THAMMASAT REVIEW
PRINT ISSN: 0859-5747 ONLINE ISSN: 2630-0303
Volume 26 No 1 (January-June) 2023 [Page 224-243]

Emancipating Academic Dependency through Critical Discourse Studies-Based Language Analysis

Kiatipong Rerkwanchai *

Independent Scholar, Thailand

Received 28 December 2022; Received in revised form 27 June 2023
Accepted 28 June 2023; Available online 30 June 2023

Abstract

Academic dependency has been a topic of discussion in various academic disciplines. Attempts to address unequal relationships between academics in the Global South and Global North have also been explored through critique of Eurocentrism, decolonial projects and Southern theories. However, the efforts have often focused on a more abstract level, with attempts to interrogate European and U.S-based models, frameworks, and methods, and sometimes to replace and/or complement them with local and indigenous ones. One aspect that has largely been understudied is the analysis of language used in knowledge production and dissemination. In this article, I argue for an inclusion of CDS-based fine-grained language analysis in the intellectual decolonisation effort. Critical language analysis is crucial because it is through language use that academic dependency and marginalisation of alternative knowledge are subtly constructed, maintained and reproduced. Thus, being conscious of the language academics use when invoking particular theories or referring to particular social groups seems to be the first important step in any decolonial project. As a flexible framework, CDS can be adjusted to suit a variety of research questions and researchers' linguistic training backgrounds. Despite potential criticisms, I contend that the synergy between CDS-based linguistic analysis and intellectual decolonisation can considerably benefit both movements.

Keywords

Academic dependency, Critical discourse studies, Intellectual decolonisation, Southern theories

*** Corresponding author**: thinking.kid@gmail.com **DOI**: 10.14456/tureview.2023.9

Introduction

Research on academic dependency, or the fact that global knowledge and its production have a long history of depending on Global North/Western principles, has emerged fast across academic disciplines in several locations (e.g., Alatas, 1993; Alatas, 2004; Ergin & Alkan, 2019; Fouad, 2018; Gareau, 1988; Murphy & Zhu, 2012; Waisbord, 2022). The concern has been examined and scrutinised, and various domains have called for change at the institutional and personal levels (e.g. Bhambra et al., 2020; Mbembe, 2016). However, what has remained rather absent in the movement against academic dependency is focus on language. Therefore, this article argues that language used by Global South scholars and their counterparts in the North should be incorporated into the struggle as language plays a pivotal role in rendering the problem invisible, thereby perpetuating the inequalities and marginalised status experienced by academics located in the Global South. It is language, I contend, that contributes to the reproduction of what Malaysian sociologist Alatas (2004) calls the "captive mind," and one important step toward the rectification of this problem is to assist people in recognising that they are being held captive.

This article provides an overview of academic dependency and "intellectual decolonisation" movements. It argues that the task of decolonising and increasing academic independence can benefit greatly from critical language studies, as the focus on language can uncover hidden and usually unacknowledged ideologies that permeate throughout the process of knowledge production. Such ideologies contribute to the uncritical acceptance of Western values and perceiving them as universal and natural. Specifically, the article suggests that language analysis inspired by critical discourse studies (hereafter, CDS) can complement academic dependency theory as it can help lay bare the ideologies that are embedded in the language that is used in producing and sharing knowledge. Moreover, the synergy between CDS and intellectual decolonisation helps broaden the scope of CDS agenda. The article discusses the two concepts, argues for the compatibility between them, and addresses possible criticisms that may be directed at the synergy between these two frameworks.

Defining Global South and Global North

The terms Global South and Global North can have geopolitical and ideological reference. Geographically, Global South "refers broadly to the regions of Latin America, Asia, Africa, and Oceania" (Dados & Connell, 2012, p. 12). Such a definition, however, would falter when countries such as Australia are considered. Although Australia is geographically located in the southern hemisphere, given its economic prosperity and status as a core-English speaking country (the language usually associated with the North), the country clearly belongs to the Global North. The task of defining Global North and Global South has been made even more complex today in the era of migration and increased mobility when opportunities to

relocate and to receive an education from abroad are great. As rightly observed by Lazar (2020) and Canagarajah (2002), some centre scholars are now working in the periphery (such as a US scholar working in Africa), and periphery scholars can also conduct research in the centre (such as an Asian-born researcher working in an educational institution in Europe). These practices blur the fine distinction between who counts as a Global North or Global South knowledge producer.

Given this complexity, defining the phrases in ideological terms seems more appropriate. Ideologically, Global South and Global North highlight relations between the two groups of countries. That is, "Global South refers not so much to a region, and to more than merely a set of geopolitical inequalities" in various domains such as "indigeneity, race, class, sexuality, poverty, gender, and colonialism" (Pennycook & Makoni, 2019, p. 2). In discussions of knowledge production in particular, Global North refers to countries whose "works […] command more attention and acknowledgement than works produced elsewhere" (Von Gizycki, 1973, p. 474). Alatas (2003) defines these countries as those that produce a large number of influential works that have a global reach and receive global recognition and respect in global publication outlets. It is the definition based on this ideological stance that this article adopts, as it is aligned with the article's decolonial aim.

Forms of Academic Dependency

Academic dependency and colonialism are intertwined. Colonisation means not only the loss of land, but it "also involved loss of control and ownership of […] knowledge systems, beliefs, and behaviours [...]" (Chilisa, 2012, p. 9). Maldonado-Torres (2007) further draws a line between colonialism and coloniality. The former is focused on how one nation and people rely politically and economically on another nation, whereas the latter means "long-standing patterns of power that emerged as a result of colonialism, but that define culture, labour, intersubjective relations, and knowledge production well beyond the strict limits of colonial administrations" (Maldonado-Torres, 2007, p. 243). The effects of colonialism are long-lasting.

Academic dependency, or sometimes called "academic imperialism" (Alatas, 2000), refers to the control of the colonised through "the cultivation and application of various disciplines […] in the colonies" (Alatas, 2003, p. 600). It is a form of "domination of one people by another in their world of thinking" (Alatas, 2000, p. 24). Academic imperialism and dependency may come in various forms. For example, Alatas (2003) points out that in academia, academic dependency could refer to periphery academics' reliance on ideas, concepts, technologies, language and financial support generated and based in the Global North, as a result of higher education being corporatized in the era of neo-liberalism. Academics in the South may also feel obliged to follow the research agenda, research topics, research methods and standards of excellence set by the North (Alatas, 2003; Connell, 2020; Demeter, 2020; Sugiharto, 2021). However, they hardly engage in theory development, thus

forming detachment that further reinforces a global division of labour (Connell, 2017) or what Hountondji (1990) calls “extraversion.” That is,

> *[t]he role of the periphery is first to supply data, and later to apply knowledge in the form of technology and method. The role of the metropole, as well as producing data, is to collate and process data, producing theory (including methodology), and developing applications that are later exported to the periphery. (Connell, 2017, p. 6)*

Alatas (2003) considers this role the foundation for all other forms of dependency.

Currently, there is also a clear reliance on published resources such as books and scholarly journals. Academics in the Global South and Global North often aspire to have their research articles published in international academic journals, and they often conceive locally published journals as inferior (Sheridan, 2015). However, international journals are often produced in the Global North and operate under the logic of monopolisation, which can further entrench academic dependency. Collyer (2018) points out that academic journals from publishers in the Global North, especially, tend to be expensive because of monopolisation that allows subscription rates to be inflated. Owing to their prohibitive costs, they are frequently associated with prestige, meaning works published in these outlets tend to be seen as carrying more value.

In addition to these forms of dependency, recent scholarship has touched upon the issue of language. To publish in international venues, scholars must write in the English language and follow the writing styles of the metropole, given the international status of English and Anglo-American writing conventions as the scientific language and norms (Connell, 2017; Juntrasook & Burford, 2017). Academic discourse community is another important issue, but it is rarely addressed in the literature on academic dependency. A discourse community is a group of people who share beliefs, conventions and language to accomplish a particular goal (Casanave, 1995; Swales, 1990). Failure to conform to the rules and conventions within a discourse community could result in rejection and exclusion. In academic communication, for example, all research writers must follow certain generic conventions for their work to be accepted for “international” publication. In an interview with one editor of a Thai journal, it was found that he would be reluctant to accept a manuscript that did not adhere to the generic structure of a research paper (personal communication, 2020). Those who do not adhere to the rules of a specific discourse community can be seen as “ignorant” (Trahar et al., 2019). Thus, to thrive in academia, scholars in the South are obliged to “write in metropolitan genres, cite metropolitan literature, become part of a metropolitan discourse [by] describing [their society] in the mode of comparison [and] placing its specificity within metropolitan frameworks” (Connell, 2017, p. 8). Dependency on Western principles seems total, encompassing every process of knowledge production.

Intellectual Decolonisation: Concepts and Challenges

In response to academic dependency, attempts have been made to interrogate and dismantle the power relations between the Global South and Global North. Although these efforts have often been subsumed under various labels such as postcolonialism, the decolonial project, or Southern theories, distinctions can be drawn (Connell, 2017). The early and perhaps the most popular form of resistance comes from the post-colonial critique of European thought, exemplified by Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978). Said (1978) argues that the 19th century literary writings by European, particularly the British and French, often "produce[d] and manage[d]" the Orient by "express[ing] a will…not only to understand what [was] non-European, but also to control the manipulate what was manifestly different" (p. 12). Colonies were often portrayed in terms and conditions which stood in contrast to those attributed to the civilised Western, thereby creating the binary ways of thinking about both worlds. In addition to offering a critique of Eurocentric knowledge, the second camp—the decolonial project—validates indigenous knowledge as alternative. In proposing the epistemologies of the South, de Sousa Santos (2018) explains: the notion "concerns the production and validation of knowledge anchored in the experiences of resistance of all those social groups that have systematically suffered injustice, oppression, and destruction caused by capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy" (p. 1). It is aimed at eliminating the hierarchical divide between the North and South and at demonstrating that the dominant criteria of valid knowledge in the North can contribute to "a massive epistemicide" by failing to acknowledge a vast array of other knowledge systems (de Sousa Santos, 2018, p. 8). A similar aim can be observed in Chen and Chua's (2015) co-edited book, which highlights thoughts by intellectuals in inter-Asia (instead of the term "Asia," as the region does not subscribe to a singular imaginary entity).

A third attempt comes from Southern theory (Connell, 2020). Although Southern theory was inspired by Said (Connell, 2020), Connell (2017) distinguishes it from postcolonialism and the decolonial project. In the words of Connell (2017), the concept that is based on Subaltern Studies concerns "[k]nowledge generated *in the colonial encounter*, and in the postcolonial experience of the colonized societies" (p. 9; italics in original). According to Connell (2020), Southern theory "concerns research and theory about [an academic discipline], and its focus is the construction and reconstruction of [that discipline]" (p. xii). The framework attempts to expose the marginalisation of Southern epistemologies and to valorise and legitimise local or indigenous systems of knowledge, directly challenging "the dominance of Northern knowledges and English language by way of publications, networks, and funding" (Juntrasook & Burford, 2017, p. 24). Although the three movements may highlight different aspects of coloniality, they broadly have the same aim of resisting and challenging academic dependency.

Despite such a long history of resistance, academic dependency remains palpable today due to several factors. Some of them stem from administration-related problems, and

others are intellectual and personal in nature. At the institutional level, as a result of corporatized research conditions in the neoliberal academy, universities are likely to be complicit in ethnocentrism, elitism and marginalisation (Kidman, 2019; Moosavi, 2020). Moreover, many institutions in the Global South often lack resources, funding and material infrastructure to produce and disseminate academic works (Keim, 2008), rendering knowledge produced from and in the South peripheral. At the personal level, some academics still support unequal arrangement, whether wittingly or unwittingly, for the sake of academic survival. One Southern academic author revealed that she would rather adopt the "Western" genre and writing in the dominant language of English, as works written in her native language, Thai, may not count toward academic promotion and could, in the worst case, jeopardise her career (personal communication, 2019). Undeniably, these concerns are valid and crucial.

Given the prevalence of scholarship regarding academic dependency, the assumption that periphery academics may be fully aware of how much they depend on Western logics and mechanisms is sensible. However, this may not always be the case: whether academics in the South are aware of the situation is a complex issue. On the one hand, non-centre scholars may still not be fully aware of academic dependency, and their mind may still be in "captivity." According to Alatas (2000), a "captive mind," which is a result of Western hegemony, refers to the uncritical adoption and imitation of Western thought (Alatas, 1993). On the other hand, in reference to Hountondji (1997) and Connell et al. (2018), Meghji (2021) argues that Global South scholars do not "uncritically imitate" or uncritically reproduce this structure of dependency. Instead, they strategically work to navigate the terrain of knowledge production and dissemination, which "is a pattern of agency, a way of dealing with a collective situation in the global economy of knowledge. This is not a position of powerlessness" (Connell et al., 2018, p. 14). Thus, what is usually conceived of as a "captive mind" could also be construed as "a strategy" that Southern intellectuals use to deal with academic imperialism in the current global economy of knowledge.

As much as the concept of agency is worth noting, evidence suggests that some academics today are still oblivious of academic dependency (e.g., Demeter, 2020), largely, I argue, due to the subtleties of the issue. As illustrated by Juntrasook and Burford (2017), this dependency has become so entrenched that it appears common: "When I [Juntrasook] have initiated conversations of this sort with colleagues here in Thailand, many people haven't been able to see any 'problem.' It seems that it is *natural*, *just the way the academic world is*" (p. 22; emphasis added). The word "natural" here evokes the caution urged by Fairclough (2015), who reminds us that "the most effective form of ideological common sense will be 'common' in the sense of being shared by most if not virtually all of the members of a society or institution" (p. 110). Thus, in the language of Fairclough, what Juntrasook's colleagues consider "natural" appears "natural" only because most academics in the discourse community, usually in the centre, hold such a view. Clearly, the effects of the domination of Western knowledge systems

are vast and "firmly rooted" (Juntrasook & Burford, 2017, p. 27). Thus, the reliance on Western concepts, means of knowledge production, and theories can have ideological implications, and these implications should be closely examined. The examination must begin with the most basic ideology-laden tool that is used to talk about and resist the tenacity of dependency: language.

Critical Discourse Studies for Intellectual Decolonisation

In this article, academic dependency is conceived not only in terms of the use of English as a dominant language in academic communication, which helps marginalise scholars whose first language is not English; this issue has been extensively explored elsewhere (e.g. Bennett, 2013; Curry & Lillis, 2004; Phillipson, 2012). Rather, my interest lies in how language can be used to perpetuate coloniality and disguise knowledge under a discourse of universality in subtle ways. I propose critical discourse studies-based language analysis as an additional tool to help interrogate and emancipate coloniality in knowledge production.

Discourse analysis refers to the study of language in use (Gee & Handford, 2013). It is "interested in what happens when people draw on the knowledge they have about language, knowledge based on their memories of things in the world" to perform something (Johnstone, 2008, p. 3). One of the assumptions underlying discourse analysis is that language carries not only utterance-type meaning but also utterance-token meaning (or 'situated' meaning) (Gee & Handford, 2013). For example, the simple word "coffee" could mean the substance coffee (its utterance-type meaning), but in other contexts, situated meanings could be generated such as "a brown liquid" (as in "the coffee spilled, go get a mop") or "grains of a certain sort" (as in "the coffee spilled, go get a broom") (Gee, 2004, pp. 66-67).

Discourse analysis has two forms: descriptive and critical. The former engages in a linguistic unit beyond the sentence, whereas the latter is interested in "*analysing, understanding and explaining social phenomena that are necessarily complex and thus require a multidisciplinary and multi-methodical approach*" (Wodak & Meyer, 2015, p. 2; italics in original). The term "critical" in "critical discourse studies" does not carry a negative connotation as often misunderstood. Instead, it is associated with critical theory in the sense of the Frankfurt School, suggesting that any social phenomena should be critically investigated, challenged and not taken for granted (Wodak & Meyer, 2015).

CDS is an interdisciplinary problem-oriented research framework aimed at addressing social problems through the study of language and other semiotic systems in use. It is interested in "show[ing] up the linguistic means used by the privileged to stabilise or even to intensify inequities in society" (Meyer, 2001, p. 30) while also "play[ing] an advocatory role for groups who suffer from social discrimination" (Meyer, 2001, p. 15). The relationship between language and society is important in CDS, suggesting that incorporation of linguistic categories into analysis is essential. However, such a relationship is not deterministic; rather,

it is mediated. In accordance with the hermeneutic circle, "the meaning [of text] can only be understood in the context of the whole, but this in turn is only accessible from its component parts" (Meyer, 2001, p. 16). Taken everything together, the primary objective of this field is to lay bare and critically investigate the relationship between language use (or discourse), ideology and power, with an underlying assumption that language can be employed to construct, maintain, perpetuate and legitimise social inequalities.

CDS's aims at social change has its genesis in Western Marxism (Fairclough et al., 2013), particularly in the works of Gramsci and Habermas (Johnstone, 2018). Instead of focusing solely on economic aspects of social relations (as traditional Marxists would), these versions of Marxism incorporate cultural dimensions into their analysis: "[S]ocial power results not just from economic or political coercion," as Johnstone (2018) reminds us, "but more subtly, through 'hegemonic' (Althusser, 1971) ideas about the naturalness of the status quo to which people assent without realizing it" (p. 54). Typically, CDS can be used to investigate any type of topic, and it can employ several types of methodology, depending on the linguistic expertise and interests of the researchers. Common topics that have been studied using CDS include gender, politics, migration, nationalism, race, sexual orientation, class, education and the environment. Academic dependency, this article suggests, holds great potential as a topic for CDS, too.

Interrogating and Emancipating Academic Dependency through Critical Discourse Studies: A Focus on Language Use

The synergy between CDS and intellectual decolonisation to address the issue of academic dependency stems from two observations. Firstly, as implied by Moosavi (2020), intellectual decolonisation may appear "excessively abstract and theoretical in manner" (p. 348). In early literature, academic dependency was focused mostly on the issue of "research agenda, the definition of problem areas, methods of research and standards of excellence," technology of education and financial resources (Alatas, 2003, pp. 603-604), prompting Alatas (2003) to suggest that the effort must engage "serious theoretical and empirical research" (p. 609). To add to this, I suggest that even in CDS itself, although there have been growing attempts to de-westernise the field, emphasis is often placed on interrogating and challenging arguably western-based models, frameworks, and methods. In arguing for the decolonization of CDS, de Melo Resende (2021), for example, focuses primarily on the problematic nature of the existing frameworks and urges scholars to refuse universalising theories originated in the North and to recognize locally produced knowledge and its explanatory potential. Therefore, it is crucial that the movement be accompanied by empirical studies. Admittedly, since the publication of Alatas (2003), there has been a growing body of empirical research to support the claims made by the movement (e.g. Ahmed, 2021; Bird & Pitman, 2020; Chen & Mason, 2018; Collyer, 2018). However, these studies often examine the big picture. For example,

in strengthening the claim of inequalities of global academic production, Collyer (2018) provides evidence of mechanisms that help to sustain the dominance of the global North. Little attention has been paid to the language itself that academics use to produce and disseminate knowledge, such as when they invoke certain theories, represent particular social groups, or promote a particular language and writing conventions. This linguistic aspect, as I would like to argue, should be emphasized because, as suggested in the previous section, it is the language that is often employed, either wittingly or unwittingly, to construct, maintain, perpetuate and legitimise social inequalities. By examining the language that is used in knowledge production and dissemination, our awareness of the Eurocentric and American implications will be heightened, which, I suggest, is the first step in the process of decolonizing any discipline. This article then could be construed as providing another methodology for addressing intellectual decolonisation and for adding language analysis into the decolonisation movement. Specifically, CDS can provide tools for systematically uncovering textual evidence to support the claims made by intellectual decolonisation.

Secondly, as noted by Pennycook and Makoni (2019), applied linguistics, the field which CDS could fall into, has not adequately engaged the issue of decolonisation. Thus, the marriage between CDS and intellectual decolonisation can benefit applied linguists in interrogating their teaching, research and knowledge practices that may contribute to the South and North asymmetry. In fact, to a certain extent, I would argue the field of applied linguistics and language studies should engage in intellectual decolonisation as "(l)anguage is an instrument of control as well as of communication" (Hodge & Kress, 1993, p. 6). As such, the proposed framework aims to investigate "the semiotic dimensions of power, injustice, abuse, and political-economic or cultural change in society" (Fairclough et al., 2011, p. 357), especially in the realm of intellectual decolonisation.

In proposing the dual approach, this article argues that intellectual decolonisation and CDS share a similar concern of addressing the conditions of suffering and inequality ascribed to capitalism and colonialism (de Sousa Santos, 2012). Both also put conditions of aggrieved members at the centre, attempting to raise the awareness of people of the powers to which they are subjected and to expose injustices and inequalities (Fairclough, 2013; Meyer, 2001). Raising awareness is perhaps the first crucial step before any redress can take place. As pointed out by Juntrasook and Burford (2017) and implied by Demeter (2020), scholars in the North are not only blind to asymmetrical relationships (because they usually benefit from them), but academics in the South may not be conscious of this unequal relationship, too. This implication suggests that the whole system has made it difficult for people to see the problem as a problem. Even the common and taken-for-granted word "research," as Sukarieh (2019) points out, can be seen ideologically:

> *For us as Arabs to follow 'research' and ignore 'search' [for passion and meaning in life] is pitiful; it is a reflection of colonised minds [...] The word we use in Arabic for research is bahth which is a synonym of search, not research. Search is connected to life; research to institutions. (p. 189)*

This example shows how even a single word or lexical choice can carry ideological significance that is often overlooked. Intellectual decolonisation-informed CDS, with emancipatory objectives, can help reveal the ideology behind the problem and bring it to the fore.

Many approaches to CDS can be adopted. For the intellectual decolonisation project, this article suggests Fairclough's dialectical-relational approach. Admittedly, this approach is not particularly new, but I would argue that it is appropriate for the decolonisation project for at least two reasons. Firstly, despite the growing interest in recent approaches such as the quantitative corpus-based CDS, it seems to overlook the fact that what is not said can be as powerful as what is said. As noted by Baker (2006), "[a] hegemonic discourse can be at its most powerful when it does not even have to be invoked, because it is just taken for granted" (p. 19). Thus, this approach may defeat the very purpose of discourse-based intellectual decolonisation which aims at exposing the "hidden" linguistic manifestations that help construction and reproduce academic dependency. Secondly, unlike other approaches (such as discourse-historical approach), Fairclough's approach is less linguistically-oriented (Meyer, 2001). Therefore, it has more potential to accommodate a wide range of researchers with varying linguistic expertise. However, this is not to suggest that CDS does not involve examinations of specific linguistic categories; the approach is centred on acknowledging the role of colonial legacies in perpetuating existing power inequities through discursive representations. However, text analysis must be coupled with context analysis. As Fairclough (2013) notes, "it is not possible to 'read off' ideologies from texts" because "meanings are produced through interpretations of texts and texts are open to diverse interpretations" and because ideological processes involve whole social events (p. 57). Thus, in analysis, text should be read vis-à-vis discursive events (how text is produced, consumed and disseminated) and social practices.

For Fairclough, the three aspects—text, discursive practice and sociocultural practice—are in dialectical relationship with one another. Although text is traditionally defined as "the written or spoken language produced in a discursive event" (Fairclough, 1995, p. 135), today the term has been broadened to mean semiotic, or any sign that communicates meaning, including written, spoken, visual text, or other semiotic systems. The second level of analysis, analysis of discursive practice, involves text production, distribution and consumption. This type of analysis is focused not only on how text is produced, disseminated and consumed, but also encompasses the rules, norms, or conventions that are involved in each process, the audience (who is allowed or not allowed to engage in each process), among other things.

According to Fairclough (2013), these are aspects that necessarily involve power and ideologies because discursive practices can create conventions, or "orders of discourse," that can influence the nature of text and privilege certain ideologies, thus making those ideologies more powerful than others. Analysis of sociocultural practice refers to an examination of the context—be it social, cultural, historical, institutional—which gives rise to the text under study. This analysis provides an understanding of how text is created, how it may be interpreted within a specific context, as well as the retention of the text across time (Fairclough, 2003). Central to CDS is the understanding of how power and ideologies affect text, and how text in turn influences the context and discursive practices.

In practical terms, data collection has no specific protocol. Several media types such as newspaper articles, advertisements, policy documents, political speeches and even multimodal texts (such as web pages and tweets) have been subject to analysis. However, as noted by Meyer (2001), CDS researchers often follow the view of grounded theory in that data collection and analysis are never two separate entities. Researchers often go back and forth between the two processes. Regarding data sizes, although Meyer (2001) notes that CDS studies often engage in small corpora, I add that large corpora can be dealt with today with the help of quantitative corpus-based CDS (See Baker (2006)). However, those adopting this approach must be aware of the limitations discussed early. Most, if not all, of the studies following Fairclough's approach typically deal with small sample sizes of data.

In terms of data analysis, text is generally examined for its linguistic categories such as its formation, use of vocabulary, style, syntax (or sentence order) and verb tenses. Modality, or the degree to which a given claim or statement is committed to by a speaker or author, is one possible linguistic-based tool. This notion can help shed light on how committed an author/speaker is to the proposition being made regarding intellectual decolonisation. The degree of commitment can be linguistically expressed through modal auxiliary verbs (such as "may" and "should"), the absence of thereof, or modal adverbs (such as "definitely" and "possibly"). For example, when journal editors state, "a research paper that does not follow the generic academic norms *will* be rejected," they firmly commit to the truth of the proposition through the use of "will" (instead of "may," for example), leaving little or no room for dispute. Fairclough (2003) further points out that in modality analysis, social limits on modality choices should be noted. Questions that should be asked are: "who is able to commit themselves to strong truth claims about this or that aspect of the world?" and "who has the socially ratified power" to make such a proposition? (Fairclough, 2003, p. 167). The same statement about the rejection of a research paper above can be uttered by anyone, but when uttered by a journal editor, it carries much more weight and entails serious repercussions for papers "deviating" from the norm.

Discursive strategy, or linguistic choices that social actors make from a pool of resources based on what they believe is the most effective way to attain their goals, can also

be employed. Reisigl and Wodak (2001) identify five discursive strategies and related questions that can be used to discriminate against and exclude others as linguistically realised in texts: referential strategies ("How are persons named and referred to linguistically?"), predicational strategies ("What traits, characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to them?"), argumentation strategies ("By mean of what arguments and argumentation schemes do specific persons and social groups try to justify and legitimise the exclusion, discrimination, suppression and exploitation of others?"), perspectivation ("From what perspective or point of view are these namings, attributions and arguments expressed?"), intensifying strategies and mitigation strategies ("Are the respective discriminating utterances articulated overtly; are they even intensified or are they mitigated?"). Analysis of discursive strategies, thus, can help systematically reveal how social actors from each group (Global North and Global South), how certain knowledge systems, how particular language and how means of producing and disseminating knowledge are either championed or excluded, on the basis of what justifications, and from whose point of view.

Another useful concept is ideological square (van Dijk, 2006, 2011), which can be adopted to examine how Global North and Global South social actors and knowledge systems are (re)presented. This notion maintains that group members are more likely to (re)present their own group positively and out-groups negatively (van Dijk, 2011). This notion may not be uncommon to decolonial projects. As discussed earlier, Said (1978) found that indigenous people were often portrayed in negative and derogatory phrases and terms. In his discussion of the English language and colonisation, Pennycook (1998) also cited several studies to demonstrate that Chinese students on an English Language Teaching scholarship were frequently depicted as "passive, imitative memorizers, to be enlightened by the advent of the creative West" (p. 185). However, as a tool for (critical) discourse studies, ideological square goes beyond such a cursory examination. This notion includes fine-grained linguistic analysis to reveal semantic structures and formal structures employed to (de-) emphasise certain attributes. By using this concept, researchers can examine the terms or names used to portray each group member and knowledge systems. They can also investigate the level of detail in the (re)presentations of positive/negative actions by both groups; positive/negative metaphors and metonymies that are employed to represent each group; hyperboles and euphemisms that may emphasise or deemphasise certain characteristics of in- and out-group members; use of demonstratives to signal detachment (such as "*those* people") or attachment ("*our* people"); and use of active sentences to emphasise negative agency and responsibility (as opposed to passive sentences to de-emphasise agency and responsibility). In speech, researchers can also pay attention not only to words (lexicons) but also to other paralinguistic elements such as volume and pitch used to draw attention to positive or negative attributes, and intonation as expressing approval or accusations (van Dijk, 2006, 2011). These linguistic strategies can provide further concrete evidence to buttress the claim of the discourse of coloniality. However,

variations exist in text analysis: text can be analysed at the minute level (as exemplified above), or at a broader level, through content or thematic analysis, depending on linguistic expertise of the researchers. Whatever linguistic categories are analysed, Fairclough's approach to CDS is aligned with Michael Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar, which is based on the premise that language is influenced (even in its grammar) by the social functions it has come to serve (Halliday, 1978).

It may be useful to briefly illustrate how this framework can be put into practice. I will refer to a section of my recent study (Rerkwanchai, 2022) that examined the proliferation of move analysis in academic journal articles in the field of second language writing in Thailand. The aim of the section was to gain insight into the motivations behind the prevalence of certain writing styles. Move analysis is one of the common research topics in the mentioned discipline, aiming to investigate the rhetorical moves in academic writing, with the goals of identifying writing patterns and helping novice writers, particularly second language writers of English, to apply them to their writing to increase the likelihood of publication. In analysing passages from journal articles written on this issue, the study found that many articles tended to promote the adoption of particular writing moves. In one article, for example, it was suggested that although non-native speakers of English may be encouraged to find a balance between conforming to the prescribed writing moves and expressing their own writing styles, the authors of the article cautioned: "However, to avoid the disastrous fate of their articles being rejected, we believe that novice writers should be discouraged from flouting any generic convention" (Zhang & Wannaruk, 2015, p. 177). Using the CDS-based analysis to examine academic dependency, I first analysed the textual aspect of this sentence by focusing on word choice. In this case, the words "disastrous fate" were examined. According to the *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*, the word "fate" is defined as "the power that is believed to control everything that happens and that cannot be stopped or changed" (n.d.). The employment of these highly evaluative terms in an empirical research article is both unexpected and ideologically significant. The word chosen, I suggested, signaled the authors' belief that there were forces that controlled the academic publication process and that the opportunities for change were limited.

To further investigate this issue, I turned to the other two aspects of CDS (discursive practices and sociocultural practices) by interviewing local well-established researchers and examining relevant secondary sources. It was found that because academic promotion was often associated with academic publication, and because academic publication was closely linked to the ability to conform to the accepted writing conventions, the need to depend on the dominant rhetorical style was almost inevitable. However, as Canagarajah (2002), citing Mauranen (1993), suggests, some of the dominant research writing styles are greatly influenced by the western discourse. For example, the need to highlight a research gap in research writing was argued to be based on the view that researchers were obliged to "sell

their findings to the readership for a variety of symbolic and material rewards" (Mauranen, 1993, as cited in Canagarajah, 2002, p. 115). This view, Canagarajah (2002) maintained, reflected the marketing discourse and the culture of "publish or perish" in the American academy. Taking both text analysis, discursive practices, and sociocultural practices into consideration, it was concluded that the authors' use of the word choice "disastrous fate" was likely to be deliberate to reflect the pressure to publish that was imposed on academics in higher education. However, the authors and uncritical readers may not be aware that the selection of such strong evaluative word choice could subtly contribute to the perpetuation of academic dependency. In a nutshell, word choice strongly suggests that if researchers want to try to avoid a "disastrous fate" (of having manuscripts rejected), they must follow the rules, an action that would help to inadvertently reinforce and promote dependency on the western discourse. As this example shows, the CDS-based approach can help shed light on this subtle phenomenon, while also raising our awareness of the powers that influence our knowledge production and dissemination. Only when this dependency is brought to our consciousness can we start taking action to change it.

In proposing this integrated framework, I am fully cognizant of possible criticisms. The first one has to do with CDS: CDS may not be applicable to researchers who have little or no linguistic background. Hence, I adopt the term CDS, rather than a more common term "critical discourse analysis," precisely because I agree with van Dijk that CDS should be seen as a movement, rather than a subfield of linguistics. According to van Dijk (2015), the term "critical discourse analysis" is misleading because the word "analysis" incorrectly implies that this framework is a method. In fact, CDS is "a *critical perspective* that may be found in all areas of discourse studies" (van Dijk, 2015, p. 466; italics in original). It puts an emphasis on scholars rather than their methods; that is, "CDS scholars are socio-politically committed to social equality and justice" (van Dijk, 2009, p. 63). Therefore, CDS is flexible such that it can be adjusted in accordance with the researchers' background, the nature of the research question and the particular discursive event (Fairclough, 2003; Meyer, 2001). In fact, CDS has been employed by scholars in various disciplines such as higher education (Mwangi et al., 2018), political science (Donoghue, 2018) and even tourism (Qian et al., 2018), suggesting that the methodology is flexible enough to accommodate any linguistic expertise.

More importantly, CDS may be seen as embodying Western perspectives (de Melo Resende, 2021; Shi-xu, 2015). It can be seen as a tool replete with "Western worldviews, values, concepts, models, analytic tools, topics of interest, and so forth, as universal and exclusive standards" (Shi-xu, 2015, p. 1). As such, to employ CDS may defeat the very purpose of intellectual decolonisation. This criticism has some force. However, I agree with previous literature (Canagarajah, 2002; Connell, 2020; Mignolo & Walsh, 2018) that the project of intellectual decolonisation should not completely reject ideas and scholarship from the North. That is, "[t]he issue is not to erase the differences between North and South, but rather to erase

the power hierarchies inhabiting them" (de Sousa Santos, 2018, p. 7). What I am arguing for is the utilisation of all available knowledges to address social inequalities and injustices in terms of academic dependency. If we were to reject knowledge from the Global North, then we might fall into a trap and commit the very same crime that we accuse the Global North of doing—that is, to exclude knowledge originated from the opposite (Moosavi, 2020). Moreover, it could be argued that the task of completely dislodging ourselves from the western discourse may be rather challenging, if at all possible. However, in order to maintain the essence of a decolonial project, the data collected may come from spoken language (such as folk tales or nursery rhymes) which values the oral tradition as opposed to written language. As Juntrasook and Burford (2017) argue, oral tradition is a more common means of knowledge production and dissemination in non-western contexts such as Thailand. Therefore, the incorporation of this form of knowledge into a CDS-based study can empower and help to resurrect the often-overlooked data while trying to achieve a blend of western and non-western cultures and perspectives.

Conclusion

This article has provided researchers in the intellectual decolonisation movement and CDS with an overview and critical analysis of the language use in knowledge production and dissemination. I argue that scholarship on academic dependency, as well as that on CDS, can benefit from the theoretical synergy between both areas of study. It is hoped that this article will serve as a resource for people considering combing both approaches in their research. In my view, to successfully conduct projects consistent with intellectual decolonisation and CDS, researchers should have the aim of resisting the power hierarchies in knowledge production and dissemination. Although such an attitude may be critiqued as "biased," I believe that no research is completely objective. As long as researchers are reflexive and critically reflect on their research practices throughout the process, the rigor of their research should not be compromised.

In bringing CDS to intellectual decolonisation, I see it as a tool that can make substantive contribution to both fields. I recognise that the inclusion of language analysis may not radically dismantle the Global South and Global North asymmetry. However, I contend that language use in research writing should be subject to analysis, as it serves as the fundamental medium for researchers in both the North and South to produce and share knowledge, but is frequently overlooked. Such analysis brings to the surface the ideologies that lurk behind academic dependency. As the peace activist Yuri Kochiyama remarked,

> *remember that consciousness is power. Consciousness is education and knowledge. Consciousness is becoming aware. It is the perfect vehicle for students. Consciousness-raising is pertinent for power, and be sure that*

> *power will not be abusively used, but used for building trust and goodwill domestically and internationally. (Sanders, 2023)*

Therefore, it is a critical examination of language that would raise the public's consciousness by way of demonstrating that language has been used to suppress and manipulate certain worldviews and possibilities while empowering others. This awareness is the initial step to wrestle ourselves out of academic dependency and to create a democratic space where all forms of knowledge may thrive.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Associate Professor Dr. Savitri Gadavanij for her invaluable suggestions on the early drafts of this manuscript.

References

Ahmed, Y. (2021). Political discourse analysis: a decolonial approach. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *18*(1), 139-155.

Alatas, S. F. (1993). On the indigenization of academic discourse. *Alternatives*, *18*(3), 307-338.

Alatas, S. F. (2003). Academic dependency and the global division of labour in the social sciences. *Current Sociology*, *51*(6), 599-613.

Alatas, S. H. (2000). Intellectual imperialism: Definition, traits, and problems. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, *28*(1), 23-45.

Alatas, S. H. (2004). The captive mind and creative development. In P. N. Mukherji & C. Sengupta (Eds.), *Indigeneity and universality in social science: A South Asian response* (pp. 83-98). Sage.

Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. Continuum.

Bennett, K. (2013). English as a lingua franca in academia: Combating epistemicide through translator training. *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, *7*(2), 169-193. https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2013.10798850

Bhambra, G. K., Nişancıoğlu, K., & Gebrial, D. (2020). Decolonising the university in 2020. *Identities*, *27*(4), 509-516.

Bird, K. S., & Pitman, L. (2020). How diverse is your reading list? Exploring issues of representation and decolonisation in the UK. *Higher Education*, *79*(5), 903-920.

Canagarajah, S. A. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Casanave, C. P. (1995). Local interactions: Constructing contexts for composing in a graduate sociology program. *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy*, 83-110.

Chen, C., & Mason, D. S. (2018). A postcolonial reading of representations of non-western leadership in sport management studies. *Journal of Sport Management*, *32*(2), 150–169. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2017-0160

Chen, K.-H., & Chua, B. H. (2015). *The inter-Asia cultural studies reader*. Routledge.

Chilisa, B. (2012). *Indigenous research methodologies*. Sage.

Collyer, F. M. (2018). Global patterns in the publishing of academic knowledge: Global North, Global South. *Current Sociology*, *66*(1), 56–73.

Connell, R. (2017). Southern theory and world universities. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *36*(1), 4-15. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1252311

Connell, R. (2020). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. Routledge.

Connell, R., Pearse, R., Collyer, F., Maia, J. M., & Morrell, R. (2018). Negotiating with the North: How Southern-tier intellectual workers deal with the global economy of knowledge. *The Sociological Review*, *66*(1), 41-57.

Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2004). Multilingual scholars and the imperative to publish in English: Negotiating interests, demands, and rewards. *TESOL quarterly*, *38*(4), 663–688.

Dados, N., & Connell, R. (2012). The global south. *Contexts*, *11*(1), 12-13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1536504212436479

de Melo Resende, V. (2021). Decolonizing critical discourse studies: for a Latin American perspective. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *18*(1), 26-42. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2018.1490654

de Sousa Santos, B. (2012). Public sphere and epistemologies of the South. *Africa Development*, *37*(1), 43–67-43–67.

de Sousa Santos, B. (2018). *The end of the cognitive empire*. Duke University Press.

Demeter, M. (2020). *Academic knowledge production and the Global South: Questioning inequality and under-representation*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-52701-3

Donoghue, M. (2018). Beyond hegemony: Elaborating on the use of Gramscian concepts in Critical Discourse Analysis for Political Studies. *Political Studies*, *66*(2), 392-408. https://doi.org/10.1177/0032321717722362

Ergin, M., & Alkan, A. (2019). Academic neo-colonialism in writing practices: Geographic markers in three journals from Japan, Turkey and the US. *Geoforum*, *104*, 259-266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2019.05.008

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse*. Edward Arnold.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J., & Wodak, R. (2011). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (2nd ed., pp. 357-378). Sage.

Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J., & Wodak, R. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis* (Vol. 1). Sage. https://www.academia.edu/2544299/Wodak_Ruth_Ed_Critical_Discourse_Analysis._Four_Volumes

Fouad, T. M. (2018). Academic dependency. *Medicine Anthropology Theory*, *5*(2). https://doi. org/10.17157/mat.5.2.538

Gareau, F. H. (1988). Another type of third world dependency: The social sciences. *International Sociology*, *3*(2), 171-178. https://doi.org/10.1177/02685808800 3002005

Gee, J. P. (2004). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge.

Gee, J. P., & Handford, M. (2013). *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis*. Routledge.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. Hodder Education.

Hodge, R., & Kress, G. R. (1993). *Language as ideology* (Vol. 2). Routledge.

Hountondji, P. (1990). Scientific dependence in Africa today. *Research in African Literatures*, *21*(3), 5-15.

Hountondji, P. (1997). *Endogenous knowledge: Research trails*. CODESRIA.

Johnstone, B. (2008). Discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 635-649). Blackwell Publishing.

Johnstone, B. (2018). *Discourse analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.

Juntrasook, A., & Burford, J. (2017). Animating Southern Theory in the context of Thai higher education: A response from Thailand. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *36*(1), 21–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2017.1249069

Keim, W. (2008). Social sciences internationally: The problem of marginalisation and its consequences for the discipline of sociology. *African Sociological Review/Revue Africaine de Sociologie*, *12*(2), 22-48.

Kidman, J. (2019). Whither decolonisation? Indigenous scholars and the problem of inclusion in the neoliberal university. *Journal of Sociology*, *56*(2), 247-262.

Lazar, M. M. (2020). Politics of the 'South': Discourses and praxis. *Discourse & Society*, *31*(1), 5-18. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926519886126

Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). On the coloniality of being: Contributions to the development of a concept. *Cultural studies*, *21*(2-3), 240-270.

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

Meghji, A. (2021). *Decolonizing Sociology: An Introduction*. John Wiley & Sons.

Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method, and politics: Positioning of the approaches to CDA. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 14-31). Sage.

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

Moosavi, L. (2020). The decolonial bandwagon and the dangers of intellectual decolonisation. *International Review of Sociology*, *30*(2), 332-354. https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2020.1776919

Murphy, J., & Zhu, J. (2012). Neo-colonialism in the academy? Anglo-American domination in management journals. *Organization*, *19*(6), 915-927. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508412453097

Mwangi, C. A. G., Latafat, S., Hammond, S., Kommers, S., Thoma, H. S., Berger, J., & Blanco-Ramirez, G. (2018). Criticality in international higher education research: a critical discourse analysis of higher education journals. *Higher Education*, *76*(6), 1091-1107. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0259-9

Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary. (n.d.) Fate. In *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/ english/fate?q=fate

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. Routledge.

Pennycook, A., & Makoni, S. (2019). *Innovations and challenges in Applied Linguistics from the Global South*. Routledge.

Phillipson, R. (2012). Linguistic imperialism. In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (05 November 2012 ed., pp. 1-7). Wiley Online Library. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0718

Qian, J., Wei, J., & Law, R. (2018). Review of critical discourse analysis in tourism studies. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, *20*(4), 526-537. https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2202

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. Routledge.

Rerkwanchai, K. (2022). Metropolitan writing practices in a local context: A Southern theory-informed critical discourse analysis of knowledge production and dissemination in the discipline of second language writing in Thailand. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). National Institute of Development Administration, Thailand.

Said, E. (1978). Orientalism: Western concepts of the Orient. *New York: Pantheon*.

Sanders, B. (2023, May 10). *5 things to know about the life and times of uptown trailblazer Yuri Kochiyama*. Columbia Neighbors. https://neighbors.columbia.edu/news/5-things-know-about-life-and-times-uptown-trailblazer-yuri-kochiyama

Sheridan, C. L. (2015). National journals and centering institutions: A historiography of an English language teaching journal in Taiwan. *English for Specific Purposes*, *38*, 70-84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2014.12.001

Shi-xu, F. (2015). Cultural discourse studies. In C. Ilie & T. Sandel (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of language and social interaction* (pp. 1-9). Wiley-Blackwell.

Sugiharto, S. (2021). De-westernizing hegemonic knowledge in global academic publishing: toward a politics of locality. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, *16*(4), 321-333.

Sukarieh, M. (2019). Decolonizing education, a view from Palestine: an interview with Munir Fasheh. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, *28*(2), 186-199. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/09620214.2019.1601584

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.

Trahar, S., Juntrasook, A., Burford, J., von Kotze, A., & Wildemeersch, D. (2019). Hovering on the periphery?: 'Decolonising' writing for academic journals. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *49*(1), 149–167. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2018.1545817

van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, *17*(3), 359-383.

van Dijk, T. A. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: A sociocognitive approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63-86). Sage.

van Dijk, T. A. (2011). Discourse and ideology. *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*, 379-407.

van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 466-485). John Wiley & Sons.

Von Gizycki, R. (1973). Centre and periphery in the international scientific community: Germany, France and Great Britain in the 19th century. *Minerva*, 474-494.

Waisbord, S. (2022). What is next for de-westernizing communication studies? *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, 1-8.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2015). *Methods of critical discourse studies*. Sage.

Zhang, B. & Wannaruk, A. (2015). Rhetorical structure of education research article methods sections. *PASAA: Journal of Language Teaching and Learning in Thailand*, 51, 155-184.