

Creative Changemaking and the Crisis of Malperformative Inclusion: A Scholarly Personal Narrative Literature Review of International Student Experience in Canadian Higher Education

Amy Tucker, Royal Roads University, Canada; Thompson Rivers University, Canada

Abstract: This literature review synthesizes scholarship on the international student experience in Canadian higher education, introducing “malperformative inclusion” as a conceptual framework for understanding how institutions demonstrate awareness of equity problems while maintaining structures that produce them. Extending Sara Ahmed’s analysis of non-performative diversity statements, this review argues that contemporary practices have evolved beyond mere failure to act to the strategic deployment of inclusion rhetoric, thereby forestalling substantive change. Drawing on scholarly personal narrative methodology, this review synthesizes literature across performativity theory, epistemic justice, the Canadian education context, trauma-informed pedagogy, and participatory methods. Each domain is subjected to critical examination through inversion thinking. The review introduces “Ghost Data” as a methodological innovation and proposes “transformational accountability” for research serving participant communities.

Keywords: malperformative inclusion; literature review; international students; epistemic justice; academic capitalism; Canadian higher education; ghost data

Introduction: Locating the Review

“**W**here do I put grandmother’s leadership wisdom?” This question, posed by an international student at Thompson Rivers University on unceded Secwépemc territory, Kamloops, British Columbia, Canada, animates this literature review. She held the assignment rubric, pointing to the requirement for “scholarly sources,” asking where her grandmother’s teachings fit within academic knowledge hierarchies. The question exposed the gap between institutional diversity rhetoric and epistemic practice: Canadian higher education celebrates the presence of international students while systematically excluding their knowledge traditions. We count their bodies in diversity statistics while discounting their ways of knowing in assessment criteria.

This literature review synthesizes scholarship addressing this gap, introducing *malperformative inclusion* as a conceptual framework for understanding how institutions actively demonstrate awareness of equity problems while maintaining the structural conditions that produce those problems. Building on Sara Ahmed’s (2006, 2012) analysis of non-performative diversity statements, I argue that contemporary institutional practices have evolved into something more troubling: strategic deployment of inclusion rhetoric that functions to forestall substantive change.

Following Nash’s (2004) scholarly personal narrative methodology, this review integrates *me-search* (examining positionality), *re-search* (synthesizing literature), and *we-search* (extending toward collective action). Nash and Bradley (2011) argue that scholarly personal narrative treats personal experience as a legitimate source of scholarly insight when systematically connected to theoretical frameworks. This structure reflects a commitment to making the researcher’s positionality visible as analytical data rather than bias to be bracketed.

The review synthesizes scholarship across five interconnected domains: performativity theory and institutional critique; epistemic justice and knowledge hierarchies; the Canadian education context; trauma-informed pedagogy and relational ethics; and participatory research methodologies. Throughout, I employ inversion thinking, systematically considering alternative interpretations and limitations of the frameworks presented. This approach, drawing on de Bono’s (1985) lateral thinking tradition, strengthens conceptual frameworks by subjecting assumptions to stress testing rather than accepting them uncritically. Each domain receives both a synthesis and a systematic critique that asks what each framework obscures and what it reveals.

Me-Search: Positionality as Analytical Framework

I am a white settler woman, doctoral candidate, and contract faculty member whose employment depends on international student enrolment. When international students pay tuition nearly five times the domestic rate (\$28,000

versus \$6,000 annually at Thompson Rivers University), the resulting differential funds the courses I teach. Their exploitation sustains my precarity. Any critique must account for this complicity.

Ahmed (2012) describes diversity practitioners' experiences of institutions as “brick walls”: solid structures that appear only upon contact. Those who move easily through institutional spaces may never perceive these walls because they never encounter resistance. My position at the intersection of precarity and privilege allows me to witness both the walls that students encounter and the doors that open for me. I see curriculum committees approve “internationalization” initiatives while rejecting proposals to reduce international student tuition. I watch colleagues celebrate diversity statistics while complaining about international students' English proficiency. I experience the institution simultaneously as welcoming (to me) and excluding (to those I teach).

The concept of *asymmetrical precarity* emerged from these contradictions: contract faculty and international students both navigate uncertain terrain, both perform belonging while experiencing exclusion, and both invest in pathways that evidence suggests are unlikely to deliver promised outcomes (Brunner, 2021; Brunner et al., 2024; Stein & Andreotti, 2016). But stakes differ dramatically. When my contract ends, I face financial hardship and professional disappointment. When a student's Post-Graduation Work Permit expires without permanent residency, they face deportation, family separation, and the collapse of years of financial and emotional investment. Recognizing structural resonance while refusing false equivalence is essential to ethical research with populations whose precarity exceeds one's own.

An inversion of this positionality, however, raises important questions. Perhaps complicity does not enable insight but instead distorts it: maybe I see what serves my interests rather than what serves students. Pillow's (2003) work on “uncomfortable reflexivity” cautions against self-reflexivity becoming self-congratulation. The me-search must remain uncomfortable, acknowledging that my position may produce blind spots as readily as insights. This tension cannot be resolved; it must be maintained throughout the review.

Re-Search: Synthesizing the Literature

Domain One: Performativity Theory and Institutional Critique

Ahmed's (2006, 2012) analysis of diversity work provides the theoretical foundation for this review. Drawing on Austin's (1962) speech act theory, Ahmed argues that institutional diversity statements function as “non-performatives”: utterances that do not bring about what they name. When universities declare a commitment to diversity, that declaration may substitute for, rather than initiate, action. The statement becomes the action; having said the words, the institution considers itself to have addressed the problem. This substitution operates below the level of conscious intention: administrators may genuinely believe that creating a diversity statement represents meaningful action.

Ahmed's (2012) interviews with diversity practitioners reveal exhausting labour in trying to make institutions act on their stated commitments, encountering resistance that is invisible to those who move easily through institutional spaces. This resistance takes multiple forms: committee delays, funding diversions, strategic forgetting, and leadership turnover that resets institutional memory. The “brick wall” metaphor captures this precisely: solid structures that appear only upon contact. Those who never push against walls may sincerely believe they do not exist.

I extend Ahmed's framework by proposing that contemporary practices have evolved beyond non-performativity into *malperformative inclusion*. Where non-performative statements fail to produce intended effects, malperformative practices actively maintain inequitable conditions by appearing to address them. The distinction is between institutional inaction (non-performativity) and institutional action that prevents change (malperformative inclusion). The diversity office documenting barriers without removing them, the equity committee producing reports without implementing recommendations, the internationalization strategy recruiting students without supporting them: these are expressions of institutional logic under academic capitalism rather than failures of institutional will. Documentation creates an appearance of action while ensuring actual conditions remain unchanged.

Table 1: Evolution of Performativity Concepts in Institutional Analysis

<i>Concept</i>	<i>Definition</i>	<i>Institutional Function</i>	<i>Example</i>
Performativity (Austin, 1962)	Speech acts bring about what they name	Creates a new reality through utterance	“I now pronounce you married.”
Non-performativity (Ahmed, 2006)	Statements failing to bring about what they name	Statement substitutes for action	Diversity statement without implementation
Malperformative inclusion (proposed)	Practices succeed by appearing to address problems while ensuring persistence	Forestalls change through the performance of awareness	Equity audit documenting but not removing barriers

Note. This progression illustrates the evolution from a state of inaction (non-performativity) to the active maintenance of inequitable conditions through the performance of awareness.

Source(s): Author's compilation, drawing on Austin (1962) and Ahmed (2006).

Inversion and critique.

The malperformative inclusion framework invites several inversions. First, what if institutional diversity work is genuinely struggling within resource constraints rather than strategically preventing change? Institutions face competing demands: equity work, fiscal sustainability, regulatory compliance, and stakeholder management. What appears as malperformative may reflect genuine constraint rather than strategic obstruction. Sara Ahmed herself left her university position over failures to address sexual harassment, yet this departure might indicate institutional dysfunction rather than strategic malice.

Second, might documentation and reporting serve functions beyond forestalling change? Institutional memory, legal protection, and incremental progress often require documentation. The report that sits unimplemented today may enable action when political conditions shift. Ahmed's (2017) work on complaints acknowledges this complexity: complaints create institutional records that matter even when immediate action does not follow. The framework must distinguish strategic obstruction from bureaucratic friction, as related but distinct phenomena.

Domain Two: Epistemic Justice and Knowledge Hierarchies

Fricker's (2007) concept of epistemic injustice provides essential tools for analyzing the knowledge dimensions of institutional inclusion. Fricker identifies two primary forms: *testimonial injustice* occurs when prejudice deflates a speaker's credibility; *hermeneutical injustice* occurs when gaps in interpretive resources disadvantage someone's understanding of their own experience. When my student asked where to place her grandmother's wisdom, she experienced both: her grandmother's knowledge faced credibility deflation, and she lacked resources to understand this exclusion because the curriculum presented citation practices as neutral rather than culturally specific.

Dotson (2011) extends Fricker's framework by introducing the concept of testimonial smothering: the self-imposed truncation of testimony when speakers perceive audiences as unwilling to receive their words. International students may engage in testimonial smothering when they learn that specific contributions will fail to be valued. Medina (2013) further develops this through *epistemic resistance*, exploring how marginalized knowers develop alternative epistemic practices. This literature suggests that epistemic exclusion produces both harm and distinctive forms of knowledge and resistance.

Inversion and critique.

The epistemic justice framework raises questions when inverted. First, do academic citation requirements represent cultural imperialism, or do they serve legitimate functions of traceability, verification, and the building of cumulative knowledge? Perhaps grandmother's wisdom and peer-reviewed scholarship serve different epistemic purposes rather than occupying a hierarchical relationship. Pluralizing knowledge forms need not mean abandoning all evaluative criteria. The challenge is distinguishing legitimate epistemic standards from illegitimate gatekeeping.

Second, might testimonial smothering sometimes reflect accurate assessment rather than oppressive silencing? Students navigate multiple knowledge contexts; choosing which knowledge to deploy in which contexts demonstrates sophisticated epistemic agency. Some silence is strategic rather than smothering. Yancy's (2017) work on "white gaze" suggests marginalized speakers sometimes withhold from recognition that specific audiences cannot receive their knowledge productively. The framework must honour agency within constraint.

Domain Three: The Canadian Edugration Context

Brunner's (2021, 2024) concept of *edugration* captures the distinctive Canadian policy landscape. Edugration and immigration are intertwined, with international students pursuing Canadian credentials as a pathway to permanent residency. This creates a three-step pathway: study permit, Post-Graduation Work Permit (PGWP), and permanent residency application. Each step carries uncertainty and the possibility of collapse. The path functions as what Brunner calls a "wicked problem": complexly interconnected, resistant to simple solutions, and producing unintended consequences. Students make decisions based on policy conditions that may change before they complete their journeys.

The 2024 federal policy changes that reduce study permits by 35% demonstrate how quickly this landscape shifts, leaving students who began under different policy regimes stranded. Thompson Rivers University in Kamloops, British Columbia, where I teach, presents challenges: a small city with limited employment opportunities makes it difficult to obtain the Canadian work experience required for permanent residency. Students recruited with implicit promises of a pathway to residency find themselves in locations where that pathway is structurally constrained. The institution benefits from its tuition, while the region cannot deliver on migration expectations.

Slaughter and Rhoades's (2004) academic capitalism provides a broader framing: market behaviours in which universities treat students as revenue sources and knowledge as a commodity. International students occupy a particular position: paying premium tuition that subsidizes domestic education while receiving services designed for different populations. The differential tuition structure at TRU (\$28,000 versus \$6,000 annually) makes explicit the extraction enabled by academic capitalism. Stein and Andreotti (2016) extend this by analyzing how international students function within "global imaginaries" of competition, charity, and cash, with each imaginary producing different institutional responses and student subjectivities. The competition imaginary positions students as assets to be recruited; the charity imaginary positions them as beneficiaries of Western education; the cash imaginary positions them as revenue sources. All three imaginaries operate simultaneously, creating contradictory institutional behaviours.

Berlant's (2011) *cruel optimism* illuminates the affective dimension: attachment to conditions obstructing flourishing. Students exhibit cruel optimism, continuing investment in pathways unlikely to deliver promised outcomes. Importantly, this is often the only available option, the least-bad choice among constrained alternatives, rather than irrational attachment. The cruelty lies in the structures that offer hope while withholding the means to realize it.

Inversion and critique.

The edugration critique invites inversion. First, differential tuition may represent a legitimate pricing mechanism reflecting actual costs and market dynamics rather than exploitation. International students consume institutional resources, often require additional support services, and their fees enable services for all students. The "subsidy" framing assumes that domestic tuition reflects the true cost rather than the political suppression of fees. Economic analysis might complicate the narrative of exploitation.

Second, cruel optimism might be reframed as a form of *strategic hope*. Students pursuing edugration pathways often possess a sophisticated understanding of risks. Their continued investment reflects calculated risk-taking rather than naive attachment. Appadurai's (2013) concept of the "capacity to aspire" suggests that hope itself is unevenly distributed; the capacity to imagine and pursue better futures constitutes a form of agency, even when outcomes remain uncertain. Reframing cruel optimism as strategic hope honours student agency while acknowledging structural constraint.

Domain Four: Trauma-Informed Pedagogy and Relational Ethics

Carello and Butler's (2014, 2015) work distinguishes teaching trauma content from trauma-informed teaching. A course might address migration or displacement as subject matter without attending to how course structures affect

students navigating these experiences. Teaching *about* precarity differs from teaching *amid* precarity. Their five principles, namely safety, trustworthiness, choice, collaboration, and empowerment, offer a framework for educational practice with populations experiencing ongoing precarity.

Wilson's (2008) Indigenous research paradigm provides complementary grounding through *relational accountability*. Wilson (2008) argues that research is ceremony: relationships formed during inquiry carry obligations extending beyond publication to community benefit. Smith's (1999, 2021) call to decolonize methodologies exposes how Western academic conventions systematically devalue non-Western knowing. Kovach (2009) extends this through a detailed examination of Indigenous methods, emphasizing that ethical research requires an ongoing relationship rather than transactional consent.

Inversion and critique.

Trauma-informed approaches invite scrutiny. First, does the universal application of trauma-informed frameworks risk pathologizing normal responses to difficult circumstances? Many international students navigate challenges with resilience and even enjoyment rather than experiencing trauma. Over-application of trauma frameworks can inadvertently reproduce deficit narratives, positioning students as damaged rather than capable. The framework must distinguish between creating supportive environments and assuming universal vulnerability.

Second, relational accountability may conflict with research integrity requirements. Ethics boards mandate confidentiality, limited contact, and clear boundaries that potentially oppose ongoing relational obligations. The tension between Indigenous and institutional research ethics cannot always be resolved; at times, researchers must choose which form of accountability to prioritize. Acknowledging this tension honestly serves research integrity better than pretending harmony exists.

Domain Five: Participatory Research Methodologies and Student Voice

Wang and Burris's (1997) photovoice methodology positions participants as experts on their own lives, using photography to document experiences that institutional metrics cannot capture. Emerging from Freire's (1970) critical pedagogy and commitment to conscientization, the development of crucial awareness through reflection and action, photovoice enables visual documentation of lived experience for dialogue with decision-makers. The methodology recognizes that participants hold knowledge that researchers lack: embodied understanding of navigating institutional spaces, tacit awareness of barriers and workarounds, and experiential learning that surveys and interviews may overlook.

Cook-Sather, Bovill, and Felten's (2014) students-as-partners framework extends participatory principles by emphasizing reciprocal learning and genuine power-sharing. The framework challenges hierarchical assumptions, positioning faculty as knowledge-holders and students as knowledge-recipients. For international students, partnership approaches can create space for expertise about their own experiences to inform institutional practice. However, as noted throughout this review, partnership rhetoric can itself become malperformative: institutions claim partnership while maintaining structures that preclude genuine power redistribution.

Tuck's (2009) influential call for desire-based research critiques damage-centred approaches that document community pain without attending to wisdom, hope, and vision. Tuck argues that damage-centred research, however well-intentioned, can reinforce deficit narratives and serve institutional interests more than community benefit. Documenting "at-risk" populations, cataloguing barriers, and measuring gaps may justify researchers' careers and institutional programs without producing change. The shift from damage to desire reorients research toward community aspirations rather than community problems.

Drawing on this literature, I propose Ghost Data as a methodological concept: treating participant withdrawal, non-response, and silence as structural evidence rather than as methodological failure. If participants withdraw due to conditions under study, such as visa changes, work pressures, or housing crises, their absence supports the research thesis. The *thesis of absence* holds that research losing participants to precarity validates its analysis through that very loss. Systematic coding through an *attrition audit* transforms methodological limitations into an institutional diagnosis. Categories include pathway displacement, extraction exhaustion, testimonial smothering, and infrastructural fallacy.

Inversion and critique.

Participatory methodologies and Ghost Data warrant critical examination. First, partnership rhetoric can become malperformative: institutions claim to “partner” with students while maintaining structures that preclude genuine power-sharing. The students-as-partners framework may inadvertently legitimize institutional practices by providing an appearance of student involvement. A genuine partnership requires the redistribution of resources and decision-making authority rather than merely consultation.

Second, Ghost Data risks romanticizing absence. Sometimes participants withdraw for reasons unrelated to structural conditions, such as personal circumstances, diminished interest, or better opportunities. Attributing all attrition to structural barriers may overstate the case. The framework requires careful documentation of withdrawal contexts rather than automatic attribution to precarity. Additionally, Ghost Data cannot capture the experiences of those who never enrolled, since the actual ghosts remain invisible even to frameworks designed to make absence visible.

Critical Synthesis: Convergences and Tensions

The five domains reviewed converge on several insights while maintaining productive tensions that sharpen rather than undermine analytical power. First, all frameworks address gaps between institutional rhetoric and lived experience. Whether examining performativity, epistemic justice, edugration, trauma-informed practice, or participatory research, scholarship consistently identifies a disconnection between stated commitments and actual conditions. Ahmed's brick walls, Brunner's pathway collapse, Fricker's credibility deficits, and Tuck's damage narratives all point toward the structural production of gaps that individual good intentions cannot bridge. This convergence suggests the gap is structural rather than incidental, produced by institutional logics rather than personal failures.

Second, all frameworks address knowledge politics. Whose knowledge counts, how it is validated, and who benefits from knowledge production emerge as central concerns across literatures. Ahmed's non-performativity reveals how institutional knowing substitutes for institutional doing. Fricker's epistemic injustice exposes the credibility economies that privilege certain knowers. Brunner's edugration analysis shows how pathway knowledge, including understanding of immigration systems, labour markets, and credential recognition, becomes crucial yet unequally distributed capital. Wilson's relational accountability and Wang and Burris's photovoice methodology foreground questions of epistemic authority and legitimacy, asking who speaks, who listens, and whose interpretations prevail.

Third, tensions emerge around agency and structure. Frameworks that emphasize structural constraint (academic capitalism, epistemic injustice, cruel optimism) may understate student agency; frameworks that emphasize voice and partnership (photovoice, students-as-partners) may overstate students' capacity for individual action within constraining structures. The synthesis suggests holding both simultaneously: structures constrain, while agency persists within those constraints. Neither structural determinism nor voluntarism adequately captures the international student experience. Students are neither passive victims of institutional forces nor free agents unaffected by structural position.

Fourth, tensions emerge around reform and transformation. Some frameworks (students-as-partners, trauma-informed pedagogy) assume institutions can be improved through better practices; others (academic capitalism critique, decolonizing methodologies) suggest institutions are fundamentally structured to reproduce inequality. Meyerhoff's (2019) distinction between “studying” and “education” and Tuck and Yang's (2012) insistence that decolonization is not metaphor push toward a more fundamental transformation that existing institutions may be unable to accommodate. The synthesis cannot resolve this tension but must acknowledge it: incremental improvement and fundamental transformation may require different strategies, different frameworks, and different timelines. Those working within institutions, while critiquing them, must navigate this tension without pretending it does not exist.

We-Search: Implications for Research and Practice

The synthesized literature suggests a framework for addressing malperformative inclusion through four interconnected dimensions. First, *epistemic justice* requires transforming knowledge hierarchies to recognize diverse ways of knowing, moving beyond a merely surface-level celebration of cultural diversity to substantive inclusion of non-Western epistemologies in curriculum and assessment. This means questioning the frameworks themselves rather than

simply adding “diverse perspectives” to existing frameworks. Second, *structural accountability* demands that institutions examine how policies and practices produce the precarity they claim to address, including honest reckoning with differential tuition structures, inadequate support services, and pathway uncertainties that institutions create and maintain.

Third, *relational ethics* requires ongoing accountability to affected communities, treating students as partners rather than as revenue sources, and maintaining relationships that extend beyond transactional interactions. This challenges the dominant model of student-as-customer that academic capitalism has normalized. Fourth, *trauma-informed practice* examines how institutional processes either reproduce or mitigate harm, and it designs systems that prioritize safety, choice, and empowerment. These dimensions interact dynamically: epistemic justice without structural accountability leaves hierarchies symbolically disrupted but materially intact; structural accountability without relational ethics produces policy changes that fail to serve affected communities.

For graduate student researchers, this review offers several practical implications. First, recognize participant-generated concepts as theoretical contributions deserving scholarly credit. Concepts emerging from participant experience, whether “checkbox inclusion,” “loneliness of diversity,” or “infrastructural fallacy,” represent legitimate theoretical work that advances understanding. Cite participants as theorists when their concepts illuminate phenomena. Second, make positionality analytically productive rather than treating it as bias to bracket. The me-search is ongoing analytical work that informs every research phase, rather than a preliminary disclosure to be completed and set aside.

Third, commit to *transformational accountability*: ensuring that research serves participant communities rather than primarily advancing researchers' careers. Ask honestly: What will this research change? How will participants benefit? If answers are mainly “degree completion” or “publication,” redesign the instrument to include action components that serve the individuals you study. Fourth, implement Ghost Data systematically and document the structural conditions that produce participant silence. Track withdrawal contexts using the attrition audit framework, recognizing that research losing participants to precarity demonstrates its thesis through that loss. Fifth, acknowledge tensions and limitations honestly rather than presenting frameworks as comprehensive solutions. The inversions explored throughout this review remind us that frameworks are tools rather than truths, useful for specific purposes and limited in others.

Contribution to the Literature

This review contributes to scholarship in several ways. First, the concept of *malperformative inclusion* extends Ahmed's non-performativity framework by identifying a more active institutional modality. Where non-performativity describes institutional statements that fail to produce effects, malperformative inclusion names institutional actions that succeed precisely by appearing to address problems while ensuring their persistence. This distinction has significant implications for evaluating institutional equity efforts: it suggests that documentation, auditing, and reporting can function as barriers to change rather than steps toward it. The framework provides practitioners and scholars with diagnostic power to distinguish substantive transformation from its performance.

Second, *Ghost Data* offers methodological innovation for participatory research traditions. By providing a systematic approach to treating participant withdrawal as structural evidence, the framework transforms what is typically considered methodological failure into analytical data. The attrition audit, thesis of absence, and coding categories (pathway displacement, extraction exhaustion, testimonial smothering, infrastructural fallacy) offer replicable tools for documenting how structural conditions shape research participation. This framework extends to contexts in which researchers study conditions that affect participants' capacity to participate; for example, research on precarity, migration, health disparities, and community-based participatory research may employ Ghost Data analysis.

Third, the review models integration of inversion thinking into literature synthesis. By systematically considering alternative interpretations alongside primary arguments, the review demonstrates how critique strengthens rather than undermines conceptual frameworks. This approach, which asks what frameworks obscure as well as reveal, considers how concepts might be misapplied, and examines tensions between frameworks, offers a template for critical literature synthesis that honours complexity while maintaining analytical clarity. The inversions sharpen the boundaries of frameworks and clarify appropriate applications rather than cancelling them.

Conclusion: Beyond Critique

My student's question about grandmother's leadership wisdom remains an ongoing provocation rather than a problem solved. The gap between institutional commitments and epistemic practices persists; my individual curricular adjustments do not transform the systems that produce that gap. The literature reviewed here offers no easy solutions because the problems are structural rather than technical. Yet the question, and the frameworks synthesized here, provide direction for creative changemaking that moves beyond malperformative inclusion toward substantive transformation.

The framework of malperformative inclusion names a phenomenon that many experience but struggle to articulate. When institutions appear to address equity concerns while conditions remain unchanged, when awareness is performed without subsequent action, and when documentation substitutes for transformation, malperformative inclusion is at work. Naming the phenomenon enables both recognition and resistance. The inversions explored throughout this review, including whether institutional behaviour reflects constraint rather than strategy, whether silence reflects agency rather than oppression, and whether reform enables or forecloses transformation, keep these tensions productively open rather than resolving them.

The Ghost Data framework transforms methodological limitations into institutional diagnostics: research losing participants to precarity demonstrates its thesis through that loss. Yet Ghost Data must be employed carefully, avoiding romanticization of absence and maintaining rigorous documentation of withdrawal contexts. Frameworks are tools rather than truths, useful for specific purposes and limited for others. The task is matching tools to purposes rather than treating any single framework as comprehensive.

Creative changemaking positions students as experts, agents, and visionaries of institutional futures that do not yet exist rather than as problems to be managed. It demands transformational accountability: research and practice that serve communities rather than merely study them. This is an uncomfortable position that requires ongoing examination of complicity, honest acknowledgment of limitations, and willingness to hold tensions that cannot be resolved. Where do we put grandmother's leadership wisdom? The question answers itself when we transform the systems that make it unanswerable. That transformation is the work this review seeks to enable.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. (2006). The nonperformativity of antiracism. *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism*, 7(1), 104–126. <https://doi.org/10.2979/MER.2006.7.1.104>
- Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822395324>
- Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. Duke University Press.
- Appadurai, A. (2013). *The future as cultural fact: Essays on the global condition*. Verso.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Clarendon Press.
- Berlant, L. (2011). *Cruel optimism*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822394716>
- Brunner, L. R. (2021). 'Edugration' as a wicked problem: Higher education and three-step immigration. *Journal of Comparative & International Higher Education*, 13(5S), 25–37. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jcihe.v13i5S.4061>
- Brunner, L. R., Karki, K. K., Valizadeh, N., Shokirova, T., & Coustere, C. (2024). Unfamiliarities, uncertainties, and ambivalent long-term intentions: Conceptualizing international student-migrant settlement and integration. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 25(2), 973–996.
- Carello, J., & Butler, L. D. (2014). Potentially perilous pedagogies: Teaching trauma is not the same as trauma-informed teaching. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, 15(2), 153–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15299732.2014.867571>
- Carello, J., & Butler, L. D. (2015). Practicing what we teach: Trauma-informed educational practice. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 35(3), 262–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841233.2015.1030059>
- Cook-Sather, A., Bovill, C., & Felten, P. (2014). *Engaging students as partners in learning and teaching: A guide for faculty*. Jossey-Bass.
- de Bono, E. (1985). *Six thinking hats*. Little, Brown.
- Dotson, K. (2011). Tracking epistemic violence, tracking practices of silencing. *Hypatia*, 26(2), 236–257. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2011.01177.x>
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
- Fricke, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198237907.001.0001>
- Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. University of Toronto Press.
- Medina, J. (2013). *The epistemology of resistance: Gender and racial oppression, epistemic injustice, and resistant imaginations*. Oxford University Press.
- Meyerhoff, E. (2019). *Beyond education: Radical studying for another world*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Nash, R. J. (2004). *Liberating scholarly writing: The power of personal narrative*. Teachers College Press.
- Nash, R. J., & Bradley, D. L. (2011). *Me-search and re-search: A guide for writing scholarly personal narrative manuscripts*. Information Age Publishing.

- Pillow, W. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(2), 175–196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0951839032000060635>
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Zed Books.
- Smith, L. T. (2021). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples* (3rd ed.). Zed Books.
- Stein, S., & Andreotti, V. (2016). Cash, competition, or charity: International students and the global imaginary. *Higher Education*, 72(2), 225–239. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9949-8>
- Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 79(3), 409–428. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.79.3.n0016675661t3n15>
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1–40. <https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/18630>
- Wang, C., & Burris, M. A. (1997). Photovoice: Concept, methodology, and use for participatory needs assessment. *Health Education & Behavior*, 24(3), 369–387. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109019819702400309>
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Fernwood Publishing.
- Yancy, G. (2017). *Black bodies, white gazes: The continuing significance of race in America* (2nd ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Amy Tucker: Amy Tucker is a doctoral candidate in the Doctor of Social Sciences program at Royal Roads University and a contract faculty member at Thompson Rivers University in Kamloops, British Columbia, Canada. Her research examines precarity, trauma, and resistance in neoliberal academia, with particular focus on international student experiences. She serves as Chair of the Federation of Post-Secondary Educators Non-Regular Faculty Committee and brings seventeen years of experience teaching organizational behaviour, business ethics, and leadership. ORCID: 0009-0006-9872-2248.