This monitoring brief provides a succinct overview of the current and diverse national debates on curriculum. It briefly traces the philosophical, political and cultural antecedents to particular lines of argument on the matter, and then raises a number of fundamental questions for discussion.

Decolonising the curriculum: stimulating debate

Purpose

The student unrest around fee increases and fee-free higher education in recent years (which may resume upon the pending announcement of the findings of the Presidential Commission on Higher Education), brought to the fore some of the deep fissures in South African higher education. Curriculum is predicated on inherently political questions such as: 'what is the curriculum for, or what purposes does it serve?'; 'how is it determined?'; 'how does curriculum change?'; 'what makes curriculum relevant?' and, perhaps most of all, 'whose curriculum is it?' Twenty-odd years after the fall of apartheid, when it might have been expected that matters of curriculum had been adequately addressed, protests around student funding were intimately bound up with contestation around the curriculum and accompanying calls for the 'decolonisation of the curriculum'. Given the vehemence of the way in which these calls were made, and the centrality of curriculum in higher education, the CHE through its permanent committee the Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC) has recognised that deep debate on the decolonisation of the curriculum is fundamental to informing understandings of quality in higher education and to guiding action in this regard.

Introduction

Student protests have been a feature of South African higher education for many years, and in the post-apartheid era they have arisen mostly in relation to concerns around the conditions of student existence at specific institutions, such as funding, accommodation, security, and academic exclusions. The 2015/16 student protests were different in a number of respects. First, they arose initially out of the Rhodes Must Fall movement, at the root of which was a fundamental questioning of the prevailing social and power relations and a legacy of inequality that students saw as not having been dealt with. Secondly, they took place on the campuses of formerly advantaged institutions in ways that had not been experienced before. Thirdly, they morphed into a national student uprising of the first generation of the 'born-frees' that was not only more fervent and powerful than localised protests,

but one which involved the general student body in a way that sometimes bypassed student political formations and served to align them differently. Fourthly, protracted protests and levels of violence and damage to property threatened to derail the academic year across the system in an unprecedented way, and finally, issues relating to the affordability of higher education became intertwined with larger social and educational questions, at the heart of which was a call for the decolonisation of the curriculum.

…a deep re-examination of current hegemonies…

Mbembe characterises the current time in higher education as a 'negative moment', one that is experienced in all large scale societal changes; 'a negative moment is a moment when new antagonisms emerge while old ones remain unresolved… when contradictory forces – inchoate, fractured, fragmented – are at work but what might come out of their interaction is anything but certain' (Mbembe, 2015, p.2). A negative moment, however, also creates the conditions for a deep re-examination of current hegemonies and for a re-imagining of how to shape the outcome of that interaction, and in this sense it is important to unpack the contestations around curriculum, what strands of thinking inform the call for the decolonisation thereof, what antagonisms they signify, and what visions of a positive and more coherent future can be discerned in them.

Debates

The clarion call for the decolonisation of the curriculum is a diverse one, not always based on

similar concepts and ideologies when used by different individuals or groups. In some versions, the decolonisation of the curriculum is based on a broad understanding of curriculum which makes it necessarily bound up with a proposed decolonisation of the university – in other words, a fundamental change in the nature and identity of such institutions and a dismantling of the apparatus that is perceived to support and continue a colonial legacy, while in other versions 'curriculum' appears to be understood mainly as what is taught, requiring an Africanisation or indigenisation of the syllabus to become more relevant to a changing student population.

A. Changing the content

In the latter narrative, the main question asked is 'what does it mean to be a University in Africa?' with responses mostly being related to the relevance of what is taught. In some versions this has meant the addition of particular disciplines to the existing ones – the introduction of African Studies for instance – or the replacement of a particular 'canon' of works perceived to be Eurocentric in nature in the study of humanities subjects such as literature, by locally-produced texts. It may also mean the use of locally relevant examples and applications of knowledge in the sciences in particular, or a reorientation of certain disciplines to address local conditions and problems, for example, shifting a focus in Agricultural Sciences from large commercial farming to sustainable food production in micro-enterprises, or providing a greater focus in medical studies on primary health care where this is most needed. It may also mean a more far-reaching reorientation of what is taught at a university as a whole to select and focus disciplines on the development concerns of a particular region in which it is located. Examples of these might be a

university in a port town which then focuses attention on maritime studies, trade law, development economics, transport etc. or one in an area that lends itself to archaeological exploration and what that entails for subjects such as history, sociology, psychology, economics and health and the like. In this version, the importance is to develop sufficiently rigorous local knowledge that relates better to the needs of students and the development challenges of South Africa, while contributing to global knowledge production from the perspective of Africa.

The concerns underlying this version are the alienation of South African students from the content of what is studied where it does not relate to lived, real-world experiences, and the usefulness of the knowledge developed in university study to the solution of the main challenges of South African society such as the alleviation of poverty, the addressing of inequality and the development of the economy.

…disciplines at African universities not linked to African cultures and realities…

Nkoane, for example, speaks to the need for "the re-invigorating of Africa's intellectuals, and the production of knowledge which is relevant, effective and empowering for the people of the African continent, and more particularly, the immediate African societies the universities serve" (Nkoane, 2006, p.49). To counter the eurocentrism of universities, Africanised education "maintains African awareness of the social order and rules by which culture evolves; fosters the understanding of

African consciousness; facilitates a critical emancipatory approach to solve the problems of their lives; and produces the material and capacities for Africans to determine their own future(s) (Nkoane, 2006, p.51). In this view, to Africanise universities means "bringing change to African universities by making them relate to the African experience and the societal needs which have emanated and continue to emanate from such experience"(Ibid. p.54).

Underlying this view is the 'African Renaissance' discourse of the time, which was about a rebirth or reawakening, a "reconstituting of that which has decayed or disintegrated" (Nkoane, 2006, p.59). The main issue identified with respect to curriculum at institutions of higher learning is that "most modules and/or academic programmes (such as education, science, law, psychology, sociology, political science) in different disciplines at African universities are not linked to African cultures and realities. The disciplinary problematisations, classifications, examples, illustrations, comparisons, models, social systems and structures, institutions, interpretations and misinterpretations, mistakes and solutions all come from Western realities and socio-cultural constructs. African students are trained in these systems but expected to work and follow a career on African soil" (Ibid. p.62).

While this argument speaks of the need to change universities as a whole, the main implication with respect to curriculum is that is it largely the content that must change in favour of African-centred 'problematisations, classifications, examples…' etc. Shay argues that the challenge of 'relevance' to real-world problems implies, certainly in the professional areas of study, asking such questions as, "in an African medical curriculum, should univerisities prepare students for the problems of

first-world specialists or those of doctors working in poor rural areas?" (Shay, 2016). Similarly, Ncube writes in relation to intellectual property (IP) curricula, that "for an African state, decolonising IP means placing the nation's conditions and developmental aspirations centre-stage and for law schools seeking to teach decolonised IP law curricula, it means using methodologies and learning materials that disrupt Eurocentric hegemonies" (in Makoni, 2017).

Mbembe problematises the understanding of decolonisation as synonymous with Africanisation. He writes, "Calls to 'decolonise' are not new. Nor have they gone uncontested whenever they have been made. We all have in mind African postcolonial experiments in the 1960s and 1970s. Then, to 'decolonise' was the same thing as 'to Africanise'. To decolonise was part of a nation-building project". He proceeds to outline Fanon's critique of the project of Africanisation – that it was likely to be a project of the African postcolonial middle class which had assimilated colonialist thought, that its call for nationalisation simply meant 'the transfer into native hands of those unfair advantages which were a legacy of the colonial past', and that the discourse of Africanisation was itself ideological and retrogressive as it can lead to xenophobia and chauvinism (Mbembe, 2016, pp. 33-34).

The Africanisation/indigenisation thread of this argument is one part of the curriculum content debate – another is the need for changing curriculum content is to make it more 'fit for purpose', as in the approach of the international Rethinking Economics network (a network of students calling for curriculum change) which argues for "an economics education that situates a plurality of economic theories within a historical context, applies these to the real world and

emphasises an understanding of other social sciences, including the political and ethical dilemmas within economics" (Mitchell, 2016). Underlying this thread is a questioning of the dominance of specific and often singular paradigms used in disciplines that have become somewhat divorced from what are perceived to be the real-world challenges of various communities, where the purpose of higher education is understood to be to contribute to the solution of the major socio-economic and political challenges of the time. In the South African context, this relates to the question of whether universities are producing people who can help to alleviate poverty and inequality, and whether what universities teach is adequate to the needs of the society in which they are located.

B. Changing not only what is taught but how it is taught, and increasing access to knowledge

A related version of the decolonisation thesis concerns not only what is taught, but how it is taught, which gives rise to an understanding of decolonisation that addresses how academic literacies are experienced. In this version, the notion of a 'decontextualised' learner, which is argued to underlie the way in which 'mainstream' university teaching takes place in South Africa, needs to be debunked if decolonisation of the curriculum is to take place successfully. The argument starts from the premise that learners and learning are socially embedded, and that 'academic literacy' is not a value-neutral set of skills to be acquired, but that academic literacies, being socially constructed, can be experienced as colonial or alienating to students who are not privy to the hidden codes and meanings that actually underlie a so-called value-neutral discourse.

Social understandings of literacy are not new, and in the South African higher education context, they

have most closely been associated with the concept of 'epistemological access', popularised by Morrow in the early 1990s. In what is here referred to as the literacy argument, alienation, which leads to calls for the decolonisation of the curriculum, arises when the meanings, norms, codes, practices and values of academia in general and disciplines in particular, are not made explicit such that students remain locked out of particular ways of knowing, thinking and understanding. Decolonisation would therefore require deliberate attention to surfacing, and inducting students into, specific forms of meaning-making, with a move away from thinking of curriculum as something received, but rather as a co-constructed set of understandings. This shift also implies a different understanding of the student, not as a passive recipient of knowledge, but as an agent of his or her own learning.

…a systemic change to the parameters of the South African curriculum… is a necessary precondition for achieving the goals of equity…

Boughey and McKenna note that despite a wealth of theoretical work on the socially constructed literacy practices demanded by universities and the implications for enabling or constraining 'epistemological access', this has had little impact on the dominant 'autonomous' model of literacy practised in the classroom and the kinds of generic academic literacy courses that have been developed to teach technical accuracy and structure. They note that, "the ongoing dominance of the autonomous model is implicated in current events. The understanding of academic literacy practices as neutral and the concomitant construction of our students as decontextualized sits alongside the anger about the rise in fees and decreased state subsidy, broad political instability, and frustrations about ongoing social inequality" (Boughey & McKenna, 2016, p. 7).

Similarly, there is an argument that changing how something is taught or learnt is as much a part of transforming curriculum as what is taught. Conana *et al* argue, for instance, in writing about science teaching, that "it is possible to counter the 'scientism' of the curriculum and its view of physics as autonomous, through embedding physics knowledge in a transformational approach that sees physics as a process of modelling and predicting phenomena in the world, and unpacks how physics knowledge is constructed as well as contrasted with other knowledge forms… so as not to alienate students" (Thesen et al, 2016, p.iii). Le Roux wonders why "mathematics education has largely escaped scrutiny in the recent student protests, in spite of it being a gatekeeper and major hurdle to degree completion" (Thesen et al, 2016, p.iii). She argues for an understanding of curriculum that is informed by the critical concepts of 'identity' and 'power', and for the importance of reimagining mathematics teaching and learning that takes it beyond deficit views.

The CHE's 2013 *Proposal for Undergraduate Curriculum Reform* argued that curriculum transformation was not only related to what is taught and how it is taught, but that fundamental structural change, such as a systemic change to the parameters of the South African curriculum, such as

the introduction of an extended curriculum across the board, is a necessary precondition for achieving the goals of equity of access and equity of outcomes. This would be important for the success of a 'decolonised curriculum' that addresses the alienation that both leads to, and accompanies, access to higher education that does not necessarily lead to success. As Badat notes with respect to the CHE proposal, "unless much needed academic transformations are instituted, we will deny opportunities to people from socially subaltern groups, tragically waste the talents and potential of these individuals, and perpetuate injustice. This compromises democracy…" (Badat, 2015).

C. Changing understandings of knowledge and whose knowledge it is…

Underlying many of the arguments on decolonising the curriculum is an attack on what are perceived to be dominant conceptions of knowledge that underlie universities in general. The academic project is said to be based on Cartesian dualism, which views knowledge as separate from being; knowledge is based on scientism and western rationality. This notion has been challenged in the so-called postcolonial turn, which questions the assumptions that underlie western scientific paradigms, seeing these as positing the superiority of empirical and detached ways of knowing, to the detriment of other non-western ways of knowing and the consequent relegation of 'African subjectivity to a perpetual state of becoming' rather than being. Western (Eurocentric) epistemology is argued to have colonised African imaginations of the future (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2014) through subjugating indigenous knowledge systems.

That western knowledge systems have been privileged in universities is a view shared in other contexts. In a paper on *Decolonizing Pacific Studies*,

for instance, which builds on arguments advanced by Fanon (1967) and Said (1978), Thaman writes that "decolonising formal education involves accepting indigenous and alternative ways of seeing the world". Decolonisation of the curriculum is thus about resurfacing subjugated knowledges and recentering the knowledge project of the university from a different vantage point.

Some of the texts relating to the decolonisation debate in South Africa speak to the postcolonial studies discourses of subalternity, that is, giving voice and agency to the classes or groups in society on whom a dominant power exerts its hegemonic influence. Such discourses had mostly been advanced in South Asia, and they draw on a long tradition of French poststructuralism and postmodernism (Spivak, Said, Bhabha). Much of the more recent South African writing on the decolonising of the curriculum appears, however, to be based on the Latin American branch of decoloniality theory (e.g. Mignolo, Quijano, Maldonado-Torres, Grosfugel) which has roots in Marxist dependency theory. Both streams build on the work of Fanon which puts at the centre of the 'decolonial epistemic perspective' the "multi-faceted struggles over subjectivity and negative representations, over the imposition of Euro-American epistemologies, and over exploitation and dispossession. Decolonial epistemic perspective's mission is to forge new categories of thought, construction of new subjectivities and creation of new modes of being and becoming" (Dastile & Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013).

Where decoloniality theory shares with postmodernism and postcolonialism a repudiation of totalising Western discourses in favour of opening up spaces for previously silenced voices, decoloniality points to the continuity of colonial

forms of power and domination after the end of direct colonial administrations (Grosfugel, 2007). As Dastile & Ndlovu-Gatsheni write, the "coloniality of knowledge speaks directly to epistemological colonisation whereby Euro-American techno-scientific knowledge managed to displace, discipline, destroy alternative knowledges it found outside the Euro-American zones … while at the same time appropriating what it considered useful to global imperial designs" (2013, p.110). The colonisation continues through the 'colonisation of the mind' or the mental universe leading to the continued subjugation of a people, a concept that was first popularised by Ngugi wa Thiong'o in his novels and essays written in the two decades or more after the end of formal colonisation in Africa.

With respect to the Latin-American decolonial theorists, Ndlovu-Gatsheni writes that, "they have exposed what has come to be termed 'coloniality' as a global structure of power, which manifests itself in the domains of being, knowledge and the rest of modern human life. They have reintroduced decolonisation/'decoloniality' as a 'family of diverse positions', which identifies 'coloniality as a fundamental problem in the modern (as well as the postmodern and information) age'" (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2016). In this argument, the decolonisation project of the 1960s in Africa did not succeed in producing genuinely African universities, but rather changed the demography of the participants while keeping intact a Eurocentric epistemology – only adding African experience and agency to existing disciplines (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2016).

In this view, knowledge becomes inseparable from the nature of the university as institution, thus curriculum in this version is understood very broadly as the entirety of the identity, nature,

values, orientation, and contextual reality of an institution – decolonising the curriculum is therefore also about fundamentally transforming the university as an institution and, even more broadly, about shifting the current global knowledge power structures. Gatsheni-Ndlovu puts forward a reading of the recent student protests in South Africa based on the "emerging student archive comprising of memoranda, speeches, graffiti, songs, placards, media articles and presentations" that sees it is "unapologetically about decolonisation. The students openly embrace the black consciousness ideals of Steve Biko and Franz Fanon's ideas on decolonisation. The students speak of changing the very idea of the university from being a 'westernised' institution into an 'African university'" (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2016).

University institutional cultures deemed to be European, anti-black, racist and patriarchal.

He writes further that, "The issue of alienating institutional cultures features prominently as a grievance in the student protests. University institutional cultures are deemed to be European, anti-black, racist and patriarchal. Hence, 'depatriarchisation' and institutional cultural change are part of the decolonisation drive" (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2016). Kamanzi echoes this in writing that, "In centring the demands for curriculum decolonisation, we find ourselves at a clear juncture where we call into question the very project of the 'university' and in particular in its relation to colonialism as a process… we begin to ask … 'to what extent do universities in South Africa

provide content and programmes that respond to the social context that is among the most unequal on the planet? … We consider to what extent classrooms themselves are providing spaces for students and teachers to interrogate their contexts, material conditions, experiences, ideals and dreams in the learning effort, and by consequence to what extent are they able, collectively, to generate more contextually relevant research that resolves our society's contractions (sic) instead of reinforcing them?" (Kamanzi, 2016). Similarly, Nyamnjoh understands the call for the decolonisation of the universities and the curriculum being about "shifting the hegemonic gaze of the Rhodes that has been lodged in our thinking and pedagogical practices" and about building an African nation of greatness and refuting the myth of African inferiority – it is "an ontological project… about an entire way of being" (Njamjoh, 2016, p. 160).

D. Changing whose knowledge and who is teaching/researching it

As part of the decolonisation discourse, there is not only a questioning of whose knowledge (western etc.) forms the curriculum in the South African university, but the questioning of who researches it and who teaches it. In carrying out an ontological project of reasserting what it means to be African, there are two tendencies that seem to follow. The first is to idealise pre-modern societies and reify the idea of a past and static tradition. Thaman writes, for example, that "… postmodernism does not provide all the answers. In my view, its ahistorical representation of social life as a continuing conflict between the coloniser and the colonised denies Oceanic cultures a past without Europeans and their colonising activities. Indigenous peoples have cultural histories that are long, authentic and material to the well-being of all their people,

whether they live in the region or not", and it is therefore important to reassert such authentic histories in higher education curricula (Thaman, 2003, p. 12). In similar vein, in an article on international university rankings systems, Ndofirepi writes that, "the problems of aping and educational borrowing growing out of globalisation and the global forces for convergence to neo-liberal norms and competitiveness as enshrined in the global university rankings offer significant threats to values and cultural norms and the knowledges produced by African people…" and "For how long should African universities continue to chase the wild goose of position-taking on the global university table with its characteristic commercialisation of knowledges through annual rankings of academic institutions? I argue that institutions of higher learning in Africa should revert to knowledges that identify their Africanness…" (Ndofirepi, 2017, p.167).

Secondly, the question becomes who can authentically engage with such histories. Quoting Ramose, for instance, Nkoane argues that "… African experience is by definition non-transferable but nonetheless communicable. Accordingly, it is the African who is and must be the primary and principal communicator of the African experience. To try to replace the African in this position and role is to adhere to the untenable epistemological view that experience is by definition transferable. Clearly, Africanisation rejects this view" (Nkoane 2006 p.53). The potential danger of such views as pointed out by Essop is that this idea of curriculum decolonisation "assumes that different knowledge systems are homogeneous. This ignores the social underpinnings of knowledge – the fact that all traditions feature dominant and marginal knowledges. These are based on power relations and worldviews linked to race, class, gender and

other societal divisions. This leads to two dangers: racial essentialism – replacing white with black or Freud with Fanon; and social conservatism, which pits modernity against tradition. It calls for African solutions to African problems. But it does this in a context where tradition is viewed as static rather than dynamic – evolving with changing social and economic contexts" (Essop, 2016).

Questions for discussion

In a recent public lecture on liberating the curriculum at South African universities, Badat problematises the issue with rich discussion and raises several fundamental questions to which it gives rise. Badat speaks to both the 'trepidation' that accompanies calls for decolonisation, the anxieties engendered and warnings proffered that "South African universities are on the path to declining quality and to becoming parochial", as well as the longing for fundamental change in higher education to bring about "belonging and social connectedness" which was expressed in the student protests of 2015 and 2016 (Badat, 2017). He argues that South African higher education finds itself in a Gramscian 'organic crisis' characterised by many underlying structural contradictions. This crisis has many dimensions – an economic one (the underfunding that affects the quality of education and the numbers of graduates produced), an ideological one (a neo-liberal context that constrains transformation through the commodification of education), and a political one (in which students expressed anger and a sense of betrayal that the promises of social justice and equity in the post-apartheid era have not been sufficiently realised) (Badat, 2017).

Badat notes that "it is clear that curriculum is connected with large and fundamental questions, and that the issue of its decolonisation involves tackling simultaneously and concertedly the question of the core purpose and goals of South African universities. It should also be clear that curriculum is connected with profound questions of values, epistemology, ontology and knowledge making and dissemination, in a context of unequal social relations" (Badat 2017).

A number of fundamental questions in relation to the decolonisation of the curriculum that can be extrapolated from Badat's paper are hereby posed to frame the HEQC's deliberations on the matter.

Questions

1. Is 'decolonisation' of the curriculum an adequate concept for mapping the transformations that are desired in curriculum and curricula? How can the dangers of 'racial essentialism' and possible conservatism (which pits modernity against tradition) be avoided? How do we avoid replacing one orthodoxy with another?
2. What education and social goals is decolonisation intended to advance? If it is Africanisation, for instance, is this a goal in itself or a strategy to achieve other goals?
3. What would decolonisation of the curriculum entail practically? Substitution or replacing of a Western curriculum with something indigenous? Displacing of the western hegemonic curriculum in favour of another knowledge system? Decentering western knowledge in favour of the pluralisation of knowledge?
4. What implications does decolonisation have for pedagogy?
5. Given the critique of Eurocentrism, what is the alternative and how would that avoid

the same critique of hegemony, for instance?

6. What philosophical and theoretical resources should be drawn on for a praxis of curriculum change? Postcolonial theory, decolonial theory, critical theory or a creative welding of different emancipatory traditions?

7. What would be the nature of a curriculum decolonisation programme? A knowledge programme, an education programme or a social justice programme?

As Badat concludes, "We enter unfamiliar territory as we grapple with the theory and practice of the transformation of the curriculum, with questions of how decolonisation or transformation is to be conceptualised, delineated, find expression, and to be implemented and with how theoretical, historical, literary, artistic, other forms of expression, and experiences of indigenous peoples, blacks and Africans and their descendants are to become institutionally embodied in universities" (Badat, 2017).

Discussions on these questions will be important in signalling ways forward in dealing with these pivotal issues in ways that take the agenda of improving quality in South African higher education forward.

Dr Denyse Webbstock is the Director in the Council on Higher Education's Monitoring and Evaluation directorate.

References

Badat, S. (2015) "Social justice in higher education: universities, state and philanthropy", Symposium, Cape Town, 29 March.

Badat, S. (2017) "Trepidation, longing and belonging: Liberating the curriculum at universities in South Africa", University of Pretoria public lecture, 10 April.

Baijnath, M. (2017) "Engaging with transformation of the humanities curriculum at an English-medium research-intensive South African university: decolonisation and academic agency in an era of uncertainty", unpublished M SocSci thesis.

Botha, M.M. (2007) "Africanising the curriculum: An exploratory study", *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 21 (2), pp. 202-216.

Boughey, C. & McKenna, S. (2016) "Academic literacy and the decontextualized learner", *Cristal*, 4 (2) pp. 1-9.

Bozalek, V. & Zembylas, M. (2016) "Critical posthumanism, new materialisms and the affective turn for socially just pedagogies in higher education", *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 30 (3) pp. 193-200.

CHE (2013) *A proposal for undergraduate curriculum reform*, Pretoria, CHE.

Dastile, P.N., & Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S.J. (2013) "Power, knowledge and being: Decolonial combative discourse as a survival kit for pan-Africanists in the 21st century", *Alternation*, 20 (1) pp. 105-134.

Essop, A. (2016) "Decolonising debate is a chance to rethink the role of universities", *The Conversation*, 16 August.

Briefly Speaking | CHE

Fataar, A. & Subreenduth, S. (2015) "The search for ecologies of knowledge in the encounter with African epistemicide in South African education", *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 29 (2), pp. 106-121.

Fomunyam, K. G. "Theorising student constructions of a quality education in a South African university, *Southern African Review of Education*, 22 pp.46-63.

Geduld, D. & Sathorar, H. "Leading curriculum change: Reflections on how *Abakhwezeli* stoked the fire, *South African Journal of Education*, 36 (4), November, pp. 1-13.

Grosfugel, R. (2007) "The epistemic decolonial turn: Beyond political-economy paradigms", *Cultural Studies*, 21 (2-3) pp.211-223

Kamanzi, B. (2016) "Decolonizing the curriculum – a student call in context", *University World News*, No. 415, 27 May.

Le Grange, L. "Decolonising the university curriculum", *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 30 (2) pp. 1-12.

Makoni, M (2017) "Urgent need to decolonise intellectual property curricula", *University World News*, No. 443, 20 January.

McKenna, S. (2017) "Unmasking the doctorate", *University World News*, 21 April.

Mgqwashu, E. (2017) "Universities can't decolonise the curriculum without defining it first", DEFSA, 25 July.

Mitchell, C. (2016) "Transforming the economics curriculum around the world", *University World News*, No. 415, 27 May.

Mbembe, A. (2015) "Decolonizing knowledge and the question of the archive", public lecture given at various venues.

Mbembe, A. J. (2016) "Decolonizing the university: New directions", *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 15 (1) pp. 29-45.

Muswede, T. (2017) "Colonial legacies and the decolonisation discourse in post-apartheid South Africa", *African Journal of Public Affairs*, 9 (5), pp.200-210.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2014) "Global coloniality and the challenges of creating African futures", *Strategic Review for Southern Africa*, 36 (2) pp.181-202.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2016) "Why are South African universities sites of struggle today?" *JoburgPost online*, 21 October.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2016) "Decolonizing the university and the problematic grammars of change in South Africa", keynote address, 5th Annual Students' Conference on Decolonizing the Humanities and Social Sciences in South Africa/Africa, UKZN, 6-7 October.

Ndoferipi, A. "African universities on a global ranking scale: Legitimation of knowledge hierarchies?" *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 31 (1) pp. 155-174.

Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1986) *Decolonizing the Mind: The politics of language in African literature.* Nairobi, Heinemann.

Nkoane, M.N. (2006) "The Africanisation of the university in Africa", *Alternation* 13 (1) pp. 49-69

Nyamnjoh, F.B. (2016) *#RhodesMustFall: Nibbling at resilient colonialism in South Africa*. Langaa Research and Publishing Common Initiative Group.

Shay, S. (2016) "Decolonizing the curriculum: it's time for a strategy", *The Conversation*, 13 June.

Shay, S, Wolff, K. & Clarence-Fincham, J. "Curriculum reform in South Africa: more time for what?" *Cristal,* 4 (2) pp. 74-88.

Thaman, K.H. (2003) "Decolonizing Pacific Studies: Indigenous perspectives, knowledge and wisdom in higher education", *The Contemporary Pacific*, 15 (1) pp. 1-17.

Thesen, L., Jacobs, C. & Paxton, M. (2016) "Editorial", *Cristal*, 4 (2) pp.i-iv.