Chapter 2

Decolonising perspectives in the era of globalisation and internationalisation

*Kelly Ngesungwo Jabosung,[1] Kehdinga George Fomunyam,[2]
Doh Nubia Walters[3] & Raymond Nkwenti Fru[4]*

Introduction

The subject of decolonisation is not new. For centuries different parts of the world went through the process of decolonisation. From Africa to Asia to America, decolonisation became a norm. However, some parts of the world experienced a wave of decolonisation differently from others. Some nations experienced complete decolonisation; others experienced political decolonisation, where only political power was transferred from the coloniser to the colonised. Sectors such as the economy and education remained remotely under the control of the coloniser. The systems that were put in place and the barbaric nature of such systems ensured that for decades these systems remained intact.

This has been the case with the higher education sector in Africa and in South Africa in particular. The nature and purpose of higher education in Africa were such that values, customs and worldviews of European or the global North were imposed on Africans. In South Africa, this became worse with the repressive and racial laws of apartheid. Under apartheid, the education system was stratified

1   Pan African Institute for Development- West Africa

2   Durban University of Technology

3   North-West University

4   National University of Lesotho

on the basis of race. Even at the advent of democracy the South African higher education sector remains replete with diverse challenges ranging from racism, access, throughput and management hegemony.

The cry for decolonisation in South African higher education reached its peak in 2016 with student protest all over the nation. Fuelled by the 'Fees Must Fall' movement, which took the nation by storm in 2015, both students and staff in the South African higher education sector intensified their demand for decolonisation. This movement took another turn when a student in the University of Cape Town defaced the statue of Cecil John Rhodes (a central figure in apartheid South Africa) located at the centre of the university. The movement spread to other universities, including Rhodes University, where students called for a change of name for the university. Students at the University of KwaZulu-Natal covered a statue of King George V with white paint and students at the University of Witwatersrand held transformation talks. In Stellenbosch, it was all about 'Open Stellenbosch', while in the University of Pretoria, the fight centred on the 'Afrikaans Must Fall' movement (Pather, 2015).

Numerous questions raised across the higher education landscape in South Africa proved that there was a need for the decolonisation of the higher education system. Though almost everyone within the sector agreed with the sentiment, there was (and still is) much disagreement on what exactly needs to be decolonised and how the decolonisation process needs to unfold. The bigger questions centred on the meaning of decolonisation in the higher education sector. Decolonising higher education had become the new buzzword with no clear-cut meaning or understanding. This situation is made more precarious, especially in the higher education sector, by the era of globalisation and internationalisation we are in. While globalisation and internationalisation focus on bringing people together and creating more avenues for commonalities, decolonisation seems to signal a depart from the status quo in place.

In response to this, different scholars adopted different definitions and understandings of decolonisation and went about decolonising in a variety of ways. This gave birth to multiple perspectives on decolonisation and what exactly needs to be decolonised. This chapter sets out to explore these perspectives in the bid to provide a general understanding of happenings around the decolonisation of higher education and points a way forward in the decolonisation process. In doing

this, the chapter is divided into three parts: conceptualisations of decolonisation, alternative areas on decolonising higher education, and decolonising higher education in the era of globalisation and internationalisation.

Conceptualisations of decolonisation in higher education

Fomunyam (2017b) argues that decolonisation has come to mean different things to different people. The findings of his study indicate that decolonising higher education is all about changing the praxis of theory and practice, language, pedagogy, contextual relevance, curriculum, partnership, social justice and academic make-up. While these range of issues are extensive, the study centres on what should change or should be engaged and not how it should be engaged. It, however, fails to offer a practical definition of decolonising higher education, which could inform the findings in the study. Mgqwashu defines decolonising education as the 'exposure to opportunities that will ensure that students learn more about other fellow South Africans who might be different to them' (Mgqwashu, 2016, p. 1). This means decolonisation is about recognising and appreciating differences and not dealing with the legacies of colonisation as articulated by students. Recognising that South Africa is made up of different races cannot be the full essence of decolonisation. Essop (2016) offers an alternative understanding by arguing that decolonisation in South African higher education can be understood as the affirmation of African knowledge and cultural traditions in universities, which remain dominated by Western traditions. Understanding decolonisation as the affirmation of African knowledge and culture in the face of a Eurocentric-dominated environment evokes the notion or idea of what needs to be added or punctuated. However, it fails to articulate what is wrong with the current system and why an affirmation of African knowledge and cultures would result in a decolonised higher education. The mere recognition and inclusion of an African knowledge system into the curriculum cannot be considered to be decolonisation of the higher education system. Other parts of the higher education sector are neglected, and the processes within the universities, which necessitated the call for decolonisation, are yet to be dealt with (Fomunyam, 2017a).

Heleta provides an alternative view of decolonising higher education by articulating it as

> *[bringing to an end] the domination of white, male, Western, capitalist, European worldviews in South African higher education and the incorporation of other South Africans, African and a global perspectives, experiences and epistemologies as the central tenets of the curriculum, teaching, learning and research in the country. (Heleta, 2016, p. 1)*

This highlights new issues around the demand for decolonisation and raises questions around the continuous domination of white male Western worldviews in higher education in the curriculum, teaching, learning and research. The only part or mission of the university not apparent in this definition deals with community engagement. Heleta articulates decolonisation as the survival of a people's experiences, worldviews and cultures championed by the university. In calling for the end of undue privileges and the subjugation of one group of people by the other, Heleta seems to echo the voices of students in the universities of Cape Town, Witwatersrand and Pretoria, amongst others.

Knight (2018) offers an alternative definition of decolonisation by seeing it as the undoing or challenging of what was done during the colonial era in higher education in a forceful manner. He continues that it is the breaking apart of the legacies of the colonial era, which we thought had been broken a long time ago, but that still exist. In this case, to decolonise is to eradicate the legacies of colonialism still evident in the higher education sector. What emerges anew from this definition is the notion that we perceived or thought that these legacies were dealt with a long time ago, however, they still persist in the higher education sector. Bennett (2017) provides yet another viewpoint by articulating decolonisation in the higher education sector as removing the European influence on what we teach, research or do in the university context and eradicating all of Europe's influence in the higher education system. (The European, in this case, is considered the coloniser.) However, the definition doesn't clearly point out what these legacies are and how exactly they are to be removed. Prinsloo (2016) provides a similar definition of decolonisation by considering it to be a re-centring of ourselves, intellectually and culturally, by redefining what the centre is, namely, Africa.

Over the years, African institutions or universities inherited the foregrounding of European experiences (cultural and social capital) at the expense of unique African epistemological nuances. Making Africa the focus of South African university academics would be foregrounding the African experience and knowledge systems as well as empowering Africans to make contextual knowledge relevant contextually and internationally. Disemelo concurs and states that decolonisation is the

> *eradication of the painful exclusions and daily micro aggressions which go hand-in-hand with institutional racism within these spaces... and also the laying bare of the failures of the heterosexual, patriarchal, neoliberal capitalist values which have become so characteristic of the country's universities. (Disemelo, 2015, p. 2)*

In this case, decolonising higher education is seen as making amends for the ills of colonisation and redressing the hegemonic practices in the higher education sector. This to ensure that the university becomes a place for the African, free from all destructive influences that have for centuries inhibited the contextual responsiveness of higher education in South Africa. Mbembe (2015) provides another line of definition by looking at the decolonisation of the higher education system as the de-privatisation and rehabilitation of the public space, which is the university. This process begins with opening up the university as what pertains to the realm of the common and giving the university a make-up or makeover to create conditions that will make black staff and students think of the university as their home, and not to see themselves as outsiders.

A further notion of decolonisation in higher education has emerged in South Africa. This is that of 'soft' decolonisation or 'conceptual' decolonisation. Jansen argues that this soft decolonisation is all about changing the 'relational position of an African-centred curriculum to the rest of the world' (Jansen, 2017, p. 159). In this light, it is about shifting positions for the African-centred curriculum. Le Grange supports this notion and argues that this kind of decolonisation is 'a process of change that does not necessarily involve destroying Western knowledge but in decentring it or perhaps de-territorialising [sic] it (making it something other than what it is)' (Le Grange, 2016, p. 6). This decolonisation in the higher education sector is not about eradicating Western thought for in this era of globalisation and internationalisation it is becoming increasingly difficult to

identify clear-cut boundaries where Western thought ends and where African thought begins. For as Mamdani argues: 'decolonisation would have to engage with this vision of the undifferentiated human – culled from the European historical experience – which breathed curricular content into the institutional form we know as the modern university' (Mamdani, 2016, p. 70). The very essence of knowledge in the university has its origin in European thought and culture and this has shaped the African thought. It is therefore difficult to pinpoint a clear-cut difference between European and African thought. Mamdani adds that 'epistemological decolonisation has and should be focused on the categories with which we make, unmake and remake, and thereby apprehend, the world. It is intimately tied to our notions of what is human, what is particular and what is universal' (Mamdani, 2016, p. 70). In this light, it is not about us and them but about making the educational experience better for students some of whom are European and some African.

Sidogi and Rasedile (2017) contest the European thought extradition decolonisation narrative, instead arguing for the de-traditionalisation, re-contextualisation and ultimately '21st-centurisation' of an African based university. They aver that contextualising and de-traditionalising the higher education sector in South Africa should be the crux of decolonising higher education and not necessarily the eradication of European thought. Carman concludes that decolonisation 'is not aimed at liberating African… thought from all influences from the colonial past, only those that are undue' (Carman, 2016, p. 236).

As has been shown, decolonisation has been understood differently by different scholars in the higher education sector. It is this multiplicity of understanding that keeps the fire of decolonisation burning and ensures that the project never comes to an end. Since different institutions respond differently to different things, there are bound to be different understandings of decolonisation in higher education. Mbembe's thoughts are quite critical in summarising this. He argues that

> *to decolonise the university is, therefore, to reform it with the aim of creating a less provincial and more open critical cosmopolitan pluriversalism [sic] – a task that involves the radical re-founding of our ways of thinking and a transcendence [sic]of our disciplinary divisions. (Mbembe, 2016, p. 37)*

Having theorised the different understandings of decolonisation in the higher education sector in South Africa, it is critical to look at the different areas being decolonised within higher education.

Areas for decolonisation

As mentioned earlier, different universities responded to different things at the peak of the call for the decolonisation of the university or the higher education sector. This is because decolonising higher education was not about a single problem but concerned multiple factors working together to ensure universities remain colonial. This is supported by Ndlovu-Gatsheni who argues:

> *By 2015 the idea of the university prescribed by the colonial and apartheid past was targeted by radical student movements in South Africa. While on the surface the 2015/2016 RhodesMustFall movement was sparked by the existence of the offensive statue of leading British imperialist Cecil John Rhodes at the University of Cape Town, there were deeper challenges behind this movement. These included the deepening and widening socioeconomic inequalities that breed poverty; the legitimate demand for expansion of access to higher education, which speaks directly to social justice issues connected to the skewed demographic and unequal economic wealth distribution; low throughput and retention of students; the irrelevance of what is taught in universities and its misalignment with labour market demands; and the connection between student demands and workers' demands, which manifested in the call for the outsourcing of workers to end. A combination of these factors forced the students to begin the struggle of 'nibbling at resilient colonialism in South Africa'. (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2017, p. 75)*

There are a variety of issues or areas in the higher education sector worthy of articulating for decolonisation. This chapter considers three of these, namely:

- institutional culture and architecture;
- the curriculum; and
- language.

Institutional culture and architecture

The architecture and culture of a university sets the pace for learning and determines who gets the moral and psychological 'higher ground' within the university. Articulating the importance of this, Mbembe argues that

> *the decolonisation of buildings is not a frivolous issue. To some extent, a good university education is impossible without an extensive material infrastructure/architecture. Intellectual life can be dependent on the sort of buildings in which conversations take place. Apartheid architecture – which prevails in most of our higher learning institutions – is not conducive to breathing. A proper campus bookstore providing more than textbooks, sweatshirts and drinking mugs. (Mbembe, 2016, p. 30)*

Institutional architecture is a vital part of learning resources as well as the process of scaffolding. When students feel ostracised in university campuses, it becomes increasingly difficult for them and impossible to learn. This leads to a continuous circle of drop out and poverty. Fomunyam (2017c) mentions that South African higher education is in dire need of decolonisation and the current institutional culture and architecture does not create room for this to happen at any level. He continues that the state of education is deplorable, especially at the undergraduate level. Fomunyam concludes that universities need a partial or complete change of institutional architecture and culture to create the right atmosphere for decolonisation and transformation. Fomunyam and Teferra (2017) support this and argue that universities in South Africa need a makeover in terms of their culture and architecture to create the right atmosphere and conditions for academic exchanges, demographic representation and eradication of sexual and racial discrimination. Institutional architecture is therefore critical for quality and for responsive higher education in South Africa.

Emphasising on the role of institutional culture in quality and responsive higher education, Thaver (2009, p. 1) argues that higher education policy documents, such as the 1997 South African government White Paper: A Programme for the Transformation of Higher Education and its regulatory instrument, the National Plan for Higher Education (2001), recognise the need for universities to change their institutional cultures. She suggests that in some universities, especially the historically white institutions, a white, male and Eurocentric institutional culture, which dominates these institutions, is perceived as a substantial barrier to black

academics. There is thus a perception that the conditions required for establishing a critical mass of black academics may not yet exist. The attack on the statue of Cecil Rhodes in the University of Cape Town and that of King George in the University of KwaZulu-Natal, the 'Open Stellenbosch' cry, and the demand for a change of name for Rhodes University all point at attempts to change institutional culture and architecture. It is, therefore, vital that the decolonisation movement touch these parts of the higher education sector.

The curriculum

The second issue or area requiring decolonisation is the curriculum. However, to articulate this issue clearly, we first need to clarify the term 'curriculum'. Grumet (1981) argues that curriculum in higher education can be understood as the stories that we tell students about their past, present and future. This raises several questions about what stories are being told to students and who tells the stories. This view of the curriculum was enhanced by Aoki (1999) who argued that curriculum is not simply about the document or curriculum-as-plan but also about the sum total of lived experiences by students and teachers – the experiences of the curriculum-as-lived. This means that questions around how students are experiencing the current university curriculum and how their experiences can be enhanced are pertinent questions to be considered in the decolonisation of an institution. To this end, a curriculum is about the plan and how the plan is experienced.

According to Fomunyam (2014), there are other dimensions of the curriculum that the higher education sector has failed to address. These he called the overt, hidden and null curriculum. The 'overt' curriculum" constitutes what is readily available to students, such as theoretical underpinnings, module frameworks, prescribed readings, assessments guidelines, methodology and paradigmatic directions. The 'hidden' curriculum, on the other hand, constitutes what students learn from the curriculum and the university without knowing that they are learning. The 'null' constitutes what is not taught and learnt in the university curriculum. The hidden and the null curriculum can, therefore, be used to advance different cultural agendas on the university campus. In most cases, this is amongst the reasons for the numerous calls for the decolonisation of the curriculum.

Decolonising the curriculum, therefore, goes beyond simply changing what is being taught. It entails deeper questions about how it's being taught, who teaches it,

what they do not teach, where they teach, what they teach, and the implications of what they teach. Pondering on the dire need for decolonisation of the curriculum, Fomunyam and Teferra (2017) point out that educational processes or discussions are hegemonic in most universities and this requires decolonisation. Le Grange provides multiple approaches to dealing with such hegemonic curriculum. The first, he argues, 'is based on the 4Rs central to an emergent indigenous paradigm. The 4Rs are relational accountability, respectful representation, reciprocal appropriation, and rights and regulation' (Le Grange, 2016, p. 9). These 4Rs speak to different dimensions of the curriculum. According to Le Grange:

> *[Relational accountability] concerns the fact that all parts of the curriculum [are] connected and that the curriculum is accountable to all relations (human and more-than-human). Respectful representation relates to how the curriculum acknowledges and creates space for the voices and knowledges of indigenous peoples. Reciprocal appropriation relates to ensuring that the benefits of knowledge produced and transmitted are shared by both communities and universities. Rights and regulation refers to observing ethical protocols that accord ownership of knowledge (where appropriate) to Indigenous peoples of the world. (Le Grange, 2016, p. 9)*

These 4Rs speak not only to the content but to who owns the content and the value it carries or emits in the society.

Another approach provided by Le Grange (2016) involves the radical rethinking of Western disciplines, which he describes as 'distant, antiseptic and removed from the experiences of the lived world [that] comes from recognising the pain, anger and anguish being experienced in society'. If the curriculum focuses on the lived experiences of the people, as already pointed out, it follows that decolonising the curriculum needs to move away from the distant, antiseptic and removed to focus on the context and experiences of the people. Concurring with this, Fomunyam and Teferra, in their article on curriculum responsiveness, indicate that the higher 'education curriculum is still championed by neo-colonialist and this needs to change. Higher education curriculum needs to be student-, learning- and context-centred so that it can be responsive to local situations' (Fomunyam & Teferra, 2017, p. 201). This neo-colonial orientation has resulted in indigenous knowledge systems being side-lined. Emphasising this they argue:

> *Indigenous knowledge is side-lined because those who are researching it and advocating for it don't have decision making power. And those who do, prefer the ivory towers they are seating [sitting] in until this power dynamic is dismantled, our curriculum would remain unresponsive and decolonisation would remain another buzzword. (Fomunyam & Teferra, 2017, p. 201)*

Articulating the way forward in the decolonisation of the curriculum, Fomunyam and Teferra (2017) maintain that a few people have dominated these discussions for the past twenty years and now it's time to change. Thousands of voices should be promoted to contribute in these discussions so that a variety of perspectives can be understood and applied. Fomunyam supports this by articulating a twofold model for decolonising the curriculum; decolonising through curriculum convergence and divergence. He argues that:

> *Curriculum divergence and convergence, on the other hand, would not only secure the transformation of South African higher education but would also ensure freedom of the mind for students and staff. Curriculum divergence would be the separation or break away from a Eurocentric curriculum, which disempowers the African mind by foregrounding European or foreign experiences at the expense of local or contextual knowledge, which can easily be applied. However, a focus on local experiences would leave the student vulnerable and excluded especially in the current dispensation of globalisation and internationalisation. It is therefore about foregrounding local content and experiences, exporting it to the rest of the world and constructing knowledge on shared experiences. Furthermore, to effectively expand on this notion of decolonising the curriculum by diverging to converge, it is vital to look at three key notions of the curriculum that reveal that curriculum matters are intertwined with the cultural, political, social and historical contexts of not only the education system but the world in which they operate. (Fomunyam, 2017c, p. 175)*

Decolonising the curriculum by converging to diverge becomes a way of answering the critical questions around the decolonisation of the curriculum, such as, what is being taught, how it's being taught, who teaches it, what they do not teach, where they teach what they teach, and the implications of what they teach. Rethinking the curriculum as an active conceptual force, which does not have fixity or closeness, relates it to the imminent potential of freeing the student from all entanglements of the colonial.

Language

The last area critical for decolonisation in the South African higher education sector is language. The issue of language in the South African higher education is a critical one with serious debates emerging from the 'Open Stellenbosch' movement and the 'Afrikaans Must Fall' movement in the University of Pretoria. Beyond this, conversations around the issue of language and the need for decolonisation of language have been boiling issues within the higher education sector. In an article about the dominance of Afrikaans published on the LitNet website, Painter writes:

> *When the rector [of Stellenbosch University], Wim de Villiers, recently revealed a language policy proposal that would see English become the 'default' language, it was hailed as an opportunity for Stellenbosch to cross its political Rubicon, to make amends with the victims of apartheid and to become a world-class university rather than a volksuniversiteit. Such responses reveal the political baggage Afrikaans still carries. Behind the enthusiasm for the devaluation of Afrikaans at Stellenbosch University is the idea that the language remains a repository of racial privilege… The language is seen instead as an active ingredient in the perpetuation of apartheid inequality; as one of the principal mechanisms mobilised to exclude non-Afrikaans speakers. (Painter, 2015, p. 1)*

This shows the particularity and importance of language in the higher education sector. Epistemological access in the higher education sector can only be gained through language, and if language becomes an inhibiting factor, then students remain outsiders. This has been the case in several universities where students have struggled with the language of instruction, be it English or Afrikaans. Painter continuous that Afrikaans undoubtedly leads a problematic existence in some South African universities by restricting access and making people feel unwelcome, victimised and barricaded in culturally defined spaces and privileges.

However, this is not restricted to Afrikaans but also by the illusory 'universalism' of English, the linguistic dimensions of exclusion and inclusion (of racism also) at universities, and the urgent need to rethink and decolonise linguistic spaces and practices. This is supported by Fomunyam (2017b) who argues that the language of instruction requires decolonisation. To the participants of his study, English was seen as a major problem in the understanding of engineering. Fanon (2008) argues that decolonising in higher education centres on the cultivation

of critical consciousness. This conscientisation will help people in learning to see settler colonialism, to articulate critiques of settler epistemology, and to set aside settler histories and values in search of ethics that reject domination and exploitation. Decolonising is about freeing or engaging the mind with a different set of knowledge paradigms, belief systems, experiences and social capital – and language becomes the vehicle for this. Without a change in the language of instruction in higher education, students would never gain epistemological access. Hence the need for its decolonisation.

Ngũgĩ (2004) supports this by arguing that knowledge is embedded in language and culture, and to a certain level, culture itself only expresses itself through language. Therefore, for the African mind to be truly decolonised, the language of engagement or instruction needs to change. Students should be taught not only in English but in their language of competence. Fanon (2008) positions decolonisation as a chaotic and unclean process or break from a colonial condition that is already over-determined by the violence of the coloniser. Regaining independence at the intellectual level on the platform of chaos would be to tear its hegemonic principles, ways of thinking and language of expression. Ngũgĩ (2004) adds that marginalised cultures and languages have the duty and responsibility of making themselves not only visible in their languages but also to challenge and shake up that view of languages in theory and practice, especially since language is for knowledge construction.

An article on the Wits University website refers to a public lecture given by Ngũgĩ at the University of Witwatersrand on 2 March 2017 entitled, '*Decolonise the Mind, Secure the Base*'. In his lecture, Ngũgĩ said that knowledge of mother tongue is empowerment; lack of knowledge is enslavement. He called on African intellectuals and students to put more urgency in the institutionalisation of African languages. Ngũgĩ proposed that African languages have failed to develop and that while African scholarship has achieved great visibility in the world, this is not so in Africa as their thoughts are only written in English (cited in University of the Witwatersrand, 2017).

In response to this and in a bid to address the language crisis, the universities of Cape Town, Stellenbosch and Pretoria took steps to address their language policy. In addition, the University of KwaZulu-Natal has made great strides towards the

intellectualisation of IsiZulu and it is gradually becoming another language of instruction in the university.

The controversies around language and its ability to inhibit access and throughput in higher education cannot be denied. The decolonisation of language to ensure that whatever language of instruction is being engaged with empowers and does not disfranchise students constitutes a greater part of the decolonisation debate. If students cannot comprehend or make sense of what is happening in an institution of higher learning because of language then the university is failing to meets the needs of its stakeholders, thereby creating the need for decolonisation.

The last part of the chapter articulates a conceptual or theoretical guide to decolonise higher education in this era of globalisation and internationalisation.

Decolonising higher education in the era of globalisation and internationalisation

The world of higher education is continuously impacted by the growing influence of globalisation and internationalisation. Fox and Hundley (2011) argue that globalisation is about the interconnectedness of people and businesses across the world that eventually leads to global cultural, political and economic integration. There is a serious move away from the local to the global in the bid to make the world a global village. Globalisation is an important concept in the higher education sector. The world faces global challenges and interdisciplinary groups will be needed to solve these inherent problems. However, creating meaningful relationships that work globally is challenging, and globalisation in the bid to bring the world together brings with it a complex set of problems.

Fox and Hundley (2011) maintain that these challenges stem from six major differences brought on by globalisation and internationalisation. The first they say are cultural differences. There are enormous differences in countries, educational systems, religious backgrounds, environments and cultures. The second set of differences centre around expertise level. The third centres on geographic time zone differences, while the fourth hinges on trust issues. The fifth is anchored on language and communication differences and the last focuses on work style differences. Dzvimbo and Moloi support this when they say that globalisation 'is an

economic phenomenon that has discernible political and social connotations and is intrinsically bound to western cultural imperialism and advanced by an alliance between the world's largest corporations and the most powerful governments' (Dzvimbo & Moloi, 2013, p. 3). Globalisation, therefore, increasingly destroys the notion of the contextual and encourages the universal.

This becomes increasingly important in South Africa at the advent of decolonisation where the cry is to move away from the global or the European to the local. With globalisation comes internationalisation and the need to increasingly respond to the needs and demands of key funders of higher education research and policy. De Wit (2011) argues that both globalisation and internationalisation are complex intertwined phenomena with many strands, and the distinction between internationalisation and globalisation, although suggestive, cannot be regarded as categorised. This means that globalisation and internationalisation serve a similar purpose: to make the world more connected. However, as pointed out by Singh, Kenway and Apple (2005), the basis of this interconnectedness becomes the problem. They argue that globalisation is a widely contested concept with many and varied implications for educational policies, pedagogies, and politics of nation states. To them, the literature on globalisation can be understood from two perspectives: globalisation from above and globalisation from below. Singh et al. maintain that that globalising from above has tendencies, such as, internationalisation, marketisation, universalisation, westernisation and deteriorisation, which entrench a top-down perspective. With the top being 'multinational corporations and multi- or supra-national political organisations', with these corporations aiming at neo-liberal economics, with its calls for state legislated and protected trade and structural adjustment in national economies. Globalisation from below, on the other hand, recognises the unevenness, differences and disjunctions in the practices and consequences of neo-liberal globalism (Singh, et al., 2005, p. 1).

With South Africa having bought into both the mandate of globalisation and internationalisation (for there exist a national policy on internationalisation), it becomes increasingly difficult to decolonise the university. This is because the nuances of globalisation and internationalisation necessitate a move away from the local (for example, the use of indigenous languages as medium of instruction) to the global. These neo-liberal forces continuously directly or indirectly enforce the continuation of colonial legacy and the overbalance of the European influences of

the modern university in Africa. It is against this backdrop that the decolonisation project in South Africa is moving. The complexities, hesitations, resistance and escapism currently being witnessed in the South African higher education system regarding the decolonisation of the sector stems from the influences and dictates of globalisation and internationalisation and the hegemonic privileges it confers on a privileged few while the majority are left to wallow in misery.

Carr and Thésée (2012) argue that the world is filled with different languages, cultures, ethnicities, religions, races, orientations and diverse identities. Failure to understand and appreciate these differences results in devastating consequences, such as wars, conflicts, subjugation, marginalisation, racism, hatred, xenophobia and despair. Fanon (2008) maintains that a decolonised education is that which raises questions about power relations among actors and different players in the higher education sector, while at the same time upholding the agency, resistance and local cultural resource knowledges of all students.

In line with this, Thésée (2006) and Carr and Thésée (2008, 2012) provide a four point framework, which can be used for the decolonisation of higher education in the era of globalisation and internationalisation. This framework centres on re-fuse, re-question, redefine and reaffirm.

Re-fusing as a decolonisation pathway provides higher education stakeholders with the opportunity of addressing the different discourses that are infused into the mind continuously in everyday life. These discourses 'present strong symbolic, implicit and explicit content. The symbolic content includes images, styles, attitudes or relations which fill the ordinary social environment with, for example, media and artistic productions' (Carr & Thésée, 2012, p. 23). Re-fusing the colonial discourse and narrative on what to teach, how to teach, whom to teach, how to measure what we teach, whose knowledge we teach, how the university is organised, and what language is used to teach, amongst others, becomes the first step towards decolonising the higher education sector. These questions, which have generally been answered from a globalised perspective, need local answers for the decolonisation project to succeed.

Re-questioning, on the other hand, relates to new forms of questions to address issues of scientific knowledge. Re-questioning the technocratic world and its hegemonic practices that ask mostly 'how much' in seeking the measurable goals in various situations is vital in creating a culture of ethos and empathy in the

university community. This kind of culture would recognise the consequences of the historical imbalances of the past. It would also necessitate the creation of various models that move beyond the politics of numbers and quantity to the quality of life in the higher education sector. This culture would re-question how the higher education sector is improving the quality of life in the communities wherein it finds itself. Carr and Thésée (2008) aver that re-questioning the 'how' would shatter the certainty and rigidity of methodologies, which have long held higher education in South Africa to ransom.

Redefining, as the third pathway to decolonising higher education in South Africa, centres around knowledge in all its dimensions. This refers to knowledge that is social in nature, namely formal traits, aesthetics, choices, ethical values and collective rituals. What constitutes knowledge in South Africa and how this knowledge is or was constructed needs to be redefined to ensure the inclusion of what has been excluded for centuries and that has been aimed at keeping the mind colonised. The presuppositions of knowledge, the curriculum, language and institutional culture all require redefinition to produce a composite atmosphere free from colonial heritage and neoliberal artefacts.

The last point in the framework is reaffirmation. It is necessary to reaffirm the self and the local in order to deviate from the pervasive Eurocentric view that the local is inferior. This reaffirmation is a gateway for departments within universities, institutions of higher learning, research entities and the higher education sector in South Africa as a whole to refocus the centre of higher education by making it African and by ensuring that higher education serves the needs of South Africans before engaging or participating in neoliberal projects in the globalised world, such as internationalisation.

Conclusion

There will be no decolonisation of our universities without a better understanding and response to the complex dynamics of the global movement to which we must respond through Africa-centred, pro-active projects. As mentioned, decolonisation has been understood in various ways by scholars in South Africa. Though each of these definitions might not be all-encompassing in themselves,

a combined look at them would shed more light on what decolonisation is all about and what it should be doing. Higher education is a means of constructing knowledge – knowledge about ourselves. And when this is completed or achieved satisfactorily it can radiate outwards and discover peoples and worlds around us. Things must be seen from the African perspective with Africa at the centre of things, not existing as an appendix or a satellite of other countries and literatures. This would ensure that higher education architecture, culture, curriculum and language, amongst others, are seen in the light of Africa. All other things are to be considered in their relevance to the South African situation and their contribution towards understanding it. This is not a complete rejection of other streams, but a clear mapping out of the directions and perspectives that should drive higher education in South Africa.

To this end, the chapter recommends the following:

First, decolonising higher education in South Africa in an era twixt or overshadowed by globalisation and internationalisation requires a complex mix of strategies.

Second, decolonisation in higher education requires serious interrogation at institutional levels for these institutions to know what they are responding to and how they should respond. Furthermore, the multiple understandings of perspectives of decolonisation within South African higher education need to be considered to ensure the development of better response approaches and decolonisation pathways, which would continuously speak to contextual realities.

Next, the multifaceted nature of higher education challenges in South Africa makes the decolonisation project a rather burdensome one. This burden creates many risks for the higher education sector in responding to decolonisation. Without serious political capital and will the project would remain in the corridors and never actually be part of the university classroom. Just like transformation, the successes might be seen in part only through policy documents, with little or no practical change in the higher education landscape.

Finally, the decolonisation of the university is guaranteed to face several challenges and resistance for a variety of reasons, some of which have been discussed. However, it is the response to these challenges that will determine whether the higher education sector cleanses itself from the vagaries of colonial life. Continuous engagement with the decolonisation project is key to successful decolonisation, for it is not a product but a process requiring careful interrogation and engagement.

References

Altbach, P. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management,* 10(1), 3-25. https://doi:10.1080/13583883.2004.9967114

Altbach, P. (2005). Perspectives on internationalising higher education. *International Higher Education,* 27, 6-8.

Altbach, P., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalisation of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education,* 11(4), 290-305.

Altbach, P., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. (2009a). Globalisation and the university: Realities in an unequal world. In J. Forest & P. Altbach (Eds), *International handbook of higher education.* Dordrecht: Springer.

Altbach, P., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. (2009b). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution.* Paris: UNESCO.

Aoki, T. (1999). Rethinking curriculum and pedagogy. *Kappa Delta Pi Record, 35*(4), 180-181.

Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalisation: The human consequences.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Bennett, B. M. (2017). Decolonisation, environmentalism and nationalism in Australia and South Africa. *Itinerario,* 41(1), 27-50.

Bhambra, G. (2007). *Rethinking modernity: Postcolonialism and the sociologicalImagination.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Brandenburg, U., & De Wit, H. (2011). The end of internationalisation. *International HigherEeducation,* 62, 15-17.

Brock-Utne, B. (2005). Language-in-education policies and practices in Africa with a special focus on Tanzania and South Africa. In A. Lin & P. Martin (Eds), *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice*, pp. 615-631. Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Butucha, K. G. (2012). The impacts of globalisation on higher education curriculum: Implications for educational practices. *University of Eastern Africa, Baraton*, 1-7.

Carman, M. (2016). A defence of Wiredu's project of conceptual decolonisation. *South African Journal of Philosophy,* 35(2), 235-248.

Carr, P., & Thésée, G. (2008). The quest for political (il)literacy: Responding to, and attempting to counter, the neo-liberal agenda. In P. Porfilio & C. Malott (Eds), *An international examination of urban education: The destructive path of neo-liberalism*, pp. 173-194. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Carr, P., & Thésée, G. (2012). Discursive epistemologies by, for and about the de-colonising project. In A. Abdi (Ed.), *Decolonising philosophies of education.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Dascal, M. (2009). Colonising and decolonising minds. In I. Kucurandi (Ed.), *Papers of 2007 World Philosophy Day*, pp. 308-332. Ankara: Philosophical Society of Turkey.

De Wit, H. (2011). Globalisation and internationalisation of higher education. *Revista de Universidad y Sociedad del Conocimiento (RUSC),* 8, 241-248.

Disemelo, K. (2015). South African student protests are about much more than just #feesmustfall. The conversation. Retrieved from https://theconversation.com/south-african-student-protests-are-about-much-more-than-just-feesmustfall-49776 [Accessed 10 March 2017].

Dzvimbo, K. P., & Moloi, K. C. (2013). Globalisation and the internationalisation of higher education in sub-Saharan Africa. *South African Journal of Education,* 33(3), 1-16.

Essop, A. (2016). Decolonisation debate is a chance to rethink the role of universities. *The conversation.* Retrieved from https://theconversation.com/decolonisation-debate-is-a-chance-to-rethink-the-role-of-universities-63840 [Accessed 10 March 2017].

Fanon, F. (2008). *black skin, white masks.* New York: Grove Press.

Fomunyam, K. G. (2014). Curriculum theorising and individualism: An exploration of the curriculum's relation to the social, personal and political dimensions of schooling. *Mevlana International Journal of Education,* 4(2), 122-131.

Fomunyam, K. G. (2017a). Decolonising teaching and learning in engineering education in a South African university. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research,* 12(23), 13349-13358.

Fomunyam, K. G. (2017b). Decolonising the engineering curriculum in a South African university of technology. *International Journal of Applied Engineering Research,* 12(17), 6797-6805.

Fomunyam, K. G. (2017c). Decolonising the future in the untransformed present in South African higher education. *Perspectives in Education,* 35(2), 168-180.

Fomunyam, K. G. (2018). Deconstructing quality in South African higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education,* 26(1), 44-59. doi:10.1108/QAE-11-2016-0072

Fomunyam, K. G., & Teferra, D. (2017). Curriculum responsiveness within the context of decolonisation in South African higher education. *Perspectives in Education,* 35(2), 196-207.

Fox, P., & Hundley, S. (2011). The Importance of globalisation in higher education. In P. Pachura (Ed.), *New knowledge in a new era of globalisation.* London: IntechOpen.

Grumet, M. (1981). Restitution and reconstruction of educational experience: An autobiographical method for curriculum theory. In M. Lawn & L. Barton (Eds), *Rethinking curriculum studies: A radical approach*, pp. 115–130. London: Croom Helm.

Heleta, S. (2016). Decolonisation of higher education: Dismantling epistemic violence and Eurocentrism in South Africa. *Transformation in Higher Education,* 1(1), 1-8.

Jansen, J. D. (2017). *As by fire: the end of the South African university.* Cape Town: Tafelberg.

Jarvis, D. S. L. (2014). Regulating higher education: Quality assurance and neo-liberal managerialism in higher education – A critical introduction. *Policy and Society,* 33(3), 155-166. https://doi:10.1016/j.polsoc.2014.09.005

Knight, J. (2006). *Internationalisation of higher education: New directions, new challenges. 2005 IAU global survey report.* Paris: International Association of Universities.

Knight, J. (2011). Five myths about internationalisation. *International Higher Education,* 62, 14-15.

Knight, J. (2015). Updated definition of internationalisation. *International Higher Education,* 33, 2-3.

Knight, J. (2018). Decolonising and transforming the geography undergraduate curriculum in South Africa. *South African Geographical Journal,* 1-20.

Le Grange, L. (2016). Decolonising the university curriculum. *South African Journal of Higher Education,* 30(2), 1-12.

Lee, J.-K. (2004). Globalisation and higher education: A South Korea perspective. *Globalisation,* 4(1), 1-28.

Lin, A., & Martin, P. (Eds). (2005). *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice*, pp. 1-19. Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Lowman, E., & Mayblin, L. (2011). Theorising the postcolonial, decolonising theory. *Studies in Social and Political Thought,* 19(1), 3-8.

Mamdani, M. (2016). Between the public intellectual and the scholar: Decolonisation and some post-independence initiatives in African higher education. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies,* 17(1), 68-83.

Marginson, S., & Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A Glonacal Agency heuristic. *Higher Education,* 43 (3), 281-309.

Mbembe, A. (2015). Decolonising knowledge and the question of the archive. Available at http://worldpece.org/content/mbembe-achille-2015-%E2%80%9Cdecolonizing-knowledge-and-question-archive%E2%80%9D-africa-country [Accessed 10 January 2019].

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

Mgqwashu, E. (2016). Universities can't decolonise the curriculum without defining it first. The conversation. Retrieved from https://theconversation.com/universities-cant-decolonise-the-curriculum-without-defining-it-first-63948 [Accessed 10 January 2019].

Mignolo, W. D. (2007). Delinking: The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality. *Cultural Studies,* 21(2-3), 449-514.

Mulumba, M., Obaje, A., Kobedi, K., & Kishun, R. (2008). International student mobility in and out of Africa: Challenges and opportunities. In D. Teferra & J. Knight (Eds), *Higher education in Africa: The international dimension*, pp. 490-514. Accra: Association of African Universities.

Nandy, A. (2007). *Time treks: The uncertain future of old and new despotisms.* Ranikhet: Permanent Black.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2017). The emergence and trajectories of struggles for an 'African university': The case of unfinished business of African epistemic decolonisation. *Kronos,* 43(1), 51-77.

Ngũgĩ wa T. (2004). *Decolonising the mind. The politics of language in African literature.* Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers.

Painter, D. (2015). Monolingualism, not Afrikaans, must fall. *Ingesluit LitNet Akademies.* Retrieved from http://www.litnet.co.za/monolingualism-not-afrikaans-must-fall/ [Accessed 21 May 2018].

Pather, C. (2015). #RhodesMustFall: No room for ignorance or arrogance. *South African Journal of Science,* 111(5-6), 1-2.

Pennycook, A. (2000). English, politics, ideology: From colonial celebration to postcolonial performativity. In T. Ricento (Ed.), *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English*, pp.107–119. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Prinsloo, E. H. (2016). The role of the humanities in decolonising the academy. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education,* 15(1), 164-168.

Sidogi, P., & Rasedile, T. (2017). Contesting the decolonisation narrative: Towards an entrepreneurship based graphic design curricula. In H. Botes & S. Giloi (Eds), *#Decolonise! Design educators reflecting on the call for the decolonisation of education.* Tshwane: Design Education Forum of Southern Africa

Singh, M., Kenway, J., & Apple, M. (20005). Globalising education: Perspectives from above and below. In M. Apple, J. Kenway, & M. Singh (Eds), *Globalising education. Policies, pedagogies & politics.* New York: Peter Lang.

Teferra, D. (2008). The international dimension of higher education in Africa: Status, challenges, and prospects. In D. Teferra & J. Knight (Eds), *Higher education in Africa: The international dimension*, pp. 44-79. Accra: Association of African Universities.

Thaver, B. (2009). Transforming the culture of higher education in South Africa. *Academe,* 91(1), 1-4.

Thésée, G. (2006). A tool of massive erosion: Scientific knowledge in the neo-colonial enterprise. In G. S. Dei & A. Kempf (Eds), *Anti-colonialism and education: The politics of resistance*, pp. 25-42. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

University of the Witwatersrand. (2017). Language at the centre of decolonisation. Retrieved from https://www.wits.ac.za/news/latest-news/general-news/2017/2017-03/language-at-the-centre-of-decolonisation-.html [Accessed 10 January 2019].

Vincent-Lancrin, S., & Kärkkäinen, K. (2009). Globalisation and higher education: What might the future bring? In CERI (Ed.), *Educational research and innovation higher education to 2030, Volume 2, Globalisation.* Paris: OECD Publishing.

Waghid, Y. (2001). Globalisation and higher education restructuring in South Africa: Is democracy under threat? *Journal of Education Policy,* 16(5), 455-464.

Walker, R. (2005). *Transformative strategies in indigenous education: Decolonisation and positive social change.* Doctoral thesis, University of Western Sydney, Sydney. Retrieved from http://handle. uws. edu. au: 8081/1959.7/678 [Accessed 11 January 2019].

Yingqiang, Z., & Yongjian, S. (2016). Quality assurance in higher education: Reflection, criticism, and change. *Chinese Education & Society,* 49(1-2), 7-19. https://doi:10.1080/10611932.2016.1192382