Historical Thinking Culture and Education

DOI 10.12685/htce.1398

Student voice in history teacher education

A means to build pedagogies around marginalized historical narratives

Sarah Godsell[*] [a], *Paul Maluleka* [b]

[a]*University of the Witwatersrand,* [b]*University of South Africa*

Abstract

This is a theoretical-conceptual paper that draws on autoethnography to explore using pedagogies in history teacher education that bring student voices and student knowledge production to the centre of the teaching and learning process. These proposed pedagogies are used to create a foundation that centers marginalized knowledges, histories, and historical narratives. This is proposed as a decolonial pedagogy, or a pedagogy built on decolonial impulses, and is invoked as such. Beyond giving weight and value to student voices, an intention of this pedagogy is to create an awareness of silences and absences of marginalized voices in the South African school history curriculum. These pedagogies also intend to create an awareness of whose knowledges, realities, and beings are included in the knowledges brought into the teacher education classroom. Through an auto-ethnographic approach, this paper explores these pedagogies as used in a history methodology course in a Bachelor of Education program in a university in South Africa, to propose the pedagogies that are explored. As the paper is theoretical-conceptual, the data draws from the autoethnographic aspect is used to explore the potential of the pedagogies rather than proving their impacts. We argue that this kind of exploration is useful in mapping out the different approaches to counter coloniality in the classroom, and that this is supported by other history education research. Our argument is underpinned by a decolonial theoretical framework that understands the education system, especially tertiary institutions, as existing in continuing coloniality.

Keywords

history education, teacher education, student voice, decolonial pedagogy, marginalised histories

Introduction

South Africa is in a moment of flux in terms of the country's history education in schools, with the potential of a new history curriculum for primary and High School on the horizon (DBE, 2018). This potential new curriculum comes after ten years of work by a Ministerial task team (appointed by the Minister of Basic Education in 2015) whose investigation found that there was indeed a continued Eurocentrism in South Africa's curriculum (Ndlovu et al., 2018). At this juncture of a potential new curriculum, it is necessary to think carefully about the current state of history in

* **Contact:** Sarah Godsell ✉ sarah.godsell@wits.ac.za
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

our schools, and crucially, to think about history teacher education in our tertiary institutions. However, our history classrooms are impacted by much more than the current of future curriculum: history teachers teach in the context of the classrooms that they find themselves in. These history classrooms, we explore below, impose severe constraints on many history teachers.

This paper explores this web of interconnections (higher and basic education, teacher education and classroom reality, history curriculum and history pedagogy) enacted in South Africa history education classrooms. We explore our own response to the interconnections through pedagogies we employ in our history teacher education courses. We locate these pedagogies as decolonial, and locate them as pedagogies that foreground student voices and critical historical thought. In foregrounding student voice and critical thought, we intend, and actively work towards, locating students as knowledge producers, bringing their own (often marginalized) histories and voices to bear on the school history curriculum (in South Africa, the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement curriculum (2011)). Through doing this work we intend to make space for marginalised histories in both the teacher education and school history classroom. We understand that any curriculum will have gaps, and there are always important histories that exist outside of formalised curricula. What we propose is an intervention in historical thinking and historical consciousness (Seixas, 2006), to allow students as knowledge producers to be able to understand processes of marginalization, and trust themselves enough to respond as history teachers.

History teacher education in South Africa is a contested space, intersecting issues of coloniality in South African universities (Heleta, 2018; Maluleka & Ledwaba, 2023) and issues around history education (also often involving coloniality). Teacher education in South Africa also requires thought around issues of overcoming the effects of colonialism and apartheid on history education, in both schools and teacher education (Ndlovu et al., 2018). While the post-apartheid school history curriculum has had three different instantiations, there are still remnants of coloniality in the current curriculum (Shabangu, 2024; Maluleka, 2023). Coloniality also manifests in some indigenous histories, and presents, being marginalized (Ndlovu et al., 2018). There are different potential responses to this, which could, for example, involve a focus on indigenous knowledge systems to push back against the marginalisation caused by coloniality (Maluleka and Mathebula, 2022; Shabangu, 2024). In this paper we explore an intervention through the pedagogical and assessment design of history methodology courses. We particularly focus on a simple pedagogy, which, we argue, explores how we get students to value their own voices and histories, and thus think about marginalized histories, through a decolonial approach (Szabó-Zsoldos, 2023).

The challenge we are thinking through in this paper is an intersecting one of realistically workable history pedagogy, the relationship between student voice and history education, marginalized histories, and the way the space of the history classroom is experienced. One of the challenges for the teaching of pre-service history teachers in South Africa is needing to prepare them for the vastly different contexts they could teach in, depending on where they find a job after their degree. The South African primary education system, over 350 years through colonialism and apartheid, continues to breed inequality, and these unequal opportunities for learners provide dramatically different contexts for our pre-service teachers to teach in (Spaull & Jansen, 2019). The state system in and of itself varies, with some excellent schools known as former Model C schools in suburban (previously white) areas. However, schools in townships and rural areas, catering almost exclusively to African students, provide a challenging context to teach in, often without basic resources like textbooks or chairs, let alone resources like internet connection and screens in the classroom.[1] Township schools are often overcrowded with up to 60 or 100 kids in a class, making learner-centred or creative pedagogies much harder to implement while maintaining control over the class (Stott & Guthrie, 2024). These conditions mean that in South Africa, where inequality has increased since the formal ending of colonialism and apartheid, race and class still play a large role in the quality of education a child receives (Soudien, 2024). The question that these conditions raises for teacher education is how to prepare future teachers for these very different contexts in which they may teach? This question has a particular configuration in history education, where the current curriculum is very content heavy, and where skills are paid lip service but not well integrated into the curriculum (Godsell, 2019). This follows history education research where, over the last several decades, the emphasis has moved onto historical thinking and historical consciousness, rather than memorization of historical fact (Seixas, 2017; Wineburg, 2001, 2018).

1 This is even though there have been digitsation drives in township schools: structural inequality has rendered these largely ineffective.

The material conditions render this kind of critical history teaching in South Africa difficult. These conditions have obvious repercussions for history teacher education: do we follow the international literature, or prepare our students for material realities? Is there a way to do both? In the education major and the subject methodologies offered at the Bachelor of Education at the institution in which we teach, students are taught constructivist, learner centered, inclusive and (sometimes) decolonised pedagogy. However, under the circumstances described above it is often impossible to apply in these methods, resulting in the reinforcing of colonial pedagogies of regurgitation and memory (Zavala, 2016). In this paper, we explore the decolonial possibilities of a low resource strategy, foregrounding student voice. As this is a theoretical/conceptual paper, it is intended to pose ideas which could be further tested in empirical research, although we draw from data from real courses we teach.

In a 2024 newspaper article entitled "Why professors of education should not be teaching future teachers" Jonathan Jansen, himself an esteemed professor of education in South Africa, bemoaned how out of touch education professors are with the South African classroom, citing his own recent experience in returning to it (Jansen, 2024, p. 202). He explained his surprise at the need for repetition of the basics in the classroom, leaving less time for learner centered strategies which allow the construction of learning, or knowledge. His intervention raises a crucial, and contested, question: what is the purpose of learning in school, and how is this measured? These questions are difficult to answer when basic literacy is not in place, which is the case in many South African schools (Spaull, 2013). What are the implications of this for history education specifically, when the discipline has worked so hard to move away from memory and repetition based teaching (Seixas, 2017; Wineburg, 2018)? This also raises the ever-troubling question of the purpose of history education in schools, globally and in South Africa. There are many answers to this, ranging from citizenship to identity formation to critical thinking development (Kallaway, 1995; Ndlovu et al., 2018). We propose, in this paper, that part of the purpose of history education in South Africa is a decolonial function, decentring Euro-Western knowledge and gaze. We suggest we can move towards this impulse through the recentering of marginalised histories and the centering of student, and learner, voice.

To think about how the decolonial function might be achieved we need to think about how pre-service and then in-service history teachers encounter themselves, their voices and their knowledges, their agency, in the contested and contesting spaces of history classrooms in teacher education? Thinking about how they encounter themselves is counterposed with continued challenges with the South African History Curriculum (CAPS), which, although it contains much more African content than previous instantiations of the curriculum, still often presents a colonized lens visible both in the content and the language of the curriculum (Maluleka and Ramoupi, 2022).

To combat the rote learning that is the legacy of colonial and Bantu Education (Kros, 2010) – the education system mandated for African learners during colonialization and apartheid, which quelled all critical thought (Soudien, 2024); we want our students to be able to approach the curriculum with a critical lens – but this requires students and teachers to overcome the very difficult dynamics these students face in the classroom.

In this paper, we examine student voices as tools that can be developed through a low resource decolonial pedagogy in tertiary education, that can, perhaps, in turn be used to create spaces for marginalized histories, and used in school history classrooms. We make the above argument in three sections: first we discuss decolonial pedagogy, secondly, we discuss student voice, and thirdly we discuss how this can link to marginalized histories.

In the question of developing student voice as a pedagogical tool we address several interlinked fields of literature on history education, decolonial pedagogy, and student voice. To ground this we locate our study in history education in Africa, which continues to struggle with the presence of coloniality (Boadu & Oppong, 2024). This presence of coloniality impacts everything from curriculum to pedagogy to assessment to classroom realities (Maluleka & Ndumeya, 2024). Much of the work on decolonising history education, in South Africa and internationally, has been limited to curriculum, with pedagogical and assessment work as an outlier (Godsell, 2019; Johnson, 2002; Karn et al., 2024; Maluleka, 2021; Szabó-Zsoldos, 2023). Thus, in the theoretical framework below we draw on a combination of decolonial pedagogies, drawn from an international literature, and a theorization of student voice (another subject with little literature in history education specifically).

This article is also located in higher education and in history teacher education, which are thought together deeply with the implications for the school history classroom. In this, we are working with coloniality in a double sense: in the higher education teacher education space, and in the school classroom. History teacher education is an extremely broad academic field, but again, focusing on decoloniality (in pedagogy and in terms of marginalized voices) and student voice speaks into a clear research gap (Dollie et al., 2020).

Theoretical framework: voice as decolonial pedagogy

Decolonisation and decoloniality: working definitions

In order to lay out our theoretical framework for this paper it is important to pause on the often contested concepts of decolonisation and decoloniality. Decolonisation and decoloniality are two dialectically interrelated yet distinct concepts that have gained significant traction in various discourses. Decolonisation and decoloniality are concepts borne in contexts that continue to encounter, live, and breathe legacies of colonialism, imperialism, and apartheid. In the global South, these concepts were coined and developed by ordinary individuals, intellectuals, thinkers, and scholars such as Aimé Cesairé, Amilcar Cabral, Funmilayo Ransome-Kuti, Wangari Maathai, Mariama Bâ, Thomas Sankara, Bantu Biko, and Frantz Fanon to name but a few.

While both concepts seek to challenge, dismantle, and transcend the continuation of systems of oppression rooted in colonial histories. These concepts differ in their scope, focus, and application. For instance, decolonisation is more concerned with undoing colonialism, imperialism and apartheid, all as historical phenomenon and as ongoing systems of domination (Ndlovu et al., 2018). Central to decolonisation is the dismantling of, and transcending colonial structures of power and governance (Maldonado-Torres, 2007). This often entails the taking apart of colonial structures of administration and domination, and the restoration of stolen land and (natural) resources to their rightful owners – the indigenous people (Grosfoguel, 2013). This is an ongoing process that continues even after formal colonisation, imperialism and aparthied have ended, especially since colonised people of the world continue to grapple with the enduring effects of those periods and a pervasive coloniality. Because of this, decoloniasation is concerned with the rehumanisation of the dehumanised at the level of material conditions (restoration of their stolen land, political and economic independence etc).

On the other hand, decoloniality is a concept that was also developed in contexts that encountered and continue to encounter colonialism, imperialism, and apartheid in many forms. Decoloniality can be considered as an extension of decolonisation in that, it delves deeper into the epistemic, ontological, and psychological dimensions of colonialism, imperialism, and apartheid (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013). This deeper engagement makes decoloniality a framework that seeks to challenge and transcend the Eurocentric ways of knowing, becoming and being that have been imposed on the colonised by the colonisers (Maldonado-Torres, 2007). As a framework, it also critiques and challenges ways in which colonial powers not only dominated territories and populations but also imposed their knowledge systems, values, and ways of being, becoming and knowing as universal and superior (Santos, 2014; Fataar, 2018).

Because of this aspect of challenge, decoloniality is also concerned with the rehumanisation of the dehumanised at the level of epistemology, ontology, and psychology (cognitive).

Despite this distinct difference, both decolonisation and decoloniality have similarities. The first thing that makes them similar is the fact that they both work towards the same goal – which is the liberation of the colonised. Secondly, they are similar in that, both concepts challenge the dominance of Euro-Western powers and seek to empower marginalized people of the world, especially from the global South.

Decolonial pedagogies: grounding concepts

We want to locate this research in decolonial pedagogies, which is itself an expansive and varied field. We remain committed to decolonial work because of the overwhelming presence of coloniality in education in South Africa, taking on board the critique and danger of one of us being a white person doing decolonial work (Tuck & Yang, 2012) and trying to use it, not as a move towards innocence, but as a commitment to keep on doing the work that needs to be done, while

working against one's own[2] whiteness. There are three key theoretical positions that shape our decolonial pedagogical jumping off point. The first one is from Zembylas (2018) about decolonial pedagogy as process - this speaks to the pedagogical development of a course as part of a process rather than a one off interaction that achieves things on its own (Zembylas, 2018). This process is one in which we, as lecturers, are one player, and the other players are the students, as well as the curriculum itself, and assessment strategies. The combination of players and pedagogy as process speaks to relationality, and for us this relationality is a big part of the decolonial voicing pedagogy: how the students experience themselves in our classes, and to what extent their voices are heard, valued, and developed. We must also say that there is no one pedagogy that suits every class, and so the design is always an impulse, to be worked with in different ways through the different constellations of classes. A second decolonial strategy comes from Shahjahan et al, who completed an international literature review on decolonising curriculum and pedagogy in 2022. These authors came up with three principles: recognizing constraints, disrupting, and making space for new initiatives (Shahjahan et al., 2022). These strategies are not in themselves tied to decoloniality, but it is studied in the framework as such, so the constraints are those imposed by coloniality, the disruptions are towards coloniality, and the new movements are decolonial. We like this approach because it is oriented in the realities of the work done in institutions that are themselves colonial in their construction but acknowledge that there is space for disruption in these spaces, and that there is the space and agency to do new things. Then we turn to Zavala (2016) who talks about decoloniality in education being about counter/storytelling, healing, and reclaiming. We like this approach particularly for history, when we are dealing with a history that had been erased and devalued by colonialization and continues to erased by coloniality. Therefore, teaching history in South Africa is also talking about the relationship that Africa has to history as a discipline (Boadu & Oppong, 2024). Counter/storytelling is a process of naming and remembering against colonialism:

> Given the fact of coloniality in everyday life, naming entails a deliberate attempt to develop a language of critique that enables colonized peoples to understand their present situation as encircled by colonialism and its structural arrangements and cultural logic. (Zavala, 2016, p. 3)

Remembering within/against coloniality serves to excavate the subsumed indigenous knowledges that are devalued by coloniality. This can be done in the tertiary education history classroom and in the school history classroom, through students and learners being able to relate their own histories and experiences to the curriculum. Reclaiming, interpreted into this history education trajectory, is part of re-visioning histories that include our students and their families, the lands and spaces that they come from. Healing, according to Zavala, involves both social/communal healing and spiritual/psychological healing: for indigenous people. The voice pedagogy described below is an individual and collective exercise that, while not framed around the spiritual, makes explicit space for it. One way that we approach these strategies is to highlight student voice as part of our pedagogy, curriculum and assessment, and to build a relationality in the courses.

Theorizing voice as part of pedagogy

Voice itself can be a slippery and somewhat dangerous concept. The danger is in a romanticization of voice that allows us to think about it as some kind of clear expression of otherwise silenced people. McLeod (2011) warns us:

> Yet the appeal of voice as a political project, as a metaphor for identity and agency and as a strategy for promoting empowerment, inclusion and equity, remains powerful. Arguably a certain romance attaches to calls to rescue and release the voices of the silenced and marginalized, allowing under-represented, excluded and neglected groups to have their say, for their perspectives to be heard and the value of their standpoints recognized. (McLeod, 2011, p. 180)

2 I, Sarah Godsell, am speaking personally here, as a white woman engaging in decolonial work in academia.

Part of the pedagogy developed around voice that is explored in this paper is, indeed, trying to centre and excavate marginalised knowledges, narratives, and histories, through the students' own knowledges and voices. However, we push back against the appropriation and the romanticisation of voice through allowing the process to be internal (silent) and not necessitating the voices become part of the class discussion to prove an 'equity' or an 'inclusion'.

Our use of voice does the kind of overlapping identified in the strategies laid out below:

> We can identify at least four common and overlapping uses of voice in educational discourse: voice-as-strategy (to achieve empowerment, transformation, equality); voice as-participation (in learning, in democratic processes); voice-as-right (to be heard, to have a say); and voice-as-difference (to promote inclusion, respect diversity, indicate equity). (McLeod, 2011, p. 182)

We use voice-as strategy to both value and develop student knowledges as well as develop a sense of understanding for marginalised histories. Through the strategies to value and grow student voice we want students to develop a sense of themselves as knowledge producers, not only as interacting with the knowledges that are otherwise brought into the course. Dialogue, and dialogic teaching, are important in this (Freire & Shor, 1987). However, we also consider that sometimes that dialogue is internal and reflective. This is a form of critical dialogic pedagogy (Ferreira & Godsell, forthcoming).

McLeod warns of the danger of "speaking for" or of "giving voice" and asks us to pay attention to the power dynamics in the spaces in which voice is invoked as something potentially emancipatory. In our own classrooms, these power dynamics involve us as teachers, as persons with the power to assess, to pass or fail. This is why we have chosen these specific dynamics around the voicing strategies, that, ironically, voice is primarily written. In this strategy it is also left open and so is the student's choice where and how to share the products of this internal dialogue. It is also the repetition and accumulation of voice that we are speaking to, that adds to the knowledge produced on the course. It is not, however, part of the formal course assessment, so is slightly outside of the potentially problematic power dynamics. There is also something important in that the students can exercise agency in what and how they write: we do not check the work so they could, in fact, be writing anything. While this may be criticised, we feel that this is important in pushing back against the power dynamics. "what counts as voice and which or whose voices are recognized?" (McLeod, 2011, p. 184)

There is also a danger of voice being essentialised or essentialising, the voice of a "people", as agency itself, or always offering some kind of essentialised link to self. This is not what we are trying to do as the use of voice in our classes is to build up a sense of trust in students' own knowledges, their own histories, their own responses and thoughts, rather than translate these knowledges into knowledges that represent "a people".

> As reviving voice as an equity and inclusion strategy is not sufficient unless it is accompanied by a more dynamic and situated account of voice-as-strategy and voice-as-communication. This requires reframing the problem of student voice as a matter of listening, recognition and engaged dialogue. (McLeod, 2011, p. 187)

Thus, our strategy towards and theorisation around voice centres on student knowledge including students' personal histories. We consider how these histories interact with the school history curriculum and how we approach teaching history in the methodology course. Voice is thus a way to develop and value student knowledge, to allow students to listen to themselves, and then engage in a dialogue (in thought, writing or vocally) with academic texts, peers, and the CAPS school history curriculum. This use of voice is intended as a non-invasive, non-performative way of using voice in the classroom.

Student discussion and voicing is part of any learner centered pedagogy, or dialogic pedagogy, and is not in and of itself decolonial. We connect to the decolonial here through thinking about knowledge production, and who the knowledge producers are in the education space. This is working towards epistemic freedom (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018). We want to take student knowledge production seriously, to note that they are producing historical knowledge, rather than just reproducing around other knowledge forms. This consideration of knowledge production links to Nomalanga Mkhize's observation that Black people in South African history have been mainly the sources, rather than the producers of knowledge (Mkhize, 2018).

We link the voice in our approach to history methodology to cultivate in our students an avenue towards their own lives, which can link to marginalized histories through excavating their own voices and histories, linked to the knowledge that they bring into the classroom, and the

knowledge that they embody. The concept of critical dialogic pedagogy is a pedagogy that asks for critical engagement with the world and with ourselves, but in a way that is arrived at relationally, through dialogue between students and lecturer, between students and texts, between students and histories, between students and students, and importantly between students and their own minds. This multiple engagement and dialogism provides for a humanising pedagogy (argued by Zembylas to be a decolonial approach) in which students' learning is framed in deep listening, deep engagement, and the engagement is framed in the decolonial strategies listed above (Zavala, 2016; Zembylas, 2018).

Methodology

This paper is primarily a conceptual/theoretical paper. It draws from the design and implementation of the ideas discussed in two courses in a Bachelor of Education course in a Historically White University (HWU) in Johannesburg, South Africa. The research received ethical clearance through ethics protocol number H22/09/06. An autoethnographic approach was used to look primarily at course design, where design was used to heighten student voice as part of the course pedagogy and assessment, as well as an interaction with the curriculum. Autoethnography is a recognised but contested research methodology, relying on the first person narrative(s) of the experience of the author(s), using different data-gathering techniques (Chang, 2016). It is contested as it can cause self-referential bias. We have worked against this by working together, and across courses. What autoethnography does offer, that we found to be of value in this paper, is a high level of reflexivity, using reflections on the authors' own experiences to reflect further on the potential research problem. This reflexivity has been cited as useful in transformative education (Belbase et al., 2008). Autoethnography has also been accused of being used to get around ethics requirements: this is not the case in this paper, as ethics clearance was given (Edwards, 2021). In this paper we value reflexivity and the examination of our own experiences, as we wanted to explore the pedagogical choices we had made. We wanted to explore these choices in the context of the specific problems of coloniality (of history education in our institution and the primary history education in South Africa), and the varied contexts for which we are preparing students to teach in, considering the limitations these contexts present.

Autoethnography as lecturers represents a specific exercise, with dilemmas attached: we cannot escape the power dynamics in our classrooms as we collect data. We recognize our students as co-participants and researchers with us, and yet, on this paper, our names are reflected. The power dynamics are acknowledged and paid attention to in specific ways: ethical clearance is granted through rigorous university procedures; all research participants are anonymous (even though no student data was used in this paper); students are invited to participate in the broader research as writers and knowledge producers (this will be reflected further in different and specific papers produced that reflect the students' specific interests, but a past example of this can be seen in (Dollie et al., 2020)). Students have many demands on their time, and their participation in the research is constrained by these demands. We are careful, as we precede in this paper, to pose our arguments based on our own experience in the classroom (thus drawing on our teaching journal data), and not to claim beyond hypothesis what students experience. We are influenced by our own positionality, and locus of enunciation. Beyond this, however, we find the hours we have spent in the classroom with students to be useful and important, giving us specific insights. Thus, we find autoethnography a suitable methodology to explain what we tried to do, and why. We find this speaks into a useful gap in history education literature on history teacher education and decoloniality, linking into the research problem.

The primary data we draw on are our experiences in teaching these classes, as recorded in a teaching journal, although we also consider course design and pedagogical rationale, to elucidate possibilities around student voice and marginalized histories. The data we thus draw on is a teaching journal, recorded by ourselves over the year of 2024, and our course outlines. We used a decolonial paradigm to inform our data analysis (Craig, 2022). This data was analysed thematically (Alhojailan & Ibrahim, 2012). Among the emerging themes were the themes where we locate our research problem: student voice (and the development of this), marginalized histories (and how to locate and access them) and teaching methods that can be applied across low resource classrooms. In the approach to this paper, as a position paper, we write critically reflecting on our own experiences using these pedagogies in the classroom, thinking simultaneously about the course application and the theoretical aspects of the research problem. This critical

reflection on our own experiences makes this research primarily concept-theoretical in nature.

It is necessary here to give some explanation of the courses we draw on and who our students in these courses are: The methodology courses focus on how to teach history in the last three years of high school, and the content ranges from the nuts and bolts of the curriculum, the lesson planning, and the theoretical issues of emotion or neutrality in the classroom. The course sizes of the methodology courses were 17 and 73 respectively in 2024. Most of our students are African, with a few (one in the 73-person class, 3 in the 17-person class) white students, as well as 7 students identifying as Indian or so called coloured[3]. The majority of our students are in university through the government's National Student Financial Aid Scheme (NSFAS), which funds tertiary education for students from households earning below a certain threshold, or through bursaries specifically for education students, like the Funza Lushaka bursary which is also a government initiative. While the majority are NSFAS students, the students do come from a wide variety of economic backgrounds. What is important for this paper is to note that the majority of our students are negatively impacted by the continuing tendrils of coloniality in the institution, where they continued to be marginalized, even in the majority, through language, culture, and curriculum. This continued impact of coloniality means that decolonial work is actively undoing the dehumanizing that the coloniality in tertiary institution does. Thus, students' voices matter in a way that disrupts coloniality – they matter in a space in which they are not supposed to.

Applying the theory in the courses

Freewriting as voice pedagogy

In our courses, we use a range of different strategies to achieve dialogue. The one we will primarily discuss here is foundational to the courses, for several reasons. It is both an individual act and a process. It is very easy to do. It does not require any technology or reasons beyond paper and a pen. The time for the exercise can be very limited: it can be structured to only take up two minutes of class time, or it can be extended. It is also flexible: it is an individual exercise, but it can easily be adapted into a group, or pair, or class discussion. This strategy is free writing – it is a type of stream of consciousness writing that is supposed to allow students to excavate their own thoughts without any academic or other pressures (Elbow, 2000). There are only two rules to free writing: one is do not stop writing for the allotted time (the times range from 1 to 10 minutes, but we typically use 2-minute exercises), and the second rule is that you do not cross anything out. The prompts can be anything: from asking for a reaction to a poem, or a prescribed paper to taking a couple of minutes in the middle of a debate to capture students' feelings, or a response to a historical narrative. Sometimes the prompts can have a socio-emotional value: how are the students doing? This personal kind of prompt gives them a moment to reflect on themselves and their emotions. A personal check in like this can be useful in high stress moments of the year close to exams, for example. In a more academic approach we also prompt their responses to specific problems, narratives or silences in history and history education, or texts we have read in class. We also prompt them to think about their own histories in relation to what we are doing in class.

These exercises are useful individually, to allow students a moment to process and think about complex questions before voicing an answer. We also use them over time for students to compile a kind of diary on the questions that we ask and think about in class. This is a departure from a lecture style that engages students in questioning but does not create any lasting record of their thoughts and responses to what the class provokes. The intended outcome with this as a repeated and protracted exercise, is that students come to an understanding that their thoughts, their internal voice, have intrinsic value, beyond being expressed in class and beyond being marshalled into a response for an assignment. This valuing of voice and story that are outside of what "knowledge" is valued in tertiary, or primary, history education is a step towards understanding and valuing marginalized historical narratives. Although this strategy is tied into our assessment strategy, which we discuss later in this paper, these writing exercises themselves are not assessed, and never have to be submitted. The fact that the pieces of writing are never

3 The so called coloured identity is very contested and was formalised as a category through apartheid legislation. There are lots of historical roots in this identity, included Cape Malay slave descendants, and descendants of groups identified as Khoi, or San.

submitted allows a, perhaps dangerous, freedom to the exercises, but pushes against the weight that assessments carry in higher education (Godsell et al., 2024).

One strategy we utilize with freewriting is to get students to track how their thoughts, their voice, and how those change over time, through engagement with external information. With this strategy we are asking them to do the metacognitive work on how their thinking develops. This kind of reflection is a valuable part of academic growth, but beyond that we want the idea that their inner voice is valuable to root, and to relate to their history teaching. With a sense of different voices being valuable, we try to develop a sense of different historical perspectives, and as their own voices are often overlooked in their studies, to get a sense of how power dynamics can cause voices, groups, histories, to be overlooked.

Sometimes the development in thought is overtly addressed: the French Revolution is taught in our Grade 10 (two years before the end of high school) and so it is covered in the curriculum we teach at University. We teach the French Revolution in conjunction with the Haitian revolution, and we discuss how the two revolutions have been treated differently in historiography and why. In free writes, we ask students to think about their definitions of freedom in the very beginning, and in the very end of the course, and discuss how their views have changed across the course, also in conjunction with how the revolutions have been historicised.

Sometimes we also bring it closer to home: we think about the 'Xhosa Cattle Killing' – a movement in which 140 000 cattle were killed and 40 000 people starved to death (Davies, 2007) - in the way the prophetess who was the heart of the movement was historicised and we think about this in relation to gender and historiography (Offenburger, 2009). However, students are also encouraged to interact with the histories in their own lives and their homes . We bring this range of historical thought into contact with discussions about evidence and historiography, about historical reliability and veracity. It remains important to develop the ideas of the histories in the students' lives, in their voices (that are multiple and layered and histories) as important, and in that way help the curriculum expand beyond textbook narratives. Students are encouraged to think about the way that the curriculum does or does not reflect their own knowledges. In the same breath, we continue to draw on the importance of a global and interconnected history: that too, is connected to the process of the students recording their own voices.

History as disrupted and disruptable

One of the key themes in our courses is history as constructed, as disrupted and disruptable, which makes the possibilities for marginalized narratives to be woven into the histories more relevant (Trouillot, 1997). It is important here to pause and take a moment to engage with some of the work talking about how ideas of history, and ideas of time, have been contested. Tisani (2018) argues these ideas in an African context, talking about how cyclical ideas of time could impact history, how linear history would interact with a history in which ancestors play a role. She in turn argues the difficulties with the types of knowledge made and ratified by settler historians. She contests the colonial, pre-colonial, post-colonial periodization that binds Africa in a framework that consistently centers colonialism (Tisani, 2018). Cutrara (2018) has talked about a "settler grammar" imposed on history by frameworks of historical thinking, that curtails thinking of history in other knowledge frameworks, especially indigenous ones. While student voice in and of itself does not provide an alternative to this, the prompts given for the writing exercises play a role in pushing student thinking about what knowledge norms we have accepted as part of historical knowledge and history teaching. Thorp and Persson (2020) contend for an openness to different indigenous approaches to history itself. We discuss conceptions of history in class, mainly to underscore the point that there are different conceptions of history, that it exists in different forms, and it is not an untouchable, immovable thing removed from the students. Students' ideas of their own voice and agency in history, become important for their ideas of voice and agency in their understanding of what history "is" and for history teaching. Thus, the idea of history as disrupted and disruptable becomes central to opening space for marginalized voices.

Student voice and marginalized histories: a relationship

This position paper is part of a larger research project, where decolonial strategies in history teaching are researched, but this paper explores, from a theoretical position, a potential relationship between student voices and marginalised histories. This relationship comes back to the

student who said to us that they want to "see and feel themselves" in the history curriculum. This desire is something that really resonated with us, and that we have touched on in our work exploring decolonial history pedagogy (Godsell, 2019; Maluleka & Godsell, 2024). In this section, we make the argument that small exercises which value and validate student voice, and beyond that student prior knowledge, experience, and histories, will pave the way for an understanding of where and how marginalized histories fit in the school history classroom and in the Curriculum and Assessment Statement (CAPS) school history curriculum. This expansion through student voice is possible especially because of the focus on colonization and apartheid in the curriculum, presenting an official narrative, in which it is possible to locate marginalized histories, like histories of women or queer histories, but also the small and divergent narratives that make up the tapestry of history (Maluleka & Godsell, 2024).

The CAPS history curriculum that is currently taught in South African schools contains important South African history, although admittedly less African history. However, Maluleka and others argue that this is still largely presented through a Eurocentric lens – (Maluleka, 2021) even when the historiography is being explicitly engaged, as it is when the grade 10 learners explore portrayals of the leader of the amaZulu, King Shaka. The history presented shows the horrors of colonialism and apartheid, but from a point of view that is both ANC centric (the ANC was one of the political parties that contributed to bringing South Africa to democracy and has ruled since 1994, however there were other important struggle ideologies, parties, and people, particularly women and queer people, that are not recognised in the CAPS curriculum) and presents the struggle as complete, even though for many South Africa remains a place of extreme oppression. Thus, what does it mean for students to see and feel themselves in the curriculum? The pedagogy we are suggesting develops and values student voice in preservice teachers. This pedagogy is a move to students acknowledging their own place in histories and developing an awareness of which histories are reflected in the curriculum and which are marginalized. Developing this awareness is with a view to opening for them to "see and feel" themselves in the curriculum. While this step is valuable, there is more potential here: with explicit guidance in class, valuing their own voices can be a step to understand how histories are marginalized, and thus to valuing marginalized histories more broadly. This process of recognizing marginalised histories cannot happen in a vacuum, and the courses provide explicit work around this in the FET method course. These questions are also raised around the curriculum.

There have been heated debates about what proportion of local history in relation to international history, and then more specifically what local and what international history, goes into the South African CAPS curriculum (Maluleka, 2021). There is also a new curriculum under development that would include different types of knowledge, as well as more afrocentric knowledge (Ndlovu et al., 2018). However, the current world events that we do have in the curriculum are often Euro-centric (the Holocaust is presented twice for example, albeit in different contexts, and the Rwandan genocide is not in the curriculum). In class, we explicitly discuss marginalized histories and where to find them. And the idea that each centered history contains marginalized ones with different perspectives. An example of this idea is, for example, the way our curriculum covers the "American dream" and the "roaring twenties" in a section on capitalism in the USA but does not differentiate that experiences would have been different for women, or black people, or indigenous people, or anyone who was not a white man. The concept we use is to develop an awareness of students' own voices, as well as the histories in them, to bring that to an analysis of the histories contained in the curriculum, (and the historiography of this). In this developing, we want their voices to interact with the histories, told and untold, aware of their own voice and the position of power on it, and bring this understanding to the histories in and out of the curriculum.

Students locating their voices within historical knowledge

To conceptualise this issue of student voices and the marginalised histories, we have needed to engage with the question: how do students navigate their own voice, histories, and knowledges within historical knowledge? We want to go back to the Xhosa cattle killing example; here the students hailing from the Eastern Cape province of South Africa often have stories in their families of the event, the event that devasted the independence of amaXhosa (broadly speaking since there are different groupings of people within what is considered as amaXhosa) and brought them into the wage labour regime of British imperialism. Family, or clan, stories vary in how and who they blame, and the student's obvious inclination is to blame the British governor at the time, the infamous governor Gray, from tricking uNongqawuse, or her colluding with them.

However, coming from different interpretations and historical perspectives presents different stories (Ashforth, 1991; Davies, 2007; J. Lewis, 1991; Offenburger, 2009; Peires, 1987).

This is important because it brings historiography into contact with voice, so the approach is not a simple one of accepting any histories emerging in/ through student voices, as true by default. The approach is about acknowledging and valuing, but also about developing, voices in relation to history, and historical knowledge. Part of this approach is humanising pedagogy, against the dehumanisation of coloniality, part of it is reflexive pedagogy (Ashwin et al., 2015; Zembylas, 2018). Part of it is about allowing for healing in an academic space that consistently dehumanizing students and reduces them to their marks, student numbers, and fees. An allowance for healing is also in a context where many students are struggling with significant mental health issues due to a combination of academic and other, often socio-economic, factors.[4] Part of the project is also about realizing the significance of their own knowledge in relation to the histories studied, and in this bringing about a heightened awareness of what is left out of the CAPS curriculum.

It is not, however, just about histories close to them. In a lecture on marginalized histories and where to find them, we watch a video by indigenous artist Gregg Deal[5], who talks about the stories that are valued in society and those that are not, and what that does to the people involved, in every way. In engaging with this source, we recognise that Indigenous peoples in the America feature almost nowhere in our history curriculum, even though there is a substantial portion of USA history in the curriculum (especially Civil Rights and Black Power movements, which are likened to South Africa's anti-apartheid struggle.). We then talk about the popular franchise restaurants, Spur and Mochachos, who utilize a "native American" theme in their décor – and how racist this is. We talk about, and students write about, why these histories are not in our consciousness as a country when the Black Power movement, for example, is. We argue that recognizing and valuing their own voices will help them recognise and value other marginalized voices, even where that marginalization has become completely normalized. This process of recognition comes with the critical dialogic approach that asks these questions of the curriculum: whose knowledge? whose choice? whose representation?

Assessments in the courses: assessing for voice

This approach of valuing voice is also in the assessment strategy of the courses where we are working with pedagogies of voice: we have shifted, in our methodology courses, from a written exam to a type of oral exam – in the methodology course, we ask our students to record a 20 – 30 minutes podcast. This assessment is authentic in that it produces something that has value outside of the assessment, it allows for a wide range of expression, and the students have a large range of choice in what they are asked to do (Maniram & Maistry, 2018). For the assessment, students are required to choose a partner from the class and record a podcast on "teaching history" drawing on what they found most useful from the course, as well as their lived experiences and their experiences in their teaching practical. There are specific criteria that the students must include, but there is a broad range for them to choose from, and the students have the space to bring their own perspectives and voices to the fore. Students are encouraged to go back to their free writes to track what has been important and impactful for them, and to track their development along the course. When we begin the freewriting exercises in the beginning of the year we tell the students that these writings are their notes for the final exam – and there is an element of agency to that, as we never check what they are writing. However, students' informal feedback has been that these writing exercises have been helpful in engaging themselves, in a sphere outside assessment (in the moment of writing). The podcast is recorded as a 20 - 30-minute conversation in which the student pairs discuss what they think is important in history teaching, and why. The student pair also touches on what has been impactful, or problematic, in the course. We have argued elsewhere why this assessment is in itself decolonial, contesting coloniality of knowledge, of being and of power, but here we want to pause on the voice in the podcast (Godsell, forthcoming). In contrast to the free writes, voice is a physical element of this assessment. The students are put in the position of the expert, rather than needing to aggregate arguments of different theorists, for example, and they get to make the calls on their own experience of the course, and their own relating of the course material to their experience of teaching history. For this podcast the students are also expected to draw on their teaching ex-

4 This comes up regularly in class discussions across different courses.

5 Gregg Deal: Indigenous in Plain Sight, 2018 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s3FL9uhTH_s

perience practicals, applying what they had done in their classrooms to the course and seeing what aligns and what does not. In this, the conclusion of the course offers a culmination of the valuing of voice during the course: this does not link it to marginalized histories, but offers students a space where their thoughts, in their voiced form, are valorised in the formal language of academia: examinations and marks. While this assessment structure is important in the working with voice throughout the course, the real value and linking between marginalized histories and the inclusion and valorisation of student voices happens in the writing exercises. It is important that these writing exercises do not require any resources other than two or three minutes of class time, a paper, and a pen. These exercises do not require the class to move around, they do not require anything that might disrupt an already restive or overly large class. This means the exercises can be repeated by the student teachers in any teaching setting, no matter how low resource the school that the students are in. This is necessary because modeling is powerful, and when writing and critical thinking are hard to implement in difficult school classrooms in South Africa, these exercises can offer something valuable. These exercises are small actions, that can yield important results, and can work in the small spaces of the decolonial cracks (Walsh, 2020).

Teaching in South Africa: voices in the decolonial cracks

With this reflection on low resource pedagogies, we want to come back to where we started: the context of teaching in South Africa. For while we have positioned student voice as a means to highlighting marginalized histories, we want to acknowledge the difficulties of bringing student voice and marginalized histories into the classroom, and the conditions under which most history teachers teach in South Africa (Boadu & Oppong, 2024). We have seen teachers successfully manage this feat – through pan Africanism, through feminism, through song – but it takes an extraordinary commitment.[6] Another reason we focus on student voice is to build up student belief in themselves, in their ability to do this work in trying circumstances (McLeod, 2011). Here though, we want to invoke another decolonial concept: Walsh's concept of decolonial cracks (Walsh, 2020). She argues that against the wall of coloniality, we need to find the small, even tiny, spaces of the decolonial cracks, in which to do decolonial work. And as the cracks are worked in, so they widen, and network. What we have tried to outline above is a small strategy that can be used in history teacher education, and that can also be imaginably carried into school history education as it is low resource, that can work in and open decolonial cracks.

Our argument in this paper has been that in the small act of valuing and developing student voice, we are creating space, for students to understand marginalization, of themselves in the current moment and also historically, and create the hope that they can find their own decolonial cracks to work in, in school classrooms, to both foreground marginalized histories, and foreground learner voice (with the work this does in and of itself). Although history teaching in many schools is arduous, we argue that the presented strategy is low in resource use: it is quick, it does not require movement across the classroom, it only requires a writing instrument and paper. In being low resource, this pedagogy also speaks to a history education pedagogy in teacher education that takes into consideration the classrooms that our students go into, and models in a practical way.

If school history learners also have their voices developed and valued, their own thoughts and insights marked as important enough to note down, this could (although much further research would be needed here) help them to see themselves in both histories and historiographies.

Limitations

This paper has several limitations: our approach was primarily conceptual-theoretical, to grapple with the questions and our experiences, and so we limited the data used to our own reflection journals. These limitations means that, in a piece about student voice, we did not include student reflections on the process. We are drawing on classroom observations, but the students may have had different take-aways from the process. This paper has these limitations partly because of the stage of the research we are in and partly because we wanted to give this theoretical aspect of the work its own space. Research focused on student experiences will be a follow up part of this project. For future research, it would also be important to actually observe students

6 This is evidenced in 2022 podcasts recordings I did with Kearebetsoe Thamae and Moosa Khumalo, who spoke about their pedagogies and how these bring in marginalized histories into the classroom.

from these classes when these students are teaching in schools, either as part of their practical teaching experience or when they are in service teachers. This paper is part of the larger research project, of which this paper serves as a theoretical exploration and foundation.

Conclusion: marginalised histories and voice

> Centimetre by centimetre my body begins to feel decolonised, brain cell by brain cell I begin to appreciate just how deeply I have been colonised. (Abrahams in D. Lewis & Baderoon, 2021, p. 277)

The above quote highlights the body, but we would like to bring it to bear on the voice as well – that the voice contains knowledge, agency, vision and history. By advocating a pedagogy that actively values voice, this paper has argued that this is a decolonial stance. This decolonial stance, we have shown, is also useful for practical application in schools that often defer to rote learning because of low resource access and physical constraints of the classroom. By promoting a decolonial pedagogy that values voice, we are also modelling a pedagogy for our teachers that they can take into any classroom they go on to teach in. This pedagogy (when paired with other careful aspects of curriculum and assessment design) can facilitate critical reflection on historical knowledge and narrative, seeing themselves as knowledge creators and valuing their own knowledge and lives as part of history(ies).

Our students' voices, in institutions imbued with coloniality, are devalued and derided, through our choice of curricula, pedagogy, and assessment (Heleta, 2018). Often assessments ask students to silence their own knowledge, while asking them about the knowledge of others contained in the course (Crossouard & Oprandi, 2022). In the process of acknowledging and valuing our students voices, knowledges and histories, we highlight the process of valuing what has been marginalized and open up a knowledge trajectory that is critical of what knowledge is presented in curricula and textbooks. This process has two potential benefits in this history classroom: firstly, valuing what is marginalized can open for a pedagogy that values historical perspectives that have been overlooked and excluded, an important decolonial impulse. Secondly, the process has the potential for these teachers to go out into classrooms and value their learners' voices, networking the work in the decolonial cracks, spreading value beyond history as a subject.

A crucial premise of the paper has been based on ideas of working where we are: how can we prepare history teachers for real-world classrooms in a decolonial way? We have had informal feedback from students who went into the classrooms saying that there was no space for decoloniality in the South African history classroom: there are not enough resources, the curriculum is too overloaded, the ideological spaces are not there, there is not enough time. We are unable to address all of these issues, but we took this feedback into our course design and worked with decolonial principles around humanization and marginalisation (Bam et al., 2018; Zembylas, 2018). We then worked with a simple pedagogy - supported by curriculum and assessment design choices, to regularly support and develop student voice and trust in their own thoughts and knowledge. This research is part of a larger project investigating the decolonisation of history teacher, and future research will include classroom studies to more accurately gauge the impact of these processes. For the purposes of this article, we wanted to investigate the potential of our pedagogies from a conceptual-theoretical perspective.

We look forward to future research that further tests the flight lines between history-teacher education classrooms, and history school classroom.

To cite this article

Sarah Godsell & Paul Maluleka. (2025). Student voice in history teacher education: A means to build pedagogies around marginalized historical narratives. *Historical Thinking, Culture, and Education.* https://doi.org/10.12685/htce.1398

Peer review

This article has been peer reviewed through the journal's standard double-blind peer review, where both the reviewers and authors are anonymized during review.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge our students who continually challenge and inspire us.

Ethical statement

This work was conducted under ethics protocol number H22/09/06 from the University of the Witwatersrand. This includes the anonymity of participants, and the safe keeping of the data from the research.

Funding

This work was supported by the National Research Foundation Thuthuka Grant under Grant TTK23040388987.

ORCID iD

Sarah Godsell https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3431-2868

Paul Maluleka https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3168-150X

References

Admin. (2024, May 15). *Why professors of education should not be teaching future teachers – Jonathan Jansen.* https://www.jonathanjansen.org/2024/05/15/why-professors-of-education-should-not-be-teaching-future-teachers/

Alhojailan, M. I., & Ibrahim, M. (2012). Thematic analysis: A critical review of its process and evaluation. *West East Journal of Social Sciences, 1*(1), 39–47.

Ashforth, A. (1991). The Xhosa cattle killing and the politics of memory. *Sociological Forum*, 581–592. https://www.jstor.org/stable/684521

Ashwin, P., Boud, D., Coate, K., Hallet, F., & Keane, E. (Eds.). (2015). *Reflective Teaching in Higher Education*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Bam, J., Ntsebeza, L., & Zinn, A. (2018). *Whose history counts: Decolonising African pre-colonial historiography*. African Sun Media.

Belbase, S., Luitel, B., & Taylor, P. (2008). Autoethnography: A method of research and teaching for transformative education. *Journal of Education and Research, 1*(1), 86–95.

Boadu, G., & Oppong, C. A. (Eds.). (2024). *History Education in Africa: Research, Perspectives and Practices*. Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-61388-3

Chang, H. (2016). *Autoethnography as method*. Routledge. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315433370/autoethnography-method-heewon-chang

Craig, I. (2022). Toward a Transformative Decolonial Paradigm of Study Abroad Research. In *Designing Second Language Study Abroad Research: Critical Reflections on Methods and Data* (pp. 65–87). Springer.

Crossouard, B., & Oprandi, P. (2022). Decolonising Formative Assessment. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research* (pp. 181–196). Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S2056-375220220000008010

Davies, S. B. (2007). Raising the Dead: The Xhosa Cattle-Killing and the Mhlakaza-Goliat Delusion. *Journal of Southern African Studies, 33*(1), 19–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057070601136517

Department of Basic Education (DBE), RSA 2018. *Executive summary of the History Ministerial Task Team*. Retrieved 30 June 2025, from https://www.education.gov.za/Resources/Reports.aspx

Dollie, A., Ramjain, A., Varachia, T., Maangoale, T. M., Tshipugu, T., Laurence, T., Laher, Y., Dabhelia, A., Abba, M., Karanie, A., Mitha, A., Mbuli, M., Mogane, K., Montshioa, T., Mamogobo, A., & Sahula, M. (2020). *Decolonial History teachers' charter: A praxis guide. Yesterday and Today, 24*, 274–288.

Edwards, J. (2021). Ethical Autoethnography: Is it Possible? *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 20, 1609406921995306. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406921995306

Elbow, P. (2000). *Everyone Can Write: Essays toward a Hopeful Theory of Writing and Teaching Writing* (1 edition). Oxford University Press.

Freire, P., & Shor, I. (1987). What is the 'dialogical method' of teaching? *Journal of Education, 169*(3).

Godsell, S. (2019). Poetry as method in the history classroom: Decolonising possibilities. *Yesterday and Today, 21*, 1–28. https://doi.org/10.17159/2223-0386/2019/n21a1

Godsell, S., Shabangu, B., & Primrose, G. (2024). Against colonial residues, towards decolonising assessment: A case study of a university history course. *Cogent Education, 11*(1), 2362552. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2362552

Heleta, S. (2018). Decolonizing knowledge in South Africa: Dismantling the 'pedagogy of big lies'. Ufahamu: *A Journal of African Studies, 40*(2). https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5wr073nc

Johnson, H. (2002). Decolonising the history curriculum in the Anglophone Caribbean. *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History, 30*(1), 27–60.

Kallaway, P. (1995). History Education in a Democratic South Africa. *Teaching History, 78*, 11–16.

Karn, S., Llewellyn, K. R., & Clark, P. (2024). Decolonizing History Curricula Across Canada: Recommendations for (Re)design. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne de l'éducation, 47*(4), Article 4. https://doi.org/10.53967/cje-rce.6583

Kros, C. (2010). The Seeds of Separate Development: Origins of Bantu Education. Unisa Press.

Lewis, D., & Baderoon, G. (Eds.). (2021). *Surfacing: On being black and feminist in South Africa*. Wits University Press.

Lewis, J. (1991). Materialism and Idealism in the Historiography of the Xhosa Cattle-Killing Movement 1856–7. *South African Historical Journal, 25*(1), 244–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/02582479108671959

Maluleka, P. (2021). Fallism as decoloniality: Towards a decolonised school history curriculum in post-colonial-apartheid South Africa. *Yesterday and Today, 26*, 68–91.

Maluleka, P., & Godsell, S. (2024). The Continued Absence of the LGBTIQA Community in School History Textbooks in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Yesterday & Today Journal for History Education in South Africa and Abroad, 31*, 37–61. https://doi.org/10.17159/2223-0386/2024/n31a3

Maluleka, P., & Ndumeya, N. (2024). Towards a Decolonized Assessment for History Teaching and Learning in Post-Apartheid South Africa. In G. Boadu & C. A. Oppong (Eds.), *History Education in Africa: Research, Perspectives and Practices* (pp. 243–264). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-61388-3_11

Maniram, R., & Maistry, S. M. (2018). Enabling well-being and epistemological access through an authentic assessment intervention: A case study of a higher education programme. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 32*(6). https://doi.org/10.20853/32-6-2982

McLeod, J. (2011). Student voice and the politics of listening in higher education. *Critical Studies in Education, 52*(2), 179–189. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2011.572830

Mkhize, N. N. (2018). The Missing Idiom of African Historiography: African Historical Writing in Walter Rubusana's Zemk'inkomo Magwalandini. In *Whose History Count: Decolonising Africa's Pre-Colonial HIstoriography*. AFRICAN SUN MeDIA.

Ndlovu, S. M., Lekgoathi, S., Esterhuysen, A., Mkhize, N. N., Weddon, G., Callinicos, L., & Sithole, J. (2018). *Report of the History Ministerial Task Team for the Department of Basic Education* (p. 156). Department of Basic Education.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2018). *Epistemic freedom in Africa: Deprovincialization and decolonization*. Routledge.

Offenburger, A. (2009). The Xhosa Cattle-Killing Movement in History and Literature. *History Compass, 7*(6), 1428–1443. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1478-0542.2009.00637.x
Peires, J. B. (1987). The central beliefs of the Xhosa cattle-killing. *The Journal of African History, 28*(1), 43–63.
Seixas, P. (Ed.). (2006). *Theorizing Historical Consciousness* (1 edition). University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division.
Seixas, P. (2017). A Model of Historical Thinking. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 49*(6), 593–605. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2015.1101363
Shabangu, B. (2024). Re-thinking the South African School History Curriculum: Theorising Indigenous Archives of History. In G. Boadu & C. A. Oppong (Eds.), *History Education in Africa* (pp. 69–90). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-61388-3_4
Shahjahan, R. A., Estera, A. L., Surla, K. L., & Edwards, K. T. (2022). "Decolonizing" curriculum and pedagogy: A comparative review across disciplines and global higher education contexts. *Review of Educational Research, 92*(1), 73–113.
Soudien, C. (2024). The Quest for Educational Equity in Schools in South Africa. *Dædalus, 153*(4), 146–164.
Spaull, N. (2013). South Africa's education crisis: The quality of education in South Africa 1994-2011. *Johannesburg: Centre for Development and Enterprise, 1–65*.
Spaull, N., & Jansen, J. D. (Eds.). (2019). *South African Schooling: The Enigma of Inequality: A Study of the Present Situation and Future Possibilities*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-18811-5
Stott, A., & and Guthrie, G. (2024). Attainable pedagogical practices for contexts of poverty: A South African case study. Pedagogy, *Culture & Society*, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2024.2437360
Szabó-Zsoldos, G. (2023). Decolonising history teaching in the United Kingdom: Movements, methods, and curricula. *Hungarian Educational Research Journal, 13*(4), 515–530. https://doi.org/10.1556/063.2023.00139
Tisani, N. (2018). Of Definitions and Naming 'I am the earth itself. God made me a chief on the very first day of creation.' In J. Bam, L. Ntsebeza, & A. Zinn (Eds.), *Whose History Counts: Decolonisng African precolonial Historiography*. AFRICAN SUN MeDIA.
Trouillot, M.-R. (1997). *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Beacon Press.
Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Tabula Rasa, 38*, 61–111.
Walsh, C. (n.d.). *Pedagogical Notes from the Decolonial Cracks*. Retrieved 13 February 2024, from https://hemisphericinstitute.org/en/emisferica-11-1-decolonial-gesture/11-1-dossier/pedagogical-notes-from-the-decolonial-cracks.html
Walsh, C. E. (2020). Decolonial learnings, askings, and musings. *Postcolonial Studies, 23*(4), 604–611. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1080/13688790.2020.1751437
Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past* (unknown edition). Temple University Press.
Wineburg, S. (2018). *Why Learn History* (First edition). University of Chicago Press.
Zavala, M. (2016). Decolonial Methodologies in Education. In M. A. Peters (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Educational Philosophy and Theory* (pp. 1–6). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-532-7_498-1
Zembylas, M. (2018). Decolonial possibilities in South African higher education: Reconfiguring humanising pedagogies as/with decolonising pedagogies. *South African Journal of Education, 38*(4), 1–11.