LYNETTE SHULTZ

9. GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP OR INTERNATIONAL TRADE?

A Decolonial Analysis of Canada's New International Education Policy

INTRODUCTION

In early 2014, Canada released a higher education policy that outlined a new vision and practice of internationalization of Canadian education. Even in its title, *Canada's international education strategy: Harnessing our knowledge advantage to drive innovation and prosperity (CIES),* the Canadian government has declared its understanding of the economic importance of the internationalization of education. This policy is a significant shift in how Canadian higher education is conceptualized and promoted. Where are the social goals of education and the ideas that students need to be global citizens that have previously framed international engagement in the last decade? What is being assembled in Canadian higher education through this policy? This chapter approaches the analysis of the policy through two theoretical frameworks to help understand how this policy came to be and what its impact might be for higher education institutions in Canada and the domestic and international partners and students assembled by its application. I use a decolonial analysis to understand the historical, material and social context for the policy, its underpinning values and principles, and its policy actors and spaces. I will use a process-based analysis of policy to understand how this policy works, including a consideration of action- nets and the relations among actors, spaces, and knowledges to understand how the multi-scalar connections create and restrain what education is possible through this policy.

As an education policy that will impact the direction of higher education in Canada and the relations among universities, academics, and students implicated in the policy (both domestic and international), it is important to understand the policy in light of the need for education that prepares or educates students about and for life on this planet. As Walter Mignolo (2009) indicates, the "geo-politics of knowledge and the geo-politics of knowing" (p. 3) are currently issues of *great* significance as we encounter the legacies of colonialism playing out in intensely globalized social, political and economic relations. Knowledge and knowing are the foundations of education. How does a higher education policy that locates the actions of universities

A. A. Abdi et al. (Eds.), Decolonizing Global Citizenship Education, 107–117.

in the global market position knowers knowledge, teachers, and learners? Are there alternative action nets emerging that might shift the centrality of the market framing of higher education? How might global citizenship be employed as a resistant action net that engages higher education actors, knowledges, and relations differently than those of a marketized/marketizing education system?

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR POLICY ANALYSIS

The increased focus on internationalization and globalization in education policy has demanded attention to how the histories and legacies of colonialism continue to shape such policies, particularly as they support global neoliberal capitalism. This study explores how colonialism *works* through and with policy to create actors, objects, and a stabilizing discourse that legitimizes particular relations and practices.

> No new discourse can be new in the sense of being created from a void; it can only be new in the sense of being constructed from the material at hand. Thus, new discourses always employ elements of old discourses. (Czarniawska, 2013, p. 17)

The internationalization of education policies is emerging around the world and with very notable similarities. We see new discourse communities being assembled through purposeful linking of macro, national and micro policy actors and objects. The intention is that the macro policies are translated and domesticated in order to stabilize the global policy network (Czaniawska, 2008, 2013). Education policy carries with it the legitimacies of its context and at the same time, a legitimizing power to enroll particular actors and exclude others according to their willingness to align their interests with those of the leaders in the policy process.

Enrolment of Local Actors to Stabilize Macro Policy Networks

Bruno Latour (2005, 2013; cited in Hernes, 2008) describes how organized systems are made durable through enrollment and how this works as a multi-scalar process. "Internal actors [are] able to significantly influence the outcome of [a case] by speaking with the voices of their chosen institutional macro-actors" (Hernes, 2008, p. 74). Through processes of translation, particular policy knowledge is made legitimate. When conflict arises, the local actors (having been enrolled as actors and legitimized by their macro-actor connections), point to the indisputablility of macro-institutionalized logics and the actors who espouse these logics (also being actors created and made legitimate by the local actors). In Latour's study of policy networks, he found that "macro-actors tend to be perceived as facts in themselves, and this confers upon them a temporal stabilizing force. Therefore, although they are perpetually in the making, they are treated as ready-made entities with certain characteristics" (Latour, cited in Hernes, 2008, p. 77). This study also examines how policy acts and as Czarniawska (2013) points out:

> the style of discourse is also a style of action, and although a change of discourse is rarely of the type desired by those who introduced the change, the changes are usually more profound than the most hard-bitten skeptics would allow. (p. 17)

Policymakers seldom see the impacts that their policies will have. Action-net analysis helps us understand why this might be the case. Seldom do policymakers attend to the processes of enrollment, legitimization, and authority in which they are embedded. For example, the colonialism that legitimized particular policies in Canada from the 1800s was viewed as constructive by the policymakers, as nation-building and citizen shaping for a *new* country. The immense violence and destruction was made invisible to the policy actors who had been enrolled and legitimized as creative actors in the emerging system. An action-net analysis helps to make visible how newly created discourse communities and their policies perpetuate old exclusions. Czarniawska (2013) found that "although the main purpose of new discourses was new communities and therefore inclusion, they excluded the same outsiders- women and strangers- as did the previous ones" (p. 17). It was clear that colonialism's racism also bounded who was included and excluded and this resulted in the long tradition of excluding the knowledge and knowledge holders of any place outside of Europe. As long as education policy is based on education for and through colonialism's triad of imperialism, patriarchy, and racism, (Abdi, 2012; Mignolo, 2000, 2011, 2012; Shultz, 2012) we will continue to have policies that legitimize the same colonial style exclusions.

Decolonizing Policy Analysis

Since the past centuries' European colonization of the majority of the world, writers and activists have provided evidence and analysis for the need to decolonize the land, the people, and the relations put into place through this domination of one region over so many others (see for example, Cesaire, 2001; Dussel, 2013; Fanon 1963/2004, 1959/1965). This study draws on Mignolo's framework of global coloniality and the global matrix of power (Mignolo, 2009, 2011). Tlsotanova and Mignolo (2012) revisit these ideas to provide a conceptual framework that maps the social relations where the struggle for power takes place (p. 44–45) and the intersectionality of economic imperialism, political exclusion and the control of authority, sexism, and epistemicide or the destruction of knowledge that was not Western: ego-logical and transcendent (2012). This destruction was often done through killing the minds and/or bodies of people who thought and acted outside the colonial system (NgugiwaThiong'o, 2009; Odora Hoppers, 2009) and its legitimized Western epistemic orientation. Education was used to control the legitimation of knowledge and subjectivities (Abdi, 2012; Shiza & Abdi, 2014). Mignolo describes how the Renaissance university was installed throughout the colonized world (e.g., Harvard was established in 1636) and served to legitimize Western rational thinking

and faithful knowledge of a transcendent (masculine) divinity as the only legitimate knowledge in the colonial space (Tlsotanova & Mignolo, 2012).

This study attends to how the recent Canadian education policy for international relations acts as part of a policy net for the global colonial matrix of power and as an evolving / emergent response to the history of Western consolidation and imperial expansionism. In this, it is understood that historical patterns of colonialism have given rise to neocolonial variations as well as decolonial options. The focus of the study is on both acts of constraint and resistance to globalized colonialism where we seek to understand the everyday translations: "through everyday translations, an action net is created, connecting the local to the translocal/micro to the macro" (Czarniawska, 2013, p. 30).

THE POLICY AS ACTION NET: ACTORS, KNOWLEDGE, SPACES

Enrolling and Stabilizing the Discourse Community

The Canadian education policy context: recognizing links to Canada's colonial history and its first international education policy. In addition to the policy's contents, it is a significant policy in that rarely does Canada have any education policy at the national level. However, it must be affirmed that the first international education policy in Canada was the policy that excluded education equity for indigenous people and the First Nations of the land that became Canada. Historically, all education of settlers/immigrants in Canada has been within the jurisdiction of the provinces, leaving Canada with no national education policies. This decentralized model of education was part of the early agreement of the colonial powers that formed the country called Canada and wrote its Constitution, the British North America Act (BNA) in 1867. With the tension between France and England tested by war and economic rivalries in the *new* colony, the provision of education was negotiated to give English and French colonialists access to education that they saw as familiar and that would encourage increased numbers of immigrants to come to *settle* the vast land claimed by England. The resulting system of education saw local communities able to make policy and practice decisions, including religious and language of instruction preferences. It is important to note that, just as with the colonial histories in other lands, the European masters limited these decisions to either French or English language of instruction, and either Protestant or Catholic Christian orientations to education.

However, this decentralized empowerment was only for immigrants. The indigenous people's education was to be handled by the federal government. The paternalism and racism at the foundation of the Canadian education system was made clear in this very early declaration. While European settlers (mostly from Western Europe) were seen to be capable and trustworthy enough to make their own educational decisions, the indigenous people were viewed as both deficient and dangerous and therefore, were to be controlled through education provided by the

government of England. The colonial powers wanted the land and the resources of this expansive territory; they did not want its people. The intertwining of capitalism, imperialism, and colonialism is evident throughout the settlement and nation-building that resulted in the country of Canada. The exclusion of indigenous people from all forms of citizenship has been present from the beginning of Canadian policymaking. The settlers who arrived pre-BNA were *the peopleof the Constitution,* and the indigenous people, *the people of the land*, were invisible in the policy. This was the history assembled by colonialism and while a full discussion of the legacies and current realities of colonial education is beyond this chapter, we should not be surprised to see that the values and principles that are expressed in the recent education policy show no sign that the colonial hand has disappeared from Canadian governance. As with federal government policies before it, the 2014 education policy excludes many for the benefit of a few; the pattern of colonial thinking continues to invade this country. The international focus of this higher education policy might open education institutions to *the world*, but the world it describes is as limited as the world the colonial governors in 1867 imagined, and the local benefactors also share the privileged status of those benefactors of the colonial policy 150 years ago.

2014 and Canada's International Education Strategy

From the first page of CIES, the policy document reveals that it is an effort to build a particular policy network: "harnessing our knowledge advantage to drive innovation and prosperity" (p. 1). It is claimed as a Canadian policy despite the historical location of education at the provincial level and the history of fierce struggle to keep power decentralized. The links to industry and economy are clear, even in the location of the policy within the jurisdiction of International Trade and Development. The opening message from the Minister of International Trade makes clear how the policy is linked to Canada's Global Markets Action Plan (Government of Canada, 2014, p. 4) and that international education is key to "ensur[ing] our future prosperity" (p. 4). It should be no small surprise then that the Advisory Panel for CIES creates education policy actors from members of the corporate community. Even the few people with connections to higher education institutions are not academics or educators but business or corporate leaders who have become part of the new style of academic administration. The mining and extractive industry and the financial sector are well represented. Other members have strong work histories with the corporate sector. Besides the Advisory Board there is also a stakeholder group that meets under the umbrella term: the National Education Marketing Roundtable (NEMR) chaired by Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada (DFATD). While many of the organizations represented will have much broader goals (for example, the Association of Universities and Colleges), the people who take part in NEMR will be the translators of the marketization of education agenda into their local organizations. Here Latour's idea of durability (2008) becomes important. NEMR becomes an important member of the discourse community and

responsible in stabilizing the discourse as it spreads the language, values, and norms of education as a marketable commodity into a wide range of Canadian institutions. The more stable the discourse, the more easily the policy becomes implementable. In the Canadian context, the policymakers will have carefully constructed these groups to ensure that their ideas have legitimacy in localized institutions, thereby achieving the enrollment of decentralized institutions into a centralized policy network.

For an education policy, there is very little discussion of education in this document. The focus is generally on the economic benefits that are gained through the money brought in either by international students or through increased research when sold to industry.

> International students in Canada provide immediate and significant economic benefits to Canadians in every region of the country. Data for 2012 show that 265,400 international students spent a total of some $8.4 billion in communities across Canada, helping sustain 86,570 Canadian jobs (see chart). Additionally, the activities of international students helped generate more than $455 million in federal and provincial tax revenues. (CIES, p. 7)

One exception is a statement by His Excellency the Right Honorable David Johnston, Governor General of Canada.

> The process of uncovering, sharing and refining all kinds of knowledge across disciplinary boundaries and international borders is something I call the diplomacy of knowledge…..[cross-disciplinary action is] most potent when we cross international borders and cultivate interactions among teachers, students, researchers, and others in different countries. (p. 15)

For this study, it is important to note that Dr. Johnston is speaking here in his capacity as the Governor General of Canada, which is the Queen of England's representative in the Government of Canada and the highest position of authority in the Canadian government. The link to the colonial past is in both Johnston's position and his words. He becomes (intentionally or otherwise) a powerful agent of enrollment in the legitimizing process of the policy shift toward the marketization of higher education.

Education policy actors who are notably absent in the policy and discourse enrollment are indigenous people and immigrants who might want to come to Canada to improve their own life expectancy (for example, refugees from conflict, economic crises, or environmental devastation). While the policy presents the strength of Canadian education as an important contribution to the world, the policy makers have crafted a controlled location for such benefits. CIES policy is to support the countries identified in the Global Markets Plan (pp. 9–10) and include only countries and geographical locations that have demonstrated a strengthened economy and where Canadian corporations would like to increase their market influence. These include Brazil, China, India, Mexico, North Africa, the Middle East, and Vietnam (p. 10) as well as continued connections with strong, longstanding economic partners: the UK, USA, France, Germany, Japan, and South Korea (p. 10).

Branding Canadian education. **"**Across the 'brand spectrum,' Canada's brand is one of the most trusted in the world" (p. 10). The rise of the corporate university has brought with it a new focus on the university brand and the creation of units to market the institution based on branding and advertisement. The Canadian government's attempt to brand Canada's higher education is difficult, again, because of the decentralized model of education. Higher education is particularly decentralized with each individual institution historically having significant independence about how it conducts its work of teaching, research, and engagement with the broader community. The new international education policy, CIES, requires a much more homogenized approach to the inclusion of international students including corporate interests into the academy, and providing support for international partnerships developed outside the institution. The process of branding Canadian higher education is a very active process of enrollment. What university would want to be seen to be left out of the Canadian brand especially a brand that promotes "a consistently high-quality education at an attractive price in a tolerant, diverse, safe and welcoming environment" (p. 10)?

The Advisory Panel for CIES committed the Canadian government to providing resources to coordinate marketing in priority markets (p. 11) and "reallocating resources to key posts in Canada's diplomatic network, including economic diplomats dedicated to achieving Canada's key education objectives within those markets" (p. 11). Not only does this highlight the changed education landscape but also that the diplomatic core is now focused on promoting Canadian economic interests rather than exclusively participating in international relations for peace, security and development. The branding is clear: Canadian universities, colleges, and technical institutions are being sold in an international market of students, teachers, and ideas.

Creating an imperialist action net. CIES prepares us for a particular action net where, as Czarniawska (2008, 2013) highlights, different types of actions are translated into one another to create stability for a particular unit or discourse. CIES translates education and business into an imperialist action-net that seeks to help create a global market for education and then claim a dominant spot within that market. Education's wider goals, for example, citizenship, society building, enlightenment, social justice, and creating knowledge for society, are destabilized in the new discourse of an urgent need be part of a global knowledge economy. In a similar way, Stanley Deetz (1992) described how the reconstruction of teaching and learning into a *knowledge economy* was a process of reconstructing meaning through a process of discursive closure. In this, policy makers suppress potential conflict and privilege particular voices which serves to delegitimize alternatives. Claims of neutrality and universalism are used to suggest that only one way is possible. Tlostanova & Mignolo (2012) remind us that the link between imperialism and colonialism continues "as long as the final horizon of life is guided by the desire to accumulate capital, as long as the economic gains and benefits continue to define 'development'" (p. 49). The neocolonialism of CIES emerges from its limiting

whose ideas are legitimate and by capturing and transforming all knowledge into its solely economic agenda. Here the elite class with business knowledge is seen as more relevant to education policy process than citizen-based and/or education or academic knowledges. The policy acts in a colonizing way as marketizing policy knowledge is made legitimate by limiting who speaks on behalf of education and translating education goals into business goals.

The CIES policy is focused only on the benefits to participating Canadian institutions and business; yet as part of a global education market action net, its influence will be cast much farther, making institutions, students, teachers, and ideas (international and domestic) into policy objects (Shultz, 2013a). There are contradictions here as education institutions become enrolled into very specific relations based on these economic goals rather than knowledge/education goals, and within these institutions, individuals become less able to engage in a free exchange of ideas (through research and teaching) than before the policy. In addition, while education goals generally promote equity and citizenship, CIES locates higher education in a competitive global market for ideas, learners, and teachers. CIES begins to act as part of a global colonial matrix of power (Mignolo, 2000, 2011).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP AS ALTERNATE EMERGING ACTION NET

This chapter seeks to provide an analysis of a new Canadian policy on higher education that moves its core mandate from education to business. By using a decolonial analysis supported by organizational process theories of action and networks, the study provides an important understanding of the policy and how the processes of enrollment, legitimization and authority act. An action-net analysis helps to make visible how new policies perpetuate old exclusions. The CIES (2014) is clearly a policy that positions education as part of a global market strategy and in doing this, it acts to enroll domestic and international students, teachers, researchers, and the ideas that form the foundation of education, within what Mignolo (2009, 2011) calls the global matrix of power, an action-net that continues to legitimize the legacies of European economic, social and political colonial practices of the last 500 years. The discourses of this colonialism continue to be renewed because, as we see in the case of Canadian education policy history, the power of the colonial roots to direct policy has never been resolved and continues to act through relations of discrimination, mis-recognition, and exclusion. The durability of these relations is important to understand if we are to disrupt the colonialism that informs our current policy context and processes as reflected in CIES.

The second area of interest in the analysis of CIES 2014 is the enrollment of Canadian higher education into an international imperialist action net, as related to education planning and provision. Here, the action net includes global and local actors enrolled to participate in the creation of a global education market. While higher education has always been international, with ideas, researchers, and students

moving across borders through research collaborations and knowledge sharing, the new marketization of ideas as proposed in CIES creates a very different situation where all aspects of education are captured in the mechanisms of a global market. Of course, the control and profit from this market is not evenly distributed. Given the colonial history of our current global market systems, education is enrolled to perpetuate the violent histories and legacies of European colonialism that divided the world into two categories: civilized and *knowing* or *savage* and knowledgeless. The oppression and violence of this system enters into the neocolonial relations of the global knowledge economy and is evident in how education actors are positioned in the global action net.

Global Citizenship as a Frame of Resistance

When we study action nets and networks, the possibilities of a transformed system can also be highlighted. As a conclusion to this chapter, I would like to suggest that transformation of the system is possible. While the new CIES (2014) has not yet had time to have its results tested, there are other discourses and emerging action nets of interest being connected even in these early stages of the policy processes. Of interest in this study (and edited volume) is the idea of global citizenship. The appearance of a *global citizen*, an anonymous body positioned in the global geo-political realm, has achieved more than any one specific meaning (see Shultz, 2007). In the midst of a dismantled public sphere (see Shultz, 2013b) and the dismal state of what we might think of as the commons or a shared planet, there is also the disappearance of localized political mediation which has been replaced through the enrollment of neoliberal ideologies and national governments beholden to transnational corporations and institutions. The global citizen acts as a subject in this sphere and as a connector to a new emerging action net. The global citizen undermines state-capital control of what is legitimately public by disrupting the role of the obedient marketized citizen (see Shultz, 2013a) through scale (local-global or glocal) and through action (global social/political movements, mobile labour, and mobility of idea networks). In this action net, global citizenship is not a replacement for local or national responsibilities and rights but an expanded citizenship to match the emerging action net that is responding to planetary crises and interdependencies. Global citizenship is a changing discourse that demands a global commons. It is globalization beyond the capitalist elite, beyond the authoritarian patriarch, and colonial master. We have been too timid and cautious in our encounters with global citizenship, limiting it to a modern, liberal imaginary. By bringing, for example, global decolonial, feminist, environmental, labour, jihadist, fundamentalist, and crime movements from the periphery and into view, we move from tamed to transformed citizenship spaces. Global citizenship as action net has the capacity to respond to this complex world of connection. This capacity makes it a dangerous idea for some (thus the need to tame it) and a liberating idea for others. Regardless of the entry point into an encounter with global citizenship, it creates a space for debate

and an unexpected publicness emerges that is relevant to, for example, precarious youth looking for ways to take their place in worldmaking; to the assaulted woman who looks for solidarity in her liberation struggle; or the small farmer who needs to be allowed to live a sustainable life of simplicity without global agri-business or land speculators changing the rules in their own favour. The problems of liberalism, neoliberalism, and neocolonialism are surfaced in these spaces and the resulting action net produces the need for citizens with global perspectives and engagements.

Can global citizenship shift colonizing policies like CIES (2014)? The work of decolonial and anticolonial scholars and activists in the past decades has contributed new understanding of international relations and interconnections. These people demand that the histories of colonial struggle for land and sovereignty and for even the possibility for leading lives of full humanity be heard at every level, local to global. We can't view a policy like CIES (2014) without its history, which is a colonial one. The liberal citizen, tied to Westphalian notions of belonging to a national territory, has been a problem throughout the colonial world. A global citizenship action net is emerging that is highly influenced by decolonial discourses and actors. By using an action net analysis with a decolonial framework, new insights emerge that identify how different policy actors and spaces will change policy spaces and processes. A *global citizenship as action net* conceptualization of higher education holds some possibility for creating a space for non-corporate/corporatizing actors to be connected in ways that will lead to changes in neoliberal policy and practices that have led to CIES (2014). More studies of global citizenship as action net are needed to help us understand policies like CIES in their broader context and with regards to the enrollment of actors, and the creation of actionable spaces of legitimacy and authority.

REFERENCES

Abdi, A. A. (2012). *Decolonizing philosophies of education*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Cesaire, A. (2001). *Notebook of a return to the native land* (C. Eshleman & A. Smith, Trans.). Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Czarniawska, B. (2008). *A theory of organizing.* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Czarniawska, B. (2013). Organizations as obstacles to organizing. In D. Roubichaud & F. Cooren (Eds.), *Organization and organizing: Materiality, agency, and discourse* (pp. 3–22). New York, NY/London, UK: Routledge.

Deetz, S. (1992). *Democracy in an age of corporate colonialism: Developments in communication and the politics of everyday life*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.

Dussel, E. (2013). *Ethics of liberation in the age of globalization and exclusion*. Durham, NC/London, UK: Duke University Press.

Fanon, F. (1959/1965). *Dying colonialism*. New York, NY: Grove Press.

Fanon, F. (1963/2004). *Wretched of the earth*. New York, NY: Grove Press.

Government of Canada. (2014). *Canada's international education strategy: Harnessing our knowledge advantage to drive innovation and prosperity.* Copyright Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2014. Retrieved from http://international.gc.ca/global-markets-marches-mondiaux/education/index.aspx?lang=eng

Hernes, T. (Ed.). (2008). *Understanding organization as process: Theory for a tangled world*. New York, NY: Routlege.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor network theory*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Latour, B. (2013). What's the story? Organizing as a mode of existence. In D. Roubichaud & F. Cooren (Eds.), *Organization and organizing: Materiality, agency, and discourse* (pp. 37–51). New York, NY/ London, UK: Routledge.

Mignolo, W. (2000). *Local histories/global designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mignolo, W. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought, and decolonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *26*(1), 1–23.

Mignolo, W. (2011). *Darker side of western modernity: Global future, decolonial options.* Durham, NC/London, UK: Duke University Press.

Odora Hoppers, C. (2009). From bandit colonialism to the modern triage society: Towards a moral and cognitive reconstruction of knowledge and citizenship. *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies, 4*(2), 168–180.

Shizha, E., & Abdi, A. A. (2014). *Indigenous discourses of knowledge and development in Africa.* London, UK: Routledge.

Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for global citizenship: Conflicting agendas and understandings. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *53*(3), 248–258.

Shultz, L. (2012). Decolonizing social justice education: From policy knowledge to citizenship action. In A. A. Abdi (Ed.)*, Decolonizing philosophies of education* (pp. 29–42). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publications.

Shultz, L. (2013a). Engaged scholarship in a time of the corporatization of the university and distrust of the public sphere: A decolonizing response. In L. Shultz & T. Kajner (Eds.), *Engaged scholarship: The politics of engagement and disengagement* (pp. 43–54). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Shultz, L. (2013b). The end of the obedient neoliberal citizen: Differential consciousness and reimagining citizenship in a time of transformation. In P. Carr & A. A. Abdi (Eds.), *Educating for democratic consciousness: Counter-hegemonic possibilities* (pp. 96–107). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Tlostanova, M., & Mignolo, W. (2012). *Learning to unlearn: Decolonial reflections from Eurasia and the Americas*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

wa Thiong'o, N. (2009). *Re-membering Africa*. Nairobi/Kampala, Africa: East African Publishers.

Lynette Shultz
Department of Educational Policy Studies
University of Alberta