

9

Writing a Doctoral Thesis in a Non-Western Voice

Sharin Shajahan Naomi

ASIAN UNIVERSITY FOR WOMEN, BANGLADESH

Abstract: My Ph.D. thesis on Tibetan Buddhism and feminism uses autoethnographic performative writing to invoke a non-Western voice that challenges colonialities of knowledge production. Studying at the time as an international doctoral student in Australia, I chose to focus my thesis on my experience as a Bangladeshi female writing in an academic context that is predominately influenced by the hegemony of Western knowledge. By waging epistemic disobedience through performative writing, I created a space for writing a doctoral thesis with a non-Western voice. Nonetheless through my journey, I encountered struggles and addressed questions of legitimacy. Despite this, I endured. In this chapter, I aim to unpack my strategies and challenges, offering a fresh perspective on what it is like to be a non-Western doctoral student enacting academic resistance.

In autoethnography, researchers analyze their own experiences to address the main themes of their research (Ellis et al., 2011). Autoethnographers work to connect personal experience to wider political and cultural contexts. Many autoethnographers have used these tools to enable the representation of the voices, languages, and narratives of others, especially the marginalized and the subaltern, who do not have the opportunity to speak due to the authority and surveillance of hegemonic power structures within the academy (Holt, 2003; Lincoln & Denzin, 2003). I am an author who builds on and extends this body of work. In my Ph.D. thesis, I used autoethnographic methods to reflect upon my life journey as a Bangladeshi female negotiating Tibetan Buddhist practice and feminist values in an in-between space of cultures, religion, and identity. I undertook this project due to the lack of autoethnographic voices of women of color with regard to understanding the relationship between Tibetan Buddhism and feminism in women's lives, particularly for women across different cultures and religions who came to know Tibetan Buddhist practice by choice, not by birth or family relationships. In this chapter, I describe what happened when I started to write autoethnographically for my doctoral thesis. I began to

experience difficulties with speaking and writing as a woman and non-Westerner in the hegemonic space of Western academia. In this chapter, I describe the sense of academic suffocation that eroded the spontaneity of my writing and expression and my feeling that I had to speak in a certain way to present my intimate experience of Tibetan Buddhism and feminism. I will make the argument that the enforcement of these writing conventions on doctoral students is evidence of the coloniality of knowledge production that operates in Western academia (see also Fa'avae, Chapter 8, this collection).

The Academic Writer: Post-colonial Approaches

Across my doctoral experience, I came to appreciate the observations of many post-colonial scholars who have argued that colonialism is not only a system that controls economic and political resources, it is also a system that controls knowledge-making through discourse representation, epistemology and ideology (Mignolo, 2009; Said, 1979; Spivak, 1988). My struggle to write in a Western academic way reminded me of both Gayatri Spivak's (1988) description of the subaltern's struggle to speak as a subject in Western discourse and Trinh T. Minh-ha's (1991) description that the people at the margins within the field of Western knowledge production are women, natives, and the others. Both poststructuralist and postcolonial paradigms critique the limitations around voice and speech, seeing these limitations as rooted in the oppressive structures of particular kinds of discourse. I found in the Western intellectual realm, if one is a woman as well as non-Westerner, her sense of otherness is tripled. She is less privileged than her White Western sisters, less fortunate than White Western men, and less advanced than non-Western men.

My desire to write in a non-Western voice invited three important questions: What might it mean to speak with a non-Western voice in my thesis? Could I do this as an international researcher studying in Australia? And, how could I invoke a non-Western voice without creating further oppositional politics, another boundary of "us" versus "them?" Before considering these questions, I want to unpack how I identify as non-Western in order to more fully understand my resistance as a woman of color in the Western academy and the context within which my voice is embedded. Explaining our location can help to reveal our own subjective views regarding who we are, where we come from, and how our experiences have shaped our identities and the intentions that may lie behind our research (Absolon & Willet, 2005). Without valuing and acknowledging location in narratives, there is a risk that the dynamic nature of a non-Western voice can be reduced to another category in opposition to a Western voice.

Since childhood, I have had an ambivalent relationship with the West as well as with my own culture. I was born and brought up in Bangladesh, which, as a part of India, was subject to British colonization for hundreds of years. Its education system and politics are highly influenced by Western liberal ideas as well as by Bengali culture and Islamic religious values. Like many other middle-class families, my family retained the paradoxical lineage of practicing traditional Bengali culture, Islamic values, and Western liberal ideas simultaneously. Western liberal ideas of freedom and human rights were attractive to me as an adolescent. This interest led me to study law. In Bangladesh, our legal system was inherited from our British colonial legacy and is rooted in Western liberal ideas, the Enlightenment approach, and the Western adversarial model of argument. I was trained in this system for years and became an excellent debater on legal issues. Yet when I was in Bangladesh, I felt I never belonged there. My thoughts and approaches to life were very radical and seemed to be incompatible with my surroundings. I thought perhaps I was like a Westerner. However, when I went to Australia for graduate study, I soon learned that I was not a Westerner either.

My graduate research was about Tibetan Buddhism and feminism. My choice of topic was influenced, in part, by my own experiences as a feminist and non-Western woman who lived in-between cultures, countries, and religions. I was not born a Buddhist. Tibetan Buddhism drew my attention later when I was in my mid-20s, having a personal crisis, and looking for meaning in life. I had the opportunity to explore Tibetan Buddhist practice with more depth and contemplation while I was in Australia, accessing Tibetan Buddhist institutions that provided Buddhist teachings mainly to Western students. As a result, my interactions and experiences with this Eastern tradition remain culturally blended, in the space of in-betweenness. Little did I realize that I was inventing a Buddhism, one shaped and reshaped by my situations, positionality, creativity, imagination, freedom of choice, and, more importantly, my in-betweenness. Occupying this in-between space has had a profound impact on shaping my worldview and my writing. Living within this space has encouraged me to negotiate creatively institutions, traditions, and cultures as well as Western and feminist values. Buddhism influenced my feminist worldview and vice versa. They encounter, interact, and co-mingle in such a way that their boundaries became amorphous and indeterminate. Their conversation began to unfold in an in-between space where categories and binaries diffused. I wanted my doctoral thesis to reflect the voice that was arising from that in-between space.

The combination of my spiritual and feminist training led me to value the diversity and universality of the human condition equally. My spiritual

practice encouraged me to internalize interdependence, the oneness of all creations, and the non-dual and non-hierarchical relationship between individualism and interconnection. Within this context, the differences I raised in my thesis were not about invoking a sense of otherness in binary and oppositional terms. Instead, the difference I invoked was similar to Trinh T. Minh-ha's (1991) concept of interdependent multifold feminist gestures—that of affirming “I am like you” without losing sight of how “I am different,” all the while unsettling every definition of “otherness” that may be arrived at (p. 152). In my thesis, I invoked a non-Western voice as the voice of difference, a voice *and* representation of a refusal to represent pure cultural authenticity. I sought to disrupt the dichotomies struck between the East and West. I wanted to unsettle the hegemony of discourses and approaches that claimed to be Western.

This non-Western voice seemed to challenge the coloniality of knowledge in rebellious ways, particularly through practices of epistemic disobedience in writing. This alternative way of writing decolonized knowledge, delving beneath—challenging and deconstructing the subtle structure within the discourse, texts, and meaning through performative narrative (Denzin, 2009; Diversi & Moreira, 2009). Yet, this chapter is not only about my strategies for claiming a non-Western voice. It is also an account of the price of the epistemic disobedience, the price of claiming that voice that I invoked in writing, and the price of crossing the disciplinary boundaries of feminism, religious studies, arts, and creative writing. The price for choosing an alternative path was high for me, resulting in having a hard time with the orthodox White dominated academic policing, which required a sustained intellectual investment from me in order to overcome such hurdles.

In Western academic realms, doctoral writing needs to show an intellectual allegiance to a particular discipline or theoretical framework, which was hard to notice in my work due to its rebellious nature. It cannot be categorized in a particular discipline like religious or gender studies nor in a particular theory like postmodernism. For some academics, this lack of categorization shown by my writing was the start of a new beginning, but for others it was a sign of disability. The effort and investment needed for finding and using a good number of references to support my argument and writing style and to reduce the risks of my thesis being rejected was an arduous process required of me if I wanted to craft a new path of negotiations and resistance. I felt I was producing a thesis in a space that was in-between multiple disciplines and theoretical approaches and worried my thesis would suffer from this non-belonging. In many ways, my thesis became a strange reflection of my worldviews and life that refused to fall into neat categories, be they categories

of religion, culture, discipline, or theoretical approaches. At the same time, my thesis offered an invitation to depart from conventional ways of writing theses as well as an opportunity to challenge colonialism and coloniality.

Hegemony of Western Knowledge

Even though I am critiquing the hegemony of Western knowledge, I think it is important to clarify that I am certainly not in favor of the total abandonment and replacement of Western knowledge, nor is this my aim. Instead, I think it is more important (and interesting) to untangle and reveal the subtle ways the hegemony of Western knowledge replicates itself and retains its power. Western colonial interests, particularly in the realm of knowledge production, are sustained through a pervasive privileging of Eurocentric ideas and representation of others (Mignolo 2009; Said, 1979). As a result, authoritative forces such as gatekeepers are invested in maintaining Western intellectual lineages that have been inherited and passed down. This means, as Obioma Nnaemaka (2003) keenly observed, Western methods of producing knowledge, even postmodern ones, have difficulty accommodating African worldviews. No wonder knowledge from Asia, Africa, and the Global South—all that belongs to subaltern and non-Western locations—becomes either muted, suppressed, or devalued when viewed from a Western perspective. Similarly, one reviewer of my thesis used these unwritten rules and practices (and even the threat of certain repercussions) to criticize the style and approach I took in it. In my thesis, I explored the ways imperialism works to prioritize one form of knowledge and position it as superior in relationship to others (Battiste, 1998). This imperialism has been seen as the dominance of knowledge from the Global North over knowledge from the Global South (Trahar et al., 2019). In this intellectual imperialism, the legitimacy and acceptability of knowledge are evaluated according to standards determined by a predominately Anglophone center. For instance, the ranking of a journal often hinges on the inclusion of scholarly references originating from the Global North (Trahar et al., 2019). Often this knowledge from the Global North is considered to be “the standard,” and knowledge from the non-Western world remains seen as inferior, supplementary, and peripheral.

I found this hegemony is nurtured and sustained by some invisible rules. For instance, it seems that one’s scholarly insights are judged on the basis of their connection to Eurocentric ideas and Western scholars and that one’s expressions are considered to be more accurate if they follow conventional and positivist rules of linearity, categorization, separation, and syllogism—inherited from classical Greek and Roman philosophic approaches. The influence

of Aristotelian logic, as Kaiping Peng and Richard Nisbett (1999) explained, is dominant in Western discourse and tends to prioritize a single claim, linear solutions, consistency, counter argumentation, and the negation of oppositional arguments. Aristotelian logic relies on forms of deductive reasoning. One example of this reasoning is the following syllogism:

All men are mortal

Socrates is a man

Therefore, Socrates is mortal.

In the Western intellectual tradition, Aristotelian logic plays a significant role in validating arguments. The importance this type of reasoning has for furthering the evolution of disciplines such as science and law is immense. However, the overreliance on this type of reasoning as *the only* (valid) form of reasoning often results in less space allocated to other forms of reasoning and argument. Eastern intellectual traditions, such as the Chinese dialectic style, are based on an appreciation of reality as holistic, fluid, dynamic, flexible, and full of contradictions. Within this style, answers are not couched in either/or terms. Instead, two contradictory positions can co-exist in harmony and mutual connection. Similarly, Indian philosophical thought aims to transcend any dualistic positions and claims. Klaus Klostermaier (2007) noted that unlike many Western philosophies, meditative reasoning in Indian philosophical thought (Buddhist and Hindu) creates space for dispute and dialogue, which do not move with logic alone. Scott Stroud (2002, 2004) has written about a particular style of argument found in Indian Vedic texts that follows an argumentative style different from that used in dominant Western argumentative discourses. In the Indian multivalent style, the point of the argument is not for a propositional claim to be accepted or rejected. Instead, the argument and textual strategy lead the mind of the reader to an experience that goes beyond oneself and reality. Stroud (2002, 2004) gives the example of *Devi Gita*, a sacred Hindu text about the Great Goddess where the Goddess is seen as both separate from the world and immanent and present in everyone and everything. These contradictory aspects are narrated in such a playful way that readers cannot reject a single claim and adopt another. Stroud thinks that (2002, 2004) when Western audiences read this narrative, they tend to either reject this contradiction as absurd and nonsensical or ponder the meaning in a new way. To find meaning, readers need to go beyond a search for the legitimacy of a single claim (e.g., whether a God or Goddess is separate or immanent in the world). As a result, readers experience the multiple possibilities that present themselves when they go beyond categorical borders of binary

judgments. Readers have to engage the contemplative facilities of their minds to uncover new wisdom, similar to the thinking process they might use to connect with poetry, music, and art. They need to experience a fusion, merging the nonverbal and nonconceptual with the analytical tendencies of the mind, to get to meaning. They need to contemplate how contradictions can come together and unfold a wider and deeper meaning that might not otherwise be comprehensible through a single claim or a straightforward reading.

When I started to write an autoethnographic thesis, my argument unfolded under the influence of these Eastern ways rather than the classical logic of mainstream Western discourse. A monologic discourse based on an essential, binary, conclusive, and reductionist view would overlook the intention behind my writing. It would miss the invitation to explore non-dual relationships that exist between the categories and fluidity of life and that value multiple creative possibilities for harmony across multiple positions and representations. When my thesis is read with a simultaneous focus on the multiple voices I tried to represent, it offers—I think—an engaging way of producing knowledge (Henderson, 2014). That's what was missed by the evaluators of my thesis. My Ph.D. thesis was about my life, full of intimate spiritual experiences, identity, and culture. I did not find Western ways of argument and linear and objective ways of writing suitable to my voice or aims, so I did not rely on them. I found my voice suppressed. I could not be spontaneous. My thesis was accused of “lacking rigor,” and my writing labeled “not so clear.” It became quickly apparent that following a non-adversarial way of argument and logic was annoying to a positivist mindset that still dominates academia.

My Strategies to Invoke a Non-Western Voice in My Thesis

I was lucky that my supervisor was aware of my struggle with this in-between space I have described. Seeing my efforts to channel my voice while, at the same time, attempting to please the dominant academic demands, my supervisor suggested that I take up different strategies for writing my thesis. One of these strategies included seeing the thesis as embodied writing—seeing it, in other words, as a part of my being. Here, autoethnography was extremely helpful, as it enabled me (as a doctoral writer) to enter a space where I could speak from multiplicity, heterogeneity, plurality, and indeterminacy of meaning—seeing all as a part of the research itself (Bordo, 1990; Tsalach, 2013). But autoethnography was not enough to challenge the ways the hegemony of Western knowledge practices prevail in academia, suffocating spontaneity and voices from non-Western worlds. While writing my autoethnography, I needed to adopt epistemic disobedience in order to resist predominately Eu-

rocentric epistemologies that prioritize hierarchy, objectification, structure, and positivist modes of clarity (Conquergood, 2002; Mignolo, 2009; Smith, 1999). But adopting epistemic disobedience is extremely risky, especially for a doctoral student who is neither a prominent academic nor a Westerner. I became interested in post-colonial writers such as Gayatri Spivak and Homi Bhaba, but I still found their epistemology and writing to be quite Western. Eventually, I found that Trinh T. Minh-ha (1989, 1991) and Shawn Wilson (2008) did more to challenge Western positivist ways of knowing and writing. I was aware that I was at risk of being alienated, but I decided to go for it anyway. In doing so, I paved a new path for myself, one that allowed me to write with a non-Western voice and to release the psychic effects of colonization at the same time. In this process of engaging in epistemic disobedience, I also discovered the usefulness of performative writing—another strategy that might be useful for doctoral writers

Performative ways of writing value creative engagement through recognizing human complexity and its relation to ideas. Since the 1960s, performative writing has been used in the humanities and other disciplines to create interactive critical insights and to bring alive ways of knowing, writing, and interpretation that would otherwise be hidden in conventional writing and its attempts at objectivity (Allsopp, 1999; Espi, 2013). According to Ronald Pelias (2014), there is a difference between conventional writing and performative writing. Conventional writing is aimed at advancing knowledge through argument and intellectual analysis. Although performative writing also addresses intellectual questions, it seeks an answer to intellectual questions through the process of connecting human emotion and intellect to scholarly ideas. Using performative writing techniques took my autoethnography and made it into an artistic tool for expression, one that invoked compassion and empathy via the relating of personal experiences (Custer, 2014; Ellis, 1999). As part of this process, the biographical narratives in my thesis were accompanied by personal photographs and art. The images responded to my research quest for “felt, touched and embodied constitutions of knowledge” through an intimate connection with the past (Scarles, 2010, p. 501; Noy, 2008). More importantly, the images had performative and strategic value in that they unsettled the text-centric culture of Western scholarly writing.

Said (1979) explained “that it is a fallacy to assume that the swarming, unpredictable, and problematic mess in which the lives of human beings live can be understood on the basis of what books—texts—say” (p. 93). Collapsing the dichotomy and categorization in texts and discourse is a part of the scholarly politics of challenging colonial authority (Denzin, 2003). When the politics transgress text-centric Western epistemologies, disciplinary boundaries, and

fixed meanings, they assume a performative nature through creative-critical pedagogical articulation (Conquergood, 2002). In terms of my biographical narrative, I was interested not only in the contents of the story but also in the way stories are told. For that, I drew on Indian and Zen approaches to narratives. Western thought has tended to follow logocentric logic since Plato (Heine, 1995; Mcquillan, 2001). Unlike Western English narrative's pursuance of a steady plot, Indian narrative allows for deliberate digressions that open up opportunities for performativity and multiplicity (Alexandru, 2015). A Western perspective might argue that this style lacks coherence and includes unnecessary talk. However, unexplained digressions are integral to the storyline. Similarly, in discussing Zen literature, Margaret Syverson (2011) noted that this type of narrative is full of deliberate and "unexplained contradictions" (p. 283). These contradictions are intended to unsettle and break up the pattern-oriented mind.

The following excerpt from my thesis might provide more of a sense of its rebellious nature in challenging the coloniality of knowledge. This excerpt is about my experience with growing up in space in-between cultures, identities, and worldviews. The main aim of this excerpt is to challenge binary and dualistic ways one might evaluate my non-Western positionality.

When she reached puberty, she was told to give up Western dress and wear the traditional attire. This dress is called Selwar Kameez—long trousers, a long body shirt and a long scarf to cover the breasts. All adult and adolescent women around her were wearing it! She protested vigorously pointing to the discrimination: 'men should also wear the traditional dresses of Bangladesh all the time! Why are they allowed to wear Western clothes (shirts and pants)?' . . .

She was born and brought up in a simple middle-class family in Bangladesh. Their religion is Islam and the culture is Bengali. This "not so easy combination" is rooted in a complicated history of Bangladesh. Once upon a time, Bangladesh was "the Bengal", part of greater India. Historical Bengal has always been a melting pot of different races. A historian friend said that her facial features indicated that some of her ancestors might be Mongolian. This is very much possible due to an untraceable mingling of different races throughout the history in Bengal!

Bengal was the place where Hinduism and Buddhism ruled for many years. These aspects are still ingrained in the festivals

and literature of Bangladesh. It was the land where Tantra (both Hindu and Buddhist tantra) flourished and feminine aspects of the divine were worshiped. When Islam arrived in this land from the Middle East, it was integrated into Bengali culture. Their co-existence had tensions as well as mutual understanding and harmonious blending. With the arrival of British colonial power, Bengal became the center of the union between Indian and British thoughts in India. One of the examples of this meeting of cultures was the European influence on Bengali literature. Bengali literature was full of passionate devotion to the divine. European ideas and literature influenced Bengali literature to move towards human's relation with each other (Bhattacharya & Renganathan, 2015; Islam, 2014). During the British period, prominent Bengali writers like Rabindranath Tagore merged the divine and human world in a unique way. The merging created multiplicity and non-duality in the meaning of human desire and relation to the mundane world and the divine. Non-duality does not mean that no difference exists between creator and creations. Rather non-duality is an ambivalent play of difference and sameness, one and many in a non-binary way. Non-duality is the possibility of plurality, at the same time it exists beyond this. Even in contemporary times, politics, human relations, mysticism and God all are enmeshed in Bengali literature without any clear line of demarcation. From a Western perspective, this is so obscure! She was brought up reading Bengali literature and unconsciously interpreted the reality from this obscure perspective. . . .

Her family carried the historical lineage of Bengal—a tension, mutual understanding as well as amalgamation among Islam, Bengali culture and Western liberal ideas. It was a third space. Within this third space, she built up her own third space. Her imagination was full of characters from Western fairy tales and she loved Western clothing, values and Western lifestyles. At the same time, she was drawn to Hindu Gods and Goddesses, history and culture of India, and Bengali literature. (Naomi, 2017, pp. 257-259)

In this narrative, embedded in a Bangladeshi context, I presented apparently contradictory feelings about my location. I created this contradiction

deliberately to challenge a Western dualistic approach to understanding identity and its tendency to arrive at a singular conclusion. Here, connecting readers to the ideas in such a way that they can “participate in an interpersonal contact of recognizing oneself in all human complexity,” my strategy became like Frederick Douglass’ (1969) participatory understanding of the politics of performance of resistance for voice and agency, where one can place oneself in the space of the other (Conquergood, 1998, p. 28; Pelias, 2014, p. 16). The performative aspect of narrative in this autoethnographic part of my thesis invoked a “whole realm of complex, finely nuanced meaning that is embodied, tacit, intoned, gestured, improvised, co-experienced, covert and all the more deeply meaningful because of its refusal to be spelled out” (Conquergood, 2002, p. 146).

By purposely writing narrative in an “obscure” way, I agree with Emma Pérez (1999) that one needs to disidentify with the normative gaze to give space to the voices in the margins. There is ambiguity, uncertainty, and unknowing. According to Édouard Glissant (1997), writing this way is an opacity that demands freedom from the violence of absolute comprehension, control, and transparency (see also Lindner & Stetson, 2009). You need to perceive reality unfolding in multiple, undefinable ways. If reality is summed up in the name of clarity and delineation, its dynamic and transformative nature is renounced.

The Price of Epistemic Disobedience

Primarily, I wanted to write my thesis to contribute to research on Tibetan Buddhism and feminism. But my epistemic disobedience took my thesis away from these disciplines. I started to realize this was happening while giving presentations in various academic workshops and seeing the academic backgrounds of the audience. My thesis began to resonate more with audiences who were interested in creative writing and less with audiences hoping to hear about religious studies.

The initial years of my Ph.D. studies were full of both appreciation and critique for my writing style, especially for my use of performative, non-Western narrative. I was fortunate enough to have a very understanding supervisor. The suggested improvements or modifications my supervisor made were never meant to alter my style; they were intended to make my ideas more meaningful, expressive, and engaging. However, not every audience in every academic or intellectual platform where I gave presentations was understanding or empathetic about my struggle to promote non-Western voice. I found their academic approaches very structurally embedded in the habitual

tendency to judge an intellectual project from objective lenses, which I see as having the capacity to promote the mutilation of a researcher's subjectivity, location, and context from academic writing. In response to their harsh criticism and silent withdrawals in workshops or conferences, I had to reshape my argument with the support of post-colonial arguments and the decolonization of knowledge to save the creative impulse of the thesis and to make space where a non-Western woman, a subaltern, could speak. More and more pages were allocated to arguing for a non-Western voice, with plenty of references. This struggle for justifying a space for a non-Western voice also continued throughout the examination process of the thesis.

Conclusion

In a hegemonic system of knowledge production, a creative tension is created when subaltern, marginalized, or different voices speak. There can be shock, wonder, confusion, and a break of presumptions and expectations. Alison Jones (1999) wrote about the disappointment of dominant groups at the resistance of subalterns as shown through their speaking and at the loss of previous patterns of their authority. Jones (1999) considered this disappointment to be positive for including non-Western knowledge and worldviews, no matter how alien they may seem. This positive disappointment paves the way for broader knowledge and a celebration of the diversity of thinking in human consciousness. Against the backdrop of myriad academic challenges, including the fears of being rejected, sidelined, and not referenced in other works, my doctoral writing symbolizes both a creative tension and a positive disappointment in terms of possibilities and critical dialogue for non-Western voices in doctoral writing. This chapter shows that the presence of non-Western voices in doctoral writing *is* possible with the help of both White and non-White allies.

There is significant potential for non-Western voices to offer new perspectives and to transform doctoral writing into a democratic platform with diverse voices. One way this diversity can be cherished is by valuing the non-Western epistemologies, narratives, and reflexivities of doctoral students who are going through challenging experiences that might include constraints around spontaneity of voice and fluidity of locations. The work of doctoral students who have chosen to give life to their voices and locations in writing rather than following objective and obedient paths of conventional academia should be supported and seen as a positive example or as a sign of inclusivity. By accommodating and critically appreciating such writing, we could challenge the hegemony of Western methods of knowledge production and explore a wider range of heterogeneous perspectives.

References

- Absolon, K., & Willett, C. (2005). Putting ourselves forward: Location in aboriginal research. In L. Brown & S. Strega (Eds.), *Research as resistance: Critical, Indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches* (pp. 97-125). Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Alexandru, M.-S. D. (2015). *Performance and performativity in contemporary Indian fiction in English*. Brill.
- Allsopp, R. (1999). Performance writing. *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art*, 21(1), 76-80. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3245984>
- Battiste, M. (1998). Enabling the autumn seed: Toward a decolonized approach to Aboriginal knowledge, language, and education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 22(1), 16-27.
- Bordo, S. (1990). Feminism, postmodernism, and gender-scepticism. In L. J. Nicholson. (Ed.), *Feminism/Postmodernism* (pp. 133-156). Routledge.
- Conquergood, D. (1998). Beyond the text: Toward a performative cultural politics. In S. Dailey (Ed.), *The future of performance studies: Vision and revisions* (pp. 25-36). National Communication Association.
- Conquergood, D. (2002). Performance studies: Interventions and radical research. *The Drama Review*, 46(2), 145-156. <https://doi.org/10.1162/105420402320980550>
- Custer, D. (2014). Autoethnography as a transformative research method. *The Qualitative Report*, 19(37), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2014.1011>
- Denzin, N. K. (2003). *Performance ethnography: Critical pedagogy and the politics of culture*. SAGE Publications.
- Denzin, N. K. (2009). *Qualitative inquiry under fire: Toward a new paradigm dialogue*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315421292>
- Diversi, M., & Moreira, C. (2009). *Between talk: Decolonizing knowledge production, pedagogy, and praxis*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315433059>
- Douglass, F. (1969). *My bondage and my freedom*. Dover Publications.
- Ellis, C. (1999). Heartful autoethnography. *Qualitative Health Research*, 9(5), 669-683. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104973299129122153>
- Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 12(1), Article 10. <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-12.1.1589>
- Espi, S. R. (2013). Writing dyslexia. *Image and Narrative*, 14 (4), 45-56. <http://www.imageandnarrative.be/index.php/imagenarrative/article/view/406>
- Glissant, É. (1997). *Poetics of relation* (B. Wing, Trans.). University of Michigan Press. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.10257>
- Heine, S. (1995). [Review of the book *Mind as mirror and the mirroring of mind: Buddhist reflections on Western phenomenology*, by S. W. Laycock]. *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 22(4), 507-510. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6253.1995.tb00720.x>
- Henderson, M. G. (2014). *Speaking in tongues and dancing diaspora: Black women writing and performing*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195116595.001.0001>

- Holt, N. L. (2003). Representation, legitimation, and autoethnography: An autoethnographic writing story. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 2(1), 18–28. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690300200102>
- Jones, A. (1999). The limits of cross-cultural dialogue: Pedagogy, desire, and absolution in the classroom. *Educational Theory*, 49(3), 299–316. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.1999.00299.x>
- Klostermaier, K. K. (2007). *Hinduism :A Beginner's Guide*. One World Publications.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Denzin, N. K. (Eds.). (2003). *Turning points in qualitative research: Tying knots in a handkerchief*. AltaMira Press.
- Lindner, K., & Stetson, G. (2009). For Opacity: Nature, difference and Indigeneity in Amazonia. *TOPIA: Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies*, 21, 41–62. <https://doi.org/10.3138/topia.21.41>
- McQuillan, M. (2001). Introduction: Five Strategies for Deconstruction. In McQuillan, M. (Eds.). *Deconstruction: A Reader*. NY: Routlage. pp. 1–43
- Mignolo, W. D. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and de-colonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(7–8), 159–181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276409349275>
- Minh-ha, T. T. (1989). *Woman, native, other: Writing postcoloniality and feminism*. Indiana University Press.
- Minh-ha, T. T. (1991). *When the moon waxes red: Representation, gender and cultural politics*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203700624>
- Naomi, S. S. (2017) *Tibetan buddhism and feminism in an in-between space: A creative-critical autoethnography in a non-Western woman's voice* [Ph.D. thesis, Murdoch University]. Murdoch University Research Repository. <https://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/id/eprint/40739/>
- Nnaemeka, O. (2003). Nego-Feminism: Theorizing, Practicing, and Pruning Africa's Way. *Signs* 29 (2), Development Cultures: New Environments, New Realities, New Strategies. Special Issue Editors Françoise.
- Noy, C. (2008). PAGES AS STAGES: A performance approach to visitor books. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 35(2), 509–528. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2008.02.005>
- Pelias, R. J. (2014). *Performance: An alphabet of performative writing*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315422770>
- Peng, K., & Nisbett, R. E. (1999). Culture, dialectics, and reasoning about contradiction. *American Psychologist*, 54(9), 741–754. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.9.741>
- Pérez, E. (1999). *The decolonial imaginary: Writing Chicanas into history*. Indiana University Press.
- Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. Vintage.
- Scarles, C. (2010). Where words fail, visuals ignite: Opportunities for visual autoethnography in tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(4), 905–926. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2010.02.001>
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Zed Books.

- Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271-313). University of Illinois Press.
- Stroud, S. R. (2002). Multivalent narratives: Extending the narrative paradigm with insights from ancient Indian philosophical texts. *Western Journal of Communication*, 66(3), 369-393. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10570310209374742>
- Stroud, S. R. (2004). Narrative as argument in Indian philosophy: The Astāvakra Gītā as multivalent narrative. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 37(1), 42-71. <https://doi.org/10.1353/par.2004.0011>
- Syverson, M. (2011). *True beginner's mind: Fresh encounters with Zen*. Appamada.
- 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>
- Tsalach, C. (2013). Between silence and speech: Autoethnography as an otherness-resisting practice. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 19(2), 71- 80. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800412462986>
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Fernwood Publishing.