Editorial

e-ISSN: 3135-5676
2026: Vol 1, pp 1-8. https://doi.org/10.51986/ijcc-2026.vol1.00
Interdisciplinary Journal of Critical Communications

Toward Critical and Pluriversal Communications: Knowledge, Power, and Justice in the Inaugural Issue

Bunmi I. Om odan[1*]
Norma Romm[2]

AFFILIATIONS

[1]Research and Development, ARPS Institute, Plano, United States.
[2]Department of Adult, Community and Continuing Education, University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa.

CORRESPONDENCE

Email: omodanbunmi@gmail.com*

EDITORIAL DATES
Received: 30 June 2026
Revised: 29 July 2026
Accepted: 10 August 2026
Published: 12 August 2026

Copyright:
© The Author(s) 2026.
Published by **ERRCD Forum.**
This is an open access article distributed under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence.

DOI: 10.51986/ijcc-2026.vol1.00

Abstract: This inaugural editorial introduces the Interdisciplinary Journal of Critical Communications and interprets its initial contributions as a cohesive research programme rather than a collection of disparate works. Through a critical-hermeneutic and thematic-synthetic analysis of the inaugural corpus, this editorial contends that the circuits through which knowledge is produced, authorised, and communicated are neither neutral nor innocuous. Furthermore, it asserts that critical scholarship must engage with the politics of knowledge as scrupulously as it addresses the content of what is known. Three analytic threads are traced across the issue: the pursuit of cognitive justice and the unfinished work of decolonisation; the contested arrival of artificial intelligence as a distributor of epistemic power; and the political economy and governance of educational and developmental institutions. The editorial contends that these apparently disparate concerns are versions of a single question about who authorises knowledge and who is silenced. It commits the journal to interdisciplinary, transparent, and pluriversal scholarship that treats knowledge as irreducibly plural and its contributors (regardless of where they are in the world) as producers of theory rather than suppliers of data. It concludes by inviting contributions that advance cognitive justice within and beyond the academy. This also entails appreciating transdisciplinary research approaches that explicitly include communities outside the academy in processes of co-generating insights by drawing on a plurality of ways of knowing.

Keywords: Critical communications, decoloniality, cognitive justice, artificial intelligence, epistemic justice.

1. Introduction

Every scholarly journal is founded on a wager about what knowledge matters and whose voices and ways of knowing deserve a hearing. To inaugurate the Interdisciplinary Journal of Critical Communications is to make that wager explicit: to insist that the circuits through which knowledge is produced, authorised, and communicated are neither neutral nor innocent, and that scholarship worthy of the present century must attend as rigorously to the politics of knowing as to the content of what is known. The studies gathered in this inaugural issue, at first glance, form a diverse assembly. They traverse the mathematics classroom, the machinery of university administration, the disability rights movement, the political economy of American schooling, the promises and perils of artificial intelligence, and the unfinished business of decolonisation in southern Africa. Yet beneath this diversity runs a single, insistent current. Each contribution interrogates how power organises knowledge and how the communication of knowledge can either entrench or unsettle inherited hierarchies. That current is the intellectual signature of this journal, an international and interdisciplinary forum whose concern is not a region but a problem: how processes of knowledge construction are practised and endorsed, and who is empowered or diminished in the "knowing" endeavour.

We launch at a moment of profound epistemic turbulence. The long-dominant assumption that Western science constitutes a universal, placeless, and culturally neutral standard against which all

How to cite this article:
Omodan, B. I., & Romm, N. (2026). Toward critical and pluriversal communications: Knowledge, power, and justice in the inaugural issue. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Critical Communications, 1,* a00. https://doi.org/10.51986/ijcc-2026.vol1.00

other knowledges are measured has come under sustained and credible challenge (Aoki Inoue et al., 2023; Akena, 2012; Santos, 2014; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018). Across the formerly colonised world, where colonial legacies still persist, scholars and communities are asking whether the university, an institution largely designed to reproduce a particular provincial tradition as though it were humanity's common inheritance, can be remade into a genuinely plural space (Mbembe, 2016; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018; Stein et al., 2020). Simultaneously, a technological revolution driven by artificial intelligence is reorganising the infrastructures of teaching, research, and public communication, among others, faster than our ethical and institutional frameworks can adapt. Moreover, it is perpetuating a technological monoculture (technological universalism) that fails to appreciate alternative technologies (Hui, 2024). These two upheavals, the decolonial and the digital, are not separate; they converge precisely on the terrain this journal calls critical communications: the study of how meaning, authority, and value circulate through the institutions, technologies, and languages of contemporary life.

This editorial does more than introduce a set of articles. It advances a claim about why a journal of this kind is necessary now, and what intellectual commitments it will honour. We argue that the contributions assembled here, read together, sketch the outline of a research programme: one that refuses the false comfort of neutrality, treats epistemic justice as inseparable from material and institutional justice, and insists that how knowledge is understood in every region and tradition (seen as dynamic) deserves equal consideration, rather than being sorted into contexts that generate theory and those expected merely to consume it (Ngulube, 2025; Omodan, 2025). In what follows, we situate the journal's vision, describe the interpretive approach through which we read the inaugural corpus, and then trace three analytic threads that bind these studies into a coherent whole: the pursuit of cognitive justice and decoloniality; the contested arrival of artificial intelligence in education; and the political economy and governance of educational and developmental institutions. We close by naming the commitments that will guide the journal's future and by extending an invitation to the scholarly community it hopes to convene.

2. The Vision and Scope of a Critical, Interdisciplinary Communications

The Interdisciplinary Journal of Critical Communications, published under the auspices of the ERRCD Forum initiative, is deliberately inclusive in the forms of scholarship it welcomes. Its remit spans empirical reports, review and conceptual papers, theoretical reflections, short communications, commentaries and opinion pieces, case studies and field reports, and community-based practice notes that engage contemporary issues within and beyond the academy. This breadth is not editorial indiscipline; it is a considered epistemic stance. To restrict a journal to a single method or a single genre is to quietly legislate what counts as legitimate knowledge, precisely the move that critical scholarship exists to question. Hence, by holding open the door to both the conceptual essay and the field report (including reflections on the underpinnings of the fieldwork), the journal signals that theory and practice, the seminar room and the community, are partners in the production of understanding rather than a hierarchy of the serious and the merely applied.

Three commitments define the word "critical" in our title. First, criticality means the refusal of naturalised neutrality, the willingness to ask whose interests a given arrangement of knowledge serves, and at whose expense (Fricker, 2007; Rosen et al., 2024). Second, it means interdisciplinarity as a matter of principle rather than convenience: the problems that most urgently confront education, humanities, technology, sciences, social lives, development, etc., in the twenty-first century do not respect the boundaries of the disciplines, and neither should the scholarship that seeks to address them (Wendt, Litvin & Hempel, 2024). Third, "communications" denotes our particular object of concern: the processes by which knowledge is represented, transmitted, translated, governed, and contested. In an age when algorithms mediate what students read, and administrators decide, when languages still carry the residue of empire, and when the very metrics of academic worth are

exported from a handful of northern centres, the communication of knowledge is no peripheral technicality. It is a central political question of intellectual life. The journal thus positions itself at the confluence of critical theory, decolonial thought, and the interdisciplinary study of education, technology, and society, an intellectual location its inaugural issue occupies with unusual coherence.

3. Approach to This Editorial

A word on method is warranted, for an editorial that claims to discern a research programme in a set of independent submissions owes its readers an account of how it reached that interpretation. We engaged with the inaugural manuscripts through a critical-hermeneutic and thematic-synthetic reading. Rather than summarising each article in isolation, we read the corpus iteratively and comparatively, moving between the individual contributions and the emerging whole in the interpretive circle characteristic of hermeneutic inquiry, asking of each study what problem of knowledge, power, or justice it addressed and what conceptual resources it mobilised. We then clustered the studies according to their shared analytic concerns, tested those clusters against the modernity/coloniality literature and the critical study of technology and governance, and refined them until each article found its place within a coherent thematic architecture. This procedure is interpretive rather than exhaustive; it makes no claim to statistical representativeness. Its warrant lies in our attempt to offer analytic plausibility and in fidelity to the arguments the authors themselves advance.

4. Cognitive Justice and the Unfinished Work of Decolonisation

The most conspicuous thread binding this issue is the decolonial turn, which posits that political independence did not dismantle the epistemic architecture of empire and that genuine liberation necessitates the deprovincialisation of knowledge itself (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018; Romm, 2025). Several contributions address this challenge from strikingly different perspectives, and their juxtaposition is instructive.

The issue commences with a theoretical interrogation of STEM education, which is often perceived as a universally applicable enterprise. Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics are conventionally presented as culturally neutral, with their truths purportedly unaffected by the histories and contexts of their practitioners. The opening study contests this fundamental assumption, arguing that decolonising STEM transcends mere cosmetic curricular diversification and demands structural epistemological pluralism. Drawing upon decolonial theory, indigenous knowledge scholarship, ethnomathematics, and African philosophy of education, it advances a three-level analytical framework (content, pedagogy, and epistemic governance) and a pluriversal model in which indigenous knowledge systems, local problem-solving practices, and various Western sciences are interwoven as co-generative starting points for teaching. This argument resonates with a burgeoning body of scholarship that demonstrates that mathematical ideas are embedded within cultural practices and that ethnomathematical approaches can enhance rather than diminish mathematical understanding (Batiibwe, 2024). Its deeper claim, that genuine decolonisation entails a shift from epistemic monoculture to cognitive justice, echoes Santos's (2014) assertion that global social justice is unattainable without global cognitive justice.

The second study contextualises this abstraction within the specific circumstances of a single nation. Interrogating what decolonisation and decoloniality actually mean in Zimbabwe three decades after formal independence, it distinguishes with welcome precision between coloniality as an enduring matrix of power, knowledge, and being; decolonisation as the historical event of juridical independence; and decoloniality as the ongoing project of epistemic and structural liberation. Its cautionary note is significant: the terminology of decolonisation has become ubiquitous, even as its substantive content has dissipated into symbolic gestures, such as renaming and Africanisation, which reproduce the very coloniality they purport to contest. By mapping the persistence of

coloniality across knowledge, language, identity, institutions, and land, and by theorising divergent symbolic and substantive pathways, the study insists that epistemic freedom necessitates the alignment of intellectual, institutional, and socioeconomic transformation, mediated by a relational Ubuntu ethic (Mbembe, 2016).

The third contribution extends the decolonial perspective to a domain that has been relatively neglected: disability activism in Africa. Mapping scholarship since the early 1990s, it documents a discernible shift towards decolonial framing that aligns with the epistemologies of the Global South and argues for the deliberate integration of African indigenous knowledge systems within the field. The fact that a thematic review of disability activism arrives at the same conclusion as a philosophical critique of STEM is itself noteworthy. It suggests that the decolonial turn is not merely the concern of a singular subfield but represents a broad reorientation of the human sciences, one that this journal is well positioned to advance. Collectively, these studies establish cognitive justice, the equal dignity of diverse ways of knowing, as a foundational commitment of critical communications.

5. Artificial Intelligence and the New Frontier of Epistemic Power

If decoloniality is the historical thread of the issue, artificial intelligence is its contemporary counterpart. Several contributions converge on technology that is now embedded in the infrastructure of teaching, assessment, research, and publishing. Together, they exemplify the critical posture that the moment demands: neither a technophobic refusal nor an uncritical embrace, but a disciplined interrogation of AI as a distributor of epistemic power.

The most theoretically ambitious of these perspectives analyses the adoption of AI in university classrooms through the dual lenses of inclusivity and decoloniality. Its central provocation is that AI is not a neutral aid but an epistemological actor; that algorithmic bias is a pedagogical problem rather than merely a technical one; that uneven access stratifies rather than democratises; and that the standardisation encouraged by AI crowds out plural ways of knowing. These claims are well-supported. A decade of critical scholarship has shown that ostensibly objective systems encode and amplify social hierarchies, that search engines can entrench racism (Noble, 2018), that discriminatory assumptions become embedded in the very design of technology as a "new Jim code" (Benjamin, 2019), that automated tools disproportionately profile and police the poor (Eubanks, 2018), that commercial facial-analysis systems misclassify darker-skinned and female faces at strikingly higher rates (Buolamwini & Gebru, 2018), and that the extraction of data has become a frontier of accumulation with distinctly colonial contours (Couldry & Mejias, 2019; Crawford, 2021). Synthesising these insights into an inclusive-decolonial pedagogy presents a challenge that every university now faces and complements a growing literature calling for the decolonisation of AI ethics in education itself (Zembylas, 2023).

Other contributions translate this critical sensibility into constructive frameworks. A conceptual analysis of AI in mathematics education, guided by self-regulated learning theory, weighs the technology's genuine capacity to personalise instruction and widen access against the danger that excessive reliance may erode the reasoning, reflection, and problem-solving that constitute mathematical understanding. Its conclusion, that AI's educational value is contingent on its capacity to support rather than supplant learner agency, serves as a model of measured judgement.

A companion study turns to Nigerian higher education, arguing that human-centred AI cannot be an afterthought bolted onto imported systems but must be built through a deliberate governance architecture that positions students, lecturers, and institutional communities at its centre, supported by pillars of equity, ethics, well-being, and accountability, and grounded in the infrastructural and regulatory realities of the context. Here, the general cautions of critical AI studies acquire local specificity: without such an architecture, AI adoption is likely to reproduce and deepen existing inequalities rather than remedy them (Selwyn, 2022; Williamson & Eynon, 2020).

A further study confronts the question that now presses on every editor and supervisor: what constitutes the ethical use of AI in academic writing and research? Rejecting the sterile binary of prohibition versus permission, it proposes an integrative framework built on transparency, responsibility, authorship-accountability, comprehension, and equity, and it reframes responsible AI use as a disciplined, disclosed collaboration with a non-author tool. For a journal being born into the generative AI era, this contribution is more than timely; it is constitutive. The norms of disclosure and accountability it articulates are precisely those a critical journal must adopt in its own editorial practice. Taken together, these studies of artificial intelligence demonstrate that technological criticality and epistemic justice are not competing agendas but a single one: the question of who governs the machines that increasingly govern what we know.

6. Governance, Political Economy, and the Architecture of Justice

A third thread grounds the issue's epistemic and technological concerns in the material institutions through which education and development are organised and frequently frustrated. Several studies examine the governance of universities, schooling systems, and rural development, with each reaching a conclusion that shares the same structural shape: that dysfunction is rarely the sum of isolated managerial failures and is better understood as the surface expression of deeper contradictions in the distribution of power and resources.

A critical communication on planning and administration in Nigerian universities makes this argument directly. It interprets the recurrent pathologies of the system, namely, policy inconsistency, bureaucratic rigidity, funding constraints, and accountability deficits, not as discrete lapses but as symptoms of an underlying contradiction between professional academic work and centralised state control. The proposed conceptual model, in which five such tensions converge on institutional sustainability, exemplifies the theoretically disciplined reflection this journal seeks to publish.

The political-economy analysis of Sustainable Development Goal 4 in the United States extends the same logic to the world's largest economy, exposing a revealing paradox: extraordinary national wealth (measured at the national level) coexists with educational outcomes stratified by income, neighbourhood, race, and class. Following the PRISMA protocol, the review synthesises evidence that locally financed schooling channels vast sums disproportionately to advantaged districts, that residential and collegiate segregation compounds advantage across the life course, and that pandemic disruption widened already substantial gaps. Its central contention, that the American pursuit of SDG 4 is constrained less by resource scarcity than by the political-economic architecture that distributes those resources, is a bracing reminder that the critique of inequality is not the property of the Global South alone.

A systematic review of political governance and rural development in West Africa carries the thread further. Synthesising evidence in accordance with PRISMA guidelines, it finds that decentralisation improves rural outcomes only when genuine fiscal authority, administrative capacity, and downward accountability accompany the transfer of functions, and that corruption and conflict consistently erode the developmental returns on public expenditure. In candidly noting the evidence base's skew towards Anglophone states and cross-sectional designs, it also models the reflexivity about the geography of knowledge production that this journal prizes. Together, these studies insist that epistemic justice cannot be achieved in isolation from institutional and economic justice, and that how we govern is inseparable from how, and whether, we come to know (Demaria et al., 2023; Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018).

7. Toward a Pluriversal Communications Scholarship

Read as a single intellectual statement, the inaugural issue advances a thesis larger than any of its parts. It posits that the great questions of contemporary education and development, namely, how to decolonise knowledge, how to govern intelligent machines, and how to distribute educational

opportunity justly, are, at their core, the same question, posed in different registers.Each concerns the construction and communication of knowledge and value: who authorises it, who is served by it, and who is silenced in the process. The studies gathered here express, with consistent emphasis, that neutrality is a myth that conceals power, and that the alternative is not a new monoculture but a pluriverse, a world in which many knowledge systems coexist on terms of genuine equality (Mignolo & Walsh, 2018; Ngara, 2017; Santos, 2014).

This is why the journal takes cognitive justice as its lodestar. The concept articulates an aspiration that is both epistemological and political: the diverse ways in which human communities interpret their worlds deserve equal standing, and the institutions of scholarship and governance should be restructured to honour that equality and invite our engagement on these terms. This aspiration unites the ethnomathematician and the AI ethicist, the university planner and the disability activist, the theorist of coloniality and the analyst of school finance. The recurrence across these studies of original conceptual frameworks, such as three-level analytics, four-quadrant diagnostics, and layered governance models, signals a further ambition that this journal shares: the determination that scholars everywhere, regardless of their location or tradition, will be treated as (co-)producers (with concerned others) of theory, rather than merely as suppliers of data to be theorised elsewhere. This determination encapsulates much of what critical communications entails.

8. An Invitation

A journal is not a container for finished knowledge but a forum for its creation. In launching the Interdisciplinary Journal of Critical Communications, we commit ourselves to several principles that this first issue already embodies. We will privilege scholarship that interrogates rather than assumes, that makes its normative commitments explicit rather than smuggling them in under the guise of neutrality. We will welcome a full range of scholarly genres, from rigorous systematic reviews to conceptual essays and community practice notes, in the conviction that no single form holds a monopoly on insight. We will insist on methodological transparency and analytic honesty, including transparency about the tools, generative AI among them, that increasingly shape academic work. And we will maintain a hospitable space for voices and knowledge traditions that the dominant circuits of publication have too often pushed to the margins.

The task is considerable, and no editorial board accomplishes it alone. We therefore extend an invitation to scholars, practitioners, and communities who share the conviction that the construction and communication of knowledge is a matter of justice: submit your most searching work; contest the arguments assembled here; enrich the conversation this issue begins. The studies that follow do not close any debate; they open one, and they do so with coherence and ambition that augur well for the enterprise. If they persuade the reader of a single proposition, let it be this: that to think critically about how knowledge moves through our institutions, our technologies, and our languages is not an academic luxury but a precondition for a more just and genuinely plural world. It is to the pursuit of that world that this journal is dedicated.

9. Declarations

Author Contributions: Conceptualisation (B.I.O. & N.R.); Literature review (B.I.O. & N.R.); methodology (B.I.O. & N.R.); software (N/A.); validation (N.R.); formal analysis (B.I.O. & N.R.); investigation (B.I.O. & N.R.); data curation (N/A); drafting and preparation (B.I.O. & N.R.); review and editing (B.I.O. & N.R.); supervision (N/A); project administration (B.I.O.); funding acquisition (N/A.). All authors have read and approved the published version of the article.

Funding: This research did not receive any external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest

Data Availability Statement: This review is based entirely on publicly available data and information sourced from peer-reviewed articles, reports, and other academic publications cited in

the manuscript. No new primary data were generated or analysed during this study. Readers may refer to the cited sources for detailed information.

References

Akena, F. A. (2012). Critical analysis of the production of Western knowledge and its implications for Indigenous knowledge and decolonization. *Journal of Black Studies, 43*(6), 599-619.

Aoki Inoue, C. Y., Ribeiro, T., Gonçalves, V. K., Basso, L., & Franco Moreira, P. (2024). Indigenous and traditional communities' ways of knowing and being in planetary justice. *Environmental Politics, 33*(7), 1225–1244.

Aoki Inoue, C. Y., Ribeiro, T., Gonçalves, V. K., Basso, L., & Moreira, P. (2024). Indigenous and traditional communities' ways of knowing and being in planetary justice. *Environmental Politics, 33*(7), 1225-1244.

Batiibwe, M. S. K. (2024). The role of ethnomathematics in mathematics education: A literature review. *Asian Journal for Mathematics Education, 3*(4), 383-405. https://doi.org/10.1177/27527263241300400

Benjamin, R. (2019). Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the new Jim code. Polity Press.

Buolamwini, J., & Gebru, T. (2018). Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, 81*, 77–91.

Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). The costs of connection: How data are colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism.*Social Forces, 99*(1), e6. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/soz172

Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. Yale University Press.

Demaria, F., Kothari, A., Salleh, A., Escobar, A., & Acosta, A. (2023). *Post-development: From the critique of development to a pluriverse of alternatives*. In The Barcelona school of ecological economics and political ecology: A companion in honour of Joan Martinez-Alier (pp. 59-69). Springer.

Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.

Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press.

Hui, Y. (2024). *Machine and sovereignty*. University of Minnesota Press.

Mbembe, A. J. (2016). *Decolonizing the university: New* directions. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 15*(1), 29–45. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022215618513

Mignolo, W. D., & Walsh, C. E. (2018). *On decoloniality: Concepts, analytics, praxis*. Duke University Press.

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

Ngara, R. (2017). Multiple voices, multiple paths. In P. Ngulube (Ed.), *Handbook of research on theoretical perspectives on Indigenous Knowledge Systems in developing countries* (pp. 332-358). IGI Global.

Ngulube, P. (2025). Indigenous theories and theorisation in African scholarship in the quest for epistemic freedom. In P. Ngulube (Ed.), *Harnessing Indigenous epistemologies for sustainable progress* (pp.139-172). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.

Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. New York University Press.

Omodan, B. I. (2025). Building reciprocal relationships through decolonial practices in academic research. *Cogent Social Sciences*, *11*(1), 2443558. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2024.2443558

Romm, N. R. A. (2025). Harvesting Indigenous onto-epistemologies for contributing to a more balanced and sustainable future. In P. Ngulube (Ed.), *Harnessing Indigenous epistemologies for sustainable progress* (pp. 51-72). IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-8447-3.ch003

Rosen, S. M., Jacobs, C. E., Whitelaw, J., Mallikaarjun, V. R., & Rust, F. (2024). Justice-centered reflective practice in teacher education: Pedagogy as a process of imaginative and hopeful invention. *Education Sciences, 14*(4), 376. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14040376

Santos, B. de S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide.* Paradigm Publishers.

Selwyn, N. (2022). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates* (3rd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.

Stein, S., Andreotti, V., Suša, R., Amsler, S., Hunt, D., Ahenakew, C., ... & Okano, H. (2020). Gesturing towards decolonial futures: Reflections on our learnings thus far. *Nordic Journal of Comparative and International Education (NJCIE), 4*(1), 43-65.

Wendt, S. P., Litvin, L., & Hempel, F. (2024). Epistemic and social diversity as an aspect of evaluating interdisciplinary research. *Issues in Interdisciplinary Studies, 42*(1/2), 223-248.

Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. *Learning, Media and Technology, 45*(3), 223–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1798995

Zembylas, M. (2023). A decolonial approach to AI in higher education teaching and learning: Strategies for undoing the ethics of digital neocolonialism. *Learning, Media and Technology, 48*(1), 25–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2021.2010094

Disclaimer: The views, perspectives, information, and data contained within all publications are exclusively those of the respective author(s) and contributor(s) and do not represent or reflect the positions of ERRCD Forum and/or its editor(s). ERRCD Forum and its editor(s) expressly disclaim responsibility for any damages to persons or property arising from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referenced in the content.