Toxic Field and Illusio: a study of neocolonial hierarchies of knowledge in marketing

Cagri Yalkin
Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus

Mustafa Ozbilgin
Brunel Business School, Brunel University

Abstract

We explore the experiences of marketing academics who currently work in the countries that have previously colonized their home countries. Building on Bourdieu's important yet rather neglected concept of illusio, we demonstrate that participants are drawn to the appeal of the academic game, which perpetuates itself as a toxic field of relations. Within this toxic field, academics from former colonies are relegated to certain roles which they accept, and which in turn sustain and exacerbate the colonial knowledge hierarchies. In responding to claims and the illusio that the colonisation has ended, we show that colonisation has not ended but transformed into contemporary forms which sustain and reproduce hierarchies of knowledge in marketing. Notably, the study illustrates first, that academia is a toxic field of colonial relations; second, that dominant exploitative academic practices serve to sustain this toxic field; and third, that there is a toxic illusio which prevents academics from developing a healthy sense of colonial relations in their knowledge production.

Introduction

Colonialism as both an ideology and practice created and accelerated the divide between the colonial powers and the places they have colonized, economically, socially, and culturally (Said 1978, Spivak 1988). The power relations between the previous colonisers and the previously colonised extend to all fields of life, and academia is no exception (Bernal and Villalpando 2002, Varman and Saha 2009). Although there are assumptions about the innocuous nature of the globalisation of knowledge production and open science, this production process requires further scrutiny in terms of power relations, and no less so in marketing since "most writings in marketing start with Eurocentric theories and then apply them to the rest of the world" (Varman 2018, p.50). Partially, this manuscript is one of them. The reason for the use of the Eurocentric theory here is not to sell more products or to make better consumers of people, but to illustrate the toxicity of contemporary marketing knowledge production. To this end, we identify ongoing mechanisms by which theories, frameworks, concepts, and ways of working in academic institutions, which are developed by former colonizers, sustain the hierarchies of contemporary knowledge production in marketing.

Despite years of anti-colonial movements and efforts of de-colonization that merely scratched the surface, colonialism still continues to shape the symbolic and material relationships in economic, social and political lives internationally. In particular, after years of post-colonial unravelling, colonialism continues to loom larger than its own shadow in former colonies: Covid-19 pandemic hit the colonised territories (CT henceforth) harder (BBC 2020), the neo-liberal transformation is felt more brutal, and the environmental damage more extreme in these regions (Chang 2010, Acemoglu et al. 2001, Acemoglu & Robinson 2012). Many individuals are compelled to leave their countries of birth in pursuit of better prospects in life in the colonizing countries (CC henceforth) (Acemoglu & Robinson 2013). Thus, it is possible to observe that colonialism merely transformed into neocolonialism, which is the "new practices of contemporary imperialism, which replace direct colonial occupation with an ever-expanding role for international institutions, in maintaining the economic and political dependence of countries of the South" (Yousfi 2021, p.83). In this paper, we explore the imprints of colonisation and its neocolonial extensions in the specific field of marketing knowledge production by giving voice to the CT academics who work in the CCs.

We use the terms CT and CC with the caveat that they are broad generalisations of the (post)-colonial world. Building on Gopal (2019), we acknowledge that whiteness, imperialism, and colonisation are not completely overlapping: there are voices of dissent among the (white) CC academics, and there are CT academics who may be complicit in sustaining the current neocolonial hierarchy. We use the terms white and colonizer in their anticolonial senses as "regimes of power that normalize white dominance" (Dar et al. 2020, p.2) and as individuals and institutions that normalize and sustain this order. Thus, we do not use these terms as descriptors of biological distinction (Al Ariss et al. 2014) or of research and political agendas (Gopal 2019). As Mills (1997), we contend that whiteness, like colonialism, constitutes "a power structure of formal or informal rule, socioeconomic privilege, and differential distribution of material wealth and opportunities, benefits and burdens, rights and duties" (p.3). We use the term West in particular to denote the former imperial powers and in general to denote Euro- and North America centric theories, practices, and mindsets. We build on the premise that outside these Anglophone centers, others are relegated to semi-peripheries and peripheries where semi-peripheries comprise some of Europe as well as Canada and Australia (Üsdiken 2014, Boussebaa and Tienari 2019, Meriläinen et al. 2008).

Theoretically, we draw on Bourdieusian concepts such as habitus, the field, and different forms of capitals in order to explore how CT academics experience the *toxic illusio* while they traverse neocolonial academia. We define *toxic illusio* as the neocolonial academic game the allure of which draws CT academics in and keeps them as participants of academia in CC countries, even when their ultimate stakes in the game are low and symbolically denigrated. Further, CT academics may experience levels of cognitive dissonance as a result of the duality of the toxic illusio which draws them in, which may provide them with different forms of capital, and yet which harms them at the same time. Bourdieusian theory has previously been used in exploring imperial domination and colonialism as a complex system that spans micro-level interactions in fields of structured relations, shaped by dispositions and social, cultural, economic and symbolic resources of individuals (Go 2008, Steinmetz 2007). "Bourdieu articulated a systematic theory of

colonialism that entailed insights on colonial social forms and cultural processes and contained the seeds for some of his later more well-known concepts and ideas like *habitus, field*, and reflexive sociology" (Go 2013, p.51). Building on this premise, we seek to extend the dialogue between postcolonial theory and its tools of analysis and the Bourdieusian framework.

The inequalities in the dynamics of knowledge production and dissemination between the center (currently the USA) and the CTs are plenty. Varman and Saha (2009) illustrate how, despite the absence of common notions, practices, and frameworks, the North American marketing and consumer behaviour frameworks have been imposed upon the Indian Institutes of Management (IIM) in India. Varman, Saha, and Skålén (2011) show how market subjectivity merges with postcolonial subjectivity - with students preferring Anglophone global corporations - to produce elitism in the CT. To complete this picture, we focus on the knowledge production hierarchies and on CT academics operating within these hierarchies in the CCs that are outside North America. Our overarching research question is: what are the knowledge production experiences and relationships of marketing academics who work in the countries that have previously colonized their homelands? In asking this question, we aim to answer two sub-questions: a) how do the lived experiences of neocolonialism manifest in marketing academia and b) what practices in the knowledge production process actually sustain this neocolonial order. In order to chart this, we give voice to the experiences of marketing scholars from the CT who currently work in marketing departments and management schools in the CCs (UK and wider Europe), which are institutions that are still governed by grand strategies of imperialism.

Literature Review

In the contemporary neocolonial hierarchy in management knowledge production, the USA and the UK hold the two top positions, followed by Northern Europe, Canada, Australia, and the rest of the world. The chasms in this hierarchy are exacerbated by the dominance of U.S. ranked journals as the gold standard that is both emulated and challenged at the level of elite institutions across the world (Üsdiken 2014). Boussebaa and Tienari (2019) identify how Englishization of management research further produces inequalities in this already hierarchical terrain. Meriläinen et al. (2008) illustrate how the hierarchy between the Anglophone core and peripheral others are maintained. In addition, knowledge producing localities outside the USA, UK, and Northern Europe too are forced into the Western elite publication system, using Western notions, theories, concepts, and frameworks (Murphy and Zhu 2012, Varman and Saha 2009). The implicit rule that academic knowledge production must be framed in "Western" terms, the persistence of Western concepts in the minds of the formerly colonised undoubtedly applies to knowledge production in the field of management (see Vijay and Varman 2018), and in particular to marketing (see Sreekumar and Varman 2016, Varman and Saha 2009, Varman and Sreekumar 2015).

The marketing theories, concepts, and frameworks developed using the USA or other Global North data are taught at the institutions in the Global South (see Saha and Varman 2009). Varman and Sreekumar (2015) illustrate the shaping of marketing theory in India by Western knowledge and how it is disconnected from the local history and particularities. As such, the knowledge hierarchy is visible: knowledge which is created

today is deeply entrenched in the colonial world order (Alatas 1999, 2000, Varman and Saha 2009). The way that these symbolic hierarchies are created and sustained to the advantage of CCs greatly echo the concerns that CCs bind both themselves and the CTs in terms of how CTs are symbolically rated, how they are talked about, how they are compared, and how they are studied (see Said 1978, Spivak 1988, Dabashi 2011). For example, research that is published in marketing journals simply state that the data has been collected in CC, and yet authors who collect data from the CT are asked to account for why the data comes from a CT in a more elaborate, apologetic, and elongated way, which reproduces the symbolic order between the CC and the CT (cf. Humayun and Belk 2020 and Nguyen and Belk 2013). In this literature review section, we first examine academia as a postcolonial site, and then elaborate Bourdieusian theory as a frame for the study of toxic illusio in the neocolonial academic field.

Postcolonial Academia

Early modern colonialism continued on well into the 20th century with the same main working principles: uneven social and economic relations based on extraction and one way flow of natural and human resources (Césaire 1972, Loomba 2015), diminishing existing local production industries to positions of dependence (see Brookes 2013). Currently, although many CTs have political sovereignty, their economic, social, and political relations with the CCs remain uneven. As academic institutions and their legacy in terms of both knowledge creation and dissemination remain key players in the colonialism debates (Mutua and Swadener 2005, Prasad 2005), academia is a relevant terrain which can be used to investigate the nature of relations between the CCs and the CTs.

We note that different localities had different social and economic organizations prior to and different initial reactions to the symbolic and material violence exerted by colonialism. As such, different geographies experienced variations to the same working principle (extraction and one way flow of resources). Despite these differences, the core working principle was the same across all the colonies: one way extraction of resources, dismantling and denigration of local institutions, and creation of dependencies. The effect of colonialism is deeply woven into the very fabric of contemporary economic, social, and cultural relations (Acemoglu and Robinson 2013, Said 1978, Spivak 1988), constituting today's neocolonial hierarchical relations. One of the key take-aways from this is that the state of neocolonial relations in marketing knowledge production needs scrutiny, especially between the CCs and the CTs.

The term post-colonial refers to the so-called aftermath or the unravelling of colonialism. Post-colonial theory focuses on the social, economic, and cultural effects of this colonial unravelling (Bhabha 1984, Said 1978, Spivak 1988) and "deploys diverse theoretical and political resources to interrogate, intervene in and transform the continued power asymmetries, imbalances and repressions, and effects of contemporary neo-colonialism, and other forms of imperialism" (Westwood and Jack, 2007, p.247). We acknowledge that there is not a particular point at which colonialism 'ceased'. Colonialism is alive and well in academia (Connell 2014, Heleta 2016, Kothiyal et al. 2018, Nyoni 2019) in its different neocolonial forms (see Boyce and Ndikumana 2001, Murphy and Zhu 2012) and the

neoliberal order refocuses attention away from historical injustice to new possibilities of social and economic relations (Taoua 2003, Adam 2019).

Here, we suggest a dialogue between postcolonial theory and Bourdieu's work. As the concept of illusio suggests, if we take the academic knowledge production as a Bourdieusian game, academics are drawn to the game as novice players and through their participation become entrenched in the game, which may ultimately harm them. Under the influence of the illusio (uncritical allure of the game) of academic knowledge production with its implicit neocolonial knowledge hierarchies, those who align their interests with the game may not prioritise or may give up altogether their critical engagement and struggles against neocolonialism. Thus, one of the dire outcomes of neocolonialism would be the way it is entrenched in the academic knowledge production game - that the game is played on an uneven terrain due to colonialism is now invisible. As noted by Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013), the way colonisation has become entrenched and invisible in the game, turned itself into a taken for granted assumption that evades daily criticism remains the worst form of colonisation, as it affects CT people's identities and consciousness.

Habitus, Field, Social Capital, and Illusio

Bourdieu defines habitus as internalised and taken for granted assumptions in a particular field (Bourdieu 1977). The notion of field denotes a web of relations, the participants of which have more shared assumptions in common than members of other fields (Bourdieu 1984). Here, we focus on neocolonial academia as a field. Bourdieu refers to struggles among fields for power and legitimacy, through which fields could retain a hold on orthodoxy, i.e. the established view, or be relegated to heterodoxy, i.e. the peripheral view. Individuals mobilise and transform their different forms of capitals such as social, cultural and economic capitals in order to craft their choices and chances in life. The cultural capital in particular is a form of intellectual capital for Bourdieu, which is later framed as science capital by Archer et al. (2015) and is of importance in the field of academia. All forms of capital could be deployed and transposed into other forms and ultimately to symbolic capital, which determines one's standing and respectability in a field or subfield of relations. Symbolic capital is ephemeral as in the process of movement between fields, symbolic capital is subjected to symbolic violence or valorisation.

Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) define illusio as the way in which players in a game fail to develop a healthy view of the game in which they participate, even when their stakes in the game do not serve themselves well. The allure of the game draws the players in and their continuous participation and their entrenched interests in the game make the toxic outcomes of the game invisible. The toxic illusio of a game is most evident when the game harms but when such harm is tacitly condoned to a degree that it does not induce cognitive dissonance or moral dilemma for the participants (Mergen and Ozbilgin 2020). The illusio of the game, even if it is toxic in some regards, due to its allure that draws in the players prevents the players from viewing the game from an emancipatory lens. Mergen and Ozbilgin (2020) explain that toxic illusio presents a shield which prevents the players of a toxic game from having a healthy view within a particular field of relations.

Previously, Steinmetz (2007) utilized Bourdieu's analytical framework to illustrate that different regions colonized by Germany constituted a Bourdieusian field in which the administrators sought for competing gains. Go (2008) used the field theory to compare the 18th century British and the 20th century American empires. Building on this theoretical fusion, we contend that Bourdieu's concept of illusio as part of his other conceptual ideas are helpful in framing power relations in particular fields such as the neocolonial academia, and the agentic and resourceful roles that individuals play in shaping and reproducing these power hierarchies. In the case of neocolonial knowledge hierarchies, the concept of illusio is helpful in understanding why individuals may remain and continue to play the toxic knowledge production games which generate uneven outcomes.

The USA and UK's hegemonic power on knowledge creation and publishing practices (e.g. Meriläinen et al. 2008, Murphy and Zhu 2012, Varman et al. 2011, Varman 2018) and the origins of the spread of scientific methods and how they were instrumentalized in sustaining colonial power are well documented (e.g. Connell 2017, Murphy and Zhu 2012). The imposition of Western knowledge creation and dissemination practices in CTs and their institutions are also well illustrated (Sreekumar and Varman 2016, Varman and Saha 2009, Varman et al. 2011). What is not studied, and what we provide in this paper is an exploration of the ways in which contemporary marketing academics from CT join in hierarchies of knowledge creation and dissemination in the CCs, and how they perceive (or question) their participation and lowly stakes in the field. To tackle these questions, we merge the post-colonial framework with Bourdieu's concept of illusio.

Method

We utilized in-depth interviews to gain insight into academics' experiences by asking them to talk about their lives (Gubrium and Holstein, 2003) and we have also drawn on documents and secondary data such as British Council booklets and previously published marketing theory papers. In order to select participants, we connected with the history of colonization and its manifestation in academia. Since there are different forms of colonization (internal and external), settler and non-settler (administrative) colonization differ in the way they extract resources from the colonized world and in the way that they marginalise, ghetto-ise, and exclude the local natives in order to achieve their First World sovereign status (see Tuck and Yang 2012). The post-colonial relations in North America (settler colonialism) are bound to differ from those of Africa or the Middle East (administrative colonialism). As the British Empire colonized a much higher geographical space than other European countries such as France, Germany, Belgium, and Spain, the number of our informants are skewed toward those that work in the UK. English speaking academia has a dominant role in continuation of colonial relations (Boussebaa and Brown 2017, Śliwa and Johansson 2016), closely followed by French speaking academia (Yousfi 2021). The composition of our participants reflect the dominance of English theorisation in contemporary marketing academia. The selection of participants was done through marketing academic networks where we approached marketing academics from CT countries who work in the CCs. We identified and invited 30 CT scholars working in CCs and 9 scholars among them agreed to participate in our study.

Our sample consists of 9 marketing academics from various countries that currently work in the UK and France. With the exception of two, all of them work in the broad area of critical marketing. The in-depth interviews were conducted via Zoom and they lasted between 60-100 minutes. Similar to Johansson and Śliwa's (2016) interviewing strategy, we intended to find out about our informants' personal and career trajectories. We asked about their motivation to pursue PhD degrees and academic careers in the CCs, their everyday experiences as CT individuals, researchers, and as faculty in the CCs.

We stopped interviewing when common patterns emerged and conceptual saturation was reached with the field data. The names have been anonymized, and any data that could point to the institutions the informants are working in/have worked in have been excluded from the paper in order to protect their anonymity. The table of informants can be found below.

<insert table 1 here>

We adopted a hermeneutic approach in order to be able to critically interpret from text. We treated the interview transcripts as texts which allowed us to identify common patterns, relevant insights and in depth responses to our research question (see Thompson 1987). We first read each transcript independently to identify emerging themes. We then discussed and scrutinized the emergent themes and allowed early interpretations to shape later ones (see Spiggle 1994). This process led us to the emergence of the three aspects of the phenomenon we investigate which we present below.

Findings

Our analysis reveals that even semi-peripheries such as the UK and France (themselves CCs) may hegemonize those in the peripheries (CTs) and how the academic practices and institutions in these secondary centers (semi-peripheries) act to impose a further layer of hierarchies on the way knowledge is produced and shared. We present our findings in three main themes. First, we illustrate that academia is a toxic field of neocolonial relations. Second, we show what roles are relegated to and accepted by the CT academics, revealing the dominant exploitative practices which sustain the neocolonial field. Third, we illustrate that toxic illusio sustains the CT academics' participation in this toxic field.

Academia: a toxic field of neocolonial relations

In the toxic environment literature, toxicity is defined as "violence, poverty, and other economic pressures...disruption of family relationships and other trauma, despair, depression, paranoia, nastiness, and alienation" (Garbarino 1997, p.12).   In addition to lower salaries, denial of promotion, and denigration (see InsideHigherEd 2018), the data point to the nature of academia as a toxic field of neocolonialism in which people from the CT operate. Most reported incidents of toxicity in our study manifested as subtle yet sophisticated forms of symbolic denigration at the level of interpersonal experiences as well as encounters in colonial institutions. One participant with elite education and high cultural

capital explained her experiences of the academic knowledge production and dissemination process in the toxic field of academia:

"when I saw that the Third World Quarterly paper about the benefits of colonialism was published, and that the publication process was even kind of rigged, my heart really hurt. I expected rage, but I sat down and cried…. A few days later, a male friend of mine, white and Christian of course, and an economist of the neo-liberal kind, told me that yes of course it was beneficial, that he could prove it… I did not speak to him again for about two years." (Reem, 41, from Egypt)

Reem, who has been working in the UK for a decade, is referring to the paper named "The Case for Colonialism" written by Bruce Gilley, which was published in the journal *Third World Quarterly*. The paper argues that colonialism was ultimately beneficial for those that were colonized. The publication of this manuscript was followed by a heated public argument about whether the editor overrode the reviewers who did not think it publishable and published it and whether or not it was injurious to actually even talk of the seeming economic benefits of colonialism (LSE 2017). The manuscript was later withdrawn from the journal. That Reem specified her friend to be male, white, and Christian suggests that not only a CC academic is responsible for part of the trauma she experienced, but also that being in particular male, white, and Christian more or less readily categorizes one's stance on these issues. As such, the dissent from the imperial centre is still seen as quite limited (see Gopal 2019). Similarly, Nina, who has high levels of social, cultural and economic capital, had a toxic experience after which she was left traumatized by the claims of her English office-mate regarding colonialism:

"My office mate… He told me that the colonial project was good for us because they built us railroads and post offices and stuff, and he referred to some history manuscripts and books that were written by the English of course... What is the point of telling him that the British took off those railroads after the Republic of Cyprus was established? Because they wanted to sell cars? And I mean, this is a man who studies the history of marketing, who is supposedly in critical marketing… so he oughta know better… you would think" (Nina, 40, from Cyprus)

Such negative experiences demonstrate that academia manifests as a toxic field where the extension of formal colonial ties constantly recur, prevail, and cause trauma with detrimental symbolic, affective, and material consequences for the CT academics. This toxicity manifests in the academic field in multiple ways, for instance, as lowly representation of CT academics in positions of power and authority in the UK and European universities (Guardian 2018, Healy et al. 2005, Sang et al. 2013) and as epistemic injustice even among 'critical' fields of social science as Nina highlighted with dismay. Lowly representation may take not only formal but also symbolic forms. For example, one participant with considerable level of social and cultural capital recalls how she was represented by her English colleague, the undertones of which suggest a deficit of trust, credibility, and value that colonial subjects felt in the toxic field of academia:

"after I spoke, he repeated what I had just said… he said 'she is saying…'… everyone had understood me anyway, he did not have to translate my English to their English" (Soraya, 34, from Kenya)

While Englishization of academia dominates the institutions in non-English speaking countries (Boussebaa and Brown 2017), even in the UK, English poses yet another layer of domination. What remains often unaccounted for in the picture of such symbolic dominance and low levels of representation, are the living and re-living in trauma, alienation, and possibly depression that some CT academics experience. Mergen and Ozbilgin (2021) explain that if the player in a toxic illusio experience a moral dilemma about the harm that the toxic context presents, this could lead to a cognitive dissonance that could alter their reflections. Below, Tray, with elite education, experiences clear cognitive dissonance, maybe even trauma. Yet, such affect as experienced by colonial subjects is often left unreported or dismissed by the dominant players of the toxic academic game. Tray explains how the CCs often lacked reflections on the impact of the academic processes which serve them well:

"When I collected the award, the person who gave it to me said I was a prime example of what a white education could do for a brown man… so i guess the question is why am i doing this to myself?" (Tray, 41, from India)

Such unreflexive and reductive approaches to those who were formerly colonized stand as testament that still in academia in the Global North, whether the formerly colonized can 'speak' (see Spivak 1988) is still decided by those in the Global North. In addition, whether the various kinds of capital CT academics possess will translate into symbolic capital that is respectability and status in the CC academic field is still decided upon by the CC academics. Ultimately, what is good for the formerly colonized is also still decided on by the former colonizers. This is in line with Reem's account above, which demonstrates that CT academics perceive the CC academics to be unreflexive, if not offensive and symbolically abusive, and that this perception is based on everyday experience. More importantly, despite attempts to decolonise the curricula and other de-colonisation attempts in academia, these unequal relations render and sustain marketing academia a toxic field (see Kamasak et al. 2020 a,b). Within this toxic field, we illustrate below how data extraction and technical-skill brokering are offered by CC academics to CT academics as means of progressing in their career.

Dominant Exploitative Practices that Sustain the Toxic Field

The sustenance of this toxic field can be further illustrated by how the roles are distributed to the academics from CT and which exploitative practices the CT academics experience. First, the toxic field is sustained by relegating a data collector role to the academics from CT, and a theory generating role to the academics from CC. A recent report distributed by the British Council on the future of UK-Cyprus research collaboration post-Brexit presents an excellent example of how the coloniser feeds the assumption that knowledge transfer is unidirectionally from the developed CC academia to the developing CTs:

"Cyprus has good research infrastructure but due to its small size Cypriot organisations and universities need strong partners such as UK universities in order to be successful in very competitive research funding for larger projects. Individuals and faculties in Cypriot universities have developed relationships and consortia with UK academics (as with those

from other countries) and they depend on these to successfully co-write grant proposals."
(British Council 2019, p.1)

Thus, the designated role for the CT academic is to be in collaboration with other academics from the countries *that matter,* especially the UK. This colonialist declaration on part of the British Council is more or less a mirror of the roles seen appropriate for the academics from the CT and such proclamations feed the neocolonial toxicity that valorises the institutions and processes of knowledge production in the CC.

We identify two types of brokering between CT and CC academics in CCs:

Data Brokering
As noted by Ergin and Alkan (2019, p.259), **"**A global academic division of labor plagues contemporary academic production. The epistemological implications assign southern knowledge to the status of "data" for the use of northern "theory"". Connell (2017) notes how this has been the case starting from the early colonial times, with many ground-breaking theorists such as Charles Darwin and Alexander von Humboldt having collected "Southern data" to examine and publish back home. Although on the surface this practice seems innocuous, examining it more closely in contemporary marketing knowledge generation reveals specific co-authorship choices in which the CT scholars supply the data and the CC scholars supply the 'theory' – meaning, they broker the exotic, culturally different data into elite journals often with their interpretation, reproducing deeply problematic representations (Said 1978, Spivak 1988). In this sense, it is possible to conclude there is a one-way flow of raw material from the CT to the imperial centre, a hallmark of colonial economy (see Chang 2010, Jarosz 1993 for the continued effect of colonial resource extraction). One participant explained how such colonial brokering happened in her case:
"Of course… I collected the data back home… and I knew their [supervisors] role was to help me in completing the PhD especially in interpretive consumer research… you rely on them to help you interpret the data… I mean, you have an interpretation in your mind but they stick a theory on it… that is why they are there. Sometimes they comment on the interview guide or something… but mostly they have nothing to do with how the data is collected" (Nina, 40, from Cyprus)

These resentments are voiced by others, too. Reem explains how her CC supervisors brought in theory and she provided the data:
"It is taken for granted… that if they take on a PhD student from elsewhere… this PhD student will collect data from his/her home country… of course that is what happened with my thesis. I collected the data, they told me which theory was emerging…. I would have interpreted it differently probably. I know what certain things mean in that context, they don't… no matter how many books you read, you cannot understand the lived experience of those people. So yes… A supervisor from Egypt would make a different paper out of it"
(Reem, 41, from Egypt)

Reem pinpoints that instead of cultivating a contextual understanding by taking part in collecting the data, especially observation and ethnographic data, CC academics merely translate the emergent picture into existing theory. The politics of translation (Gal 2015)

seem to be playing a part within these exploitative practices: translation of not just concepts or excerpts, but also what contexts mean or denote are often brushed under the carpet and reduced to their essence. As such, they are both reduced in richness and meaning, which Nina refers to as 'sanitized':

"Those journals that every one of us little people from around the world yearn to get into just take run of the mill concepts and they sanitize it to meet the marketing or the general management readership, and suddenly it becomes a thing… Like, take a very critical theory such as the post-colonial theory… and just spray some sprinkle all over it… get rid of its provocativeness, get rid of everything about it that will disturb the white heterosexual man… and you will probably make into that journal… same goes for hegemony, inequality, poverty… they make a mockery of these words." (Nina, 40, from Cyprus)

The benefit CT academics may receive from such one-way flow of resources is accrued through the systems of supervising or mentoring. Academics in earlier phases of their careers may benefit from mentoring in order to develop as scholars and mentorship is formally practiced in most of the academic institutions in CC and CT (Evans and Cokley 2008, Ku et al. 2008, Tansel et al. 2013). Whether this mentoring relationship happens in an equitable manner regardless of the origins of the junior academics is not clear. As these types of relations happen within and around the framework of career development, the academics from the CT may not have a chance to develop the organized reaction to call out the neocolonial nature of such collaborations. In most instances, the CT academics may become complicit in the data extraction and brokering themselves, acting voluntarily as native informants (Spivak 1988), ensuring that they progress their career in the CC. One participant explains how she observed her CT data translated into CC theory:

"surely, it was my data… I had collected it back home, and my supervisor and my mentor were co-authors… but they did not even let me interpret it the way the data spoke to me… they had something in their mind, and boom… my data was categorized… I tried to bring in a local concept, and they were like "no, you are wrong, this cannot be X, this seems an extension of some (obscure) Western theory"… so I guess if it goes on like this, there will be no theory from any country in Africa that gets published in Western journals… they know how to play the ropes" (Soraya, 34, from Kenya)

Thus, Soraya experienced the material and symbolic consequences of supervising and mentoring: the essentialization of the data she collected and the erasure of her voice from the manuscript. Supervising and mentoring relationships are where data extraction and sanitization most likely occur. Another participant explained how the CC actors operated in the toxic field, instrumentalising whatever comes their way, be it academic connections, doctoral students, and data. Neocolonialism operates in a predominantly unidirectional fashion serving the careers and ambitions of the academics who are from the CC, and thus never challenging their sanctioned ignorance (Spivak 1988). One participant with exceptional economic and social capital has accepted the dominant logic of practice as given and uncontestable:

"I guess my supervisor was a bit out of sync with the whole American publication game at the time, although he did have, you know, two publications in that infamous journal… He woke up quite late to the fact that you need this Eastern data to run your Western theory on… anyway… with my thesis, he thought if you don't have British data, you will not be published. Then I guess he changed his mind, when he started blending with the big

American boys, because he took on this PhD student from Thailand, and made her collect a bunch of data, and juxtaposed some sexy theory on it, and boom… it was a publication in a very good journal" (Suresh, 41, from India)

Suresh is quite clear about the way hierarchies of knowledge are organized around the globe. 'Big American Boys' denote the highly active academics who regularly publish in the top elite US journals. The British/English academics are second in this pecking order - they often need to build necessary networks with the scholars from North America and emulate their style of work to get into the top US journals. This style often involves recruiting PhD students from the CT and extracting the data through them. During this process, some CC scholars have minimal presence in the data collection locale, if not full absence. Suresh openly discusses that his supervisor would have done the same with his data if the supervisor had realized beforehand that some elite scholars work in this fashion. For example, recently, a CC professor posted on a critical consumer behaviour group on Facebook that he is looking for "*a cultural insight researcher… who is familiar with Kenyan market and culture*" to collect data. He stipulates that the person he is looking for should either be Kenyan or someone who has collected data from Kenya before (Consumer Culture Theory Facebook Group 2021). In essence, the recruiter is looking for a native informant (see Spivak 1988). As such, extracting CT data through CT researchers is a common and mostly unquestioned practice, and it often goes hand in hand with Spivak's (1988) notion of sanctioned ignorance demonstrated by the CC academic in the above example. Alarmingly, the studies aligned with critical theory or consumer culture are not exempt from this practice. Often, this process which CC scholars usurp and engage with CT data and scholarly collaboration is veiled behind theoretical frameworks such as critical theory and post-colonial theory.

Technical Skills Brokering

While the above examples pertain to qualitative studies, the fetish with quantitative studies in marketing on finding cross-cultural differences requires that CT data are supplied constantly. This also sustains a second form of exploitative practice: extracting the statistical expertise of the researchers from the CT. Looking at both the make-up of the PhD students' home countries and their supervisors' home countries, it is possible to argue that certain spots in the CT are used as quantitative skills recruitment centres. While a part of this may be because of the population's concentration in the said areas of the CT, the trend is hard to miss. One participant explained:

"I worked hard to get a very good score on GMAT, although it is not a thing in the UK, it still shows people that you have data science capabilities… I am good at data science…" (Suresh, 41, from India)

The division of academic labour that has existed for centuries with CC scholars at the core and the CT at the periphery, renders CC academics as scholarly with theoretical and philosophical insights and the CT as technical assistants with statistical skills:

"We all try to help each other… whoever is good at writing the model will write the model, whoever is good at analysis will do it, stuff like that… my other (white, British) co-author has the data collected, and he sends it to me and I run it… it's a matter of minutes for me" (Suresh, 41, from India)

That Suresh specified his co-author to be white and British signals that the co-author is a CC academic. That this co-author '*has the data collected*' further illustrates that this CC academic is highly skilled in extracting data and technical skills from CT academics. The pattern of stigmatising certain regions for technical expertise is reproduced among scholars from CTs, once they are established in the academic system. One participant who has considerable social capital learned and played, rather than to contest the rules of the neocolonial academic game:

"I get my amazing Chinese PhD student to do it… I can also run it myself but I have done it so many times now, I feel like I should work on the theory and the framework…. The model…"
(Taylor, 44, from Taiwan)

Working on the theory and the model are held to a higher regard in the pecking order, something a CT academic may graduate into after supplying the data or the technical expertise for many years.

In addition, adding new 'categories' to quantitative models or data analysis only changes or adds to the core, widely used theory. It merely recirculates and further legitimizes the dominance of CC theories and the CC-designed labor division in marketing research. Cross-cultural research fetishizes the other, yearns to find significant differences between the CTs and the CCs, because this is a fruitful research stream with a consistent return. The long challenged essentialist and uncritical Hofstedean (1984) assumptions about culture are not the only culprit: these dominant exploitative practices sustain both the material and the symbolic hierarchies in marketing knowledge.

Toxic illusio in the academic knowledge production

Toxic illusio manifests as the misguided allure and admiration that draws individuals from CT to remain participants of CC academic system, which continues to denigrate the CT and holds a self-espoused superior position, partly owing to its wealth and privilege accrued through its colonial past. Kamasak et al. (2020b) suggest that a toxic illusio is similar to a pyramid scheme, which draws people with the hope of high yield, when the outcome is that only the few at the top of the pyramid benefit. Toxic illusio is hard to shatter as individuals who join the game have already bought in the normative expectations of the game. As such, toxic illusio can sometimes coexist with cognitive dissonance if players become aware that their yield from the game is less than those who were privileged to set the rules of the game. At other times, their lack of cognitive dissonance is often due to their passion to play the game, e.g. playing the academic game, the often invisible nature of the harm that the game causes, and the implicit nature of the toxicity in which the academic game is played. Yet the illusio became evident when the cognitive dissonance and moral dilemma of the neocolonial toxicity is felt to a significant degree by the participants who nevertheless stay in the field. For many participants, illusio was lifted later in their studies, although this did not translate into abandoning the game. One of the participants with mainstream disposition, economic capital, and strong academic and social ties (social capital) with the CT explained their first academic encounter when they came to Britain from Cyprus and how they were unable to frame their experience of being trivialised and symbolically devalued as a neocolonial experience:

"I never thought about it before I came to the UK… I was very upset with my masters' thesis supervisor because he acted like he was the Englishman who knew everything and I was this little person from a small country… even then… I thought it was because he thought Cyprus was very small...I did not think he meant it in a colonial way" (Arno, 41, from Cyprus)

Arno (41) went on to explain his unease in framing his academic experience in colonial terms as this created a level of cognitive dissonance between the appreciation he felt for his supervisor and the neocolonial nature of the academic experience in the UK, which led him to offer caveats soon after he recalled disparaging attitudes:

"I know many nice British people… so I can't generalize that attitude to everyone… like my PhD supervisor was an amazing woman… she was like my mother in the UK" (Arno, 41, from Cyprus)

Offering these caveats, however logical they may be, helped Arno stay in the game and prevented his cognitive dissonance from translating into action. Similarly, although Nina is later disillusioned, she opts to stay in the game. Nina moves from a state of admiration, with little reflexivity, of the academic publishing system which is imbued with implicit colonial biases and only later develops a critical reflexivity about the toxic illusio and its initial allure:

"When I first started, I was in awe of my supervisor… here was this person that published amazing things in amazing journals… it would take me another 5 years to realize neither the journal nor what he'd published were actually that amazing… but when I was younger and I guess largely more impressionable, I did think I need this man to look at my data to tell me what my data is telling me… to make it into a product that could go into one of those hotshot journals…looking back now, i feel so naive and stupid about it…" (Nina, 40, from Cyprus)

At least initially, the desire to get published in elite marketing journals alongside elite CC academics is one of the reasons why CT academics choose to work in the toxic CC academic institutions. It must be noted that the initial awe and excitement for some CT academics change over time as they reflect on the nature of their professional relations with the CC academics and as they examine the yield they receive from the game. Yet, this critical reflexivity is not sufficient for Nina and some others to leave the CC academia altogether. It is important to note that the colonial status beliefs are not only evident in the CC. Such uneven status beliefs are also globally enforced as previously discussed by Varman and Saha (2009). For example, the top journals in the field of marketing, although embedded in colonial relations, are revered globally and similarly in the CC and CT regions. Nina still publishes within roughly the same circle of CC co-authors and targets the said top journals. In this sense, she is conflicted, as are many others: she has been trained in CC academy, and sees the metropole as where her career is, but the grand strategies of imperial domination pose everyday symbolic and material conflicts for such CT academics. Academic games are powerful. Their rules are taught through strong rituals of training, acculturation, tacit forms of learning in socialisation and many other forms of symbolic and ceremonial experiences along the way. As Bourdieu explains, it is difficult for participants in the academic game, as in any game, to have a full set of reasons for their own participation or position in the game: "Participants have ultimately no answer to questions about the

reasons for their membership in the game, their visceral commitment to it." (Bourdieu 2000, p. 102). Thus, the valorisation of the coloniser and their academic systems above and beyond those of the CT is often presented as the rule of the game as demonstrated in the above section on the toxic field. Once located in such a toxic neocolonial field, participants absorbed the rules of the game through the collective habitus of their social and academic environments which allowed them room for joining the game as conformers (Padilla et al. 2007; Edmonds 2021). This type of conformity is not one of pure complacency or non-reflexivity, it may have elements of cognitive dissonance, but it is one which does not actively challenge the game. One participant explains how she accepted that her mother's study in the UK was more valuable than anything she could have at home, which suggests how the habitus with its internalised subjectivities serves to entrench neocolonialism:
"I thought that is what you did in life… my parents grew up during the war, obviously caused by the Brits… and despite being a refugee, my mom won a scholarship to Imperial College, and I remember growing up I was in awe of her… going to study in the UK is what you did if you wanted to be your best self in life… so I strived to go there, and I did" (Nina, 40, from Cyprus)

In the context of contemporary marketing academia which manifests itself as a toxic field, toxic illusio emerges as the allure of the academic game despite its dark side. CT academics also often resigned to the toxic nature of the academic knowledge production game due to the endemic nature of the toxic routines observed and internalised over the years, the radical transformation of which was beyond the possibilities of their power and influence. Toxic illusio serves as a shield which helps actors in academia to both recognise and yet persevere in colonial undertones of their work experiences and careers in academia.

There is a boundary condition in our sample. We only interviewed participants who remained as academics from CT and who continue academic careers in the CCs. Even though our participants showed varied degrees of recognition of and reaction to the toxic aspects of neocolonial knowledge hierarchies in which they operate, they are the ones who remained in the game. Bourdieusian concepts illusio, field, and habitus help us frame the way colonised subjects valorise and uphold the knowledge hierarchies which devalue their scientific capital, by accepting their lowly stakes in exchange for recognition as outsiders within. The earlier the CT academic learns to make their home country and data appealing to the gaze of the CT, the earlier they may advance in their careers. This auto-orientalization is carried out by the CT academics, all the while being able to pinpoint instances of Orientalism in writing processes and in social relations. As such, data flow from the CT to the CC is sustained. One participant explains how the CC theorisation would caricature and transmorph CT concepts into its ontological position.
"But if you look closely… Guanxi has nothing to do with what Guanxi actually is… similarly… Ubuntu in western management journals has nothing to do with ubuntu… because… although they go on and on about how important the context is, they decontextualise these concepts from the Global South… and it ends up very blandly, if it is lucky in a qualitative paper, if it is unlucky, a quantitative paper". (Soraya, 34, from Kenya)

The continued participation in the game creates material consequences for itself: it manufactures its own consent, and sees elite publications as the yield of the game. It is a prime example of symbolic domination in academic hierarchy – it illuminates how CT

academics accept the reality of operating in hierarchies and naturalize the dominant and privileged position of the CC. For example, *guanxi* has been translated, auto-orientalized and brokered into an CC-centric concept (see Chen et al. 2004, Luo 1997), despite other Chinese scholars' persistent warnings that the way that *guanxi* is brokered and understood in the USA- and Euro-centric management journals is deeply flawed (see Zhai 2009). As such, translation, a seemingly innocent task, is not exempt from power asymmetries and reproduces different subjectivities, of which the CT academic subjectivity is one (see Gal 2015, Maranhao and Streck 2003).

Meriläinen et al. (2008) illustrated that in management, any context outside of the Anglophone core has to be defended and it has to be positioned as different from the core in a fundamental way to warrant interrogation.   Similarly, the CT academics have to justify their context, whereas data that originates from the CC is not questioned as closely in terms of the choice of context. As Meriläinen et al. (2008) note, the review process also enables this – reviewers do believe that they are expected to ask about justifying the context if the context is outside of the CC. Although indeed contexts are important, the CC contexts usually are not subjected to the same scrutiny, as seen by the sheer length of the justification of the context in some consumer research studies. For example, comparing the related sections in Humayun and Belk (2020) and Nguyen and Belk (2013) reveals how lengthy the justification for the data from outside the CC is in comparison to the statement about data collection in CC:

"*The participants for in-depth, semi-structured interviews were recruited using purposive sampling (see Table 1) (McCracken, 1988). Ads were initially posted on the university student mailing lists and social media groups asking for participants who used either Moleskine notebooks or film cameras. Interview informants also connected the researcher to other participants in their network. Two interviews were conducted via email, while the rest took place in coffee shops around the United Kingdom and Canada*" (Humayun and Belk 2020).

While the above statement merely mentions the collection took place in the UK and Canada, the excerpt below shows that data collected from the CT is (sometimes imposed by reviewers) defended and contextualized at length:

"*We chose to study Vietnamese wedding-ritual consumption because of its complexity, a complexity that is due to both the sheer number of people and objects involved and to the emotion associated with the process. Each of our wedding couples spent the equivalent of US$3,000–US$6,000 on their wedding consumption, in a country that has a per capita annual GDP of less than US$1,000, while an average wedding costs US$28,000 in the United States (Mead 2007). The number of guests in our sample of weddings ranged from hundreds to thousands. Ritual artifacts included, but were not confined to, wedding costumes, jewelry, invitation cards, decorations, flowers, food, beverages, music, dancing performances, and many gifts for the bride's family. Meanings of consumption are created and negotiated around wedding rituals. Our field observation is consolidated with scholarly work on Vietnamese culture (Phan 2006; Trần 2004) to provide the description of the research site below, which helps to explain the context of meaning creation and negotiation*" (Nguyen and Belk, 2013)

A similar pattern can be observed in context specification sections in many other publications (see Thompson and Ustuner (2015) and Ustuner and Holt (2010) for comparison). When the context is CTs or elsewhere in the Global South, lengthy justifications are provided, as they are asked for. Through toxic illusio, the CT academics continue to engage in over-explaining their research contexts, as it is a naturalised requirement of the publication process, which in turn sustains the knowledge production hierarchy. Our study shows that in a toxic field of neocolonial marketing knowledge production, key actors engage in a double bind with neocolonial knowledge hierarchies: while joining them they also serve to reify and reproduce their illusio, which may blur the toxic nature of the neocolonial academic game especially for outsiders. We accounted for how this happens through the process of toxic illusio which makes it difficult for scholars from the CT to exert especially collective resistance against the system as they become entrenched in the academic game.

Discussion and conclusion

Adopting a qualitative approach, we describe the specific experiences of scholars from the previously CTs in the CCs and offer three novel contributions. First, our analysis and findings differ from gendered and racialized epistemic practices that prevail in academia (e.g., Sliwa & Johansson, 2014; Dar et al., 2020) and from the experiences of scholars writing from the postcolony (e.g., Varman & Saha, 2009). We illustrate the existence of the toxic field of academia against apparently innocuous processes of knowledge production, dissemination, and careers at mostly elite institutions that surround it. Second, we illustrate the mechanisms that exacerbate knowledge hierarchies: we show that data extraction and brokering and technical skills extraction and brokering are the mechanisms with which the toxic field operates - they are the roles relegated to CT academics, and the roles that CT academics, at least at one point in their careers, accept to fulfill. Third, through the use of *toxic illusio*, we illustrate the continued participation of CT academics in this toxic field and highlight that both the allure of the game and the lack of similar opportunities, as a longtail consequence of neocolonialism, in their home countries render the CT academics complicit in the game. Such quasi-voluntary complicity sustains management and business schools as imperialist contexts (Boussebaa and Brown 2017), and CT academics who work in management and business schools in their home countries use mimicry and hybridity to forge their identities, which, in turn, sustain the neocolonial relations between business schools around the globe (Kothiyal et. al 2018). Our study contributes to the completion of this picture and furthers the understanding of neocolonial relationships and role distribution in academia: we show which exploitative practices the CT academics who work in CCs have to perform, and how these practices sustain marketing knowledge production as not only a neocolonial but also a toxic field. We illustrate that although mimicry and hybridity explain part of the picture in how CT academics conduct themselves in the periphery (see Kothiyal et al. 2018), illusio explains why CT academics continue to stay in the game in CC institutions. In this way, our study contributes to the post-colonial theory by exploring how, despite their lowly stakes in the game, CT academics even with high levels of social, cultural, and economic capital face demarcation of their symbolic capital and yet continue to remain as observers and participants of the illusio of the neocolonial relations.

We show the complicity of even the critical marketing studies in the toxic illusio, in sustaining this flawed field. This complicity is partially embedded in a wider regime of excellence dictated by the management and business studies (see Butler and Spoelstra 2014). While postcolonial theory queries the representational practices forced on by Western knowledge systems (Spivak 1988, 1999; Westwood and Jack 2007), the roles given to and accepted by the CT academics perpetuate the current hierarchy of knowledge. To this end, we illustrate that it is not enough to do a particular type of research (i.e. qualitative vs. quantitative, critical vs. managerialist). What is necessary to survive in CC institutions is to supply data, supply the 'exotic' reading of the data which may or may not be translated with care or sanitized by the CC academics, and/or supply the necessary technical skills all the while working with the correct CC academic that can broker these research projects as publications into the elite journals. Thus, colonisation is still alive and well in the toxic field of marketing knowledge production.

CT academics bring in diverse and rich forms of capital, they often come from privileged backgrounds in the economic, cultural, or social sense. Also, they are often supported by national bursaries, or had exceptional elite education and attainment in their studies, and bring and build social capital in the CC academic institutions. However, common to all their experience is a denigration of their symbolic capital, which is a toxic outcome of the neocolonial field in which they have to operate. Toxicity in the neocolonial academy was sometimes rendered invisible due to a complex set of factors. CT academics who would like to advance their careers in CC institutions are given some seeming privileges as outsiders within - PhD scholarships, tenure-track jobs, mentoring, and co-authorship. These privileges are conditional upon their acceptance of certain roles which translate into exploitative practices within hierarchies of marketing knowledge generation. This is not unlike certain privileged positions that existed during colonisation, such as the people from CT joining the Royal Army during WWII, helping manage the resource extraction process, and filling other forms of privileged civil servant roles. Complementary to Kothiyal et al.'s (2018) work which demonstrates how Indian scholars are rendered precarious in their relations with their Western collaborators, we illustrate that in the CC institutions, too, CT scholars remain in a position of precarity, as they afforded low levels of autonomy and security. Although diversity in terms of ethnicity and scholars from CT increased (InsideHigherEd 2016, LSE 2016), the same did not happen for tenure-track or tenured faculty (InsideHigherEd 2018), which remains largely CC dominated. Furthermore, as we illustrated, symbolic representation of CT scholars still continues to devalue their roles and contributions to CC-centric academic institutions and structures. Colonization still exists in structures as well as in symbolic relations, and binds academics to specific roles within academia and publishing. The toxic field of academia has precarious material and symbolic consequences for CT academics: pay, career prospects, and value and nature of their involvement in academic labour and knowledge production and dissemination processes.

Furthering the research on toxic illusio (Mergen and Ozbilgin 2019), we illustrate that cognitive dissonance may be present, but this does not necessarily mean that the CT academics will leave the academic field. Our data also shows that the participants often resign to the entrenched nature of the neocolonial toxic field in academia, due to the allure of the academic game weighing heavier than the demands of struggling against the neocolonial knowledge hierarchies. The toxic elements of the field are sustained through

the participation of the CT academics also because colonialism as a project has diminished or annulled alternative career paths in CT academics' home countries. CT political institutions, and their interplay with economic and cultural institutions also contribute to the CT academics' continued participation in CC fields. As noted by Fanon (1963), some people in the CT are still enslaved, some have achieved a simulacrum of independence, and some continue to fight for sovereignty. The reflection of this in academia is almost the same: some academics from the CT are in a simulacrum of independence which is sustained by toxic illusio. This sustains the existing hierarchies, and even may strengthen them. However, joining CC institutions also does not offer much room for agency and progress for CT academics unless they publish or collaborate with CC academics strategically. As such, this presents a double bind of toxic illusio for the CT academics in the CCs. Moreover, the continued dominance of the CC academics and global institutions is also enforced by the political-economic institutions in the CTs. For example, many CT universities are striving to get into the global rankings (Brabet et al. 2021), directly catering to the rules stipulated by CC institutions. In the case of academia, working in an elite university in the CC may at the same time offer respectability and status to a CT scholar, and it may also harm their self-interest and career progression prospects as the elite institutions are highly entrenched in the uneven power relations of the colonial system that denigrates CT scholars. Thus the engagement of a CT scholar with the toxic illusio presents a duality, which allows them status on the one hand (Srinivas 2013), and yet strips them of agentic power and equal access on the other.

As quantitative methods and finding significant cross-cultural differences in marketing are still fetishized, the toxic field requires that such data are both supplied and technically processed constantly. The CC-centric treatment of cross-cultural differences is thus strengthened by the supply of cross-cultural data, which means at least some of the data will be collected from the CTs. In tandem, the persistence of Hofstede's (1984) framework in marketing and management studies as a proxy for culture and cultural differences points to the reification process that is both made possible and fuelled by some academics from CT in order to survive in academia. In this very academic field, the rules, the gatekeeping, and the checks and balances are all carried out by CC scholars despite the newly increasing existence of people from the CT on faculty rosters, editorial boards, and publication lists. The studies aligned with critical theory or consumer culture are not exempt from the hierarchies in knowledge production processes. It is highly possible for one academic to come from a position of privilege (being from the CC), to study post-colonialism in an academic capacity, and to still traverse the academic publishing field in the manner of a colonial agent.   As such, the nuances drawn out by Gopal's (2019) work in terms of some of the CC academics importing ideas of dissent, but in a sanitized manner, hold in neo-colonial marketing academia and help to sustain hierarchies of knowledge. Similarly, it is highly possible for an academic from the CT to internalize the very hierarchy s/he critiques. Even if such hierarchies are not internalized, some CT academics nevertheless choose to stay in the game despite the cognitive dissonance they persistently feel. The fact that there exist publications on the legacy of post-colonial relationships and its effect on the current marketplace relations does in no way guarantee the absence of neocolonial relations in publishing collaborations. While the CC academics, under the pretense of looking at the CT, objectify their CT research collaborators, colleagues, co-authors, and PhD students, these

very objectified CT academics, over time, to survive the field, naturalize such encounters and become complicit in their reification as the colonized.

When we suggest that some marketing academics who come from the CT are complicit in the continuation of the neocolonial practice of marketing knowledge generation, we do under no circumstances discount the evidence of discrimination, lack of representation, overt and covert racism, and the inequality in academia that is a long-tailed consequence of colonialism (Guardian 2018, InsideHigherEd 2016, 2018, LSE 2014). Although both the CC and the CT scholars that are regarded as elite scholars (i.e. regularly publish in well regarded journals) do write about inequality, the consequences of colonization, and Eurocentric dominance, this does not necessarily translate into transformative struggles within the academic field. We note that their actions in the metropole are similar to Spivak's (1999) discussion of the 'native informant' and Varman and Saha's (2009) work on comprador intellectuals. Amidst the spread of critical studies in marketing, we find the still persistent practice of looking for the 'other' data and applying Eurocentric theory to it. Lincoln (1993) notes the absolute necessity to include the voices of those that are and have been silenced. In the same way, we seek to generate an understanding of how neocolonialism is sustained in academia by listening to those scholars whose labor such neocolonialism exploits via specific dominant practices in marketing theory generation. Following Frantz Fanon's tradition, we seek not to speak to the colonizers, but to speak to the colonized. As such, this study is a meditation on neocolonial experiences of scholars from the CTs in the CCs. In charting their experience, we also acknowledge the role of political-economic institutions in CTs that are also accountable for the continued domination of CC-centric knowledge production.

That knowledge production is reduced to exotic sites and 'sexy' theory, as illustrated by our informants, remains a key challenge to be overcome in the existing hierarchies in knowledge production. Future research is needed to explore how neocolonial structures could be transformed with future facing institutional and collective struggles. Our study highlighted a level of awareness which does not yet connect with collective struggles or institutional interventions among marketing academics. Secondly, further research is needed to chart the lived experiences of other CT academics, such as those who now have to strive to exist in an academic field dominated by settler colonialists. Illuminating what practices, in addition to the ones highlighted here and in previous literature, shapes and sustains their relationship to colonialists in terms of marketing knowledge production is necessary to complete the picture. Finally, further research is needed to disentangle how race and gender may make a difference in the way these hierarchies are sustained: it is necessary to investigate whether all CT academics are subject to the same role relegation, whether the male CT academics' experiences differ from those of female and LGBTQ CT academics, and whether a CT academic's race results in other types of relegations than the ones documented above.

References

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S. & Robinson, J.A. (2001) The colonial origins of comparative development: An empirical investigation. *American Economic Review 91*(5): 1369-1401.

Acemoglu, D. & Robinson, J.A. (2012) *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, And Poverty*. New York: Currency.

Adam, T. (2019) Digital neocolonialism and massive open online courses (MOOCs): colonial pasts and neoliberal futures. *Learning, Media and Technology* 44(3): 365-380.

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

Alatas, S.F. (2000) Academic dependency in the social sciences: Reflections on India and Malaysia. *American Studies International* 38(2): 80–96.

Al Ariss, A., Özbilgin, M., Tatli, A. & April, K. (2014) Tackling whiteness in organizations and management. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 29(4): 362-369.

Archer, L., Dawson, E., DeWitt, J., Seakins, A., & Wong, B. (2015). "Science capital": A conceptual, methodological, and empirical argument for extending Bourdieusian notions of capital beyond the arts. *Journal of research in science teaching 52*(7) 922-948.

BBC (2020) Covid-19 pandemic: Tracking the coronavirus outbreak. Available at: https://www.bbc.com/news/world-51235105 (accessed at 31.10.2020)

Bernal, D.D., & Villalpando, O. (2002) An apartheid of knowledge in academia: The struggle over the" legitimate" knowledge of faculty of color. *Equity & Excellence in Education35*(2): 169-180.

Bhabha, H. (1984) Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse *28*(10): 125-133.

Bond, P. (2006) Looting *Africa*: The Economics of Exploitation. London: Zed Books.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L.J. (1992) An *Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. University of Chicago Press.

Boussebaa, M., & Brown, A.D. (2017) Englishization, identity regulation and imperialism. *Organization Studies 38*(1): 7-29.

Boussebaa, M., & Tienari, J. (2019) Englishization and the politics of knowledge production in management studies. *Journal of Management Inquiry* 30(1): 59-67.

Boyce, J.K. & Ndikumana, L. (2001) Is Africa a net creditor? New estimates of capital flight from severely indebted Sub-Saharan African countries, 1970-96. *Journal of Development Studies 38*(2): 27-56.

Brabet, J., Ozbilgin, M. and Yamak, S. (2021) Changing the rules of the game in academic publishing: three scenarios in the field of management research, *International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics* (forthcoming).

British Council (2019) The Future of UK Cyprus Collaboration Post-Brexit. Available at: https://www.britishcouncil.com.cy/sites/default/files/british_council_report-_the_future_of_uk-cyprus_collaboration.pdf

Brooks, A. (2013) Clothing Poverty: The Hidden World of Fast Fashion And Second-Hand Clothes. London: Zed Books.

Butler, N., & Spoelstra, S. (2014). The regime of excellence and the erosion of ethos in critical management studies. *British Journal of Management*, *25*(3), 538-550.

Césaire, A. (2001) *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: NYU Press.

Chen, C.C., Chen, Y.R. & Xin, K. (2004) Guanxi practices and trust in management: A procedural justice perspective. *Organization Science 15*(2): 200-209.

Chang, H.J. (2010) *Bad Samaritans: The Myth of Free Trade and The Secret History of Capitalism.* New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Connell, R. (2017) Southern theory and world universities. *Higher Education Research and Development 36*(1): 4-15.

Dar, S., Liu, H., Martinez Dy, A., & Brewis, D.N. (2020). The business school is racist: Act up!. *Organization* doi.org/10.1177/1350508420928521.

Edmonds, W. (2021) *Intoxicating followership in the Jonestown Massacr*e, Emerald Press, Bingley.

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.

Evans, G.L. and Cokley, K.O. (2008) African American women and the academy: Using career mentoring to increase research productivity. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology 2*(1): 50-57

Fanon, F. (1963) *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.

Gal, S. (2015) Politics of translation. *Annual Review of Anthropology 44*: 225-240.

Garbarino, J. (1997) Educating children in a socially toxic environment. *Educational Leadership 54*(7): 12-16.

Given, M. (2005) Mining landscapes and colonial rule in early-twentieth-century Cyprus. *Historical Archaeology 39*(3): 49-60.

Go, J. (2008). 'Global Fields and Imperial Forms: Field Theory and the British and American Empires.' *Sociological Theory* 26: 201–29.

Gopal, P. (2019). *Insurgent empire: Anticolonial resistance and British dissent*. London: Verso.

Guardian (2018) UK universities making slow progress on equality, data shows. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/education/2018/sep/07/uk-university-professors-black-minority-ethnic (accessed at 31.10.2020)

Gubrium, J.F. and Holstein, J.A. (Eds.). (2003) *Postmodern Interviewing*. London: Sage Publications.

Healy, G., Özbilgin, M. and Aliefendioğlu, H. (2005) Academic employment and gender: A Turkish challenge to vertical sex segregation. *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 11(2): 247-264.

Heleta, S. (2016) Decolonisation of higher education: Dismantling epistemic violence and Eurocentrism in South Africa. *Transformation in Higher Education 1*(1): 1-8.

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Vol. 5). sage.

Humayun, M., & Belk, R. (2020). The analogue diaries of postdigital consumption. *Journal of Marketing Management 36*(7-8): 633-659.

Inside Higher Ed (2019). The Inequities of the Tenure-Track System. Available at: https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2019/06/07/nonwhite-faculty-face-significant-disadvantages-tenure-track-opinion (accessed at 31.10.2020)

Inside Higher Ed (2016) More Faculty Diversity, Not on Tenure Track. Available at: https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2019/06/07/nonwhite-faculty-face-significant-disadvantages-tenure-track-opinion (accessed at 31.10.2020)

Jarosz, L. (1993). Defining and explaining tropical deforestation: shifting cultivation and population growth in colonial Madagascar (1896–1940). *Economic Geography 69*(4): 366-379.

Kamasak, R., Ozbilgin, M. & Atay, D. (2020a) The cultural impact of hidden curriculum on language learners: A review and some implications for curriculum design. In beyond language learning instruction: *Transformative Supports for Emergent Bilinguals and Educators, IGI Global:* 104-125.

Kamasak R, Ozbilgin, M & Esmen, A.R. (2020b) The high stakes use of language proficiency tests as illusio and pyramid scheme: An evaluation of their social aspects, validity, and reliability. In *Optimizing Higher Education Learning Through Activities and Assessments, IGI Global*: 188-203.

Kothiyal, N., Bell, E., & Clarke, C. (2018) Moving beyond mimicry: Developing hybrid spaces in Indian business schools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 17(2): 137-154.

Ku, H.Y., Lahman, M. K., Yeh, H.T., & Cheng, Y.C. (2008) Into the academy: Preparing and mentoring international doctoral students. *Educational Technology Research and Development 56*(3): 365-377.

Lincoln, Y.S. (1993) I and thou: Method, voice, and roles in research with the silenced. In McLaughlin D and Tierney WG (eds) *Naming Silenced Lives.* New York: Routledge, pp.29–50.

Loomba, A. (2015) *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge.

Luo, Y. (1997) Guanxi: Principles, philosophies, and implications. *Human Systems Management 16*(1) 43-52.

LSE (2017) There is No Case for Colonialism: Insights from the Colonial Economic History. Available at: https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/africaatlse/2017/10/17/there-is-no-case-for-colonialism-insights-from-the-colonial-economic-history/ (Accessed 31.04.2021)

LSE (2014) Black Academia in Britain. Available at: https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/equityDiversityInclusion/2014/08/black-academia-in-britain/ (Accessed 31.10.2018)

Maranhão, T. & Streck, B. (2003) Translation and Ethnography: The Anthropological Challenge of Intercultural Understanding. Tucson: Arizona University Press.

Meriläinen, S., Tienari, J., Thomas, R., & Davies, A. (2008). Hegemonic academic practices: Experiences of publishing from the periphery. *Organization 15*(4): 584-597.

Mergen, A., & Özbilgin, M.F. (2021). Understanding the followers of toxic leaders: Toxic illusio and personal uncertainty. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 23(1): 45-63.

Murphy, J. and Zhu, J. (2012) Neo-colonialism in the academy? Anglo-American domination in management journals. *Organization 19*(6): 915-927.

Mutua, K. & Swadener, B.B. (Eds.) (2004) Decolonizing Research in Cross-Cultural Contexts: Critical Personal Narratives, SUNY Press: Albany.

Nguyen, T.D.T., & Belk, R.W. (2013). Harmonization processes and relational meanings in constructing Asian weddings. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *40*(3), 518-538.

Nyoni, J. (2019) Decolonising the higher education curriculum: An analysis of African intellectual readiness to break the chains of a colonial caged mentality. *Transformation in Higher Education 4*(1): 1-10.

Özbilgin, M.F. (2009) From journal rankings to making sense of the world. *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 8(1): 113-121.

Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R.B. (2007). The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments. *The leadership quarterly* 18(3): 176-194.

Prasad, A. (2015) Toward decolonizing modern western structures of knowledge. In Prasad, A. Prasad, P., Mills, A.J, and Mills, J.H. (Eds.). *The Routledge companion to critical management studies.* London, Routledge: 161-199.

Pustelnikovaite, T. (2020) Locked out, locked in and stuck: Exploring migrant academics' experiences of moving to the UK. *Higher Education*: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00640-0.

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

Sang, K., Al-Dajani, H. & Özbilgin, M.F. (2013) Frayed careers of migrant female professors in British academia: An intersectional perspective. *Gender, Work & Organization* 20(2): 158-171.

Śliwa, M., & Johansson, M. (2015) Playing in the academic field: Non-native English-speaking academics in UK business schools. *Culture and Organization* 21(1): 78-95.

Spiggle, S. (1994) Analysis and interpretation of qualitative data in consumer research. *Journal of consumer research 21*(3): 491-503.

Spivak, G.C. (1988) Can the subaltern speak? In Nelson, C. & Grossberg, L. (Eds.) *Marxism and the interpretation of culture.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp.271-313.

Sreekumar, H., &Varman, R. (2016). History of marketing in India. In Jones, D. B., & Tadajewski, M. (Eds.). *Routledge Companion to Marketing History.* London: Routledge, pp.389-405.

Steinmetz, G. (2007). T*he Devil's Handwriting: Precoloniality and the German Colonial State in Qingdao, Samoa, and Southwest Africa.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Syed, J. & Özbilgin, M. (2009) A relational framework for international transfer of diversity management practices. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 20(12): 2435-2453.

Tansel, C.A., Kizil, C. & Zengin, H.I. (2013) Impact of mentoring on organizational commitment and job satisfaction of accounting-finance academicians employed in Turkey. *Emerging Markets Journal 3*(2): 1-28.

Taoua, P. (2003) The anti-colonial archive: France and Africa's unfinished business. *SubStance 32*(3): 146-164.

Thompson, C.J., & Üstüner, T. (2015). Women skating on the edge: Marketplace performances as ideological edgework. *Journal of Consumer Research 42*(2): 235-265.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K.W. (2012) Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, education & society 1*(1): 1-40.

Üsdiken, B. (2014) Centres and Peripheries: Research Styles and Publication Patterns in 'Top' US Journals and their European Alternatives, 1960–2010. *Journal of Management Studies 51*(5): 764-789.

Üstüner, T. & Holt, D.B. (2010) Toward a theory of status consumption in less industrialized countries. *Journal of consumer research 37*(1): 37-56.

Varman, R. (2018) Postcolonialism, Subalternity, and Critical Marketing. Tadajewski, M., Higgins, M., Denegri-Knott, J. and Varman, R. (Eds.) *The Routledge Companion to Critical Marketing.* London: Routledge, pp.49-63.

Varman, R. & Saha, B. (2009) Disciplining the discipline: understanding postcolonial epistemic ideology in marketing. *Journal of Marketing Management 25*(7-8): 811-824.

Varman, R., Saha, B., & Skålén, P. (2011) Market subjectivity and neoliberal governmentality in higher education. *Journal of Marketing Management 27*(11-12): 1163-1185.

Varman, R., & Sreekumar, H. (2015) Locating the past in its silence: history and marketing theory in India. *Journal of historical research in marketing*, *7*(2): 272-279.

Westwood, R.I. & Jack, G. (2007) Manifesto for a post-colonial international business and management studies. *Critical Perspectives on International Business* 3(3): 246-265.

Yousfi, H. (2021) International Management, Should We Abandon the Myth of Cultural Hybridity? A Re-examination of the Contribution of Postcolonial and Decolonial Approaches. *M@n@gement*, 80-89.

Zhai, X. (2009) From Social Capital to Guanxi: A Study of Small and Medium Enterprise Growth in China. In *Residency, Class, and Community in the Contemporary Chinese City*, pp.85-103.