and more global views (Bourn, 2011) and preparing students in the West better to live and work in a more interconnected world where there is a responsibility to acquire the knowledge and skills for diversity and transculturality (Green & Whitsed, 2015). However, internationalisation is not always implemented this way in curriculum. For many UK universities, it is interpreted as a marketing goal and strategy, for some it is regarded as a sustainable development goal. For many, it is an uncritical knowledge society pursuit in a digitalised global competitive world, however, at this time with little appreciation of privacy and security issues, or the impact on thinking, learning and identity. Green and Mertova (2016) also warn about assuming that rhetoric of internationalisation actually becomes implemented in the thinking, self-reflective awareness, knowledge and activities of faculty. Part of internationalising is the policy borrowing, or policy transfer, practices that underpin globalisation activities resulting in

foreign curriculum and pedagogy. Expatriate staff defining internationalisation as ‘what works’ is a deceptive measure since it often reflects ‘what works’ for Western criteria, for example, higher PISA scores and other assessment surveys while destroying culture, values, identity, and other knowledge traditions. Lemke (1995) describes such ‘evidence’ as ‘technocratic discourse’, Whitty (2012) as ‘quasi-research’ produced by think tanks and advocacy groups, and Ball (2012) as private sector consultants, entrepreneurs and others in ‘edu-businesses’ in those Western states heavily engaged in globalising curriculum and teaching. One contentious area is the use of US and UK accreditation by universities in non-Western countries as an inappropriate policy transfer involving foreign conceptions of curriculum and teaching that are imposed as a colonising activity (e.g., Altbach, 2015).

The conception of internationalisation has changed over the last three decades, though, becoming more diverse and inclusive and responding to many postcolonial critiques. Paige and Mestenhauser (1999), for example, reflect some of the Western notions of internationalising during the 1990s, consisting of moving away from a parochial perspective to one that is more inclusive and cross-cultural and cognizant of the importance of context as well as global forces shaping the conditions in which educational administration is constructed and practiced. Also recognised was the possibility of policy transfer in using other countries’ experiences as precedents for change. However, the authors also noted the highly resistant nature of the field in internationalising often leading to dismissing knowledge and experience outside the local context. Their critique of some of the conceptions of internationalisation is that it often takes the form of privileging one’s own system into a norm while viewing all other forms as foreign, an ethnocentrism that is both a social justice problem and exclusionary of other values, knowledges and practices. At this time, too, the ‘international’ was taken as a bilateral concept rather than a multilateral one. The effect on curriculum is to regard one’s own traditions as foundational and others as supplemental and leading to using research methodology and curriculum inappropriate to other contexts as well as a diminishment of context itself. Paige and Mestenuhuser also note that many guidelines and collections of literature purport to either be universally applicable (and other sources as not epistemologically legitimate) or more international than they really are.

However, a more recent decolonising literature examines more deeply changes that need to take place before revisions to curriculum and pedagogy, reflecting subaltern and colonisation of mind concerns on ontological and epistemological levels. Pirbhai-Illich, Pete and Martin (2017) identify a number of levels on which decolonising curriculum needs to be done. The first is a re-construction of self and professional identity and the nature of the relationships we have where colonising characteristics and assumptions play a role in shaping experience, discourse and knowledge and justifying a colonising practice. It is these that define how educational organisations are formed and designed, the nature of classroom dynamics, what experiences and knowledge have value, and how roles are shaped, including creating subaltern identities and colonisation of mind. This requires reflexivity on the part of governing bodies, administrators, teachers and students themselves, sometimes involving entering uncomfortable realms and learning to let go of ideas of superiority, or for the subaltern, inferiority.

Welikala (2011) has proposed a number of initiatives that should be pursued in adequately internationalising higher education, termed a ‘multi-perspective curriculum’: presenting multiple world views on topics and using comparative teaching approaches; using reflexive techniques such as diaries or logs so that students can critically reshape their views; creating a safe culture for staff and students that allows for diversity and developing new knowledge

and understanding; and drawing on collaborative learning practices that allow for sharing diversity among students.

A major question that needs to be addressed in internationalisation of higher education is the degree to which curricular and related pedagogical practices are involved. Many sources examining the topic define it in institutional terms that do not include curriculum and pedagogy. For example, Maringe (2009) defines it functionally for the purpose of his study as the drivers and benefits in the organisation, organisational and management models that are being used, and the risks and challenges in the process. The results demonstrate that while some changes occurred during the 1990s and after UK higher education budget cuts, the majority of the features are positioning the university in rankings (including international partners), acquiring a competitive edge, attracting more foreign students for budget reasons, and defining organisational strategy in mostly marketing terms. There was evidence of internationalising through a greater diversity and inclusion of knowledge, however, this aspect of internationalisation was a minor one in relation to the others, particularly the expectations of UK students in a focus on local versus global content and perspectives.

For others, though, like Larsen (2016), a necessary indicator of internationalisation is the way and degree to which knowledge has been internationalised through curriculum. One of the limitations she identifies, though, are Western universities that bifurcate curriculum to that taught at home, requiring little adjustment, and that delivered abroad that has been heavily modified. The approaches vary, from those aimed at producing global citizens through curriculum that contains international and comparative content, often with foreign language training, but which privilege Western knowledge, to curricular models that explore a number of national systems' knowledges that flow from West to other and conversely, grounded in Appadurai's (1990) conception of ideoscapes that flow internationally. Alternatively, Larsen presents Bhabha's (1994) approach that treats knowledge as complex and hybrid (rather than Western or foreign), allowing for the many influences historically parts of the world have had on others, such as the European Renaissance adoption of Islamic medieval scholarship (which itself drew heavily on knowledge from many countries and empires) in pure and applied fields (Hourani, 1991) that are now neglected in the presentation of fields and disciplines.

Decolonising curriculum is also seen as a form of achieving social justice by meeting the multicultural and cross-cultural needs of students and staff through valuing equally their knowledge systems, identity constructions, and belief systems in curricular and pedagogical practice. Achieving social justice in education requires governance and policy commitment, placing subjective and traditional knowledge and norms centrally in teaching, reconstructing curriculum and pedagogical practice, and redefining professional codes of ethics and professional roles. In higher education it means changing one's supervisory relationships, curricular content, and research approaches that are sensitive to and respect legal and cultural norms in other countries. Social justice from a postcolonial perspective means cognitive and epistemological justice, liberating people from the unspoken political assumptions of how society should be – in effect creating a hegemonic epistemology (Paraskeva, 2016), but one that also carries moral and an ontological hierarchy of principles and values that need to be challenged.

Principles for Internationalising Educational Administration and Leadership Curriculum and Pedagogy

Proposed here are principles for internationalising that meet many of the postcolonial critiques. This requires identifying those dimensions that have implications for curriculum, teaching, and researching in non-Western contexts (particularly non-Anglo-American) and for international students in Western universities. One of the most accepted definitions is that by Leask (2009), requiring that all aspects of the field be developed including curriculum and pedagogy: the preparation, delivery and the outcomes of study. Characteristics of such internationalised education is described by Green and Mertova (2009) as having three goals: ensuring that all students acquire a global perspective consisting of knowledge of other countries, their cultures and languages, knowledge and skills for intercultural competence that demonstrates an understanding of other perspectives and the ability to communicate effectively, and acquiring a sense of global citizenship that brings the internalisation of principles of equity, social justice, and the rejection of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination (Green & Whitsed, 2015).

These consist of four levels of societal and jurisdictional characteristics for sustainability in the literature: 1) the individual level of self, identity and social interaction; 2) context (e.g., culture, religion, social institution configuration); 3) knowledge traditions; and 4) culturally appropriate research methods. Each of these have three aspects of educational administration: 1) 'decolonising' curriculum (e.g., Kanu, 2003; Stein, 2017); developing pedagogy for diversity (Progler, 2014); and criteria for research methods (Crossley & Watson, 2003). The main aim is to generate curricular and pedagogical principles for educational administration and leadership at graduate levels that are necessary to maintain the diversity of educational systems and social institutions that meet countries' values and goals for the preservation of culture, the formation of citizenship (Stein & Andreotti, 2016), and continued development (Boroujerdi, 2004). These approaches do not necessarily mean abandoning modernisation but achieving an appropriate modernisation, described in the multiple modernities literature (Eisenstadt, 2017), that allows for modernising within different cultural, religious, historical and socio-political frameworks and knowledge traditions used in social institutions. Such principles apply to all aspects of educational administration and leadership: the major divisions of knowledge in the field, including organisation studies, administrative and management studies, policy studies, leadership studies and research methods. It has implications for all aspects of teaching and supervision, and the management and administration of student recruitment, syllabi, programme design, and assessment.

Drawing in part on Green and Whitsed (2015) and synthesising the practices identified from the above discussion, the framework for a set of guidelines consists of at least five levels needed to create the knowledge and understanding necessary for epistemic justice and to provide culturally appropriate development and the continuity of culture and societal constructions. The first level, self, identity and social interaction, requires a curriculum that provides the national and cultural content that informs the shaping of identity, consisting of the values, cultural norms (e.g., Côté & Levine, 2016) and language (Preece, 2016) that shape identity formation in multiple ways.

The contextual level can refer to any forces that have shaped society, culture and the individual, including economic, political, cultural, environmental, and religious. From a postcolonial perspective, this includes the multidimensional impact of colonisation periods that can have far-reaching and significant effects from the individual to regional levels. Of great current concern is the effect of globalisation, for many it is a neo-imperialism or neo-colonisation that affects all key features of educational administration such as those identified by Bush (2018): the role of administrators and leaders; distribution of powers throughout the

educational system; complexity in the forms and structure of educational context; the role and form of moral obligations (that may come also from religion); and how educational administrators are trained and educated. There are important societal dimensions that vary such as different definitions of public versus private, the level of security necessary in a society, the degree of conflict taking place, and the role of the military in civilian agencies.

An equitable inclusion of knowledge traditions internationally is another level upon which internationalisation of curriculum rests. Two main aspects of knowledge recognition and use are critiqued from postcolonial perspectives: presentism, that assumes a hierarchy of knowledge value as a temporal construction; and secondly, a hierarchy of value determined by Westernisation, predominantly Anglo-American knowledge and skills enforced through globalisation. However, such a view excludes valuable knowledges in many parts of the world that have international value to scholarship and have pragmatic value in the societies from which they derive. Of value are those primary internationalised disciplines and public administration and management studies providing a foundation and sources of knowledge that educational administration and leadership are embedded in such as non-Western public administration (e.g., Drechsler, 2015) and cross-cultural management studies (e.g., Branine, 2011). These include knowledge traditions that have served to sustain societies, in some cases for millennia and that still have relevance (e.g., Dangor, 2005; Hussein, 2007). Important in the pedagogy of curriculum is also a language of inclusion (Paraskeva, 2017) that does not exclude knowledge, and which represents Western traditions as equal to other significant traditions.

There are two main issues with research methodology: first, using styles and types of research that originate in other knowledge traditions; and secondly, ensuring that one is conducting research in a culturally sensitive and ethical manner. One problem in attribution of research to non-Western traditions is the appropriation of research knowledge and methods from other cultures (e.g., Morgan, 2007). The second is identifying research approaches that are more appropriate in diverse contexts, such as forms of narrative inquiry that are related to story-telling traditions in many societies (Webster & Mertova, 2007), including ethnographic story-telling among indigenous and Bedouin peoples (e.g., Taieb, 2014). For Bristol (2012), the postcolonial brings a critique to the current forms of imperialism that define others' identities and knowledge that harnesses education as a colonising instrument, replacing hegemonic practices with other ways of knowledge, such as various indigenous forms.

There are also pedagogical practices that advance diversity and mutual understanding and respect more than others, according to Ganzevoort (2006). A prominent one is a dialogical approach that is mutually respectful and aims at understanding different perspectives, over a detached approach that can reduce communication by occupying an illusory position of an objective observer' and the committed which can lead to exclusivity, creating a hierarchy of knowledge and traditions, and does not lead effectively to multicultural awareness.

Conclusion

The consequences of internationalising curriculum to meet postcolonial goals requires of academics not only changing curricular content to reflect other traditions and conditions but also teaching and understanding in an inter-cultural manner. This requires a significant effort in changing one's values, how one thinks, what one knows, and learning different styles of interpersonal interaction. This also affects the rationale for internationalising curriculum – it should not be done to attract student diversity as an economic, market-based venture, but to

recognise the inherent value in other knowledge traditions. For Paraskeva (2017), this requires movement from ‘curriculum epistemicide’ through ‘abyssal thinking’ that designates one’s own Western tradition as legitimate and others as ‘non-existent’, towards a post-colonial Itinerant Curriculum Theory – in other words, not assuming that one’s immediate knowledge tradition is a sufficient basis for curriculum and pedagogy for anyone.

Bodycott and Walker (2000) discuss three important aspects in their study of university teaching for Westerners in the policy context of Hongkong, drawing on Ogbu’s (1991) model of viewing culture through these lenses: 1) language and communication that can prevent students from engaging in discussion in a ‘face-saving’ culture, involving that recall of personal experience be stressed and that materials used match the national context; 2) social and cultural distance involving differences in roles, practices, and how student group work is carried out; and 3) the effects of hierarchy on distributing decision-making and in group discussions where ‘face’ can be implicated among student and professional groups. How faculty understand their role, even unconsciously, is important in their approaches to professional identity, values, knowledge, teaching, students and colleagues that have implications for the societies in which they are working. These can be represented in metaphors that reflect three ways in which one can approach foreign students, either in a Western university or as an expatriate faculty member working abroad: as a Public Servant motivated by public service to the goals and aims of a foreign country’s development as articulated by its governing actors and its citizens; as a Cultural Diplomat, representing the Western tradition and its scholarly achievements while respecting other traditions an engaging in authentic dialogue; and as an Intellectual Imperialist, aimed at a colonising incorporation of others into the Western academic world (Samier, 2014).

Addressing postcolonial critiques requires a holistic approach to the broad range of postcolonial critiques. Decolonising curriculum is not just being more inclusive of knowledge about societal arrangements and knowledge traditions from non-Western countries, but aiming for a truer use of the term ‘educational’. Quite often it is euphemistically used for ‘schooling’ as it is defined in many Western countries, when it should include many other levels and forms of a system of education, from pre-school to advanced forms of further education taking place in many kinds of organisations, as well as informal and non-formal educational practices (Mocker & Spear, 1982) that vary considerably globally. Comprehensiveness in the field requires also that government agencies, interest groups, research centres and think tanks be included as well as organisations in all sectors and at the international levels that practice further education and training. Contextual conditions are also critical important – for many taking the form of dire conditions and conflict (Samier, forthcoming). Doing so requires more emphasis on comparative education, identity issues, cultural and values, and cross-cultural studies. In order not to falsely universalise, all studies in the field need to be contextualised.

The most fundamental step in internationalising curriculum is a collaborative approach with communities and representatives of diverse knowledge traditions to reconstruct an inclusive curriculum and pedagogy of diverse practices, agency, materiality and temporality (Oland, Hart & Frink, 2012). This requires a highly reflexive ability, drawing on transculturality and cosmopolitanism to distance oneself from assumptions about society, knowledge and practices. For Waghid et al. (2020), a cosmopolitan pedagogy means engaging with the ‘other’, with differences, and more strategically with inclusion practices that involve cooperation, co-existential recognition, meaningful engagement and acts of resistance against

the colonial conceptions of education that lead to interculturalism, social justice, and globalism of respect.

Pedagogical practices also need to be revised in terms of differing roles and relationships, religious assumptions, and cultural norms, including supervision practices and roles. The diversity that foreign professors and students bring should be embraced rather than marginalised and expecting them to assimilate. Different designs of curriculum, assessment and activities need to be incorporated. Research methods and practices also need considerable revision for use in non-Western countries and with minority groups in Western countries, not only to conform to legal and cultural norms, but also to be effective in collecting meaningful data that Western methods may not capture, requiring revision of research ethics, research methods, and analysis of data that are contextually embedded. Administrative and leadership roles in a university need to both require and support these changes through policies, support programmes, and community and international relations.

For Zane (2015), a decolonisation of curriculum means changing how one perceives others – too often an infantilisation of indigenous and other non-Western communities and students. This has to be replaced with an active recognition of their capabilities and by removing what Battiste (2017) argues is a patronising attitude in which the ‘other’ is assumed to need to learn curriculum content and skills and by attributing the problem to students and the communities and countries of origin, rather than in the underlying foundation and macro-structures of Western educational systems that need reconstruction.

References

- Ahmed, A. (1986). *Toward Islamic anthropology*. Ann Arbor, MI: New Era.
- Alvares, C., & Faruqi, S. (Eds.) (2012). *Decolonising the university: The emerging quest for non-eurocentric paradigms*. Negara, Malaysia: Perpustakaan.
- Aman, R. (2018). *Decolonising intercultural education: Colonial differences, the geopolitics of knowledge, and inter-epistemic dialogue*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Anderson, W., Jenson, D., & Keller, R. (Eds.) (2011). *Unconscious dominions: Psychoanalysis, colonial trauma, and global sovereignties*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Altbach, P. (2015). Academic colonialism in action: American accreditation of foreign universities. *International Higher Education*, 32, 5-7.
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 7(2), 295-310.
- Arizpe, L., & Amescua, C. (Eds.) (2013). *Anthropological perspectives on intangible cultural heritage*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Bailey, L., Purinton, T., Al-Mahdi, O., & Al Khalifa, H. (2019). Conceptualizing school leadership in the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) cultures. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, DOI: 10.1177/1741143219884682.
- Bajunid, I. (1996). Preliminary explorations of indigenous perspectives of educational management: The evolving Malaysian experience. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 34, 50-73.
- Ball, S. (2012). *Global education inc*. London: Routledge.
- Bates, R. (Ed.) (2011). *Schooling internationally: Globalisation, internationalisation and the future for international schools*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

- Battiste, M. (2017). Foreword. In F. Pribhai-Illich, S. Pete, & F. Martin (Eds.), *Culturally responsive pedagogy: Working towards decolonization, indigeneity and interculturalism* (pp. vii-xi). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Bhambra, G. (2014). *Connected sociologies*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Bhambra, G., Gebrial, D., & Nişancıoğlu, K. (2018). Introduction: Decolonising the university? In G. Bhambra, D. Gebrial, & K. Nişancıoğlu, K. (Eds.), *Decolonising the university* (pp. 1-17). London: Pluto Press.
- Bilgin, P. (2018). Thinking about world order, inquiring into others conceptions of the international. In G. Hellmann (Ed.), *Theorizing global order* (pp. 37-65). Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag.
- Bodycott, P., & Walker, D. (2000). Teaching abroad. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 5(1), 79-94.
- Boroujerdi, M. (2004). Subduing globalization: The challenge of the indigenization movement. In B. Schaebler & L. Stenberg (Eds.), *Globalization in the Muslim world* (pp. 30-38). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., Wacquant, L., & Farage, S. (1994). Rethinking the state. *Sociological Theory*, 12(1), 1-18.
- Branine, M. (2011). *Managing across cultures*. London: Sage.
- Bristol, L. (2012). Postcolonial thought: A theoretical and methodological means for thinking through culturally ethical research. In J. Lavia & S. Mahlomaholo (Eds.) *Culture, education, and community: Expressions of the postcolonial imagination* (pp. 15-32). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bush, B. (2006). *Imperialism and postcolonialism*. Harlow: Pearson.
- Bush, T. (2018). Preparation and induction for school principals: Global perspectives. *Management in Education*, 32(2), 66-71.
- Brock-Utne, B. (2000). *Whose education for all? The recolonization of the African mind*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Cheng, K. (1995). The neglected dimension: Cultural comparison in educational administration. In K. Wong & K. Cheng (Eds.), *Educational leadership and change: An international perspective* (pp. 87-102). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Collard, J. (2007). Constructing theory for leadership in intercultural contexts. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 45(6), 740-755.
- Côté, J. & Levine, C. (2002). *Identity formation, agency and culture*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Crossley, M., & Watson, K. (2003). *Comparative and international research in education*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Cupples, J., & Grosfoguel, R. (Eds.) (2019). *Unsettling eurocentrism in the westernized university*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Dangor, S. (2005). Islamization of disciplines: Towards an indigenous educational system. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 37(4), 519-531.
- De Sousa Santos, B. (2016). *Epistemologies of the south: Justice against epistemicide*. London: Routledge.
- De Sousa Santos, B. (2017). *Decolonising the university*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2000). Developing comparative and international educational leadership and management. *School Leadership and Management*, 20(2), 143-160.
- Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2005). *Educational leadership: Culture and diversity*. London: Sage.

- Dolowitz, D., & Marsh, D. (2000). Learning from abroad: The role of policy transfer in contemporary policy-making. *Governance*, 13(1), 5-24.
- Donn, G., & Al Manthri, Y. (2013). Education policy transfer – borrowing and lending education policy. In G. Donn & Y. Al Manthri (Eds.), *Education in the broader Middle East: Borrowing a baroque arsenal* (pp. 9-21). Oxford: Symposium.
- Drechsler, W. (2015). Paradigms of non-Western public administration and governance. In A. Massey & K. Johnston (Eds.), *The international handbook of public administration and governance* (pp. 104-131). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Eisenstadt, S. (Ed.) (2017). *Multiple modernities*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Galligan, L. (2008). Internationalization of the curriculum, University of Southern Queensland, Learning and Teaching Support Unit. Available online.
- Gandhi, L. (1998). *Postcolonial theory*. Crows Nest, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Ganzevoort, R. (2006). Teaching religion in a plural world. In N. Lantinga (Ed.), *Christian higher education in the global context* (pp. 117-124). Proceedings of the International Conference of IAPCHE, Granada, Nicaragua, 2006.
- Goh, J. (2009). Parallel leadership in an ‘unparallel’ world – cultural constraints on the transferability of Western educational leadership theories across cultures. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 12(4), 319-345.
- Goodman, J., & Silverstein, P. (Eds.) (2009). *Bourdieu in Algeria: Colonial politics, ethnographic practices, theoretical developments*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Green, W., & Mertova, P. (2009). *Internationalisation of teaching and learning at the University of Queensland*. Brisbane: University of Queensland.
- Green, W., & Mertova, P. (2016). Transformalists and transactionists: Towards a more comprehensive understanding of academics’ engagement with ‘internationalisation of the curriculum’. *Research in Comparative & International Education*, 11(3), 229-246.
- Green, W., & Whitsed, C. (2015). Introducing critical perspectives on internationalising the curriculum. In W. Green & C. Whitsed (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on internationalising the curriculum in disciplines* (pp. 3-19). Rotterdam: Sense.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2011). Decolonizing post-colonial studies and paradigms of political-economy. *Transmodernity*, 1(1), 1-37.
- Grosfoguel, R., Hernández, R., & Velásquez, E. (Eds.) (2016). *Decolonizing the westernized university*. Lanham, ML: Lexington.
- Gundara, J. (2000). *Interculturalism, education and inclusion*. London: Sage.
- Hall, B., & Tandon, R. (2017). Decolonization of knowledge, epistemicide, participatory research and higher education. *Research for All*, 1(1), 6-19.
- Hallam, E., & Street, B. (Eds.) (2000). *Cultural encounters: Representing otherness*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hamm, B., & Smandych, R. (Eds.) (2005). *Cultural imperialism*. Orchard Park, NY: Broadview Press.
- Hammad, W., & Shah, S. (2018). Dissonance between the ‘international’ and the conservative ‘national’: Challenges facing school leaders in international schools in Saudi Arabia. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 54(5), 747-780.
- Harris, A., Jones, M., & Adams, D. (2016). Qualified to lead? A comparative, contextual and cultural view of educational policy borrowing. *Educational Research*, 58(2), 166-178.
- Hess, J. (2006). *Art and architecture in postcolonial Africa*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co.
- Hiddleston, J. (2014). *Decolonising the intellectual: Politics, culture, and humanism and the end of the French empire*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Higgins, C. (2009). *English as a local language: Post-colonial identities and multilingual practices*. Bristol: Multiculturalism Matters.

- Hourani, A. (1991). *Islam in European thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hussein, S. (2007). Critical pedagogy, Islamisation of knowledge and Muslim education. *Intellectual Discourse*, 15(1), 85-104.
- Kanu, Y. (2003). Curriculum as cultural practice: Postcolonial imagination. *Journal of the Canadian Association for Curriculum Studies*, 1(1), 67-81.
- Keith, K. (Ed.) (2019). *Cross-cultural psychology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell.
- Kitayama, S., & Cohen, D. (Eds.) (2007). *Handbook of cultural psychology*. New York: Guildford Press.
- Khelifa, M. (2010). Trading culture: Have western-educated Emirati females gone western? *OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 1, 19-29.
- Knight, . (2004). Internationalization remodelled. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(1), 5-31.
- Kusno, A. (2014). *Behind the postcolonial: Architecture, urban space and political cultures in Indonesia*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Larsen, M. (2016). *Internationalization of higher education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leask, B. (2009). Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(2), 205-221.
- Lemke, J. (1995). *Textual politics*. London: Routledge.
- Lumby, J., & Foskett, N. (2016). Internationalization and culture in higher education. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, 44(1), 95-111.
- Lumby, J., & Morrison, M. (2010). Leadership and diversity. *School Leadership and Management*, 30(1), 3-17.
- Manthalu, C., & Waghid, Y. (Eds.) (2018). *Education for decoloniality and decolonisation in Africa*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Maringe, F. (2009). Strategies and challenges of internationalisation in HE: An exploratory study of UK universities. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 23(7), 553-563.
- Memmi, A. (2003). *The colonizer and the colonized*. London: Earthscan.
- Milligan, J. (2005). *Islamic identity, postcoloniality, and educational policy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mocker, D., & Spear, G. (1982). *Lifelong learning: Formal, non-formal, informal, and self-directed*. Columbus, OH: National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
- Morgan, M. (2007). *Lost history: The enduring legacy of Muslim scientists, thinkers, and artists*. Washington DC: National Geographic
- Muldoon, J. (2019). Academics: it's time to get behind decolonizing the curriculum. *The Guardian*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2019/mar/20/academics-its-time-to-get-behind-decolonising-the-curriculum>
- Nader, L. (2013). *Culture and dignity: Dialogues between the Middle East and the West*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Naqvi, Z. (2019). If universities value overseas students, they must stop marginalising them. *The Guardian*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2019/sep/18/if-universities-value-overseas-students-they-must-stop-marginalising-them>
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S., & Zondi, S. (Eds.) (2016). *Decolonizing the university, knowledge systems and discipline in Africa*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Nee-Benham, M. (1997). *Indigenous educational models for contemporary practice*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Nkrumah, K. (1965). *Neocolonialism: The last stage of imperialism*. New York: International Publishers.

- Noori, N., & Anderson, P.-K. (2013). Globalization, governance, and the diffusion of the American model of education: accreditation agencies and American-style universities in the Middle East. *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, 26, 159-172.
- Normore, A., & Lahera, A. (2019). The evolution of educational leadership preparation programmes. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 51(1), 27-42.
- Nxumalo, F. (2019). *Decolonizing place-based pedagogies in early childhood education*. New York: Routledge.
- Ogbu, J. (1991). Low school performance as an adaptation. In M. Gibson & J. Ogbu (Eds.), *Minority status and schooling* (pp. 249-285). New York: Garland.
- Oland, M., Hart, S., & Frink, L. (Eds.) (2012). *Decolonizing indigenous histories*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Oliver, K. (2004). *The colonization of psychic space*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Paraskeva, J. (2016) Opening up curriculum canon to democratize democracy. In J. Paraskeva & S. Steinberg (Eds.), *Curriculum: Decanonizing the field* (3-25). New York: Peter Lang.
- Paraskeva, J. (2017). Against the epistemicide: Itinerant curriculum theory and the reiteration of an epistemology of liberation. In M. Uljens & R. Ylimaki (Eds.), *Bridging educational leadership, curriculum and didaktik* (199-213). Cham: Springer.
- Patel, L. (2016). *Decolonizing educational research*. New York: Routledge.
- Pirbhai-Illich, F., Pete, S., & Martin, F. (2017). Culturally responsive pedagogies: Decolonization, indigeneity and interculturalism. In F. Pirbhai-Illich, S. Pete & F. Martin (Eds.), *Culturally responsive pedagogy: Working towards decolonization, indigeneity and interculturalism* (pp. 3-25). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ponzanesi, S., & Waller, M. (2011). *Postcolonial cinema studies*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Preece, S. (Ed.) (2016). *The Routledge handbook of language and identity*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Quist, H., (2001). Cultural issues in secondary education development in West Africa: Away from colonial survivals, toward neo-colonial influences? *Comparative Education*, 37(3), 297-314.
- Rodriguez, C. (2019). *Decolonizing academia*. Black Point: Fernwood.
- Rodriguez, E., Boatcă, M., & Costa, S. (Eds.) (2010). *Decolonizing European sociology*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Roofe, C., & Bezzina, C. (2018). Introduction. In C. Roofe & C. Bezzina (Eds.), *Intercultural studies of curriculum*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rothermund, D. (2006). *The Routledge companion to decolonization*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ruggles, D., & Silverman, H. (2009). From tangible to intangible heritage. In D. Ruggles & H. Silverman (Eds.), *Intangible heritage embodied* (pp. 1-14). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Sachsenmaier, D., Riedel, J., & Eisenstadt, S. (Eds.) (2002). *Reflections on multiple modernities*. Leiden: Brill.
- Saffari, S., Abdolmaleki, K., & Akhbari, R. (2017). Introduction: Unsettling colonial modernity. In S. Saffari, R. Akhbari, K. Abdolmaleki & E. Hamdon (Eds.), *Unsettling colonial modernity in islamicate contexts* (pp. 1-14). Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- Said, E. (1994). *Culture & imperialism*. London: Vintage.
- Said, E. (2007). On the university. In F. Ghazoul (Ed.), *Edward Said and critical decolonization* (pp. 26-36). Cairo: American University in Cairo Press.

- Samier, E.A. (2014). Western doctoral programmes as public service, cultural diplomacy, or intellectual imperialism? In A. Taysum & S. Rayner (Eds.), *Investing in our education?* (pp. 93-123). Scarborough: Emerald.
- Samier, E.A. (2015). Is the globalization of higher education a societal and cultural security problem? *Policy Futures in Education*, 13(5), 683-702.
- Samier, E.A. (2019). Toward a postcolonial securities critique of higher education leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*.
Doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2019.1591514
- Samier, E.A. (forthcoming). Educational leadership challenges in destabilised and disintegrating states: The intersectionality of violence, culture, ideology, class/status group and postcoloniality in the Middle East. In K. Arar, D. Örüçü & J. Wilkinson (Eds.), *Neoliberalism and education systems in conflict*. London: Routledge.
- Satterthwaite, J., & Atkinson, E. (2005). *Discourses of education in the age of imperialism*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Shaheen, (2009). *Reel bad Arabs: How Hollywood villifies a people*. Northampton, MA: Olive Branch Press.
- Shilliam, R. (2011). Non-western thought and international relations. In R. Shilliam (Ed.), *International relations and non-western thought* (pp. 1-11). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Slethaug, G. (2015). Introduction. In G. Slethaug & J. Vinther (Eds.), *International teaching and learning at universities* (pp. 1-10). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Smith, L., Tuck, E., & Yang, K. (Eds.) (2019). *Indigenous and decolonizing studies in education*. New York: Routledge.
- Spivak, G. (1987). *In other worlds: Essays in cultural politics*. New York: Methuen.
- Spivak, G. (1992). Can the subaltern speak? In P. Williams & L. Chrisman (Eds.) *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory* (pp. 66-111). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Stein, S. (2017). The persistent challenges of addressing epistemic dominance in higher education. *Comparative Education Review*, 61, 25-50.
- Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. (2016). Postcolonial insights for engaging difference in educational approaches to social justice and citizenship. In A. Peterson, R. Hattam, M. Zembalys & J. Arthur (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of education for citizenship and social justice* (pp. 229-245). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stewart-Harawira, M. (2018). Indigenous resilience and pedagogies of resistance. In J. Kinder & M. Stewart-Harawira (Eds.), *Resilient systems, resilient communities: Intersections of sustainability* (pp. 158-179). Edmonton: University of Alberta.
- Swain, H. (2019). Students want their curriculums decolonized: are universities listening? *The Guardian*. Available at:
<https://www.theguardian.com/education/2019/jan/30/students-want-their-curriculums-decolonised-are-universities-listening>
- Taieb, B. (2014). *Decolonizing indigenous education: An Amazigh/Berber ethnographic journey*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tam, K.-K. (2019). *The englishized subject: Postcolonial writings in Hong Kong, Singapore and Malaysia*. Singapore: Springer.
- Thiong'o, N. (1986). *Decolonizing the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Tomlinson, J. (1991). *Cultural imperialism*. London: Continuum.
- Trinder, V. (2020). *Teaching toward a decolonizing pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.
- Unterhalter, E., & Carpentier, V. (2010). *Global inequalities and higher education: Whose*

- interests are you serving?* Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Waghid, Y., Manthalu, C., Terblanche, J., Waghid, F., & Waghid, Z. (2020). *Cosmopolitan education and inclusion: Human engagement and the self*. Cham: Palgrave.
- Ward, A. (2007). Psychological formations. In J. McLeod (Ed.), *The Routledge companion to postcolonial studies* (pp. 190-201). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Weber, M. (1968). *Economy and society*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Webster, L., & Mertova, P. (2007). *Using narrative inquiry as a research method*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Welikala, T. (2011). *Rethinking international higher education curriculum: Mapping the research landscape*. Universitas 21, Global network of research universities for the 21st century. Available at: <http://www.naylornetwork.com/iie-nw1/articles/index.asp?aid=158947&issueID=26292> (accessed 15 February 2020).
- Whitty, G. (2012). Policy tourism and policy borrowing in education. In G. Steiner-Khamsi & F. Waldow (Eds.), *World yearbook of education 2012* (pp. 354-370). London: Routledge.
- Zane, M. (2015). *Leading and managing indigenous education in the postcolonial world*. Abingdon: Routledge.