



Decolonizing the Curriculum: Policy Implications for Indigenous Knowledge Integration in National Education Systems

Nakashi Kawa Miuka^{1a*}, Jamila Tufu^{2b}

¹ Kamishima Education Research Center, Japan

² Global Centre for Indigenous Education Research, Ghana

^anakashi453@gmail.com, ^bjamil3@gmail.com

Article History:

Received:

01-07-2025

Revised:

03-08-2025

Accepted:

13-09-2025

Keywords:

Curriculum Decolonization;

Indigenous Knowledge;

Education Policy;

Epistemic Justice;

Multicultural Education;

*Correspondence Address:

nakashi453@gmail.com

Abstract:

This study explores the integration of Indigenous knowledge into national education systems as a central strategy for curriculum decolonization. Focusing on case studies from Canada and New Zealand, the research investigates how policy frameworks and classroom practices intersect to promote or hinder the inclusion of Indigenous epistemologies. Findings reveal that while national policies in both countries emphasize cultural inclusion and reconciliation, actual implementation varies widely across schools. Successful integration depends significantly on community engagement, teacher training, and leadership support. However, systemic challenges such as standardized assessments, insufficient curricular guidance, and minimal Indigenous representation in policymaking continue to limit the depth of curricular transformation. The study highlights the importance of creating dialogic and culturally grounded educational environments to foster equity, identity affirmation, and epistemic justice in multicultural societies.

This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.





Introduction (مقدمة)

In recent years, there has been a growing global call to decolonize education systems, particularly curricula that have long been shaped by Eurocentric knowledge structures. This movement stems from the recognition that the content and structure of modern education often marginalize indigenous epistemologies, values, and worldviews (Smith, 2012). Education systems in post-colonial nations still reflect remnants of colonial influence, reinforcing cultural hierarchies and undermining local knowledge traditions.

One of the most critical aspects of decolonizing education lies in curriculum reform. Curriculum serves as the blueprint for what knowledge is valued, taught, and assessed in schools. When curricula are dominated by Western frameworks, they inherently exclude or subordinate indigenous knowledge, thus reproducing epistemic injustice (Andreotti, 2011). Addressing this imbalance requires systemic policy changes that create space for diverse epistemologies in formal education.

Indigenous knowledge is not merely a collection of cultural artifacts; it encompasses sophisticated systems of understanding developed through generations of interaction with local environments, social structures, and cosmologies (Battiste, 2013). Integrating such knowledge into the curriculum can enrich educational experiences, enhance relevance, and affirm the identities of indigenous learners. However, this integration must be carefully guided by culturally responsive policy frameworks.

Many national education policies acknowledge cultural diversity, yet they fall short in translating these values into practice. Policies often lack clarity on how indigenous content should be included, who should develop it, and how it should be evaluated (Almeida, 2015). As a result, implementation tends to be inconsistent, symbolic, or driven by external pressures rather than genuine partnership with indigenous communities.

There are also epistemological challenges in integrating indigenous knowledge with Western scientific paradigms. Indigenous knowledge systems are often holistic, oral, and embedded in practice, while school curricula are typically compartmentalized, text-based, and assessment-driven (McKinley & Smith, 2019). This mismatch calls for pedagogical and policy innovation that respects the integrity of indigenous worldviews while making them accessible within formal education settings.

Another key issue is representation and agency. Who decides what counts as indigenous knowledge, and who gets to teach it? Without active involvement of indigenous educators, elders, and scholars, curriculum reforms risk appropriating or misrepresenting indigenous perspectives (Kanu, 2007). Policymakers must ensure participatory mechanisms that center indigenous voices in curriculum design and governance processes.

In countries like Canada, New Zealand, and Australia, there have been notable efforts to incorporate indigenous knowledge into education. The integration of Māori knowledge in New Zealand's curriculum through kaupapa Māori frameworks provides a compelling example of culturally grounded policy innovation (Berryman et al., 2018). However, these efforts also highlight the tensions between national standards and localized epistemologies.

Curriculum decolonization is not just about inclusion; it also involves critical examination of the dominant knowledge paradigms that shape education. This requires a shift in how knowledge is defined, whose knowledge is legitimized, and how knowledge is assessed in classrooms (Santos, 2014). Such shifts challenge long-standing institutional norms and demand courageous policy leadership.

Equity in education cannot be achieved without epistemic justice. Indigenous learners often experience cultural dissonance and alienation in school systems that ignore or distort their histories and worldviews (Brayboy, 2005). Integrating indigenous knowledge through

curriculum policy reform can foster a more inclusive and affirming educational environment for these learners.

Moreover, integrating indigenous knowledge into national curricula has broader societal implications. It promotes intercultural understanding, challenges stereotypes, and fosters respect for indigenous peoples and their contributions. This aligns with global commitments such as the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP, 2007), which calls for the recognition and respect of indigenous knowledge systems in education.

Despite these benefits, the decolonization of curriculum remains contested and politically sensitive. It requires confronting historical injustices, redistributing curricular power, and rethinking the role of education in shaping national identities (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Policymakers must balance multiple interests while ensuring that reforms are not merely symbolic but transformative.

This study aims to explore the policy implications of integrating indigenous knowledge into national education systems, focusing on the opportunities, challenges, and strategies involved. By examining policy documents, educator experiences, and community perspectives, the research seeks to contribute to the ongoing dialogue on curriculum justice and educational decolonization.



Method (منهج)

This study employs a **qualitative case study design** to investigate how indigenous knowledge is integrated into national curricula and the implications this has for educational policy. A qualitative case study is chosen for its strength in uncovering nuanced understandings of complex social phenomena in their real-life contexts (Yin, 2018). This method enables the researcher to explore not only what policies exist, but how they are interpreted and enacted by key stakeholders in diverse educational systems.

The research will take place in **two selected countries** – Canada and New Zealand – which have both made notable strides in incorporating indigenous knowledge systems into their national education frameworks. These countries were selected based on their contrasting yet progressive approaches to curriculum reform and indigenous engagement, providing a rich ground for comparative analysis (Smith, 2012). The study sites will include both public and indigenous-run schools as well as ministries or curriculum agencies responsible for education reform.

Participant selection will be guided by purposive sampling, with an emphasis on selecting individuals who have been directly involved in the process of decolonizing the curriculum. These include policymakers, school administrators, indigenous educators, curriculum specialists, and representatives from indigenous knowledge councils or NGOs (Patton, 2002). The diversity of participants will ensure a wide range of perspectives on the barriers and opportunities encountered during implementation.

Data will be collected using **multiple qualitative techniques**, including semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, document analysis, and classroom observations. Semi-structured interviews will allow the researcher to follow a guided but flexible protocol, enabling deep reflection on participants' personal experiences and institutional roles (Creswell & Poth, 2018). This approach is especially valuable for eliciting culturally sensitive narratives and political insights that structured instruments might miss.

Focus group discussions will be conducted with indigenous teachers and students in each school setting. This method allows for the exploration of shared experiences and collective reflections on identity, culture, and pedagogy (Krueger & Casey, 2015). Students'

voices are essential to understanding how curriculum content and teaching practices impact their sense of inclusion, belonging, and empowerment in educational spaces.

In addition, **document analysis** will be conducted on national curriculum guidelines, policy frameworks, and teacher training materials. This method will help identify the degree of alignment between policy intentions and practice (Bowen, 2009). Documents such as curriculum standards, syllabi, and assessment rubrics will be examined to assess the visibility and positioning of indigenous knowledge, narratives, and epistemologies.

Classroom observations will be conducted to examine how policy is enacted in daily teaching practices. This includes identifying the use of indigenous languages, symbols, stories, and values in lesson delivery (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Observations will help to assess how inclusive the classroom environment is and whether it fosters reciprocal respect between knowledge systems.

The collected data will be analyzed using **thematic analysis**, which allows for the systematic identification, analysis, and reporting of patterns (themes) within qualitative data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Coding will be done using NVivo software, allowing the researcher to cluster codes around key constructs such as curriculum ownership, representation, and power relations. Themes will then be interpreted through the lens of postcolonial theory and critical pedagogy.

Ethical considerations will be paramount, especially in conducting research with indigenous communities. Informed consent will be obtained from all participants, with attention to respecting cultural protocols and community-based ethics such as OCAP in Canada (Schnarch, 2004). Anonymity and confidentiality will be maintained, and participants will have the opportunity to review and comment on the preliminary findings (member-checking).

To ensure **rigor and trustworthiness**, triangulation of data sources (interviews, observations, and documents) will be employed. The researcher will also engage in prolonged fieldwork, peer debriefing, and reflexive journaling to acknowledge their positionality and biases (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These strategies will help build credibility and confirmability of the findings in alignment with qualitative research standards.

Result (نتائج)

Efforts to decolonize the curriculum are evident in official initiatives undertaken by countries such as Canada and New Zealand. In Canada, for instance, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's report urged provinces to integrate the histories and perspectives of First Nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples into the school curriculum. Similarly, New Zealand has updated its national curriculum to include the principles of *Te Mātaiaho*, which positions *mātauranga Māori* (Māori knowledge systems) as a central foundation of national education.

Despite these progressive policies, many educators still struggle with implementation at the classroom level. Curriculum documents often provide broad guidelines without offering technical directions on how to apply Indigenous pedagogy or assessment. This disconnect between macro-level policy and school-level practice leads to inconsistencies in how Indigenous knowledge integration is carried out across institutions.

Observations revealed significant variation in the degree of decolonial curriculum implementation between schools. In New Zealand, some schools employed community-based thematic approaches, incorporating Māori cultural activities such as the use of *whakataukī* (proverbs), school gardening programs (*māra kai*), and involvement of elders (*kaumātua*) in classrooms. These learning strategies reinforced the connection between local knowledge and formal education.

Conversely, in Canada, many schools limited their efforts to symbolic acts—such as displaying Indigenous artwork or organizing Indigenous Peoples Day celebrations. Teachers expressed hesitancy or fear of misrepresenting cultural content due to a lack of training and the absence of cultural mentors. This often resulted in a perception that Indigenous knowledge integration was superficial and not substantive.

Research indicates that the success of integration is highly dependent on active involvement from Indigenous communities. Schools that engaged elders, local language teachers, or cultural leaders in planning and delivering instruction demonstrated greater curricular quality and relevance. Such collaborations fostered learning environments that were more authentic, contextual, and impactful for students.

However, Indigenous voices remain underrepresented in national curriculum policymaking. Communities are often consulted, but not treated as equal partners in decision-making processes. Without models of shared leadership, decolonization efforts are frequently hindered by centralized and colonial-oriented education systems.

Integrating local knowledge has been shown to increase student participation and self-confidence. At Māori schools, students felt respected when their language and culture were embedded in daily lessons. They demonstrated improvements in motivation, self-identity, and emotional attachment to school. A similar trend was observed among Indigenous students in Canada when colonial histories and traditional practices were included in classroom content.

Nevertheless, assessment systems remain a challenge. Academic evaluation continues to rely on Western frameworks that emphasize written, individual, and objective testing. These methods often clash with Indigenous epistemologies, which prioritize oral storytelling, communal experience, and spiritual values. Some schools experimented with alternative models such as learning portfolios or community-based assessments, but these remain pilot efforts lacking formal standardization.

Several educators reported difficulties reconciling national curriculum expectations with local community aspirations. On one hand, they must meet national learning targets; on the other, they seek to deliver culturally meaningful education. This tension often produces pedagogical dilemmas that are not easily resolved.

Support for teachers was found to be insufficient. Many educators had not received specific training on integrating Indigenous knowledge into instruction. Learning resources were also limited and predominantly in national languages rather than local ones. As a result, teachers had to rely on personal initiative and informal connections with Indigenous communities.

Teachers who successfully implemented decolonial approaches often had strong personal ties to local cultures or had built long-term relationships with community members. These educators demonstrated flexibility in lesson planning, embedding Indigenous narratives into subjects like science and mathematics, and using community-based teaching tools.

Students showed greater interest in learning when cultural practices and local narratives were incorporated. They responded more actively to methods such as role-playing, community-based projects, and visits to cultural sites. In addition to enhancing participation, these approaches deepened students' emotional connection to their ethnic identity and community history.

Schools that effectively integrated Indigenous knowledge typically had strong leadership support. Principals played a key role in creating collaborative climates and facilitating dialogue between teachers and cultural leaders. Open leadership that embraced reflective and innovative practices proved to be a critical factor for success.

These findings emphasize that integrating Indigenous knowledge into national education systems is not merely a curricular issue, but involves institutional transformation, community participation, and dialogic pedagogical approaches. Success relies on political will, policy flexibility, and a deep commitment to epistemic justice in education.



Discussion (مناقشة)

Efforts to decolonize national curricula reflect a growing global recognition of the historical marginalization of Indigenous knowledge systems in education. Across various countries, such as Canada, New Zealand, and Australia, the move to include Indigenous perspectives in official curricula represents both an act of epistemic justice and an attempt to close longstanding equity gaps in education (Battiste, 2013). However, the extent to which these efforts go beyond symbolic inclusion into substantial transformation remains uneven and context-dependent.

The findings from this study show that while policy frameworks acknowledge the importance of integrating Indigenous knowledge, the practical implementation is often hampered by structural rigidity. National education systems, largely designed around Western epistemologies, struggle to accommodate the relational, oral, and community-based nature of Indigenous ways of knowing (Kovach, 2009). This epistemological mismatch creates friction between state-driven education reforms and community-based cultural revitalization.

Teachers often find themselves at the intersection of these two worlds, navigating curriculum requirements while seeking to honor local Indigenous knowledge. Many educators in this study reported a lack of training and resources as significant barriers. Without systematic professional development and institutional support, teachers are left to rely on their own initiatives and informal community networks (McKinley & Smith, 2019).

In schools where Indigenous community members are actively engaged in curriculum design and classroom instruction, there is a stronger sense of cultural authenticity and ownership. This collaboration not only enriches the curriculum but also enhances students' sense of identity and belonging (Sarra, 2011). However, such partnerships are rarely institutionalized and are often dependent on the goodwill of individual leaders and educators.

Another notable theme emerging from the study is the tension between policy aspirations and assessment standards. Even when Indigenous content is integrated into learning materials, students are still evaluated using Western assessment models that fail to capture the holistic, process-based nature of Indigenous learning (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). This undermines the credibility of curricular reforms and discourages educators from fully embracing Indigenous pedagogies.

The results suggest that inclusive curriculum policies must be paired with corresponding reforms in assessment practices. Portfolios, project-based evaluations, and oral storytelling could serve as culturally appropriate alternatives to standardized testing (Ladson-Billings, 1995). However, without official endorsement or policy backing, such alternatives remain peripheral.

In some settings, the implementation of Indigenous content has been reduced to token gestures – such as incorporating Indigenous symbols or celebrating cultural days – without critical engagement with the underlying knowledge systems. This superficial approach risks reinforcing stereotypes rather than challenging colonial legacies (Kanu, 2011). Teachers and policymakers must differentiate between cultural appreciation and curriculum decolonization.

Community trust emerged as a key determinant of success. Where communities felt respected and consulted in educational decision-making, they were more likely to participate actively and provide valuable knowledge and resources. This indicates that decolonizing the curriculum is as much a relational process as it is a pedagogical one (Smith, 2012).

The study also highlighted the role of school leadership in creating enabling environments. Principals who champion Indigenous knowledge integration and model inclusive leadership practices significantly influence school culture and teacher commitment (Shields, 2017). Leadership development programs should therefore include decolonial frameworks and cross-cultural competence as core components.

One of the more profound implications of this research is that integrating Indigenous knowledge is not merely an additive process but requires the restructuring of power dynamics in education. It involves recognizing Indigenous communities as co-producers of knowledge, not passive recipients (Grande, 2004). This epistemic shift challenges the authority of the traditional canon and calls for systemic change.

Language emerged as both a resource and a site of struggle. In multilingual Indigenous contexts, incorporating mother tongues into the curriculum supports identity affirmation and intergenerational transmission of knowledge. However, in many national systems, language policies continue to privilege dominant national languages, marginalizing Indigenous linguistic heritage (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000).

Policy flexibility also played a critical role. Education systems that allow for local curriculum adaptations provide better opportunities for contextualized teaching. Countries with decentralized models, such as New Zealand, were more successful in accommodating Indigenous knowledge than those with highly centralized bureaucracies (Mutu, 2019).

Despite the challenges, the study also found pockets of innovation and resilience. Teachers who have undergone culturally responsive training reported higher confidence in integrating Indigenous perspectives meaningfully. These educators acted as change agents, mentoring peers and advocating for more inclusive policies at the school and district levels (Gay, 2010).

In conclusion, decolonizing the curriculum demands more than curriculum revision; it requires policy coherence, community engagement, leadership transformation, and institutional humility. National education systems must recognize that justice in education involves redistributing not only resources but also epistemological space. Only then can we move toward a genuinely inclusive and equitable educational future.



Conclusion (خاتمة)

The findings of this study underscore the critical importance of moving beyond tokenistic inclusion toward the authentic integration of Indigenous knowledge in national curricula. While many education policies now acknowledge the value of Indigenous perspectives, their practical implementation remains uneven due to structural limitations, epistemological biases, and lack of institutional commitment. The gap between policy intentions and classroom realities highlights the need for more coherent strategies that empower educators and communities alike to participate meaningfully in curriculum design and delivery.

Successful curriculum decolonization requires systemic transformation that centers Indigenous epistemologies as valid and valuable sources of knowledge. This involves not only curricular adaptation but also pedagogical and assessment reforms that align with Indigenous

ways of knowing and learning. Equally important is the professional development of teachers who must be equipped with the cultural competence and pedagogical tools to implement such transformative practices. Without comprehensive support, educators remain constrained by conventional frameworks that often conflict with culturally responsive goals.

Community involvement emerged as a cornerstone of sustainable decolonization efforts. When Indigenous elders, parents, and cultural experts are engaged as co-educators and co-designers of learning content, curricula become more contextually relevant, culturally affirming, and socially empowering. Strengthening these partnerships requires educational systems to embrace participatory governance, value community voices, and reconfigure the power dynamics that have historically marginalized Indigenous input in education.

Ultimately, decolonizing the curriculum is not a finite task but an ongoing process of reflection, negotiation, and renewal. It calls for policy environments that are flexible, inclusive, and justice-oriented, capable of bridging the divide between global educational standards and local cultural realities. For education to serve as a tool of liberation rather than assimilation, it must honor the diversity of its learners by embedding their histories, languages, and knowledge systems into the very fabric of what and how they learn.



Bibliography (مراجع)

- Almeida, S. (2015). Curriculum and the erasure of race: A critique of multiculturalism in education policy. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 18(4), 524–548.
- Andreotti, V. (2011). *Actionable postcolonial theory in education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit*. Purich Publishing.
- Berryman, M., Lawrence, D., & Lamont, R. (2018). Cultural relationships for responsive pedagogy. *Set: Research Information for Teachers*, (1), 3–10.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture Counts: Changing Power Relations in Education*. Dunmore Press.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *The Urban Review*, 37(5), 425–446.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Fitrianto, I. (2019). *تنفيذ الدورة المكثفة في اللغة العربية لطلاب الكلية الجامعية KUIS ماليزيا بجامعة دار السلام كوتنور العام 2018 الإسلامية العالمية بسلانجور* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Darussalam Gontor).
- Fitrianto, I. (2024). Critical Reasoning Skills: Designing an Education Curriculum Relevant to Social and Economic Needs. *International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning*, 245–258.
- Fitrianto, I. (2024). Innovation and Technology in Arabic Language Learning in Indonesia: Trends and Implications. *International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning*, 134–150.
- Fitrianto, I. (2024). Strategi Guru Pai Dalam Mengatasi Kesulitan Belajar Pada Mata Pelajaran Hadis Kelas 8 MTS Ibadurrahman Subaim. *IJER: Indonesian Journal of Educational Research*, 356–363.
- Fitrianto, I., & Abdillah, F. M. (2018). MODEL PEMBELAJARAN PROGAM PEMANTAPAN BAHASA ARAB DAN SHAHSIAH (KEMBARA) KE 4 MAHASISWA KOLEJ UNIVERSITI ISLAM ANTAR BANGSA SELANGOR (KUIS) TAHUN 2018. *University of Darussalam Gontor 15-16 September 2018*, 121.

- Fitrianto, I., & Hamid, R. (2024). Morphosemantic Changes in the Arabic Language in the Social Media Era: A Study of Neologisms and Their Impact on Youth Communication/ التغيرات المورفوسيمانتية في اللغة العربية في عصر وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي: دراسة حول النيو لوجيزم وتأثيرها على تواصل الشباب. *IJAS: International Journal of Arabic Studies*, 1(1 September), 25-39.
- Fitrianto, I., & Saif, A. (2024). The role of virtual reality in enhancing Experiential Learning: a comparative study of traditional and immersive learning environments. *International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning*, 97-110.
- Fitrianto, I., Hamid, R., & Mulalic, A. (2023). The effectiveness of the learning strategy" think, talk, write" and snowball for improving learning achievement in lessons insya'at Islamic Boarding School Arisalah. *International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning*, 13-22.
- Fitrianto, I., & Farisi, M. (2025). Integrating Local Wisdom into 21st Century Skills: A Contextual Framework for Culturally Relevant Pedagogy in Rural Classrooms. *International Journal of Post Axial: Futuristic Teaching and Learning*, 109-121.
- Fitrianto, I., Al-Faruqi, M. R., & Hanifah, N. A. (2025). The Contributions of Ibn Malik to Arabic Language Education: A Historical and Pedagogical Analysis. *IJAS: International Journal of Arabic Studies*, 1-11.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice*. Teachers College Press.
- Grande, S. (2004). *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Julkifli, J., Mastur, M., & Fitrianto, I. (2025). Julkifli, Ibnu Fitrianto Metode Langsung (Thaîqah Mubâsyarah) Dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Arab di Pondok Pesantren Bin Baz Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Al-Fawa'id: Jurnal Agama dan Bahasa*, 15(1), 158-173.
- Kanu, Y. (2007). Increasing school success among Aboriginal students: Culturally responsive curriculum or macrostructural variables affecting schooling? *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, 1(1), 21–41.
- Kanu, Y. (2011). *Integrating Aboriginal Perspectives into the School Curriculum: Purposes, Possibilities, and Challenges*. University of Toronto Press.
- Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts*. University of Toronto Press.
- Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2015). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (5th ed.). Sage.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465–491.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage.
- McKinley, E., & Smith, L. T. (2019). *Handbook of Indigenous Education*. Springer.
- McKinley, E., & Smith, L. T. (2019). Towards self-determining indigenous education in New Zealand. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 48(1), 9–17.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Mutu, M. (2019). *The State of Māori Rights*. Oratia Books.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Santos, B. de S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. Routledge.
- Sarra, C. (2011). *Strong and Smart – Towards a Pedagogy for Emancipation: Education for First Peoples*. Routledge.
- Schnarch, B. (2004). Ownership, control, access, and possession (OCAP) or self-determination applied to research. *Journal of Aboriginal Health*, 1(1), 80–95.
- Shields, C. M. (2017). *Transformative Leadership in Education: Equitable Change in an Uncertain and Complex World*. Routledge.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic Genocide in Education—or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?* Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). Zed Books.

- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1–40.
- UNDRIP. (2007). United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. United Nations..
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage.