

## **Globalisation and Coloniality: Implications for Collaborative Research and Knowledge Production in Africa**

Ikechukwu ONAH<sup>1</sup> & Anayochukwu Kingsley UGWU<sup>2</sup>

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/ft.v14i3.4>

**Submission: Sept 9, 2024 Acceptance: Nov 4, 2025**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Philosophy  
University of Nigeria, Nsukka  
Email: [kingsley.onah@unn.edu.ng](mailto:kingsley.onah@unn.edu.ng)  
**ORCID: 0000-0002-0456-8870**

&

<sup>2</sup>Department of Philosophy  
Madonna University, Nigeria  
Email: [anayochukwu.jp@gmail.com](mailto:anayochukwu.jp@gmail.com)  
**ORCID: 0000-0003-0465-5277**

### **Abstract**

As global forms inhabit local spaces and draw the local into the global, previous deliberate mechanisms of system transform into fluid processes that require constant investigation. The globalisation of knowledge raises an old challenge: the standardisation of knowledge. What and who determines knowledge system as a universal model? This research analytically interrogates the nature and outcomes of the divide between the production of knowledge about globalisation and its manifestation as a process. It also interrogates the relationship between Western academia as a global centre of knowledge production and indigenous scholarship on globalisation in sub-Saharan Africa. Educational systems in sub-Saharan Africa currently witness the expanding impact of ideas from global centres in ways that challenge existing norms, originality and cultural relevance. This calls for the re-interrogation of area studies in core comparative international research in response to coloniality. Hence, the need to identify common profiles and map onto globalisation, demand for a stronger cross-national collaborative scholarship devoid of knowledge subordination.

**Keywords:** Coloniality, Decoloniality Globalisation, Knowledge production, Area Studies, Knowledge subordination

### **Introduction**

The last few decades have witnessed the emergence of decolonial scholars. These scholars are mainly from the global South, and include the following: F. Fanon, N. Wa Thiong'o, V. Y. Mudimbe, J. C. A. Agbakoba, P. Hountondji, O. Yâi, K. A. Appiah, K. Wiredu, O. Taiwo, J. O. Chimakonam, A. D. Attoe, A. Agada, L. U. Ogbonnaya, A. E. Chimakonam, S. J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni, W. D Mignolo,

R. Grosfoguel, among others. They are not opposed to Western knowledge, but rather question the continued domination of knowledge production by the West. They also advocate for globalised knowledge production that anchors on the inclusiveness of what knowledge means, rather than the current legitimisation by the West. This further underscores the need for researchers to pay very serious and critical attention to indigenous knowledge systems, especially those of postcolonial societies in what is currently known as the Global South. This is to mitigate the effects of dominant models of knowledge production driven by epistemic hegemony. Obviously, a culture of superiority would hardly accommodate those it regards as inferior even in the era of globalisation. Given our experience in research, particularly in knowledge production in the humanities and social sciences, we have observed that there is little about Africa in our academic curriculum. It is also more worrisome that theoretical frameworks one deploys in analysis often emanate from outside the researcher's own shores. Many scholars have bemoaned the nature of knowledge production in the world as it affects the Global South. Aptly captured, Celine-Marie Pascale says that:

Knowledge and its production is never an individual enterprise. Rather, to a significant extent, knowledge, cognition and perception must always be discursive formation and cultural productions. In this sense, science is most correctly understood as a cultural activity- a kind of performance that enacts itself knowledge production is a conditioned performance that generates not innocent or objective knowledge (PASCALE 2016, 219)

The crucial points from the above excerpts are: that knowledge production is not always innocent; that it is not as objective as usually claimed; that science, which is a form of knowledge is cultural; that the paradigm of knowledge production and its subsequent canons produced by scholars from Western Europe is what drives the production of knowledge all over the world, making the scholars from the global North gatekeepers of knowledge, knowledge production, and knowledge legitimisation.

Thus, the cogency of globalisation as a multidisciplinary intellectual preoccupation and as an actual unfolding and movement of bonds and interconnections offers a suitable space for interrogating historical issues regarding the emergence and spread of knowledge regimes. Framed as knowledge production, the evolution of ideas, norms, practices, and resources and their penetration into the interstices of the political, cultural, economic and social structures of developing countries constitutes serious substance for intellectual inquiry. Such intellectual inquiry demands considerable attention since developing countries (and in this study, those of the African continent south of the Sahara) are currently witnessing exponential changes explainable by the expanding contours of globalisation (SASSEN 2007). Not only is knowledge production a critical topic for research; but also the complexities of the current research ethos and the nature of scholarly networks between Europe and North America also challenge the grounds for such research (APPADURAI 2000). On the one hand, there is

disagreement over how globalisation is, or indeed should be theorised and researched, as seen in efforts to indigenise the discourse within specific disciplines, which raises the question of the politics of research acceptance. Whether in matters of political economy, cultural studies, educational policy studies, legal studies, and, of course, international relations studies, the acceptance or merit of research production does not require a colour of skin or region of origin. But on the other hand, how globalisation proceeds, not just as an intellectual discourse but as actual manifestations of numerous social, economic and cultural transformations, remain to be fully understood, explained or even predicted. The current politics of research production, where most research facilities across Africa are primarily funded by the global North and insist on adherence to Euro-American epistemic models, is a wake-up call to rethink and retool indigenous epistemologies that accommodate African values, cultures, and uplifted identity. Since most of the research agenda is dictated by the global North, African scholars mainly generate data for these foreign funders which are then used to produce value-added innovations for them. Consequently, as African research continues to be dictated by the Euro-American agenda, it will be unable to address local social, economic, ethical and political challenges. This challenging situation has necessitated a discourse on the globalisation of research production, the subordination of knowledge, and mutual collaboration amongst scholars across diverse cultures.

This research analytically investigates the nature and outcomes of two distinct divides: the first between the production of knowledge about globalisation and its manifestation as a process, and the second between Western academia, serving as a global centre of knowledge production, and indigenous scholarship on globalisation in sub-Saharan Africa. The paper is organised thematically to capture these divides and utilises data from a wide range of comparative and scholarly publications, as well as data on educational policy and practice in Nigeria, to interrogate the problematic yet critical questions arising from globalisation and coloniality as mechanisms of knowledge production and use. Central to the significance of the findings from this research is the need for a novel structural linkage between external and internal actors with critical knowledge and tools—one indigenous and the other technical—in ways that foster a more qualitative generation and use of knowledge of globalisation as a discourse and a process. The paper examines the long-standing clamour for a nation-centered education and decolonisation of epistemic production. It is on this note that this study focuses particularly on the interplay of research, policy and practice. On these grounds, the paper argues for the need for more structured, purposefully thought scholarly networks that will bring together the research expertise of Western scholars and the indigenous understanding of local contexts from indigenous researchers, thereby pursuing a decolonised globalised knowledge production.

This work is structurally divided into sections. While the introduction explores the background to the research, the second section takes a panoramic survey of the main preoccupation of the nature of globalisation. The third part examines coloniality, focusing on theorisations with a consideration of its

principles. The fourth part explores the interrelations between globalisation and coloniality with an emphasis on knowledge production and epistemic hegemony. This section also addresses the challenges of globalisation of knowledge and examines the societal, policy, and international factors associated with globalisation, education, research collaborations and their dynamics, with a particular emphasis on the decoloniality of research. The final section of the work concludes with an advocacy for a paradigm shift, contributing to conversations on alternative theorising, the understanding, and application of globalised knowledge production in a manner that develops both indigenous epistemology and foreign one. However, the dynamics that unfold are complex, and assessing how these dynamics matter for the long-term significance of the deconstruction of epistemic hegemony and the fallout of collaborative research networks across cultural borders is a promising avenue for future research.

### **Globalisations**

Globalization could be seen as the process of increasing interdependence and integration among economies, markets, societies, and cultures of different peoples. By this, the implication is that with the concept of globalization, the world can become one economically, culturally, religiously, politically, socially, and otherwise. It is a term that refers to the act or activity of global unification across many aspects, such as language, culture, philosophy, the act of philosophizing, and philosophical traditions (ABAH n.d.n., 2025).

As a process, globalisation predates most contemporary social organisational forms. Bayly's exploration of 'archaic globalisation' (BAYLY 2002) seeks to bring those primeval forms under recent globalisation discourse, a project consistent with efforts at 'decentering' world history. Globalisation is detached from its original association with progressive integration and interdependence of modern world economy and ascribed to historical inter-regional and intercontinental impacts of the agrarian empires of the early modern world. But as a discourse, it still defies cohesive conceptual articulation in an intellectually honest fashion. To review globalisation in its entirety here may thus be preposterous; themes relevant to the positioning of the national to the global are prioritised.

Culturally, societies across the world witness exchange and reconfiguration of norms and social imaginations. Educationally, particular nations find it increasingly difficult to make autonomous decisions independent of international politico-economic funding agencies. Ultimately, the autonomy of the nation-state to act as an independent agent is seriously undermined. But the global competitiveness of professionals makes this nation-oriented professional training almost anachronistic. Yet, globalisation appears to engender novel processes capable of infusing the nation-state with the capacity to adapt to new global realities and maintain its significance as a critical actor in the global space. This constantly evolving nature and rhizomatic dimensionality of globalisation make it particularly cogent for understanding the dilemma of nationalist-oriented education in the face of global integration, networks, and flows.

## **Coloniality**

Coloniality ordinarily conveys a sense of capture and domination. It is, therefore, “an invisible power structure, an epochal condition, and epistemological design, which lies at the center of the present Euro-North American-centric modern world” (NDLOVU-GATSHENI 2015, 488). For Chimakonam and Oluwagbemil-Jacob, ‘Coloniality is not a chance but a progressive historical occurrence. It is a phenomenon that emerged from the long history of European expansion and domination of the rest of the world, dating back to 1492’ (2023). From the definitions above, a point stands out clearly: it is a Western superiorist agenda and calculated attempt to dominate every other people of the world. In Africa, coloniality, simply put, is one tragic historical development that would haunt post-independent African subjects for a long while, given that the epistemological configurations cannot easily be altered like an algorithm or a complete program. Coloniality is, therefore, the continuity of colonial forms of domination after the end of the colonial administration, produced by colonial culture and structure (GROSGOUEL 2011).

Coloniality thus challenges the epistemic binary oppositions created by the West in its othering of Africans from itself. In Western cultural symbolism, angels are white, while the devil is black. Two of the drastic effects of colonialism on the African continent, especially sub-Saharan Africa, are identity crises amongst Africans and the labelling of all knowledge production from Africa as non-rational. This distrust in one’s capacity creates room for epistemic imperialism. Coloniality puts recognition of the conscience of the colonial matrix of power-subjectivity and the concentration of knowledge in fewer hands (MIGNOLO 2007). For Quijano, modernity and coloniality are two sides of the coin. Coloniality is the dark side of Western modernity (MIGNOLO 2007). The concern here is to unmask the Western epistemic framing of African reality that denies the acceptance of knowledge production or area studies from Africa, especially sub-Saharan Africa. This unmasking is about the systemic peeling off of the layers of Western imposed reality. The reason behind the deconstruction is to remind the theorist that there are perspectives unexamined and that even the examined was done with an alien perspective structured in superiority. Coloniality dwells in constructing African identity in line with its ontological status. Coloniality is driven by the idea that one is better than the other and that one is the footnote of the other.

## **Dominance of External Research and Nation-Centric Education**

The German term *Heimatkunde* eludes direct translation, especially into many languages. But it denotes an explicit, direct, and purposeful pedagogical exercise in cultivating knowledge about, value for, and love of, homeland. Such knowledge and love for the homeland are held to underpin rootedness and orderliness. Fascination with and instruction about ‘homeland’ emerged in coincidence with the emergence of statehood as an analytic descriptor and sociologic category. In Europe, ideas of homeland served potent functions in building societies on civic grounds as well as dethroning its original religious foundations. However, critics

charge that *Heimatkunde* can be over-sentimentalised and emotionalised such that its correspondence to reality is compromised (SPINDLER, n.d.n, 1973; TUAN, 1976). As Renner (1988) implies, although it constitutes a hallmark of most European primary school education, *Heimatkunde* does not command equal cogency as an educational agenda in all societies (RENNER, 1988). It can be argued that a sense of ownership and authorship of one's homeland is a requisite for *Heimatkunde*. The extent to which such ownership and authorship exist in Nigeria is readily apparent from a cursory review of social and educational institutions.

Now, although informal education in Nigerian societies predates any known Western influence, formal education in contemporary Nigeria overwhelmingly adheres to Anglo-Saxon intellectual traditions. Pre-colonial and colonial education emblematised Western categories intended to instruct a purportedly uncultured and uninformed African. Following the legacy of European expansionism from the sixteenth century onward, Nigeria embodies ideals and norms shaped by problematic assumptions of European modernism and modernity. This is not ipso facto wrong or right; however, the relevance of much of Nigerian educational principles, ideas, ideals and practices is through indigenisation or domestication; very few are autochthonous. Often, the domestication of pedagogic practices is preceded by the domestication of foreign conditions.

Advocacy for domestically oriented education builds on discontent with the double alienation characteristic of this 'mimicry', a double alienation that creates 'half de-Africanized and half Europeanized intelligentsia'. The premier conference of African states on the development of education in Africa at the dawn of political independence held in Addis Ababa in 1961, captures this double alienation in its call for an integrative education that, although domestic in orientation, advances the states in 'modernist' (technological) lines. The conference's report charges that the content of education in Africa is alien to existing African conditions, the demands of political independence, the essential elements of a technological age, and the imperatives of balanced economic development that involved rapid industrialisation. It is rather based on 'non-African background, allowing no room for the African child's intelligence, powers of observation and creative imagination'. It is recommended that the content of education in Africa be revised, with a focus on curricula, textbooks, and methods (that is, instructional practices) to account for the African environment, child development, cultural heritage, and the demands of technological and economic progress.

The problem of national relevance (a chief preoccupation of African philosophers of the late 20th century) is intricate and as problematic as the nation's origins. It calls for evaluating national needs, characteristics, and resources, all of which change with time and across ethnic domains (YOLOYE 1986). But, whether seen in Tanzania's *Ujamaa* or Ethiopia's Hibtetsebawinett, political education to some form of socialism, Nigeria's UBE programme, or efforts to integrate indigenous languages into the education language of different countries, African nations have recorded definite progress in making education relevant to its

context through policy prescriptions, educational plans, and creation of curriculum development centres.

Advocacy for national relevance recommends that local conditions and the particularities of specific learning communities shape the epistemic profile generated thereof. To place Nigeria and indeed specific local conditions at the centre of intellectual inquiry, without necessarily subscribing to the postmodernist tendency toward reductionism or extreme relativism, is still a work in progress for most of the Nigerian education system. Specifically focusing on higher education, Teferra and Altbach identify among others, access, funding, the role of private institutions, governance and autonomy, management, gender inequality, role of research and scholarly communication, language divides, and brain drain (or recently, brain train), as some of the salient issues confronting African education to which African scholars should turn organised and ordered gaze (TEFERRA and ALTBACH, 2004).

### **Knowledge Production and Epistemic Hegemony**

The efficiency and distributive effects of globalised knowledge production are deeply affected by the rules of intellectual property which point to the fact that individuals produce knowledge. To perpetuate epistemic hegemony, these rules were globalised by a small group of individuals in the West. Protecting a national interest is not wrong as long as it does not impede the growth of others across national boundaries within a globalisation regime. But a situation in which a few people driven by Euro-American interests, impose Euro-American intellectual property standards on all other countries by incorporating these rules into international organisations like UNESCO, UNICEF, and the WTO is epistemic despotism. This desperation to control, in effect, has found new ways to rob developing countries of optimal development. Stringent patent rules have hindered easy access to knowledge across borders because of the latent desperation to maintain global power through ownership of knowledge assets in what they call an epistemic empire. The consequence of epistemic empires is that they determine who is considered experts or authorities in any field of study. Hence, they have the sole barometer of truth and can be only relied on as regards authentic knowledge. This being the standard, any intellectual output, reference or conceptual framework is judged as true only if it is in line with the models set by authorities from the global North.

It is not unusual that farmers in many traditional African societies for instance Mbu, located in Isi-uzo Local Government Area, Enugu State, Eastern region of the Southern Nigeria, can prepare their farm seedlings, cultivate, plant and harvest their crops in a specified period of the year without adherence to any Euro-American knowledge model in agriculture. The methods of bush fallow, mulching and preservation of their farm products are driven by local scientific knowledge. Women prepare palm produce using very tactical and scientific methods that provide evidence that science is really cultural, and not knowledge given only to a particular geographical location as in the case of epistemic regimes. There are also traditional methods of preserving corpses (mummification and embalming) and the rigorous processes for the actualisation of these

preservative methods, which are not just scientific but also models that require further development. All these are instances of thought formation that is local-based (ONAH and UGWU 2024).

In actuality, knowledge is not just power but the precursor of domination. Most post-colonial African countries today rely on knowledge models and production from the global North. The influence of such knowledge production from the West is evident in all aspects of endeavours in African society. Such influences are noticeable in education, agriculture, religion, ethics, social relations and culture. This foreign universalised model of knowing excludes indigenous and local ways of knowing in traditional African society. By and large, traditional epistemic systems of African people can be veritable means to decolonise Eurocentric epistemic knowledge models. Repositioning that disregards indigenous African traditional knowledge systems and negotiating African identity in a globalised world call for urgent attention. There is a pressing need to extricate and decolonise the public/academic intellectual in Africa from diverse forms of coloniality, including the coloniality of power, knowledge, intellect, being, and ideas. The public/academic/Afro-intellectual in the global south seems to be fascinated, bamboozled, overwhelmed, confused, intoxicated and intemperately overzealous over the manipulative, exploitative and marginalistic concept of 'international best practices' continually being advanced by intellectual musketeers of the global north. This Eurocentric concept, thoroughly stripped of Africanness, and essentially deprivative of intellectual platform for indigenous agency, is often profusely instrumentalised by the local cabal in the education industry as a cover to subjugate rich indigenous intellectual values, contents, culture, heritage and enduring aspirations, over the so-called external practices/blueprint.

## **Discussion**

The quagmire and irritating depth of decay in research networks as revealed by the covid-19 pandemic has necessitated and brought to the fore the need for global collaboration amongst researchers. The globalisation of knowledge production as an evolutionary view derives its roots in memetics. Hence, knowledge transmitted from one geographical entity to another with fluid fidelity of its dependence on any single individual could be said to be a globalised one. Obviously, the system of knowledge production across the globe is not even. Scholars from Nigeria were shocked to hear from a presenter at an international education conference at the University of Nigeria that people in the Eastern part of Nigeria, mostly males, do not enroll in school because of their penchant for quick money. This researcher lost cognition of many factors that could have affected enrolment in higher school. Imagine if knowledge production on such a subject were carried out in collaboration with indigenous researchers who have better information about the subject. Certainly, when the researcher conducted the study, he did not consider that the need for pre-nursery and pre-kindergarten is not a desideratum in most parts of Africa. Some knowledge producers have concluded that we now have a world culture of schooling, (meaning that what you find in schools in one part of

the world is similar to what you find in schools in other parts). But in contrast, every educational or research conduct has its own problems. What some encounter as a problem might not be the same as what others encounter.

Knowledge production is tied to identity just as identity is tied to culture. Identity, being a culture grounded in a particular location, is, at the same time, a social construct domiciled in an individual, which, to a large extent, influences the knowledge production of an individual. Taking it further, Habib avers that identity is the basis of the epistemic binary discourse created by the West, which portrays the East and other non-western cultures as mysterious, dark and irrational as opposed to the former, supposedly rational positive, balanced, and superior culture (HABIB 2005). Culture is simply put as the values, norms, institutions and modes of thinking to which successive generations in a given society have attached importance. The glued hold on epistemological hegemony and supremacist ideology denies balanced knowledge production, especially as it concerns the labelling of knowledge production from Africa and other non-western countries as non-rational and not worth relying on for solutions to human problems, even when such productions are effecting positive changes in the originating environment. Globalisation powered by Eurocentric modernity has marginalised other knowledge systems (ASHER and WAINWRIGHTS, 2019).

Knowledge is not restricted to one region in the world or to one colour of skin but is always indigenous to a place. No particular colour of skin was created without rational capacity. Prior to the European invasion, Africans had various ways of treating malaria-induced illnesses, treating snakebite victims, vaccinating against snakebites and scorpion stings, and processing (highly technical) foods like oil palm and other cuisines. During this period, Africans also possess the technical know-how to detect poisonous foods, fruits and vegetables.

### **Knowledge Production and Research Collaboration**

The globalisation of knowledge production is a scheme for transformative research advances that not only connects researchers across borders but also makes research products adaptable beyond their origins. It also enhances intensified intellectual interaction across spatial borders. Globalisation of knowledge at its best promotes sharing of best academic and research practices and products through interfaces between diverse academic systems. Such an interface helps develop international scholars through the interactions of researchers and scholars. It is obvious that the major challenge of globalisation of knowledge is how little substantive information for researchers can evenly be cascaded across the global research network and how best to manage the challenges posed by international collaboration.

In this section of the work, we examine the importance of international research collaboration before outlining some of its challenges. Research collaboration is an effective way to get access to developed scientific knowledge and technologies. Collaborative research, especially across cultural inclinations, presents scholars with opportunities to share experiences, data and methods that can provide the basis for new and important perspectives on existing practices. International research collaborations can facilitate the acquisition of new research

skills and push the boundaries of research methods and techniques beyond epistemic supremacy.

Undoubtedly, many prospects arise from research collaboration across ethnic frontiers, including broadening of researcher's horizons and meeting diverse epistemic systems that are workable but unknown to the foreign researcher. Collaborative research by people with different cultural proclivities is a means of looking at the world through a different window. It means equally that collaborative research by persons across diverse cultures enthrones respect, resolves and accommodates differences, and promotes a consensus approach to decision-making.

Essentially, the aim of knowledge is to restore the dignity of humanity and not to dominate or marginalise a particular community of persons. This, by extension, questions the manner and kind of intellectual conceptualization scholars put forward as theories and epistemological traditions to guide human affairs socially, politically, religiously, and otherwise. (UGWU and OZOEMENA 2019). This idea is central in some scholarly exercise. It encourages best practice through the sharing of ideas and facilitates evidence-based practice and promotes the exchange of information and ideas.

### **Decolonization of Knowledge Production**

Coloniality is not merely a belief system or a mindset, or even an individual's wrong requiring a confession. It is an ongoing system of violent extortion, extraction, exploitation, depredation and hegemonic extremism. The endeavor to decolonize knowledge production is a transformative mandate that challenges scholars to critically examine and reassess the traditional paradigms that have molded intellectual research. Decolonization in research is not merely a passing academic trend but a profound shift in perspective that acknowledges the historical injustices perpetuated by colonial ideologies. African scholars like Chimakonam and Ogbonnaya argue that both decoloniality and Africanization are two principles that could not satisfactorily and efficiently function without each other. Chimakonam, in another scholarly outing, argues that Africanisation as an intellectual decolonial revolutionary movement involves two stages, thus, "the first is rooting out Western background logic and planting African logic as its replacement to drive the new hybrid curriculum. The second is assembling relevant foreign contents from diverse cultures and combining them with relevant local content to form a formidable system" (2019, 185). But to carry this out effectively, the tenets of conversationalism must be prioritized as core methods. This view is later projected for further philosophical engagements when Chimakonam, elsewhere, raises the question of global justice in response to the high level of global injustice perpetuated by Western scholars. In this regard, he advised that "Philosophers in the West must end the practice of keeping their counterparts in the South away, as though they are not worth conversing with and realise that difference in approach does not translate to inferiority of method" (2017, 132). Going further, Chimakonam would attempt a conversational ideology which is centrally summarized in three cardinal points to include the following:

never promote a thesis from one philosophical tradition as just and globally applicable, (2) never demote a thesis from the other philosophical tradition without prior conversational engagement and (3) do not accept as justly formulated any thesis from any philosophical tradition whatsoever without a globalised conversational engagement (2017, 121-2)

However, it is imperative to explore the need for decolonizing knowledge production, emphasizing the requirement for a more inclusive, equitable, and culturally sensitive approach in academic pursuits. This shift in perspective is essential for the advancement of comprehensive knowledge, and it is necessary that globalisation embraces it with open hands, due diligence and commitment.

In most societies in Africa, the imprint of colonial biases on academic disciplines has left an adverse impact, often marginalizing non-Western voices and experiences. Eurocentric viewpoints have dominated knowledge production, excluding, silencing, and misrepresenting diverse perspectives. Pointing the danger in such a move, Chimakonam opines,

that philosophers of science have been neglecting the coloniality of knowledge as an issue in the production of scientific knowledge. Coloniality of knowledge imposes the scientific protocol of the West on the rest of the world while gatekeeping the protocols of epistemologies of the South... Coloniality of knowledge bases its logic on the pretension that the Western episteme is acontextual and therefore superior to the rest that is not (2022, 47)

However, it must be noted that to truly decolonize research, scholars must examine the origins of their disciplinary frameworks and confront the inherent biases embedded in their methodologies. By recognizing and validating indigenous knowledge systems, we can offer unique insights that are often overlooked within Western-centric research paradigms. In Africa, traditional ways of knowing, passed down through generations, offer a wealth of knowledge that can enrich our understanding of the world. To achieve this, we need to center indigenous voices, acknowledge the validity of local knowledge, and foster collaborations that bridge the gap between traditional and academic wisdom. By doing so, we can create knowledge production that is more reflective of the diverse cultural milieu it seeks to understand, and ensure that everyone's voices are heard, not considering the colour or geographical location.

## **Conclusion**

When great challenges confront people, they either surrender to the challenges or resolve to do whatever is reasonably possible to overcome them. Scholars in sub-Saharan Africa and other postcolonial societies engaged in research production should begin to examine alternative approaches to addressing the challenge of

epistemic subordination. These possibilities include the option of regarding oneself as a helpless instance of victimhood in contemporary Africa, or the option of one claiming liberation from an old order that disadvantaged him or her. There is also the option of reconstructing the old in a developing context and interrogating both the old and new methods to create a compatible model. This idea has been corroborated by many scholars (UGWU and ABAH, 2021). However, scholars from sub-Saharan Africa cannot simply choose what they like from the new and old orders without examining the dividing variables for possible knowledge production adaptable to recipient localities. The foregoing discussions also point to the need for more engagement with local communities and to finding the best way to ensure that research is communicated in local languages and published on platforms that are not necessarily Euro-American standards but highly impactful according to local realities. The dismantling of international boundaries provides opportunities for extensive knowledge sharing and encourages research collaboration. It is also important to note that Africa cannot afford to pursue an isolationist, inward-looking policy and they must not simply emulate Euro-America or other developed countries in designing and implementing curriculum for schools and research modalities. It is possible to find a different constellation of variables in different knowledge production by foreign researchers and indigenous researchers, but the underlining principle should be equity in funding and collaboration.

This calls into question whether an area-study approach can help us better understand the evolution of Africa since independence. Language is a powerful force that shapes our thoughts and beliefs, and can even perpetuate colonial legacies. But to truly decolonize our thought pattern, researches, methodologies, we must reject the hegemony of colonial languages and embrace linguistic diversity. This means engaging with local languages and ensuring that knowledge is accessible to all, while accurately representing indigenous perspectives. It is not a question that one can avoid. Indeed, current debates about the future of the continent clearly show that the assessment of current trends in Africa is largely predicated on our approach to this question. The conflict therein is the tension between supremacist universalism and equity. Thus, this work concludes that an effective global bond of knowledge production is the interrelationship among researchers. No researcher is an island. Hence, both foreign and local researchers should complement each other in ways that decolonise knowledge production and promote indigenous epistemologies because responses to comparative questions demand an understanding of a particular region.

**Declaration:** The authors declare no conflict of interest or ethical issues for this work.

### Relevant Literature

1. ABAH, George O. *n.d.n.* "A Discourse on the Socio-political and Cultural Homogenization and the Question of African Identity." [American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation], Pp3060-74, 2025. Vol 28. No 1. <https://doi.org/10.69980/ajpr.v28i1.486>
2. APPADURAI, Arjun. "Grassroots Globalization and the Research Imagination." [Public Culture], pp1-19, 2000. Vol 12. No. 1. Paperback
3. ASHER, Kiran & WAINWRIGHTS, Joel. "After Post Development Capitalism, Difference and Representation." [A Radical Journal of Geography], pp23-39, 2019. Vol 51. No. 1. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12430>
4. BAYLY, Christopher A. "'Archaic' and 'Modern' Globalization in the Euroasian and African Arena c.1750-1850." [Globalization in World History, Anthony Gerald HOPKINS Ed.], 54-70, 2002. Pamlico: London. Paperback.
5. CHIMAKONAM, Jonathan O. "African Philosophy and Global Epistemic Injustice." [Journal of Global Ethics], pp120-37, 2017. Vol. 13, No. 2. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17449626.2017.1364660>
6. -----, "Decolonisation, Africanisation and Transformation: Why we need that African Contribution to World History and Civilisation." [Ezumezu], pp181-10, 2019. Springer Nature: Switzerland. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11075-8\\_11](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11075-8_11)
7. -----, "Decolonising Scientific Knowledge: Morality, Politics and a New Logic." [Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science and Technology: Bridging Across Academic Cultures, Tomás MARVAN, n.d.n. Eds], pp47-68, 2022. College Publications: Rickmansworth. Paperback
8. -----, & OGBONNAYA, Lucky U. [African Metaphysics, Epistemology and new Logic: A Decolonial Approach to Philosophy], 2021. Palgrave Macmillan: Switzerland. Paperback
9. -----, & Oluwagbemi-Jacob, Dorothy N. "Self-Preservation and Coloniality." [Dialogue And Universalism], pp111-28, 2023. Vol. 33, No. 1. <https://doi.org/10.5840/du20233317>
10. GROSGOUEL, Ramón. "Decolonizing Post-Colonial Studies and Paradigms of Political-Economy: Transmodernity, Decolonial Thinking and Global Coloniality." [TRANSMODERNITY: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World], pp1-15, 2011. Vol 1. No 1. <https://doi.org/10.5070/T411000004>.
11. HABIB, Rafey M. A. [Modern Literary Criticism and Theory], 2005. Blackwell Publishing: Malden. Paperback
12. IKENBERRY, Gilford J. "Globalization as American Hegemony." [Globalization Theory: Approaches and Controversies], pp41-58, 2007. Paperback

13. MACLEOD, Gordon. "New Regionalism Reconsidered: Globalization and the Remaking of Political Economic Space." [International Journal of Urban and Regional Research], pp 804-29, 2001. Vol 25. No 4. **<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.00345>**
14. MIGNOLO, Walter. "Drinking: The Rhetoric of Modernity, the Logic of Coloniality and the Grammar of Decoloniality." [Cultural Studies], pp449-14, 2007. Vol 21. No 2-3. Paperback
15. NDLOVU-GATSHENI, Sabelo J. "Decoloniality as the Future of Africa." [History Compass], pp485-96, 2015. Vol. 13. No. 10. **<https://doi.org/10.1111/hic3.12264>**
16. ONAH, Ikechukwu & UGWU, Anayochukwu K. "Kant's Thought Formation and the Role of the Mind: A Groundwork for Development." [Conatus Journal of Philosophy], pp131-55, 2024. Vol 9. No 1. **<https://doi.org/10.12681/cjp.32404>**
17. PASCALE, Celine-Marie. "Discourse of the North Atlantic Epistemology and Hegemons." [Qualitative Inquiry], pp213-26, 2016. Vol 22. No 4. Paperback
18. RENNER, Richard R. "Developing Homeplace Values in Children: European Origins and American Implications." [American Journal of Education], pp519-32, 1988. Vol 96. No 4. Paperback
19. SASSEN, Saskia. "The Places and Spaces of the Global: An Expanded Analytic Terrain." [Globalization Theory: Approaches and Controversies, David HELD & Anthony MCGRE Eds.], pp79-108, 2007. Polity Press: Malden, MA.
20. SPINDLER, George D. n.n.n [Burgbach: Urbanization and Identity in a German Village], 1973. Holt, Rinehart & Winston: New York
21. TEFERRA, Damtew & ALTBACH, Philip G. "African Higher Education: Challenges for the 21st Century." [Higher Education], pp21-50, 2004. Vol 47. No 1. Web. **<https://doi.org/10.1023/B:HIGH.0000009822.49980.30>**
22. TUAN, Yi-Fu. "Geopietty: A theme in man's attachment to nature and place." [Geographies of the Mind, David LOWENTHAL & Martyn J. BOWDEN Eds.], pp11-39, 1976. Oxford University Press: New York.
23. UGWU, Anayochukwu K. & ABAH, George O. "A Discourse on the Meaning and Implications of Philosophy." [International Journal of Humanitatis Theoreticus], pp28-53, May, 2021. Vol 5. Issue 1. **<https://integhumanitatis.com>**
24. UGWU, Anayochukwu K. & OZOEMENA, Leo C. "The Irony and Reality of Humanism." [International Journal of Integrative Humanism], pp34-44, 2019. Vol 11. No 1. **<https://doi/10.5281/zenodo.3252068>**
25. YOLOYE, Ayotunde E. "The Relevance of Educational Contents to National Needs in Africa." [International Review of Education], pp149-72, 1986. Vol 32. No 2. Paperback