

---

## Contesting American Academic Hegemony in the Author Guidelines of SINTA Journals: An Analysis of Structure, Language, and Academic Tools

Amin Basuki<sup>1</sup>, Ida Rohani Adi<sup>1</sup>, Aris Munandar<sup>1</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia  
✉: basuki.amin2012@gmail.com

---

### ABSTRACT

The dominance of American academic standards has shaped scholarly writing practices worldwide, including in Indonesia. This influence is evident in the adoption of the IMRaD structure, APA citation style, English as the primary language, and reliance on tools such as Turnitin, Grammarly, and reference management software. This article shows how these forms of dominance operate within the author guidelines of Indonesian scholarly journals indexed by SINTA and how local academic actors engage in resistance and negotiation. Drawing on Antonio Gramsci's theory of hegemony and decolonial perspectives—such as epistemic disobedience (Mignolo), epistemic freedom (Ndlovu-Gatsheni), and ecologies of knowledges (Santos)—the research employs a critical qualitative approach. The data consist of 319 author guidelines from SINTA-accredited journals (levels 1 and 6), analyzed thematically and discursively. The findings show that while many journals conform to American standards, others resist by adopting non-IMRaD structures, alternative citation styles, and Indonesian or Arabic. In addition, local initiatives such as the Garuda portal and institutional repositories provide spaces for resisting epistemic domination. Overall, the article highlights both the persistence of American hegemony and the possibilities for negotiation, contributing to theoretical debates on academic power while offering practical insights for developing more autonomous and context-sensitive academic standards in Indonesia.

Keywords: *academic hegemony; decolonization of knowledge; epistemic freedom; epistemic resistance of SINTA journals*

Article information  
(Filled by Editorial  
Management)  
Received: 28 Jun, 2025  
Revised: 23 Sep, 2025  
Accepted: 24 Sep, 2025

## INTRODUCTION

In the era of knowledge globalization, the academic world is increasingly marked by massive standardization in writing styles, article structures, evaluation systems, and language preferences. This phenomenon not only reflects efforts toward integration within the global scholarly community, but also generates epistemic disparities in access, recognition, and distribution between the academic center and periphery (Altbach, 2011; Marginson & Rhoades, 2002). A concrete manifestation of this dynamic can be seen in the dominance of the IMRaD format (Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion), the APA (American Psychological Association) citation style, the use of English as the lingua franca of global scientific publication, and the reliance on technologies such as Turnitin, Grammarly, and reference management tools.

This hegemony does not operate in a vacuum. It is deeply rooted in the long history of epistemic colonialism and the logic of academic capitalism, which prioritizes quantifiable productivity through international indexing systems such as Scopus and Web of Science. Countries in the

Global South, including Indonesia, often find themselves in structurally inferior positions, compelled to comply with standards set by Western academic power centers (Quijano, 2007; Santos, 2014). Within this context, national accreditation systems such as SINTA (Science and Technology Index) in Indonesia—although originally intended to promote academic independence—demonstrate a tendency to adopt these American epistemic norms.

This tendency is visibly reflected in the author guidelines of SINTA-accredited academic journals. These documents function not merely as technical instructions, but also as normative discourses that legitimize certain forms of knowledge while disciplining others (Fairclough, 1995).

The process of academic internationalization is frequently accompanied by a tendency to conform to standards originating from the centers of global scholarly power. In this context, Indonesian academic journals have gradually adopted the IMRaD article structure, the APA citation style, the use of English as the primary medium, and the reliance on technologies such as Turnitin, Grammarly, and reference management tools. While

such measures are often viewed as part of efforts to improve quality and competitiveness, they also carry the risk of absorbing the Indonesian academic system into a pattern of American epistemic domination, where local forms of knowledge are increasingly marginalized.

Based on this background, this article articulates how to (a) identify how American epistemic hegemony is manifested in the author guidelines of SINTA-accredited journals in Indonesia, (b) examine the extent to which Indonesian journals reproduce Western academic values and structures in the writing and management of scholarly manuscripts, and (c) analyze the strategies employed by journal editors to negotiate or resist these American standards.

By pursuing these objectives, the study not only contributes to theoretical discussions on academic hegemony and knowledge sovereignty in the Global South but also offers practical benefits. The findings highlight the urgent need for Indonesian journals to critically evaluate their adoption of global academic standards and to develop independent approaches more aligned with local academic contexts. Moreover, the insights generated may serve as a valuable resource for future

research, particularly for quantitative investigations into the impact of American academic dominance on national scholarly publishing practices.

Conceptually, this study employs Antonio Gramsci's (1971) theory of hegemony as its core framework, examining how American academic values and practices are internalized "voluntarily" by local institutions through mechanisms of consensus. In this context, author guidelines function not merely as technical tools but also as ideological instruments that discipline ways of thinking and writing. This approach is enriched by Santos's (2014) concept of the epistemologies of the South, which calls for the recognition of diverse knowledge systems and the rejection of a singular Western epistemic model. Indonesian journals, therefore, are viewed as potential spaces for constructing ecologies of knowledges by privileging local languages, contextual topics, and non-standardized writing structures. Additionally, Canagarajah's (2002) perspective is used to understand that the adoption of global norms is not always passive. In many cases, local actors—such as journal editors and lecturers—can negotiate compromise, integrating technical norms while preserving

local values. This process, known as negotiated accommodation, is key to understanding symbolic resistance within Indonesian academic spaces.

With this conceptual framework, this article aims not only to describe the phenomenon of domination but also to reconstruct new possibilities for building a national knowledge system that is more reflective of diversity, contextually grounded, and epistemically sovereign. This study makes a significant contribution to understanding the dynamics of academic hegemony in the Indonesian context, particularly in an area that has often been overlooked: the author guidelines of academic journals. While previous research on academic hegemony has largely focused on macro-level policies, incentive systems, or international publication criteria, documents such as author guidelines serve as normative mechanisms that directly shape scholars' academic behavior and determine what kinds of knowledge are considered legitimate for dissemination.

By examining 319 author guideline documents across various SINTA journal rankings, this article portrays a complex landscape in which Western epistemic domination is strong,

yet subtle and adaptive forms of resistance simultaneously emerge. This resistance does not always take the form of explicit rejection, but is more often embodied in structural flexibility, the use of alternative citation styles, bilingual abstracts, and the continued use of Bahasa Indonesia in academic publications.

Another key contribution of this study is the mapping of local agency in journal management practices. Editors, journal managers, and academic institutions in Indonesia are not passive actors in the process of academic globalization. On the contrary, they employ a range of adaptive strategies that allow them to preserve local values while meeting global credibility expectations.

Thus, this article reinforces the argument that hegemony does not operate in a linear or totalizing manner. It is dynamic, marked by negotiations that create grey zones between compliance and resistance. The study shows that these spaces can be strategically utilized to build an academic system that not only follows global trends but also articulates its own intellectual position and identity.

The focus of the Discussion section is to explore in detail the forms of symbolic and structural domination embedded in journal guidelines—such as the enforcement of the IMRaD format and English language use—alongside various forms of resistance by journals, including alternative formats, linguistic flexibility, and local actors' agency in navigating global academic norms. This analysis offers an in-depth view of how Indonesia's knowledge system is being negotiated within an asymmetrical transnational space.

By centering author guidelines as the object of study, this article proposes a new approach to examining academic power relations—not merely from the top down, but through the everyday textual practices that constitute the primary battleground of epistemic struggle. The urgency of this research lies in its focus on elucidating how American academic hegemony is reproduced within SINTA-accredited journals, shaping linguistic norms, citation practices, and evaluative standards. By exposing these mechanisms, the study not only deepens our understanding of global-local epistemic dynamics but also highlights the critical need for Indonesian journals to

develop independent standards more attuned to the national academic context.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Theoretical Framework**

This article is grounded in a theoretical framework that integrates Gramsci's (1971) concept of hegemony, Boaventura de Sousa Santos's (2014) alternative epistemologies, and Canagarajah's (2002) notion of negotiated accommodation. Gramsci's theory of hegemony explains how domination is exercised not solely through coercion, but through the internalization of dominant values within civil society institutions such as educational bodies and academic journals. In this context, the use of the IMRaD structure, APA citation style, and English language in journal author guidelines is interpreted as a form of consensus constructed through global normalization.

Complementing the Gramscian perspective, Santos proposes the epistemologies of the South, a framework that challenges the epistemic universalism of Western knowledge systems. Santos calls for recognition of the plurality of knowledge systems rooted in local and non-Western contexts. His principle of cognitive justice is especially relevant in understanding how

journals in the Global South—particularly in Indonesia—face the dilemma between adopting global standards and preserving local epistemic distinctiveness.

Furthermore, Canagarajah's concept of negotiated accommodation provides an analytical lens to examine how local actors—journal editors, reviewers, and managers—strategically negotiate the dominance of global standards. Rather than acting passively, they exhibit subtle forms of resistance, selective adaptation, and localized innovation that allow for a more flexible and context-sensitive academic system.

These three frameworks are employed synergistically to interpret journal author guidelines not merely as technical instruments but as discursive arenas in which values, power, and knowledge are produced and contested.

### **Literature Review**

Inequities in the global knowledge system have become a central concern in postcolonial studies and globalization discourses in higher education. According to Phillipson (1992), the dominance of English in global science is not merely a linguistic phenomenon, but an ideological instrument that sustains the symbolic

superiority of Western nations. English functions as a hegemonic tool that defines the validity of knowledge and places other languages in an inferior position.

Marginson (2008) further explains that the global higher education system operates through a hierarchical structure in which institutions from the Global North dominate as the primary producers of knowledge, while countries in the Global South are often relegated to the roles of consumers or followers. In this context, knowledge from the periphery must be "packaged" in Western styles and formats to gain international recognition.

Canagarajah (2002) emphasizes that scholars from non-Western countries face pressure to conform to global academic norms that may not align with their local contexts. However, within this pressure lies a space for negotiation, enabling strategic forms of adaptation referred to as negotiated accommodation.

Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2014) offers the epistemologies of the South as a framework of resistance against the universalization of Western knowledge. He calls for the advancement of cognitive

justice—the recognition of diverse knowledge systems, including those from marginalized non-Western societies.

Altbach (2004) asserts that the globalization of higher education is not a neutral process. It carries the values, norms, and institutional structures of developed countries, which are then adopted as standards in developing nations. In this context, writing conventions such as the IMRaD structure and APA referencing style become part of a hegemonic mechanism that may not reflect local epistemic characteristics.

This article not only addresses a gap in the literature but also introduces significant innovations by making journal author guidelines the primary object of analysis—conceptualizing them as normative texts that reflect either compliance with or resistance to global academic standards. Methodologically, this focus represents a departure from the prevailing emphasis on published articles or citation practices, while theoretically it applies a critical discourse perspective to interrogate how epistemic power relations are embedded in seemingly technical instructions. In terms of findings, the study provides

new insights into how accredited Indonesian journals reproduce, negotiate, or contest dominant academic conventions through the prescribed formats, styles, and linguistic requirements.

## Methods

This article is conceived via a qualitative approach with a document analysis design. The primary data consist of 319 author guideline documents collected from nationally accredited journals listed in the SINTA (Science and Technology Index) portal. The sample includes two distinct groups: 109 journals from SINTA 1 and 210 journals from SINTA 6, representing the two polar extremes within the national journal hierarchy. Data collection was conducted in June 2024 through direct downloads from each journal's official website.

Journal selection was based on the Slovin formula, using the total number of SINTA-accredited journals as of June 2024, with a 95% confidence level. This approach ensured proportionality and representativeness across SINTA clusters. The selected sample reflects diversity in academic disciplines, publishing institutions, and geographic affiliations.

Once collected, the documents were analyzed textually to identify patterns of epistemic domination, forms of resistance, and symbolic manifestations of American scientific systems within the local context. The analysis involved manual categorization of content across five key dimensions: (1) article structure (IMRaD vs. non-IMRaD), (2) citation style (APA, MLA, Chicago, etc.), (3) language policy (English, Indonesian, bilingual), (4) recommended supporting tools (Turnitin, Grammarly, Mendeley, etc.), and (5) normative narratives embedded in the guidelines.

These categories were then interpreted within the theoretical framework outlined earlier to uncover the ideological meanings and epistemic positions conveyed in the documents. The analysis focused not only on what is written but also on how it is written and why it is framed in a particular way.

To ensure data validity, internal triangulation across categories was conducted, along with cross-checking between journals from different SINTA levels. The findings were developed inductively and serve as the basis for the thematic discussions.

## DISCUSSION

### **Global Standardization as Epistemic Hegemony: Reinterpreting Scientific Objectivity in IMRaD, APA Style, and English Language**

The findings indicate that current academic practices in Indonesia are deeply entrenched in a system of epistemic hegemony shaped predominantly by the dominance of American academic standards. Three key instruments—namely the IMRaD article structure, APA citation style, and the use of English—have become the prevailing norms in scientific publishing, particularly among journals indexed in SINTA. However, this adoption cannot be interpreted merely as an attempt to participate in the global academic system. Rather, it reflects the internalization of specific norms that ideologically reproduce hierarchies in the production and validation of knowledge.

#### *IMRaD Format as a Symbolic Regime*

The IMRaD structure (Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion), now widely regarded as the standard for scholarly writing, originated in the Western tradition of medical research reporting. Although initially developed for the natural sciences, this format has been

extensively applied across the social sciences and humanities, including in Indonesia. The data in this study show that more than 85% of SINTA 1 journals and nearly 91% of SINTA 6 journals adopt the IMRaD structure—an indication that it has been institutionalized as a national scientific benchmark.

However, as Swales (1990) noted—and later expanded by Gross, Harmon, and Reidy (2002)—the IMRaD format is far from value-neutral. It promotes an expository logic that is linear, deductive, and often abstracted from its social context—characteristics better suited to the natural sciences than to social sciences, which demand interpretive and reflective nuance. In many cases, the rigid application of IMRaD undermines the diversity of academic reasoning, particularly in disciplines requiring contextual and narrative-based approaches.

As Bourdieu (1991) emphasizes, symbolic power operates through instruments that appear neutral but in fact exert dominative effects. In this context, the IMRaD structure functions not merely as a communicative tool, but as a mechanism of symbolic subjugation—directing authors toward a form of argumentation

aligned with Western epistemic logic.

#### *APA Citation Style and the Politics of Referencing*

Alongside the IMRaD structure, the APA citation style—originating from the American Psychological Association—has become the dominant referencing method in academic writing in Indonesia. The data from this study indicate that 69% of SINTA 6 journals and 31% of SINTA 1 journals explicitly employ APA style. This preference is not merely an aesthetic choice in writing but functions as an epistemological tool that determines who is worthy of being cited and what forms of knowledge are deemed legitimate.

APA style emphasizes the chronology of publication and formal scientific authority, implicitly discrediting local sources, oral traditions, or community-based knowledge that are not standardized within Western documentation systems. In line with Foucault's (1980) concept of the regime of truth, citation systems such as APA delineate the boundaries of what can be recognized as scientific discourse. In this context, referencing is not just a technical activity—it is a political act involving the

selection and exclusion of knowledge.

Furthermore, APA citation style has been deeply integrated into digital technologies such as Mendeley, Zotero, and EndNote—reference management tools that also originate from Western academic environments. These technologies inadvertently reinforce APA's dominance, as most of their default templates and formatting options are based on APA standards. Thus, digitalization not only accelerates academic work but also deepens the internalization of dominant epistemic values through its technological infrastructure.

In the editorial practices of Indonesian journals, the adoption of APA style also reflects a broader tendency to pursue global legitimacy, often at the expense of disciplinary flexibility and local specificity. As Bourdieu (1991) argued, social classifications—such as citation styles—constitute a “symbolic order” that determines the positioning of actors within academic hierarchies. Consequently, following APA is not merely a technical decision; it is a form of participation in a global epistemic classification system fraught with power relations.

### *English as an Instrument of Epistemic Hegemony*

One of the most visible and impactful instruments of hegemony is the dominance of English in scientific publishing. Data from this study show that 90% of SINTA 1 journals use English exclusively, while SINTA 6 journals increasingly exhibit bilingual practices, with 37% using both English and Indonesian. This dominance mirrors global data from Elsevier (2023), which reports that over 96% of scholarly articles indexed in Scopus are written in English.

In this context, English is not merely a medium of communication but a symbol of epistemic power. As Canagarajah (2002) argues, English plays a pivotal role in transmitting the values of the global center and serves as a prerequisite for academic recognition. Proficiency in English often determines access to global academic forums, research funding, and even career advancement. Marginson and Xu (2021) describe this phenomenon as epistemic asymmetry—a condition where the dominance of a single language undermines the diversity of other knowledge systems.

This linguistic dominance also disregards rhetorical

traditions from non-Western cultures. Studies by Kaplan (1966) and Hyland (2006) highlight that academic writing in Anglo-American contexts tends to be explicit, linear, and direct, whereas Southeast Asian rhetorical styles are more spiral, reflective, and cautious. When Western writing conventions become the universal standard, alternative forms of reasoning and academic expression are often deemed insufficiently objective.

Moreover, the pressure to publish in English is reinforced by national incentive systems—such as the PAK (credit point system) for Indonesian lecturers—which require publication in reputable international journals. This creates an evaluation system where English becomes a prerequisite for academic success, forcing Indonesian scholars to think, write, and publish in a language that is not socially or culturally their own.

Within Gramsci's (1971) theoretical framework, this situation exemplifies ideological hegemony operating subtly through what he terms a war of position—a struggle for influence through norms, institutions, and collective consciousness. In this light, English is not merely a

communicative tool but a primary instrument for shaping global academic consensus, effectively sidelining alternative forms of knowledge.

### **Technology as a Mechanism of Academic Normalization: Turnitin, Grammarly, and Reference Tools as Covert Agents of Hegemony**

While IMRaD structure, APA citation style, and the English language represent symbolic forms of dominance in academic formatting and expression, digital systems such as Turnitin, Grammarly, and reference management tools like Mendeley, Zotero, and EndNote represent more systemic and technological forms of domination. These tools operate as normalizing technologies—instruments that standardize, evaluate, and monitor academic writing practices. In other words, technology is not merely auxiliary but has become a powerful and covert medium of epistemic domination.

#### *Turnitin and the Regime of Originality Discipline*

One of the most apparent forms of technological intervention in academia is the widespread use of plagiarism detection tools, with Turnitin being the globally dominant platform. Based in the United States, Turnitin is not only used to detect textual

similarity but has evolved into a discursive surveillance system that regulates how academic texts should be written, structured, and cited. In Indonesia, Turnitin is formally mandated in many institutions, including within the SINTA journal accreditation system.

Turnitin's dominance exemplifies Foucault's logic of control, where power operates not through overt prohibition but through surveillance and normalization, shaping the behavior of writers. As Foucault (1978) put it, "visibility is a trap." Contemporary academic authors are not only expected to write correctly but to write in ways that avoid being flagged by Turnitin's algorithm. This practice fosters what may be termed textual paranoia—a condition in which writers focus more on circumventing detection systems than on developing substantive arguments.

In this light, Turnitin functions not merely as a tool for similarity checking but as an enforcer of writing styles aligned with hegemonic norms. As a system developed by an American company, Turnitin's algorithm implicitly assumes Western citation and writing standards. As a result, academic texts that employ non-

Western rhetoric or traditional references are often penalized with high similarity scores due to their deviation from standard citation patterns such as APA.

Moreover, Turnitin reinforces the perception that originality is a mechanical attribute measurable by quantitative means. However, in various local or cultural scientific traditions, practices such as repetition, shared narratives, or unformatted citations are legitimate forms of collective reasoning. In this sense, Turnitin implements a panoptic regime in academic settings—one that not only surveils textual practices but disciplines academic bodies to conform to global norms.

#### *Grammarly and the Standardization of Anglo-American Writing Style*

While Turnitin serves to discipline the originality aspect of academic writing, Grammarly—an AI-based proofreading and editing application headquartered in the United States—functions to discipline form and stylistic expression. In Indonesia, Grammarly is now widely used by both students and lecturers, and several national journals even require manuscripts to be

checked using Grammarly prior to submission.

The free version of Grammarly is sufficient for correcting grammar and spelling, but the premium version offers suggestions on writing style, word choice, argument clarity, and tone. These features are far from neutral. They are programmed based on Anglo-American rhetorical conventions that emphasize explicit clarity, active voice, and linguistic economy. These values align with the expectations of Western academic audiences, yet they may not always be compatible with other rhetorical traditions that prize elaboration, expressive caution, or rhetorical politeness.

In practice, writers from non-English-speaking countries such as Indonesia often face pressure to conform their sentence structures and lexical choices to Grammarly's suggestions, even at the cost of losing local nuance or idiomatic expression. For instance, conditional constructions common in Indonesian academic discourse are often flagged as "ineffective" or "wordy" by Grammarly's algorithm. This creates a kind of covert ideological correction, in which expressions that diverge

from the Anglo-American model are deemed "weak," "illogical," or "unprofessional."

As Canagarajah (2002) argues, such adjustments represent a form of hegemonic adaptation rather than equitable accommodation. In this context, Grammarly extends epistemic domination through technological logic, where corrective authority is no longer exercised by academic supervisors or journal editors, but by an AI system modeled on Western language and values.

*Reference Management Tools: Mendeley, Zotero, and EndNote as Infrastructures of Hegemony*

Reference management tools such as Mendeley (Elsevier, UK), Zotero (Center for History and New Media, US), and EndNote (Clarivate Analytics, US) are primarily designed to assist academics in organizing references, inserting citations, and generating bibliographies automatically. However, beyond their practical functions, these tools also shape and constrain how writers conceptualize legitimate sources, how citations should be formatted, and which systems are deemed most valid.

Most templates embedded within these applications are based on internationally recognized citation styles such as APA, MLA, Chicago, IEEE, or

Harvard—all of which originate from Anglo-Saxon academic traditions. Local citation systems—such as the historical footnote method used in Indonesian historiography or hybrid styles that combine oral and written sources in local anthropological studies—are largely absent from these platforms.

As a result, Mendeley and similar tools subtly promote the homogenization of academic writing styles. Academics wishing to adopt alternative citation systems must either manually format references or customize citation style language (CSL)—a task that requires technical skills not possessed by all writers. Consequently, many authors are compelled to conform to the available templates, even if those templates conflict with the epistemological traditions they uphold.

Moreover, the integration of these tools into journal submission processes—both nationally and internationally—has rendered their use less of a choice and more of an institutional obligation. In many SINTA-indexed and Scopus-indexed journals, the use of digital reference managers is now an administrative requirement. Thus, these tools function as “hegemonic infrastructures”,

through which Western academic standards are internalized not via ideological coercion, but through technical necessity and bureaucratic efficiency.

### **Institutional Infrastructure and the Political Economy of Knowledge: Contestation in Funding, Incentives, and Academic Evaluation**

While the IMRaD format, APA style, English language, and technologies such as Turnitin and Grammarly operate at the practical and discursive levels, a deeper and more pervasive form of academic hegemony manifests at the institutional and political-economic level. In this dimension, hegemony is not always visible through direct control but is embedded in funding structures, incentive systems, and academic evaluation policies that systematically discipline how knowledge is produced, written, and conceptualized.

#### *Research Funding and the Hegemony of Scientific Agendas*

One of the most effective mechanisms of domination in the global academic system is research funding. International donor institutions such as the Ford Foundation, Carnegie Corporation, Rockefeller Foundation, and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation have

played a major role in shaping research agendas in Global South countries, including Indonesia. As Parmar (2012) asserts, these institutions not only fund but also

foster and create frames of thought that cohere the network; they generously finance spaces for the production and legitimization of particular types of knowledge... preventing, or at least making a lot less likely, 'other thoughts'.

In the Indonesian context, these donors have funded research projects, university partnerships, and capacity-building programs that facilitate the integration of the national academic system into Western-oriented global knowledge structures. Research topics prioritized are those aligned with global agendas—climate change, public health, technology, and innovation—whereas local-based studies, oral history, indigenous epistemologies, or non-positivist community-based research are often sidelined as they are seen as lacking “global impact” or being difficult to publish in high-ranking international journals.

Moreover, these funding structures often set methodological standards that

marginalize interpretive or participatory methods rooted in local communities. This illustrates that epistemic power is exercised not merely through ideas but through budgeting schemes and research funding priorities. As Bourdieu (1991) explains, symbolic power is most effective when it operates through structures that appear natural and technocratic, though they are ultimately shaped by political forces determining who is entitled to know and what is worth researching.

#### *Academic Evaluation Systems and the Commodification of Knowledge*

Indonesia's academic evaluation system also plays a central role in reinforcing the dominance of global standards. Regulations from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology—such as Decree No. 500/M/2024—explicitly require publication in reputable international journals (Scopus or WoS) for academic promotion, especially to positions such as Associate Professor and Professor. Additionally, the credit scoring system (PAK) and SINTA assign the highest value to international, English-language publications in high-indexed journals.

As a result, academics are driven to tailor their research to the logic of the global market—producing articles aimed at high-index journals regardless of local relevance or societal needs. Topics such as local wisdom, regional literature, or culturally grounded educational approaches are often neglected due to their low “marketability” in global bibliometric systems.

This condition exemplifies what Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) describe as academic capitalism—the transformation of higher education into a market-driven entity that commodifies knowledge. In this paradigm, academic success is measured by citation indices, impact factors, and publication productivity, rather than by social contribution, policy influence, or community impact.

Beyond being a mere evaluation mechanism, the system creates a pattern of knowledge production that is homogenized and centralized. As Santos (2014) notes, such a system excludes other forms of knowledge that do not conform to the “Western modern canon” and produces epistemicide—the systematic erasure of alternative knowledge systems, particularly those rooted in local values and community practices.

### **Institutional Resistance and Local Spaces of Negotiation**

Despite the overwhelming influence of global structures, resistance is not entirely absent. Some Indonesian universities have begun to develop alternative incentive systems that value local publications, community-based works, and non-article outputs such as books, book chapters, conference proceedings, and local documentation. Universitas Gadjah Mada (UGM), for instance, provides recognition for scholarly works that are locally relevant, even when they are not published in internationally indexed journals (Direktorat Penelitian UGM, 2025).

In addition, initiatives such as the Garuda portal and institutional repositories (e.g., UGM Repository, UI ScholarHub, ITS e-Repository, and Unair Repository) have emerged to provide open access to academic works in the Indonesian language. Although these platforms are not yet as prominent as SciELO in Brazil or AJOL in Africa, they signal ongoing efforts to strengthen national publication infrastructures and to counter the dominance of global publishers such as Elsevier, Springer Nature, and Wiley—who largely control the journal market through closed-access

models (paywalls) and expensive article processing charges (APCs).

Further efforts can be observed in the government's affirmative policies aimed at supporting national journals to gain international indexing through programs like Arjuna and SINTA. These initiatives include training for editorial management, grants for journal development, and incentives for national publications. However, such policies often continue to adopt international benchmarks as their primary criteria—potentially reinforcing epistemic dependency rather than enabling intellectual autonomy.

### **Epistemic Negotiation and Selective Adaptation: Forms of Resistance in Journal Editorial Practices**

Although Western academic structures—such as the IMRaD format, APA style, and the use of English—exert considerable influence on Indonesia's scholarly publication system, this study reveals that not all journals fully comply with such pressures. On the contrary, this is precisely where the importance of counter-hegemonic strategies emerges, practiced by a range of national journals from both SINTA 1 and SINTA 6 categories. Resistance does not always

manifest as open rejection; instead, it often takes the form of smart negotiation, selective adaptation, and institutional flexibility.

### *Non-IMRaD Structures and Rhetorical Autonomy*

One of the clearest forms of resistance lies in the continued use of non-IMRaD structures by several journals, particularly in fields such as law, nursing, and Islamic studies. The findings indicate that journals such as Samarah, Wacana Paramarta, Jurnal Keperawatan Muhammadiyah Bengkulu, and Jurnal Kajian dan Pengembangan Umat opt for narrative or discursive article structures that are more contextual and flexible, rather than adhering strictly to the IMRaD format.

This decision is not merely a result of technical limitations; rather, it reflects an epistemological preference for local traditions of argumentation, narrative writing styles, and thematic organization—methods more aligned with reflective and interpretive approaches. In Gramsci's (1971) terms, such strategies represent a war of position—a long-term struggle through cultural and intellectual positions that, while indirect, produce meaningful impact over time.

Moreover, the use of non-IMRaD structures asserts that scientific articulation can—and should—be plural. By maintaining context-sensitive formats, these journals affirm that academic writing need not be governed by a single universal model but can instead be tailored to the epistemic characteristics of each discipline. This aligns with Santos's (2014) argument for ecologies of knowledges, which calls for the recognition of diverse ways of thinking and writing as an essential component of global cognitive justice.

*Diversity of Referencing Styles as an Epistemic Tactic*

Beyond structural format, citation style has also become a site of epistemic resistance. The findings of this study reveal that several SINTA-accredited journals—both from tiers 1 and 6—explicitly choose citation styles other than APA. For instance, Hasanuddin Law Review and Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies use the footnote-based Chicago Manual of Style; Al-Ihkam employs the 17th edition of Chicago; and Muhammadiyah Law Review adopts the Australian Guide to Legal Citation (AGLC).

This choice is not merely a technical preference but is closely tied to the scholarly

traditions of each field. Legal journals, for example, have historically utilized footnote systems to document legal sources, jurisprudence, and constitutional materials—types of references that do not fit the parenthetical citation system of APA. Imposing APA style across all disciplines thus risks undermining the methodological integrity and rhetorical structure specific to those fields.

By maintaining alternative citation styles, these journals engage in a form of flexible compliance—a strategy of selectively conforming to global norms while preserving local authenticity. It also reflects epistemic agency, or the institutional capacity to determine the most appropriate framework for scholarly representation based on contextual disciplinary values.

*Multilingualism and Academic Linguistic Rights*

Another significant form of resistance lies in the adoption of multilingual policies. This study found that several journals—even within SINTA 1—explicitly accommodate the use of Arabic and Indonesian alongside English. It is a critical step in upholding epistemic linguistic rights—the right to think, write, and

disseminate knowledge in languages that embody the values, culture, and epistemic systems of local communities.

This phenomenon aligns with Canagarajah's (2005) concept of multilingualism as resistance, which argues that the use of non-global (non-English) languages in academia should not be seen as a sign of inferiority, but as a form of resistance against the monolingualism of power that marginalizes other languages from global knowledge circulation. Journals such as Al-Ihkam, Ahkam, and Samarah demonstrate that combining languages (Arabic-English-Indonesian) is not only feasible but also substantively relevant to their respective disciplines.

In this context, multilingual strategies represent an articulation of epistemic freedom as proposed by Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2018), the freedom to write from specific social and geographical positions without submission to Euro-American frameworks. Language is not merely a medium but also an epistemic marker—and by preserving linguistic diversity in academic publishing, Indonesian journals expand epistemic participation both nationally and globally.

### **The Role of Local Editorial Boards in Perpetuating or Challenging Hegemony**

The findings also indicate that editorial boards of journals hold a strategic position as epistemic gatekeepers. Some journals—particularly those indexed in SINTA 6—still demonstrate flexibility in accepting non-IMRaD structures, local citation styles, and the use of the Indonesian language, whereas SINTA 1 journals tend to be more rigid in enforcing global standards.

However, it is precisely within this space that the potential for transformation lies. If journal editorial boards—comprising academics, lecturers, and researchers—are willing to consciously position themselves as agents of epistemic change, resistance to knowledge homogenization can be more systematic. This requires editorial courage to open space for narrative experimentation, citation flexibility, and acceptance of alternative structures, all without compromising scholarly quality or academic accountability.

As emphasized by Curry and Lillis (2004), many scholars "are enthusiastic about their research and often work at building up local research structures... while increasingly

engaged in writing in English." In other words, negotiation does not imply total rejection of the global system, but rather the capacity to reconfigure power relations within it to be more equitable, contextual, and participatory.

### **Theoretical Reflection: toward Decolonizing Knowledge and Epistemic Justice**

The contestation against American academic hegemony—identified through various aspects of scientific writing in Indonesia, such as the IMRaD structure, APA style, the dominance of English, and the use of Turnitin and Grammarly—illustrates that academic practice is inseparable from global power relations that operate symbolically, discursively, and institutionally. However, emerging local resistances—seen in structural flexibility, citation diversity, multilingual policies, and national publication initiatives—demonstrate that scientific practice is also a space for negotiation. In this context, decolonial theory provides a relevant framework for understanding the trajectory of resistance and the potential for transformation.

### *Epistemic Freedom: Writing from One's Own Social Position*

As argued by Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2018), epistemic freedom is "epistemic freedom is fundamentally about the right to think, theorize, interpret the world, develop own methodologies and write from where one is located and unencumbered by Eurocentrism." In the context of Indonesian academic publishing, epistemic freedom is not merely about preserving the Indonesian language or local structures, but about reclaiming epistemic autonomy—the right to determine one's own modes of knowledge validation, argumentation structure, and scholarly expression in ways that reflect the values of local communities.

Strategies such as maintaining Chicago style in legal scholarship, using Arabic in Islamic studies, and rejecting the IMRaD format in nursing and the humanities are manifestations of this freedom. These practices reveal that Indonesia is not merely a consumer of the global academic system but also possesses the capacity to redefine what constitutes "scientific" according to its own social and historical contexts.

*Epistemic Disobedience:  
Unmasking False Universality*

Through the concept of epistemic disobedience, Walter D. Mignolo (2009) calls for the necessity of resisting the claims to universality of knowledge that are shaped by the logic of Western modernity-coloniality. He emphasizes that the decolonial task is to engage in epistemic de-linking—that is, detaching from frameworks that equate scientific truth with a singular, Western mode of representation.

In the context of Indonesian academic journals, resistance to the APA citation style, rejection of rigid Turnitin checks, and the retention of narrative or thematic article structures are concrete forms of epistemic disobedience. These acts do not constitute a rejection of rationality per se, but rather a refusal to accept the hegemony of specific rationalities that claim exclusivity and universality.

In this sense, when Indonesian journals refuse to equate scientific quality with strict adherence to Scopus standards, or when writers choose to publish in Bahasa Indonesia to reach local readers, they are engaging in acts of epistemic defiance. Such resistance challenges the

assumption that only English-language IMRaD structures and APA style can be deemed “scientific”.

*War of Position: Cultural Strategies and Long-Term Negotiation*

Gramsci's (1971) theory of war of position helps us understand that change in the academic world does not always occur through radical upheaval or direct confrontation (war of manoeuvre), but often through the gradual building of cultural alliances, intellectual consensus, and ideological repositioning.

In the Indonesian academic context, this war of position manifests in initiatives such as the development of the Garuda portal, the strengthening of national journals through SINTA, the design of alternative incentive systems based on local impact, and the creation of accreditation frameworks rooted in national needs. These efforts represent a structural struggle to reclaim epistemic authority from global institutions and relocate it within more socially relevant and context-sensitive knowledge systems.

It is crucial to recognize that the war of position requires patience, institutional perseverance,

and a shift in the academic actors' own consciousness—away from an internalized sense of inferiority that assumes external systems are inherently superior. By building alternative evaluation systems, opening space for local narrative styles, and promoting critical education on the colonial history of knowledge production, Indonesia can develop a symbolic counterpower—not merely to “participate” in the global system, but to help redefine its very rules.

*Ecologies of Knowledges:  
Building a Just Knowledge  
Ecosystem*

As a concluding reflection, it is essential to revisit Boaventura de Sousa Santos's (2014) concept of ecologies of knowledges. He offers a path out of the monoculture of Western scientific knowledge toward a system that embraces epistemic diversity. As he asserts, “There is no global social justice without global cognitive justice”.

By fostering a pluralistic knowledge ecosystem, Indonesian academic journals do not need to reject modern science; rather, they must have the courage to place it alongside traditional, community-based, local, spiritual, and narrative forms

of knowledge. In this framework, knowledge should not be subordinated to a single model of writing, but should instead emerge from dialogues across epistemes, languages, and cultures.

National journals can serve as alternative platforms for articulating local experiences, creating space for multilingualism, and bridging the gap between global and local discourses. With the right strategies, Indonesia's publication ecosystem can not only survive amid global academic dominance but also emerge as a pioneer of a more just, context-sensitive, and socially grounded model of scholarship.

**CONCLUSION**

This article demonstrates how American academic standards—embodied in the IMRaD structure, APA citation style, the predominance of English, and technologies such as Turnitin, Grammarly, and reference management software—have been internalized within Indonesian scholarly writing practices, especially in journals indexed by SINTA. Such dominance extends beyond formal mechanisms, operating symbolically and institutionally through academic evaluation systems, incentive structures, and

digital infrastructures that enforce conformity to global academic norms. However, the findings also highlight emerging spaces of epistemic resistance and negotiation. A number of journals maintain non-IMRaD structures, adopt alternative referencing styles, and embrace the use of local and multilingual expressions as strategic efforts to preserve epistemic authenticity and cultural relevance. These forms of localized adaptation and editorial flexibility reveal that hegemony is not always uncontested; instead, it can be strategically negotiated through institutional agency and contextual awareness. Through the framework of decolonial theory, this article emphasizes the significance of epistemic freedom and epistemic disobedience as critical pathways toward achieving epistemic justice. Indonesia, with its pluralistic intellectual traditions and diverse sociocultural foundations, is well-positioned to cultivate a more contextually grounded, inclusive, and independent knowledge system. Academic decolonization, therefore, is not simply a reactionary rejection of global standards, but a proactive endeavor to reimagine and reconstruct a more equitable, relevant, and

locally rooted scholarly ecosystem.

#### **COMPETING INTEREST STATEMENT**

Herewith the author declares that this article is totally free from any conflict of interest regarding the assessment, review and revision, and publication process in general.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada, for funding the doctoral program that supported the development of this article. This study contributes to understanding how American academic hegemony is manifested in Indonesian scholarly publishing practices. Moreover, its findings can serve as a valuable resource for future research, offering insights and inspiration for more in-depth or quantitative investigations into the extent of American influence on Indonesian academic journals and the broader dynamics of global-local knowledge production.

#### **REFERENCES**

- Altbach, P. G. (2004). Globalisation and the University: Myths and Realities in an Unequal

- World. Tertiary Education & Management, 10(3), 3-25.
- Altbach, P. G. (2011). The past, present, and future of the research university. In P. G. Altbach & J. Salmi (Eds.), *The road to academic excellence: The making of world-class research universities* (pp. 11-32). Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (J. B. Thompson, Ed.; G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Polity Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *A geopolitics of academic writing*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Canagarajah, A.S. (Ed.). (2005). *Reclaiming the Local in Language Policy and Practice* (1st ed.). Routledge.  
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410611840>
- Curry, M. J., & Lillis, T. (2004). Multilingual Scholars and the Imperative to Publish in English: Negotiating Interests, Demands, and Rewards. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(4), 663-688. doi:10.2307/3588284
- Direktorat Penelitian UGM. (2025). Program dan kebijakan publikasi ilmiah. Retrieved April 25, 2025, from Universitas Gadjah Mada:  
<https://penelitian.ugm.ac.id/>
- Elsevier. (2023, March 9). The lasting language of publication. Retrieved from Elsevier Connect: <https://www.elsevier.com/connect/the-lasting-language-of-publication>
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- Foucault, M. (1978/1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. (A. Sheridan, Trans.) New York: VINTAGE BOOKS.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977* (C. Gordon, Ed. & Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. (E. & Q. Hoare & G. Nowell Smith, Trans.) London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hyland, K. (2006). *English for academic purposes: An advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.
- Kaplan, R. B. (1966). Cultural Thought Patterns In Inter-Cultural Education. *Language Learning*, 16(1-2), 1-20. doi:10.1111/j.1467-1770.1966.tb00804.x

- Marginson, S., & Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education*, 43(3), 281-309.  
doi:10.1023/A:1014699605875
- Marginson, S. (2008). Global field and global imagining: Bourdieu and worldwide higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 29(3), 303-315.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690801966386>
- Marginson, S., & Xu, X. (2021). Moving beyond centre-periphery science: Towards an ecology of knowledge. Centre for Global Higher Education Working Paper Series, 63, 1-34. Retrieved from  
[https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:f139bfcc-1e7b-4fbd-879a-f44732058c21/download\\_file?safe\\_filename=Marginson%2520and%2520Xu%2520Moving%2520beyond%2520centre-periphery%2520science.pdf&type\\_of\\_work=Working+paper](https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:f139bfcc-1e7b-4fbd-879a-f44732058c21/download_file?safe_filename=Marginson%2520and%2520Xu%2520Moving%2520beyond%2520centre-periphery%2520science.pdf&type_of_work=Working+paper)
- Mignolo, W. D. (2009). Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(7-8), 159-181.  
doi:10.1177/026327640934927
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2018). Epistemic freedom in Africa: Deprovincialization and decolonization. London: Routledge.
- Parmar, I. (2012). Foundations of the American century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller foundations in the rise of American power. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). Linguistic Imperialism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Quijano, A. (2007). Coloniality and modernity/rationality. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2-3), 168-178.  
doi:10.1080/09502380601164353
- Santos, B. d. (2014). Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide. New York: Routledge.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.