

Decolonial goals and pedagogies for Indigenous studies

N. Martin Nakata, Victoria Nakata, Sarah Keech & Reuben Bolt

Nura Gili Centre for Indigenous Programs, University of New South Wales, Australia

Abstract

This article explores decolonial priorities in Indigenous Studies, raises questions about the pedagogical approach, and challenges the primary educational goal for students, arguing that Indigenous Studies has become fixated on a simplistic decolonisation of Western knowledge and practices. We put forward a case to prioritise the development of learning dispositions in students that encourage openness to further inquiry and productive ways of thinking in and through complex and contested knowledge terrains. We argue that this pedagogical approach adds a critical dimension to the decolonial task.

Keywords: *Indigenous Studies, Indigenous learning and teaching, Indigenous curriculum, Indigenous pedagogy, decolonial studies*

Introduction

In the Australian higher education sector, a current trend in the learning and teaching of Indigenous Studies is the focus on decolonising knowledge in the disciplines as a method for emancipating colonised peoples and reinstating Indigenous worldviews (e.g., Walker, 2000; Mackinlay, 2005; Phillips & Whatman, 2007). Following scholars such as Tejeda et al (2003), decolonising pedagogies are manoeuvred to contribute to social justice curricula in Australian universities. In this article we draw attention to some specific problems for student learning outcomes when the emancipatory claims of decolonial approaches in Indigenous Studies interpret and mediate practices of self-determination for students in lecture rooms. We suggest an alternate pedagogical approach for equipping students with understandings and analytical tools that can make explicit the conditions of the knowledge complexity Indigenous peoples confront

as they move forward in their efforts to ‘decolonise’ knowledge, assert Indigenous analysis, re-assert Indigenous ‘ways of being, knowing and doing’, or generate new knowledge to transform Indigenous social conditions.

A number of points are threaded through our argument. We agree that anti-colonial critique is a fundamental beginning point for unsettling entry-level students’ presuppositions about Indigenous-Western relations. However we argue that the end-point of instating re-generated Indigenous ‘ways’ or ‘traditions’ as the counter-solution to overcoming colonial legacies occurs too hurriedly in some scholarly analysis and in lecture settings. In this process, explorations in lecture rooms skip the more complex theoretical dilemmas students need to engage with to understand the conceptual limits of their own thinking, as well as the discipline’s, and to critically engage propositions from within Indigenous Studies scholarship. Our stance also leads us away from approaches that focus on decolonising students. Approaches that focus on changing students’ thinking through constant engagement with or reflection on their complicity with colonialism, its knowledge, and its privileges personalises a deep political and knowledge contest in ways that can be counter-productive for both students and their educational goals. Our argument is that the complex grounds of this ‘Indigenous-Western’ contest make it a difficult task to resolve what is colonial and what is Indigenous, or what ultimately serves Indigenous interests in contemporary knowledge practice. Furthermore, the quest to resolve this contest in lecture rooms relies on engaging students in an oversimplification of the way colonial, Western, and Indigenous meanings are produced and operate in contemporary lifeworlds. We propose that students might be more disposed to understanding the limits of their own thinking by engaging in open, exploratory, and creative inquiry in these difficult intersections, while building language and tools for describing and analysing what they engage with. This approach engages the politics of knowledge production and builds critical skills — students’ less certain positions require the development of less certain, more complex analytical arguments and more intricate language to express these arguments. Pedagogically, we propose this as a way to also prevent slippage into forms of thinking and critical analysis that are confined within dichotomies between primitivism and modernity; and as a way to avoid the closed-mindedness of intellectual conformity, whether this be expressed in Indigenous, decolonial, or Western theorising.

Australian Indigenous Studies

Indigenous Studies programs in Australian universities are the primary programs for educating both Indigenous and non-Indigenous students in preparation for professional work and future engagement with Indigenous Australians, or for more general understanding of the knowledge, cultures, histories and contemporary concerns of Australia’s First People. While Australia does not have a dual system to accommodate separate or ‘tribal’ education for Indigenous people, as Aotearoa/New Zealand and North America do, the political agenda for self-determination has shaped Indigenous activity in tertiary education for almost forty years. Over time, Australian universities have recognised and accommodated Indigenous political will through the provision

of identified spaces on campus in the form of Indigenous Student Support Centres, specialised units in Faculties/Schools, various configurations of Indigenous Studies courses in main degree programs of Schools/Faculties, specialised Community Programs, and in some places Indigenous research centres (for more background see [Nakata, 2004](#)).

Australian Indigenous Studies programs are taught out of Indigenous centres in universities or may be taught within different Faculties under a variety of arrangements. Some universities have attempted to embed Indigenous perspectives, knowledge, or content in courses across all Faculties as part of a wider commitment to Reconciliation (see, for example, [McLaughlin & Whatman, 2007](#)). And for a long time now, preparation of graduates in Indigenous areas, for instance in pre-service teaching¹, have been a particular focus ([Board of Teacher Registration, 1993](#); [Commonwealth of Australia, 2000](#); [Craven, 2002](#)). Like the experience internationally, there is strong resistance to compulsorily requiring students to undertake such courses (see for example [Dehass, 2012](#)). Student enrolment in Indigenous Studies might span anything from a single elective or a compulsory course to a Minor, a Major, or more rarely a Degree in Australian Indigenous Studies. Each year those who undertake Indigenous Studies courses include Australian Indigenous students, who are often a minority in lecture rooms, other Australian students who outnumber Indigenous students, and quite significant numbers of international exchange students who are motivated to learn something of their host nation's Indigenous people.

Indigenous Studies programs are generally managed by Indigenous academics and where possible are taught by Indigenous academics, though demand often outstrips the availability of Indigenous academics. For this reason, there continues to be a high number of non-Indigenous academics teaching Australian Indigenous Studies courses. The selection of content for Australian Indigenous Studies, like any undergraduate program, is informed by the knowledge, scholarly conversation, and inquiry that occur across the field, as well as the particular interests and specialisations of those who teach these courses (e.g., [Dudgeon & Fielder, 2006](#)). Indigenous community members are also often recruited as a direct source of knowledge for Indigenous Studies and, at times, the teaching of it.

However, as in international contexts, a range of tensions presents and complicates educational discussions and questions about what and how to teach Indigenous Studies in higher education institutions. At the heart of these tensions is Indigenous contestation of Western worldviews, philosophies, knowledge, theories, methods, histories, and positioning of Indigenous people, as well as the well-being of the planet (e.g., [Smith, 1999](#)). And as in other countries (e.g., [Thaman, 2007](#)), it is usual for the Academy and the university to be presented as problematic contexts for the teaching of Indigenous Studies. The role of the disciplines in the subjugation of Indigenous people and Indigenous knowledge ensures that, along with other

¹ See the professional standards & procedures for the accreditation of Australian teacher education programs, Standards 1.4 and 2.4 in particular, of the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership at http://www.aitsl.edu.au/verve/_resources/Accreditation_of_initial_teacher_education.pdf

disciplines, the discipline of Education is also a site of contestation for Indigenous Studies (Nakata, 1993, 2006). And so the content, processes, methods, and forms of education are also a contested matter, caught up as they are in the colonial and decolonial impulses. A great deal of the Indigenous Studies and Indigenous higher education teaching and learning literature engages this very contest (see, for example, Battiste, Bell & Findlay, 2002).

Indigenous Studies, in its *raison d'être*, engages the politics of knowledge production, the politics of education, and the Indigenous politics of self-determination; these bleed into each other to confound the purposes, goals, content and pedagogies for teaching Indigenous Studies in the Australian higher education context. Indigenous Studies' students then, whether Indigenous or non-Indigenous, are narrowly but differentially positioned by a range of vested interests even before they arrive. They then draw from and inquire through their own social locations when engaging with the content and pedagogies of Indigenous Studies courses. In the structuring of programs and courses, in the selection of content, and through the development of teaching approaches, Indigenous academics and non-Indigenous academics make not just educational but political choices. These are based usually on political and scholarly allegiances and dispositions, the generalities and specificities of national and local Indigenous community and institutional contexts, and on individual academic's conceptions of what the goals and purposes of Indigenous Studies are or should be at the higher education level.

In Australian universities, the decolonising rationale has secured its legitimacy as a teaching framework through various academic propositions (e.g., Smith, 1999) and via the wider Indigenous politics of self-determination (Gibson, 2002). These align with the liberal inclusionary politics of the social justice framework in Australian social policy-making (e.g., Behrendt, 2001). The inclusionary framework developed currency through broader educational agendas of, for example, 'Inclusive Curriculum' (e.g., Blackburn, 1985), 'Social Justice Education' (e.g., Connell, 1992), and 'Multi-cultural Education' (Banks & McGee Banks, 2009) which all come together to represent the institutional accommodation of diversity more generally and embed the agendas of social justice and reconciliation with Indigenous Australia, more specifically. The synergies with Latin American decolonising approaches drawn from the work of Paulo Freire (1972), Donaldo Macedo (1999), Walter Mignolo (2007), and others (e.g., De Lissovoy, 2010; Monaldo-Torres, 2011) are evident in Australian approaches.

Decoloniality, critical theory and the cultural interface

Decolonial theorists from Latin America now inform an international field of 'decolonising thought' and share "a view of coloniality as a fundamental problem" (Maldonado-Torres, 2011, p. 2). Across the globe Indigenous peoples, in common with other colonised populations, also assert a "definitive rejection of 'being told'...what we are, what our ranking is in relation to the ideal of *humanitas* and what we have to do to be recognised as such" (Mignolo, 2009, p. 161). Imbo (1998), for instance, as a critic of such understandings and responses as practised in parts of Africa, suggests this is at risk of being no more than a "rush toward that inviting community

called ‘humanity’ [which] turns out to be no less than a succumbing to a world defined by Europe” (p. 131). Thus, while the decolonial turn holds emancipatory and identity goals central to its project, decolonial inquiry engages the question of knowledge and epistemology critical to understanding the presence of others’ worldviews and the limits these impose on Western philosophy (Maldonado-Torres, 2011). Mignolo (2009), for example, makes the argument for ‘epistemic disobedience’ as a way to ‘delink’ from the Western epistemological assumption that there is a “detached and neutral point of observation” (p. 160) through which to interpret and know the world. For Mignolo, it is both the geo- and bio-politics of knowledge that necessitates disobedience. By these he means the universalising of European thought and reason as the ideal and global human system of thought and the contemporary positioning of colonised peoples who now act “knowing [they] have been described as less than human” (2009, p. 174).

Mignolo’s call for epistemic disobedience is evident in the work of Australian Indigenous scholars whose critical analysis is constructed in strident opposition to positivist traditions embedded in colonialisms. This is despite the recruitment of embedded positivist traditions in many Indigenous theoretical propositions for going forward (e.g., Rigney, 1999; 2001). However, this aside, in this oppositional analysis, the role of the disciplines in constructing a corpus ‘about’ the Indigenous, which continues to shape and re-shape understandings and knowledge production ‘about’ and ‘by’ the Indigenous in the present, is revealed for critique. Indigenous critique of the universalising Western standpoint announces that there are other epistemologies and other standpoints from which Indigenous people come to know the world and from which we understand and analyse our more recent encirclement by Western knowledge over the last few centuries and its legacies. In Australia, this critique underpins Indigenous political resistance and principles of self-determination within the nation-state, as well as relations of solidarity with other Indigenous peoples internationally. However, critique of the Western is not sufficient for the defence of Indigenous systems of thought or the re-building of Indigenous lives and communities. And so an imperative of decoloniality and a central task of Indigenous people, including scholars in this field, is ‘decolonial knowledge-making’ that re-asserts and draws in concepts and meanings from Indigenous knowledge and systems of thought and experience of the colonial. This makes for a complex knowledge interface in Indigenous knowledge production, and here the challenge for Indigenous Studies in the Academy becomes a little clearer.

In the Academy, Indigenous Studies is ‘discipline-like’ in the way it contests and seeks to transform ‘Indigenous’ relations to ‘the Western’ academy. There is, in much Indigenous inquiry, an embracing of Critical Theory with its emphasis on emancipation or liberation, and on its arguments for participatory knowledge-making and actions that empower and transform Indigenous individuals and collectives (e.g., Freire, 1972; Horkheimer, 1993). Critical Theory’s great attraction lies in its promise of overcoming ‘dominant’ power relations and delivering ‘empowerment’ to Indigenous people on the ground in the form of practical action in Indigenous interests. An assumption is that this knowledge production is transparent and Indigenous participants are self-knowing, apolitical agents of knowledge when producing knowledge in their

own contexts and on Indigenous terms. The ‘knowledge in action’ approach (following Habermas, 1984-1987) also marries well with Indigenous approaches to re-utilise the colonially-usurped traditional knowledge of Indigenous collectives. Critical theory, particularly as it came to apply in teaching and learning areas (e.g., Murphy & Fleming, 2009), is also drawn into the production of ideological and oppositional analysis via ‘grassroots’ knowledge production in Indigenous communities in a way that animates political resistance to dominating Western theory and intellectualism.

However, various interpretations of Critical Theory’s conception of power and loyalty to early beginnings in Structuralism and Western philosophy appear not to pose concerns for Indigenous theorists. On the surface at least, Indigenous decolonising knowledge production appears to be controlled by Indigenous knowers ‘on the ground’ supported by Indigenous scholars from within the Academy who understand and have subjected to critical analysis the practices of Western knowledge production and practice (Rigney, 1999, 2001; Bishop, 2003; Martin, 2008). Here Indigenous knowledge traditions are made available for re-working on the contemporary ground to give shape to new knowledge production for Indigenous social practices, such as health, education, and governance, that are continuous with older or colonially-displaced Indigenous social meanings. And here a sense of practical knowledge production for Indigenous life-worlds is prioritised ahead of disciplinary or academic concerns for theory and method.

By contrast, other Indigenous scholars, along with other critical pedagogues (e.g., Hountondji, 1983; Deloria & Wildcat, 2001; Smith, 2011), do more than simply contest a destructive and imposed Western framework. These scholars acknowledge that Indigenous people have more complicated, embodied histories of observing colonial impacts, ignoring or refusing colonial demands, conforming to colonial demands (albeit ambivalently or contradictorily), and appropriating Western understanding for Indigenous purposes and interests (Nakata, 1993). This view of more engaged histories evidences Indigenous agency and both continuity and discontinuity with Indigenous social meanings, as well as the assimilation of ‘new’ meanings and, much more unevenly across different local contexts, some internalisation of colonial meanings. Nakata (2007b), for instance, emphasises the role of Indigenous agency in everyday standpoints and argues that Indigenous agency is premised on forms of analysis that are historically-layered, responsive to changing social conditions, often traditionally-grounded, and often forward-looking. These reflect a practice of intelligent, self-interested, and pragmatic sense-making based on a distanced observation of the external colonial order being imposed, via the logic and reasoning of traditional modes of analysis, and against the oppressive and often seemingly absurd logic of colonial reasoning applied in local and everyday contexts. In this form of practised analysis are myriad refusals, non-engagements, and ambivalent or conditional deferrals of and to colonial meaning. As well, historically, in places, Indigenous forms of analysis enabled domestication of Western meanings and practices into traditional meaning systems in ways that served some practical, self-interested purpose. Domestication practices worked to uphold continuity of social practices but often misunderstood the logic and reasoning

of the Western order in which meaning was embedded. Such practices could both subvert and uphold the colonial order.

As an example, for Nakata (2007b), who writes in relation to the experience of Torres Strait Islanders, the minority within Australia's Indigenous minority, Islander analysis of the Islander position *vis-a-vis* the imposed colonial order was always limited by the inaccessibility of the underlying organisation of imposed 'outside' knowledge, its logic and practices. Islander analysis derived from being centred in the continuing but changing Islander world, and this enabled 'a view' that allowed a gauged domestication and appropriation of outside ideas, rather than 'mimicry' and collapse of a sense of 'being' in the Islander realm. It could not, however, provide Islanders with a full, self-knowing account of themselves in their changing world as they confronted external impositions from outside their own spheres of knowledge and experience. This historical process of domesticating outside meanings, which depended to some extent on geographical isolation, is now more fragile and exposed due to fast changing technologies of communication. More than ever, understanding the terms and conditions of the Western order of things, or 'outside meanings', is critical to the production of Islander political, economic, and social analyses that now need to be more than immediately pragmatic or politically reactionary. Nevertheless, a persistent Islander standpoint, continuous with the older traditional forms of social organisation and knowledge practice can be discerned in the way Islanders continue to look out at the world and interpret what that world might mean for continuing Islander worlds of meaning. That is, Islanders have been and are always first disposed to 'outside meanings and influences' as in need of domesticating on Islander terms – never disposed to outright rejection of their propositions but always inquisitive about how their various elements can assist Islander futures.

Nakata (1993; 2007a) has long argued, in contrast to the many Australian Indigenous education theorists who emphasise cultural agendas in Indigenous education, that full access to 'knowledge about knowledge' is a critical pre-condition of Islanders' understanding of themselves 'in the world', as they are positioned at the point of convergence between competing systems of thought. For him, 'the Western' is able to be 'made sense of' and is best worked on when its history and its workings are understood. This enables a fuller appreciation of its complex interface with ongoing Indigenous systems of thought and ongoing analysis of colonial experience and the ever-changing face of the ongoing 'Western' knowledge presence. This conceptualisation of the Indigenous contemporary space allows analytical attention to be drawn to the presence of both systems of thought and their history of entanglement and (con)fused practice, all of which conditions the way that contemporary Indigenous lifeworlds can now be understood and brought forward for analysis and innovative engagement and production.

Our concern in this sense, in the teaching of Australian Indigenous Studies, is with how Indigenous peoples can defend their interests and construct their arguments in spaces where a wide and complex world of converging knowledge and practice shapes the way lives can be enacted. Our concern for non-Indigenous students is with how they might come to understand the depth and complexity of the challenges Indigenous people confront in trying to pursue their

goals and how students might think about the effects of their own practices, as they move into professions. For this, a clearer understanding of the politics of knowledge production and the effects of knowledge positioning is required all round.

The politics of Indigenous Studies in the academy

In Indigenous Studies, simplistic critique of the Western has had a tendency toward reductive ideological critique in the effort to demonstrate political resistance as the path to Indigenous ‘liberation’ and re-affirmation of traditional identities². By simplistic critique, we mean that which represents the Western in singular terms and antithetical to the Indigenous. This reflects, in part, the activism of the struggle for freedom, recognition, and self-determination. When coupled with the determination to affirm dynamically adapting cultural practices or to re-instate conceptual thought from Indigenous knowledge systems or ‘traditions’, Smith’s (1999) decolonising priority to re-claim, re-name, re-write and re-right is upheld. This approach is ideologically powerful in terms of the Indigenous sense of autonomy and distinctiveness. However, it runs the danger of reifying the colonial binaries, even though ‘deconstruction’ of them re-turns the negative binary into a positive force mobilised by re-generated Indigenous meanings. More importantly, political resistance that demands the routine dismissal of the Western, as colonial and as the singular originary source of Indigenous struggles, when coupled with the quick re-claiming and re-naming of the Indigenous, inhibits fuller, more measured examination of the complex layers of meaning that now circumscribe what it means to be Indigenous and how Indigenous contemporary social conditions and concerns can be understood (see, for example, Sutton, 2009).

Further to this, in the decolonising effort, attention to ‘epistemic concerns’ likewise engage in simplistic oppositional analysis between Indigenous and Western knowledge epistemologies as the antithesis of each other, when the epistemological conditions of each demand much more measured and complex analysis (see, for example, Edwards & Hewitson, 2008 in contrast to Agrawal, 1995; Christie, 2006; Verran, 2005). As well, Indigenous knowledge, meanings, and practices are often re-constructed and applied without sufficient mechanisms for critical examination of them. The invocation of the ‘traditional’ or ‘community’ realm brings a regime of knowledge authorisation tied to the assertion of ancestral, spiritual, authentic, and distinct Indigenous identities grounded in claims to time-tested, collectively agreed-upon forms of truth-making. These are assumed as evidence of emancipation from Western inscriptions and practices but do not provide methods for critical examination of such assumptions or their limits in the contemporary space, which remains circumscribed by ongoing intrusions of Western meaning and logic (e.g., Wilson, 2008). In the teaching and learning

² See for instance the Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority’s Indigenous educational agenda in the proposed national curriculum at <http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/CrossCurriculumPriorities/Aboriginal-and-Torres-Strait-Islander-histories-and-cultures>

literature, for example, are descriptions of some attempts to instate Indigenous knowledge practices in Indigenous Studies in the Academy that trivialise, distort, misunderstand, misuse and romanticise Indigenous knowledge and systems of thought. In these instances, academics both claim and, at the same time forgo, the specificities of the lived contexts of these forms of knowledge through which Indigenous people continuously interpreted and managed in the world and from which particular forms of social organisation were operationalised (see, for example, Sheehan, 2003).

As well, in the context of the international field of Indigenous Studies scholarship, the borrowing of concepts and meanings across groups (for example, sharing and talking circles from North America to Australia) also generalises from the specific inter-relations between traditional knowledge practice, colonial experience, and contemporary concerns and goals that exist in local spaces. This need not be a problem if brought to awareness in analytical accounts; knowledge re-working routinely involves utilising other ideas. It is a problem if this knowledge production is not transparent and mystifies its sources by a practice of homogenising or universalising the Indigenous. A familiar risk re-presents: that of misrepresentation of Indigenous people via generalisation, misunderstanding, or distortion of knowledge, social meanings and the social functions of knowledge organisation. All these practices evidence a ‘determined’ but arguably too hurried movement from colonial critique to the instatement of alternative Indigenous knowledge positions.

Decolonial theorist, Maldonado-Torres, speaks of the problems of pre-occupation with claims for emancipation and identity above epistemic concerns:

The problem emerges when liberation is translated as a claim for immediate political action, a kind of political immediatism that becomes antipathetic to theoretical reflection...When the two combine, that is, the worst aspects of the claim for identity and those of the search for liberation, then we have a form of what Lewis Gordon calls epistemological closure. (2011, p. 4)

Epistemic concerns, however, are arguably heightened rather than overcome when Indigenous epistemologies are re-presented as the antithesis of Western epistemology and argued as the basis to serve Indigenous contemporary needs, interests and practices. The major weakness of opposing positivism as the singular Western epistemology, while recruiting other ‘Western’ epistemologies emanating from critiques of positivism and in wide use for social and human inquiry, means that epistemic distinctions become much harder to sustain but are nevertheless often assumed and asserted. These assumptions sometimes support false propositions, a primary one being the split between theoretical (Western and colonial) and practical (Indigenous and emancipatory) forms of knowledge-making. The privileging of action as Indigenous practice, at the expense of theoretical inquiry, implies, to use Mignolo’s words, Indigenous people cannot “function as...theoretically-minded [people]” (2012, p. 160), or that to do so would be to devalue Indigenous ways of knowing or even to cease being Indigenous (Deloria, 2004). Indeed, in Indigenous Studies sometimes discussions about theoretical questions are excluded by arguments

that position intellectualism as the tool of ‘cognitive imperialism’ or as the antithesis of Indigenous knowledge as lived action or received wisdom (e.g., Rigney, 2001; Martin, 2003). The cause for concern here is neither the methodologies utilised nor the questioning of the place of theoretical inquiry. Rather, the concern is how the claims to truth that attach to accounts generated from ‘the ground’, or from within Indigenous knowledge traditions, establish themselves as unquestionably ‘authentic’ forms of decolonial knowledge production, when it is not at all clear that they are.

Under these conditions and in the absence of critical examination of contemporary innovations of Indigenous knowledge practice within Indigenous academia, the risks entailed in moving from ‘epistemic disobedience’ of the Western to ‘epistemic obedience’ of the regenerated Indigenous are less examined. In these practices, Indigenous academia exemplifies a determination by some to eclipse the influence of the Western by moving too quickly to instate modes of knowledge authority that valorise markers of authenticity based in tradition (see, for example, Anderson and Hokowhitu, 2009). As these authors have argued, in the challenging decolonial spaces where the presence of both Western and Indigenous knowledge traditions produce fields of difficult comprehensibility or total incomprehensibility, it is the ‘easily translatable’ that becomes ‘knowable’ to the Academy, including the Indigenous Academy (2007, p. 45). It is also the ‘easily translatable’ from academic theory that becomes ‘knowable’ to Indigenous communities. In all of this movement, what is accorded the most legitimacy from recognised Indigenous community authorities is arguably ‘recognised’ more broadly by higher education institutions and the Academy, albeit often in the form of inclusive patronisation or tolerance.

The growing frustration with the difficulty of questioning traditional/cultural/community forms and sources of Indigenous authority pivots around the Indigenous political and scholarly allegiance to conceptualisations of Indigenous worldview as a counter-narrative to the Western. This is concerning because the production of counter-narratives is the work of decoloniality. However, if Indigenous cosmology and epistemologies are positioned as the unquestionable basis of renewed Indigenous resistance, knowledge and authority, then what is not brought into question in this decolonial analysis in the Indigenous academy are notions of Indigenous authority. Here Indigenous Studies, even when under the control of Indigenous scholars, operates in a ‘discipline-like’ way. Indigenous people, including Indigenous academia, construct and defend Indigenous grounds for good reason and justifiably in the Indigenous epistemic sense. But for many, these Indigenous conditions of knowledge-making are no more transparent than, and just as mystifying as, Western disciplines, in terms of how they disguise the politics of their production in contemporary collective spaces. For instance, emancipatory agendas propositioned on the basis of some cultural beginning along the road between primitiveness and modernity, can lead to the de-identification of Indigenous people (e.g., Driskill, Finley, Gilley & Morgensen, 2011). Here, decolonial theory provides some critical questions to turn back onto the assumptions of decolonial knowledge-making practices. Should Indigenous academia and the Indigenous ‘grassroots’ community be more concerned about the positioning effected through all

conceptual frames when, as Vallega (n.d.) reminds us, “conceptual knowledge in its articulations of senses of beings is always a source of power, and the configuration of practices and institutions that will sustain specific ideas are clearly instruments of power” (p. 6)? Might Indigenous Studies scholars also heed Mignolo’s discussion of the function of knowledge-making for social organisation and his argument that “institutions are created that accomplish two functions: training of new (epistemic obedient) members and control of who enters and what knowledge-making is allowed, disavowed, devalued or celebrated” (2009, p. 176)? Should we be more open to the question of what Indigenous oppressions are unable to be interrogated when Indigenous ‘decolonial knowledge-making’ assumes an epistemic blind-eye to its own practices?

These questions are not to make an argument for constant deferral of Indigenous meaning or authority but for more open inquiry in the difficult and intricate tasks that go toward the decolonial project as envisioned by its theorists. As Deloria suggests in relation to the North American context, “Indians must examine some of the same phenomena as Western thinkers and must demonstrate that their perspectives and conclusions make sense” (p. 6). Here also, the Caribbean scholar, Lewis Gordon, in his discussion of ‘disciplinary decadence’ offers cautionary food for thought for the ‘discipline-like’ field of Indigenous Studies:

Instead of being open-ended pursuits of knowledge, many disciplines have become self-circumscribed in their aims and methods in ways that appear ontological. By this I mean that many disciplines lose sight of themselves as efforts to understand the world and have collapsed into the hubris of asserting themselves *as the world*. (2006, p. 8)

While Gordon might have the disciplines in his sight and be contributing to decolonial discourse, he constructs an argument that should apply to all quests to know and understand the world, including the contemporary Indigenous world. It may seem unfair to apply this to a field of inquiry emerging from within a contested philosophical, epistemological, theoretical, and methodological intersection where scholars are currently preoccupied with attempts to render visible all that has been submerged, excluded or overwritten. However, where claims to know are authorised via asserting Indigenous epistemologies and ‘traditions’, to oppose and invalidate colonial/Western constructions, the less examined entanglements - where the Western and Indigenous converge and constitute each other - deserve more thought and more analysis, especially in terms of how we understand the everyday of contemporary Indigenous life.

Problematic Indigenous efforts to decolonise knowledge and methodologies while carving out ownership of the field of Indigenous Studies within higher education institutions can be understood as early incursions into a challenging and contested knowledge space. Nakata’s conceptualisation of the Cultural Interface is useful here to militate against hurried ‘claims to know’ the Indigenous on Indigenous terms at this very complex knowledge interface. Nakata’s conceptualisation (2006) supports the idea of Indigenous scholarship as a space for developing dispositions for not yet contemplated ways of thinking by bringing more attention to the conditions of knowledge, both ‘Western’ and ‘Indigenous’. This implies the need for

engagement with the world of Western theory as well as Indigenous analysis forged from lived experience of everyday historical and contemporary spaces. Defence of the Indigenous does not necessarily depend on authenticating or separating the Indigenous (e.g., Grande, 2011) by appeals to notions of ‘intellectual sovereignty’ and resistance of the Western (e.g., Rigney, 2001), for example, but rests on understanding the positioning effect of knowledge or claims to know, as well as the practices that order, privilege, and operationalise some claims to know by excluding or silencing others. The will may be to overcome the Western but to pretend its presence disappears when the Indigenous re-asserts its epistemic conditions is a dangerous delusion. At the complex Indigenous-Western knowledge interface, “forms of scepticisms and epistemic attitudes” (Maldonado-Torres, 2011, p. 1) are necessary to consider the delimitations and dispositions of both Western and Indigenous theorising for understanding Indigenous contemporary social realities in this space and possibilities for the future. As Maldonado-Torres contends, for “a consistent decolonization of human reality.... [o]ne must build new concepts and be willing to revise critically all received theories and ideas” (2011, p.4). In this space, Wiredu’s (1995) appeal to ‘epistemic awakening’ and “not a return to anything” (see Mignolo, 2012, p. 169) offers more than the call to ‘epistemic disobedience’ as a means to counter the demand for ‘epistemic obedience’ of the disciplines.

However, those Indigenous scholars in higher education areas who construct and/or teach Indigenous Studies programs and who are interested in these complex knowledge entanglements are often caught in battle with both ongoing coloniality (from the institution and the Academy) and simplistic Indigenous analysis that positions them as traitors or wayward spirits (from the Indigenous commonsense) merely because they dissent from or question popular and comforting Indigenous positions (see, for example, Anderson and Hokowhitu, 2007).

The teaching of Indigenous Studies

What are the implications of these challenges being grappled with in Indigenous scholarship for the teaching of Indigenous Studies in universities? If we are to think of Indigenous Studies as a largely Indigenous effort to reposition how the colonial-Indigenous relation can be understood and re-worked, then Indigenous Studies in higher education courses is a critical point for the exploration, analysis and circulation of ideas from a range of places. Indigenous Studies courses select from an extensive array of content and themes. From understandings of pre-colonial Indigenous worldview and social organisation, through the historical facts and impacts of colonial invasions, dispossession, and discriminatory and oppressive policies and administrations, to the contemporary regenerations of Indigenous Knowledge, cultures and histories from the Indigenous standpoint, to explorations of the intersections with Western social, economic and political theories around all aspects of historical and contemporary Indigenous realities, through to deeper attention to philosophical and theoretical questions and attention to practice in/for Indigenous communities. A wide range of pedagogical approaches are also used and too numerous to reference here. Clearly, any discussion about the teaching of Indigenous

Studies across these specificities, which all present differently in different institutions, communities and countries, is generalised within our discussion of the broader decolonising framework and decolonial project.

In the academic world of twelve week courses, the challenging scholarly arguments and contestations that underpin the decolonisation quest at the level of philosophy, knowledge and theory are subject to simplification in order to be brought in at the first year level to frame course rationales and selection of content. Here students and academics engage complex arguments through content and theories that are often collapsed for examination along the Indigenous-Western divide. This is not a concern in and of itself - analytical meaning-making from the Indigenous standpoint is crucial and useful for teaching purposes, even if in the form of simplistic oppositional critique. For always in critique of the Western is the re-positioning of the Indigenous and it is through this re-positioning that we want to develop all students' understanding of Indigenous histories, knowledge, cultures, and futures and how these understandings have been shaped within the colonial frame. Indeed, simplistic critique, although a dangerous end point, provides an entry point for understanding the presence of other ways of viewing the world and one's position in it. It provides an entry point for understanding the erased and continuing Indigenous knowledge systems and societies. It also provides an entry point for understanding the political struggles of Indigenous people to exert some control over Indigenous pasts, present, and futures. Importantly it provides an entry point for understanding the relations between the history of Western philosophy and Enlightenment thinking, colonial expansion, colonial injustices and ongoing Indigenous grievance.

However, the repeated presentation of series of critiques of the Western that reinforce a singular and oppositional Indigenous analysis, in course after course, validated via Indigenous narratives of some imagined collective consensus, works to close down inquiry and limit students' understanding of the complexity being engaged in the decolonial project. Moreover, in a sequence of learning in higher education courses that typically engages students in 'deeper' learning at the theoretical levels in the later years of their undergraduate degrees, the utilisation of simple Indigenous critiques of the Western reinforces the logical sense of simplistic representations of Indigenous knowledge and regenerated practices presented as the path to solving Indigenous contemporary 'problems' in different subject areas, such as health, education, and governance. Here students engage forms of political and social theory from a range of disciplines as applied to Indigenous contexts. Here they also engage reconstituted Indigenous knowledge and practices. In these engagements students are expected to engage in critical analysis to interrogate 'the Western' and uphold 'the Indigenous'. However, without deeper theoretical explorations, the lines between these are not clear or certain and whose interests ultimately prevail is not always evident on the surface of these contests.

What do we want students to take from their early engagements with Western critique and Indigenous standpoints on the world? We suggest that colonial critique must always be used to stress the legacy of a very complex and historically layered contemporary knowledge space. Here we do not advocate the quick logic of 'cause-effect' or 'problem-solution' reasoning and its

application to practice for Indigenous contexts as the way to traverse these complexities. The corpus ‘about’ Indigenous people circulates and constitutes contemporary Indigenous understandings of what it means to be Indigenous, in a tight relation to past and ongoing trends and theorising in the Western social sciences. Here, theories of knowledge, the histories of their systems of thought, and the politics of their production cannot be avoided. To understand the complexities produced in this ‘interface’ position requires quite explicit, quite measured attention, not just to the Western but also to Indigenous analysis and argument that critiques the Western and re-constructs the Indigenous. By learning to focus on the conditions of the Indigenous arguments, in relation to the conditions of Western theorising, students can be led to develop awareness of the limits of various positions, the persistent pervasiveness of ‘all-knowing’, ‘taken-for-granted’ Western frames, an awareness of the reproduction of those frames in Indigenous analysis, and an appreciation of just how intricate and open to interpretation the dance around worldview, knowledge and practice is as a result. We suggest that in this way, students begin to understand why a rush to ‘understand’ in order to find and ‘know the answers’ that will overcome the colonial legacy is more likely to be evidence of not understanding sufficiently. Moreover, our argument is that effective teaching strategies for the exploration of complexities are ones that provide students with more language and tools for navigating, negotiating, and thinking about the constraints and possibilities that are open at this challenging interface. Here, the ‘end-game’ mentality that mobilises some interpretations of decoloniality or decolonisation in lecture rooms is suspended in order to delve deeper into the world of critical learning engagements to produce richer forms of analysis and other possibilities for action.

Gordon (2006) also argues for the “ongoing defence of thinking” (p. 17) and this argument can be usefully extended when discussing teaching in Indigenous Studies. In the teaching of Indigenous Studies, an emphasis on ‘thinking about thinking’, or the meta-thinking, disposes students to engage their own conceptual limitations but also the conceptual limitations of all the ideas and discussions put forward in the teaching space. Engaging conceptual limitations requires, in turn, an understanding of the historical developments in Western philosophy and the human and social sciences, as well as an understanding of how Indigenous epistemologies interpret reality and support other forms of social organisation and knowledge production. To paraphrase Gordon, if we are to recognise Indigenous Studies scholarship “as an inexact activity, as the effort to think about” (2006, pp. 33-34) the implications of coloniality for how non-Indigenous people understand the Indigenous and on contemporary Indigenous thought and practice, then it becomes easier to see the scholarly, and by default the teaching, project in terms of creative engagements with ideas. This proposition to consider Indigenous Studies as an ‘effort to think about’ the implications of coloniality for the contemporary Indigenous space, rather than foreclose on the possibilities that reside there, presents Indigenous Studies as a most interesting and challenging intellectual engagement for undergraduate students. We argue that this is a better basis for teaching both Indigenous and non-Indigenous students, rather than those approaches which expect to see the evidence of an ‘attitude’ change in non-Indigenous students within twelve weeks of a course of studies.

Our argument for a teaching approach that engages the complex ‘middle ground’ where Indigenous and Western are brought into inter-relation to be worked on is not entirely new (see, for example, Norman, 2004; Harrison, 2005; Dudgeon & Fielder, 2006; Pelletier & Gercken, 2006; Phillips, 2011; Anderson, 2012). But we depart from some other approaches with which we are familiar in two major respects. One area of departure is around the pedagogical positioning of students as learners. This has implications for our second concern, which is with scope, sequencing and theoretical development issues over year levels. These are the areas we are currently re-thinking in our own courses and where we are in the process of further analysis of the Indigenous Studies teaching and learning literature to refine our argument, curriculum design and pedagogical practice.

We turn now to our first concern, to make some observations about the pedagogical urge to decolonise non-Indigenous students in Indigenous Studies courses framed by decolonising rationales. There are sound arguments that non-Indigenous students have difficulty engaging the conceptual limits of Western knowledge because of the ‘naturalness’ of its modes of logic and reasoning and the ‘commonsense’ of these in their lived experience (see Phillips, 2011). However, we consider less-sound the argument that non-Indigenous students are unable to work outside of dominant colonial modes of thinking without first having their own identities and histories disrupted (e.g., Phillips, 2011; Andersen, 2012). This position argues that for these students to transform their thinking, they must first engage Indigenous knowledge systems of thought and/or be brought to account for their own embodied, ‘white’, privileged identities as the beneficiaries of colonial productions. In either case, we question as a pedagogical practice or a demonstrable learning outcome, the practice of calling non-Indigenous students, particularly in introductory courses, to personally or collectively account for their historically-produced position in the present. The pedagogical inference is that to decolonise disciplinary constructions of the Indigenous, and to be able to contribute to ‘decolonial practice’, students’ minds and ways of thinking must be decolonised as a first step. We seriously question this as an approach, pedagogically or otherwise. At this complex knowledge interface, nothing is so simply and quickly achievable and Andersen’s (2009) frustrations are instructive in this regard. Moreover, we raise a concern that, at the extreme, this strategy comes too close to practices of mental disorientation as the basis of re-education and runs the risk of positioning teaching and learning in Indigenous Studies as the practice of “asserted beliefs” (Gordon, 2006, p. 2). Further, we suggest that this approach positions non-Indigenous students as objects of the teaching act, not subjects of knowledge who have come from a range of social locations to learn and understand the most complex of knowledge contestations that possibly exist. We argue in contrast, that students who are disposed towards more uncertain, less resolved, but more complex critical analysis have more opportunities to think about other positions at their own pace, rather than defending their own. Somewhat paradoxically, to support uncertain positions, students must search for and develop more nuanced and intricate language and logic. While the way they think about how they know the world may or may not be transformed to meet decolonial criteria, their dispositions for more open forms of inquiry and reflection is developed. Pedagogically, this may

be more productive than attempts to confront, condemn, and convert their thinking so quickly it, as we have all witnessed, breeds resistance or muted engagements.

At the introductory level, we do not dispute the usefulness of presenting the Indigenous-settler relation in binary terms. Nor do we dispute, that non-Indigenous students in the course of their learning need to or will be confronted and 'unsettled'. But we would suggest, initially at least, teaching the practice of 'suspension' viz., suspension of pre-suppositions and suspension of foregone conclusions while engaging the implications of the knowledge interface for Indigenous analysis, Indigenous resistance, Indigenous knowledge revitalisation, Indigenous practices, and Indigenous futures. This is disruptive but intellectualised practice of a less personalised nature which still engages students in the politics of knowledge production and ultimately the politics of their location and of social reproduction. It is not an easily mastered practice either and requires academics to think about how to manage dialogue and discussion in lecture rooms so students do not revert to resigned fence-sitting but move on to re-thinking and re-articulating more complex positions. We argue it is a worthwhile skill to develop in students who will graduate into the human service professions which engage Indigenous people and practices at the interface of ongoing knowledge entanglements. Our stance on this question of student positioning calls into question the sufficiency of the 'Indigenist' (Rigney, 1999) principles of political resistance to the Western and the unconditional privileging of the Indigenous as a tool and outcome in teaching and learning. To think about the Indigenous position as one produced through colonial practices and to take on an expanded analytical stance that is open to decolonial and decolonising arguments does require students to be open to critical analysis of their own social locations and what these obscure from their view, what remains unarticulated in their language, and what has been absent from their thoughts. But it also requires a lot more than that. It requires a lot of thinking and reflection over time, it requires dealing with a lot of difficult questions, and it requires an acceptance that not everything can be resolved immediately. We should expect, particularly for non-Indigenous or reluctant students, that learning and thinking will involve a lot of slippage back to well-established logic and commonsense, even when they understand the arguments. Academic staff have no way of knowing the effects of their teaching beyond the duration of their courses so we need students to leave courses still open to thinking, reflecting and learning. Why would we not think more about how we lead students into interesting intellectual and practical engagements by expanding their understandings of the world of human ideas and systems of thought, rather than attempting to 'discipline' them to submit to our Indigenous analysis of them as embodied agents of continuing colonialism? Do we ask too much of students when we expect them to demonstrate decolonised thinking when we ourselves are not in agreement about whose interests and what sort of futures our own various attempts really serve?

Conclusion

All students come to Indigenous Studies ill-prepared for the knowledge and political contests they will encounter. How students are positioned to engage in these contests has everything to do with whether they stay with or exit the encounter. How they are brought to the encounter has everything to do with whether they resist, oppose, defend, convert, patronise, tolerate, or thoughtfully engage the content of their courses to the best of their ability. A simplified decolonising framework, as a rationale for teaching, too often bypasses assisting students to think and navigate through complex and contested knowledge spaces on their way to understanding Indigenous worldviews, colonial experiences, contemporary dilemmas, and future goals. Instead of teaching students to ‘resist’ Western inscriptions of the Indigenous and take up Indigenous ones, we might uphold Indigenous resistance and reassertion by teaching students to think about the limits of current language and discourse for navigating the complexities of knowledge production Indigenous people now must engage in the quest to determine our futures knowingly to continue on. A rationale that focuses on revealing the politics of knowledge production in Indigenous Studies – one that makes spaces for the exploration of ideas, that insists on critical reflection on the limits of all thinking on both sides, and that requires the development of better language for navigating such intricate and complex entanglements of meaning - provides good grounds for teaching both non-Indigenous and Indigenous students together. For Indigenous students the stakes are high as they seek to honour the intelligence and knowledge of their forbears and transform the possibilities for their families and communities in an ever-changing world. They need more than analytical and language tools for simple critique and a decolonising framework that slips them too quickly across the Western-Indigenous binary. Can they hope to be liberated? That is a question that requires further consideration if we do not want them to be the captives of the limits of our current propositions of decolonisation.

References

- Agrawal, A. (1995). Dismantling the divide between Indigenous and Western knowledge. *Development and Change*, 26(3), 413-439.
- Andersen, C. & Hokowhitu, B. (2007). Whiteness: Naivety, void and control. *Junctures*, 8, 39-49.
- Andersen, C. (2009). Critical Indigenous Studies: From difference to density. *Cultural Studies Review*, 15(2), 80-100.
- Andersen, C. (2012). Critical Indigenous Studies in the classroom: Exploring the local using primary evidence. *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies*, 5(1), 67-92.
- Banks, J. & McGee Banks, C. (2009). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. Milton, Qld: John Wiley & Sons.

- Battiste, M., Bell, L. & Findlay, L. (2002). Decolonising education in Canadian universities: An interdisciplinary international Indigenous research project. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 26(2), 82-95.
- Behrendt, L. (2001). Indigenous self-determination: Rethinking the relationship between rights and economic development. *UNSW Law Journal*, 24(3). Accessed on April 4, 2012 from <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/UNSWLJ/2001/70.html#Heading13>
- Bishop, R. (2003). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. New York: Zed Books.
- Blackburn, J. (1985). *Ministerial review of postcompulsory schooling*. Melbourne: Department of Education.
- Board of Teacher Registration. (1993). *Yatha: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies in teacher education*. Brisbane: Board of Teacher Registration.
- Christie, M. (2006). Transdisciplinary research and Aboriginal knowledge. *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 35, 78-89.
- Commonwealth of Australia. (2000). *Katu Kalpa: Report on the Senate Inquiry into the effectiveness of education and training programs for Indigenous Australians*. Canberra: AGPS.
- Connell, R.W. (1992). Citizenship, social justice and curriculum. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 2(2), 133-146.
- Craven, R. (2002). Is the dawn breaking? The first empirical investigations of the impact of mandatory Aboriginal Studies teacher education courses on teachers' self-concepts and other desirable outcomes. Paper presented at the Second International Biennial Conference on Self-concept Research, Sydney, Australia, August 6-8. Accessed on April 4, 2012 from http://www.self.ox.ac.uk/Conferences/2002_CD_Craven.pdf
- Craven, R., Halse, C., Marsh, H.W., Mooney, J. & Wilson-Miller, J. (2005). *Teaching the teachers mandatory Aboriginal Studies: Vol 1, Recent successful strategies*. Canberra: Report for Indigenous Education Strategic Initiatives Programme, Department of Education, Science and Training. Accessed from <http://www.dest.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/F9F80E28-C3D2-4EE9-9E78-E03272C5832D/7429/TeachingtheteachersVOLUME1executivesummaryonlyPDF.pdf>
- De Lissovoy, N. (2010). Decolonial pedagogy and the ethics of the global. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 31(3), 279-293.
- Dehass, J. (2012, February 23). Why Indigenous Studies shouldn't be mandatory. *Macleans, On Campus*. Accessed on April 4, 2012 from: <http://oncampus.macleans.ca/education/2012/02/23/why-indigenous-studies-shouldnt-be-mandatory/>
- Deloria, V. Jr. (2004). Philosophy and the tribal peoples. In A. Waters (Ed.), *American Indian Thought: Philosophical essays* (pp. 3-11). Malden, M.A.: Blackwell Publishing.
- Deloria, V. & Wildcat, D. (2001). *Power and place: Indian education in America*. Colorado: Fulcrum Resources.

- Denzin, N. (2010). Grounded and Indigenous theories and the politics of pragmatism. *Sociological Inquiry*, 80(2), 296-312.
- Driskill, Q., Finley, C., Gilley B. & Morgensen, S. (Eds.). (2011). *Queer Indigenous Studies: Critical interventions in theory, politics and literature*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Dudgeon, P. & Fielder, J. (2006). Third spaces within tertiary places: Indigenous Australian Studies. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 16(5), 396-409.
- Edwards, S. & Hewitson, K. (2008). Indigenous epistemologies and tertiary education. *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 37, 96-102.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Gibson, C. (2002). Cartographies of the colonial/capitalist state: A geopolitics of Indigenous self-determination in Australia. *Antipode*, 31(1), 45-79.
- Gordon, L. (2006). *Disciplinary decadence: Living thought in trying times*. Boulder, London: Paradigm Publishers.
- Grande, S. (2011). Confessions of a full-time Indian. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 8(1), 40-43.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action: Volume 2*. (TT. McCarthy). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Harrison, N. (2005). The learning is in-between: The search for a metalanguage in Indigenous education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 37(6), 871-884.
- Hokowhitu, B. (2009). Indigenous existentialism and the body. *Cultural Studies Review*, 15(2), 101-118.
- Horkheimer, M. (1993). *Between philosophy and social science*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Hountondji, P. (1983). *African philosophy: Myth and reality*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Imbo, S. (1998). *An introduction to African philosophy*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Macedo, D. (1999). Decolonising Indigenous knowledge. In L. Semali & J. Kincheloe (Eds), *What is Indigenous Knowledge*, (pp. xi-xvi). New York: Falmer Press.
- Mackinlay, E. (2005). Moving and dancing towards decolonisation in education: An example from an Indigenous Australian performance classroom. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 34, 113-122.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2011). Thinking through the decolonial turn: Post-continental interventions in theory, philosophy, and critique—An introduction. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(2), 1-15.
- Martin, K. (2003). Ways of knowing, being and doing: A theoretical framework and methods for Indigenous and Indigenist re-research. *Journal of Australian Studies*, 27, 203-214.
- Martin, K. (2008). *Please knock before you enter: Aboriginal regulation of outsiders and the implications for researchers*. Flaxton: Post Pressed.

- McLaughlin, J. & Whatman, S. (2007). Embedding Indigenous perspectives in university teaching and learning: Lessons learnt and possibilities of reforming/decolonising curriculum. In *Proceedings 4th International Conference on Indigenous Education: Asia/ Pacific*. Vancouver, Canada.
- Mignolo, W. (2007). Delinking: The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2/3), 449-514.
- Mignolo, W. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and decolonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(7/8), 159–181.
- Murphy, M. & Fleming, T. (Eds.). (2009). *Habermas, critical theory and education*. New York: Routledge.
- Nakata, M. (1993). Culture in education: For us or for them? In N. Loos & T. Osanai (Eds.), *Indigenous minorities and education: Australian and Japanese perspectives of their Indigenous peoples, the Ainu, Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders* (pp. 334-349). Tokyo: San-You-Sha.
- Nakata, M. (2004). Indigenous Australian Studies and higher education. [presentation]. *Paper presented at the AIATSIS Wentworth Biennial Lecture*. Accessed 4 April 2012 at http://www.aiatsis.gov.au/events/wentworth/docs/a352185_a.pdf
- Nakata, M. (2006). Australian Indigenous Studies: A question of discipline. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology*. 17(3), 265-275.
- Nakata, M. (2007a). The cultural interface. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 36, 7-14. Accessed on April 4, 2012 from http://www.weraonline.org/pdfs/Marti_%20Nakata_AJIE_Article.pdf
- Nakata, M. (2007b). *Disciplining the savages: Savaging the disciplines*. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- Norman, H. (2004). Exploring effective teaching strategies: Simulation case studies and Indigenous Studies at the university level. *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 33, 15-20.
- Pelletier, J. & Gercken, B. (2006). The “old ways” as new methods: decolonizing and native values in academia. *Studies in the Humanities*, 32(2), 245.
- Phillips, J. (2011). *Resisting contradictions: non-Indigenous pre-service teacher responses to critical Indigenous Studies* (Doctoral dissertation). Australia: Queensland University of Technology. Accessed on April 4, 2012 from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/46071/>
- Phillips, J. & Whatman, S. (2007). Decolonising preservice teacher education: Reform at many cultural interfaces [Presentation]. *Paper presented at the The World of Educational Quality: 2007 AERA Annual Meeting*. Chicago, United States of America (pp. 194-194). Accessed on April 4, 2012 at <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/7333/1/7333.pdf>
- Rigney, L. (1999). Internationalization of an Indigenous anticolonial critique of research methodologies: A guide to Indigenist research methodology and its principles. *Wicazo Sa Review*, 14(2), 109-121.

- Rigney, L. (2001). A first perspective of Indigenous Australian participation in science: Framing Indigenous research towards Indigenous Australian intellectual sovereignty. *Kaurna Higher Education Journal*, 7, 1-13.
- Sheehan, N. (2003). *Indigenous knowledge and higher education: Instigating relational knowledge in a neo-colonial context* (Doctoral dissertation). Australia: Department of Education, University of Queensland.
- Smith, A. (2011). Queer theory and Native Studies: The heteronormativity of settler colonialism. In Q. Driskill, C. Finley, B. Gilley & S. Morgensen (Eds.), *Queer Indigenous Studies: Critical interventions in theory, politics and literature* (pp. 43-65). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous people*. New York, New York: Zed Books.
- Sutton, P. (2009). *The politics of suffering: Indigenous Australia and the end of the liberal consensus*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Tejeda, C., Espinoza, M. & Gutierrez, K. (2002). Toward a decolonizing pedagogy: Social justice reconsidered. In P. Trifonas (Ed.), *Pedagogies of difference: Rethinking education for social change* (pp. 10-38). New York: Routledge.
- Thaman, K. (2007). Decolonizing Pacific Studies: Indigenous perspectives, knowledge and wisdom in higher education. *The Contemporary Pacific*, 15(1), 1-17.
- Vallega, A. (n.d.). Decoloniality and philosophy, from a Latin American perspective. Online paper accessed on April 4, 2012 from <http://www.dialogoglobal.com/barcelona/texts/vallega/decoloniality-of-philosophy.pdf>
- Verran, H. (2005). Knowledge traditions of Aboriginal Australians: Questions and answers arising in a databasing project (Draft paper). *Making Collective Memory with Computers, School of Australian Indigenous Knowledge Systems*. Australia: Charles Darwin University. Accessed on April 4, 2012 at <http://www.cdu.edu.au/centres/ik/pdf/knowledgeanddatabasing.pdf>
- Walker, P. (2000). Native approaches to decolonising education in institutions of higher learning. *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 28(2), 28-37.
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Wiredu, K. (1995). *Conceptual decolonization in African philosophy: Four essays*. Ibadan, Nigeria: Hope Publications.