



Cuts destroy, hurt, kill: a critical metaphor analysis of the response of UK academics to the UK overseas aid budget funding cuts

Maria Grazia Imperiale & Alison Phipps

To cite this article: Maria Grazia Imperiale & Alison Phipps (2022) *Cuts destroy, hurt, kill: a critical metaphor analysis of the response of UK academics to the UK overseas aid budget funding cuts*, Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 17:1, 61-77, DOI: [10.1080/17447143.2021.2024838](https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2021.2024838)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2021.2024838>



© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 27 Jan 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 946



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Cuts destroy, hurt, kill: a critical metaphor analysis of the response of UK academics to the UK overseas aid budget funding cuts

Maria Grazia Imperiale and Alison Phipps

School of Education, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

In this article, we analyse the response of UK academics to the UK government decision to cut international development research funding as part of the overseas aid budget reduction, undertaken in March 2021. This decision affects and will have long-lasting effects on any research project involving the UK and international partners, particularly in Global South contexts. We use Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA) to analyse news, blogs, interviews that UK-based academics wrote in response to the cuts announcement, from 11 March 2021 to 30 April 2021. We identified the following metaphors: CUTS ARE AN ENTITY; CUTS ARE A THREAT, CUTS ARE ILLNESS, CUTS ARE VIOLENCE; plus, on the other hand, RESEARCH IS HEALTH, RESEARCH IS A JOURNEY, RESEARCH IS CONNECTION. UK academics have used ‘idioms of distress’, which are cultural expressions, often metaphorical, through which people articulate distress. Therefore, our contribution is threefold. First, we suggest that the metaphors used have a persuasive and evaluative aim and function. Second, we open up a space for an interdisciplinarity between CMA and ‘idioms of distress’. Third, we warn about the need for the UK government and responsible institutional bodies to restore communication and trust with the global academic research community in International Development.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 11 August 2021
Accepted 27 December 2021

KEYWORDS

Critical metaphor analysis (CMA); idioms of distress; research cuts; international development research; overseas development assistance (ODA)

Introduction

On 11 March 2021, the UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) body, which leads research funding across the UK, announced a substantial reduction in the international development research budget as a result of the UK government decision to cut the overseas aid budget. The news of country-by-country cuts was first broken by journalist Peter Gough in early March 2021¹ and the UKRI cuts by Robin Bisson of Research Professional News, on 9 March 2021.² Most of the research projects funded by the Global Challenge Research Fund (GCRF), which funds international research partnerships in Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) contexts, have been affected by the decision to different

CONTACT Maria Grazia Imperiale  Maria.Imperiale@glasgow.ac.uk

© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

extents. An estimated 800 projects are having to face the consequences of the cuts and 'reprofile' their work, to use the metaphor of choice of UKRI, the funders. Some of these projects have been suspended for the next financial year, others were to be abruptly terminated on 31 July 2021 (despite being contracted to last longer), and for others, UK institutions have invested resources to cover and allow to continue – at least partially – already contracted work. For many, the outcome is uncertain and subject to much delay and several budget wranglings between UKRI and higher education institutions (HEIs) in the UK. During this painful and chaotic time, UK-based academics, specifically a number of affected projects' principal investigators (PIs), have been campaigning publicly to reverse the decision in the press, on social media, and through petitions and letters to Parliament and their elected representatives.

Our project, *Culture for Sustainable and Inclusive Peace Network Plus (CUSP)* (University of Glasgow, PI: Alison Phipps) has been affected by the cuts. We work on Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 5 and SDG16 to strengthen women's participation in society and to promote the work of arts and cultural organisations that foster peacebuilding in the UK, Ghana, Palestine, Mexico, Morocco and Zimbabwe. Alongside our work with the campaign, we have also continued our work as academics who, even within uncertain circumstances, try to construct knowledge and make meaning. With our backgrounds in applied linguistics and anthropology, we resort to language, and to the analysis of the discourse around the cuts, as our way to (attempt to) make meaning for this unprecedented time of crisis for the UK academy. Another project, which Phipps acts on as Co-I and Co-Director, has also been affected *Migration for Development and Equality* (Coventry University; Director: Heaven Crawley; Co-I & Co-Director: Alison Phipps).

The study of discourse in international development studies (IDS) and in development studies (DS) has drawn considerable attention. For instance, this journal has hosted an interesting debate on the topic (see, for example, Della Faille 2011; Pieterse 2011), and it is our hope to contribute to the debate. Discourse analysis in development and international development studies started in the 1990s; however, it is still considered marginal by some authors (e.g. Della Faille 2011). Other scholars have pointed out that critical discourse analysis (CDA) has been successfully used to counter hegemonic discourses and practices (Ziai 2015; Pieterse 2011). Attention to language and discourse in DS and IDS is found in the work of Hilary Footitt (2017) and Cornwall and Eade (2010). Footitt (2017) explored multilingualism in humanitarian contexts and the language of humanitarian intervention, while Cornwall and Eade (2010) deconstructed buzzwords found in development discourses. The contribution of these authors is notable as they have unpacked discourses and narratives, critiquing and pointing out power dynamics, silences and subtle ways in which language(s) shapes practices in DS and IDS in ways that had not been addressed before.

In this article, we use Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA) (Charteris-Black 2004) to analyse the metaphors that UK academics have used in the news, blogs, and interviews within the campaign in response to funding cuts. Metaphors are considered powerful tools to express concepts and to shape reality (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). They can reveal language users' intentions beyond what is said and what is not said, and CMA allows us to unpack these. Metaphors are also a common way through which distress can be articulated; in global mental health, psychologists have coined the term 'Idioms of distress' (Nichter 1981, 2010) to refer to culturally representative ways in which people

express distress, which are often metaphorical. In this article, we open up an interdisciplinary conversation between CMA and ‘idioms of distress’, analysing the metaphorical idioms of distress used by UK academics to express the distress caused by the funding cuts.

This article is structured as follows: in the first section, we present an overview of CMA and of idioms of distress, bringing them into the conversation. In the second section, we present the methods used in our study, and in the third, we present our analysis and discussion of the findings. Finally, we draw our concluding remarks, pointing out the contribution that this article makes to Critical Metaphor Analysis and to idioms of distress, while also discussing potentially problematic issues for future international development research.

Critical metaphor analysis and idioms of distress

In this section, we introduce Critical Metaphor Analysis and the concept of idioms of distress, showing the potential for interdisciplinary conversations. In a search of over 40 databases within PROQuest Academic and EBSCOHost, both keyword combinations of ‘critical metaphor analysis’ AND ‘idioms of distress’; ‘critical discourse analysis’ AND ‘idioms of distress’ gave *no* results. To the best of our knowledge, and after a careful review of specific applied linguistics journals, we are confident that CMA and idioms of distress have *never* been explored in combination. This is not entirely surprising since, as applied linguists ourselves, we first encountered the concept of ‘idioms of distress’ thanks to interdisciplinary working between Global Mental Health and Applied Linguistics during the *Idioms of Distress, Resilience and Wellbeing* research project (Imperiale 2020) (University of Glasgow, PI: Alison Phipps). In this section, we first discuss CMA and then idioms of distress, and we conclude by trying to open up a conversation between the two concepts.

Critical metaphor analysis

First developed by Charteris-Black (2004), Critical Metaphor Analysis (CMA) is a critical approach within metaphor studies that aims to reveal the ‘covert intentions of language users’ (34), and it involves critical discourse analysis (CDA), conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) and corpus linguistics. Given that this study aims to explore the metaphors used by academics in their response to research funding cuts, and to understand the ideological role of these metaphors in a specific discourse context, this theory seemed the most appropriate. In the next sub-sections, we illustrate the pillars of CMA – namely CDA and CMT. We do not focus on corpus linguistics, since, as further explained in the ‘Methods’ section, we did not adopt it as part of our study.

Critical discourse analysis

CDA is concerned with theorising the ‘mediation between the social and the linguistic’ (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, 58) through the integration of textual analysis and social theories. CDA studies the text but also how a text is produced, distributed and received and how it could shape narratives and social action. There is a variety of approaches and methods used within CDA, suggesting the development of different strands and focuses (Van Dijk 2001). However, there are certain basic principles and tenets that constitute the shared agenda of CDA practitioners (Weiss and Wodak 2003;

Van Dijk 2001). For instance, texts are perceived as fundamental to meaning making and are studied in terms of the social effects that they can produce and as 'representations which can be shown to contribute to social relations of power and domination' (Fairclough 2003, 9–10). The approach, therefore, aims to address social problems and power relations, which are discursive (Wodak and Fairclough 1997) and textually produced. CDA has been used widely also as a tool to reveal the 'silences' and covert assumptions present in texts and discourses, therefore revealing power dynamics and dominant positions between language users (Wodak 1996; Munro 2018).

Van Dijk (2001, 2009) works from the understanding that power, in contemporary societies, is expressed and performed through what Antonio Gramsci called 'cultural hegemony' and consensus. Power is seldom perceived in terms of overt domination but rather exercised through the creation of consensus, and this largely occurs through language. Therefore, any analysis of discourses should consider the context in which discursive practices are constituted, including the socio-political and historical context. CDA helps to link the 'macro' and 'micro' levels (Van Dijk 2001).

The only way to link the 'macro' and the 'micro' levels, according to Van Dijk (1993), is through a socio-cognitive approach which was initially neglected in CDA, and this was one of its major shortcomings. Similarly, Koller (2005) points out that CDA has usually considered metaphors in terms of linguistic expression rather than through a cognitive approach, hence the limited work overall on metaphors within CDA (Koller 2005; Davidson 2010). Fairclough (1992a, 194–195, 1992b), however, did consider metaphors as part of his work:

When we signify things through one metaphor rather than through another, we are constructing our reality in one way rather than another. Metaphors structure the way we think and the way we act, and our systems of knowledge and belief, in pervasive and fundamental ways. How a particular domain of experience is metaphorised is one of the stakes in the struggle within and over discourse practices.

Davidson (2010) and Koller (2005) wrote that the quote above resonates with Lakoff and Johnson (1980)'s understanding of metaphors as carrying an intrinsic evaluative power and as shaping realities. This is the main principle of Lakoff and Johnson's seminal work *Metaphors we live by*, on which conceptual metaphor theory, the second pillar of Critical Metaphor Analysis, is based.

Conceptual metaphor theory

Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) work *Metaphors We Live By* has been influential in developing conceptual metaphor theory (CMT), which is a cognitive approach to metaphors. In their work, the authors argue that there are 'conceptual metaphors' that govern the creation of our metaphors (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). Conceptual metaphors link and move across two domains – the source one, and the target one; for instance, in the formula A IS B, B (the source domain) is mapped into the domain of A (the target domain). In the well-known example, ARGUMENT IS WAR,³ the domain of WAR is transferred to ARGUMENT. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) explain that by interpreting ARGUMENT AS WAR, while we highlight a series of meanings related to winning/losing an argument, at the same time, we hide other aspects of 'argument': for example, a more positive approach in which interlocutors recognise that they donated time and energy to build the argument

and to reciprocally listen to each other. Metaphors create realities by associating two domains *coherently* (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). The source domain, B (WAR in our example), is often experiential, while the target domain, A, is often abstract (ARGUMENT). Abstract concepts are usually less clearly delineated, whereas we have a better knowledge and shared understanding of B as a sensory, embodied, concrete experience (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). The form 'A IS B', therefore, is not arbitrary; it presupposes 'directionality' and some shared life experiences between language users (Koch and Deetz 1981). Coherence is given by the association of the two domains.

Kövecses (2020) highlights that CMT has been well developed after the initial work of Lakoff and Johnson (1980), and that it has addressed some of the critiques of it that had been made. However, he acknowledges that the main critique, the fact that CMT researchers did not pay sufficient attention to 'the discourse and social-pragmatic functions of metaphors in real discourses', remains valid (Kövecses 2020). This includes the oral domains of social life. A second critique of CMT concerns 'universal conceptual metaphors' (Kövecses 2020).

CMT scholars argue that there are 'universal conceptual metaphors', whereas other metaphors are culturally and contextually coherent and created. Kövecses (2020, 11), we believe, simplifies the response to this critique by writing that

Since the human body and the brain are predominantly universal, the metaphorical structures that are based on them will also be predominantly universal. This explains why many conceptual metaphors, such as KNOWING IS SEEING, can be found in a large number of genetically unrelated languages. This does not mean, however, that *all* conceptual metaphors that are based on primary metaphors will be the same from language/culture to language/culture.

Even though he acknowledges that there are non-universal, 'context-induced' metaphors, we believe that this statement partially fails to recognise the agency of human beings, and how discourses are locally and contextually constituted. We believe that CMA addresses the main shortcomings of both CDA and CMT by using the two theories in a complementary way; on one hand, CMT offers a stronger cognitive dimension to CDA, while on the other, CDA contributes to CMT with its socio-discursive and linguistic approach.

Idioms of distress

Idioms of distress are contextually grounded expressions through which individuals articulate distress. The concept was developed by Mark Nichter (1981, 2010) in the field of global mental health and then used to provide culturally responsive psychological interventions and assessment of mental distress (Nichter 1981, 2010). In his initial work, Nichter (1981) studied the ways in which women in South India expressed distress through different modes – often through metaphors – also focusing on the dynamic social contexts that affect our expressions. He argues that being attentive to idioms of distress and metaphors helped him build emphatic connections with the individuals suffering from mental distress (Nichter 1981). In his revised definition, Nichter (2010, 405) states:

Idioms of distress are *socially and culturally* resonant means of experiencing and expressing distress in local worlds. They are evocative and index past traumatic memories as

well as present stressors, such as anger, powerlessness, social marginalization and insecurity, and possible future sources of anxiety, loss and angst. Idioms of distress communicate *experiential states* that lie on a trajectory from the mildly stressful to depths of suffering that render individuals and groups incapable of functioning as productive members of society. In some cases, idioms of distress are culturally and interpersonally effective ways of expressing and *coping with distress*, and in other cases, they are indicative of psychopathological states that undermine individual and collective states of well-being (our emphasis).

Nichter (2010) argues that some idioms are 'commonplace', whereas others are 'culturally unique'. For example, references to cleanliness and order are often identifiable with obsessive compulsive disorder; however, for Brahman women in India, cleanliness is associated with purity and individual identity, hence it carries localised cultural meanings (Nichter 2010).

Idioms of distress communicate 'experiential states' in metaphorical forms. For example, common idioms of distress are 'thinking too much' (Keiser et al. 2015), 'feeling broken/destroyed' (Barber et al. 2016). These idioms of distress communicate an experiential state of feeling unwell, not being able to sleep, having migraines, feeling anxious or depressed. Keiser et al. (2015) study on 'thinking too much' found that the metaphor is used all over the world to describe the syndrome, symptoms and causes of distress. Although it is used widely, the idiom carries different nuances in different locations, and it is linked to local values and social constructs. For instance, Baganda men in Uganda, use 'thinking too much' to describe the illness that men develop after their wives leave them (Okello and Ekblad 2006).

The literature on idioms of distress in global mental health is abundant, but of particular interest to our discussion – relating idioms of distress to Critical Metaphor Analysis – is how the experiential domain is not the source domain – as per Lakoff and Johnson's theorisation – but rather the target domain. For instance, instead of saying 'I am physically unwell', we often say 'I am thinking too much'. In our understanding, then, the directionality of A IS B, when applied to idioms of distress, is not univocal.

A second relevant point for our discussion is that while conceptual metaphors are harmonious and follow a precise image-scheme (Johnson 1987), idioms of distress are contradictory and may disaggregate coherence (Nichter 2010). Nichter (2010) argued for an approach attentive to semantics, pragmatics and micropolitics of communication which avoids static representations and rather allows for contradictory and negotiable presentations to emerge. The lack of coherence and the irrational fluidity of thought might be explained following Scarry (1985), as she argues that pain and trauma are language destroying. As other psychologists and psychotherapists have pointed out, pain and trauma reduce our capacity to 'language', to articulate thoughts logically and rationally (Costa and Dewaele 2012; Rolland et al. 2017).

The points above may seem to contradict both CMT and Lakoff and Johnson (1980)'s work. We argue that these do indeed contradict with the schemes they have developed, because Lakoff and Johnson (1980) did not conceptualise what happens to language and to languaging when pain and trauma are experienced. Extreme circumstances also push language into extremity. We, therefore, argue that considering idioms of distress in CMT may add a further dimension to the refinement and application of conceptual metaphors and coherence in traumatic and painful situations.

A final point for our discussion is that scholars argue that idioms of distress are not independent of the socio-political context in which they are produced (e.g. Nichter 2010). These need to be considered and understood *within* the socio-political contexts, and not just in terms of psychological processes (Barber et al. 2016; de Jong and Reis 2010; Nichter 2010). Citing an example from Palestine, Barber et al. (2016) find that ‘feeling broken/destroyed’ are sentiments that directly reflect the political history of the protracted conflict that Palestinians experience. This, therefore, points towards not only understanding the individual’s personal story, but – referring to Van Dijk (2001)’s work in CDA – also, the historical and social context, and potentially how one way of expressing distress creates a structural discourse and practices around distress and wellbeing (Cork, Kaiser, and White 2019).

However, perhaps for efficiency, idioms of distress are sometimes not analysed in context, but rather extrapolated, thus limiting understanding of structural issues. For example, Hassan and colleagues (2015) compiled a table with a translation of idioms used in Kurdish and in Arabic, translated into English. However, Imperiale (2020) demonstrated that taking idioms out of context may result in misunderstandings. For example, analysing the idioms used by Palestinians in Gaza during the 2014 military operation, ‘I can’t breathe’ was one which frequently indicated distress. The analysis showed that this was both a metaphorical and a literal phrase, as it was the result of explosions, where breathing issues were due to the dust and rubble and anxiety attack symptoms. Imperiale argued for using a context-based translation approach and for studying the idioms of distress through CDA, which could offer an understanding not only of distress but also of the discursive power in which distress is manifested (Imperiale 2020).

Methods

In our study, we followed the three-step process identified by Charteris-Black’s (2004) conceptualisation of CMA: identification, interpretation, and explanation. To identify the metaphors, we first read our sample closely and critically. We then used the Pragglejaz Group’s approach (2007), which considers lexical units and determines if each unit has ‘a more basic contemporary meaning in other contexts than the one in the given context’ (Pragglejaz Group 2007, 3). The interpretation step involves establishing the conceptual metaphor and identifying the source domain (Charteris-Black 2004). Imperiale identified and interpreted the metaphors, and Phipps checked the expressions grouped into conceptual metaphors; the codes over which both authors disagreed were negotiated until agreement was reached. This process ensured the metaphors’ coding reliability (Fallah and Moini 2016). For the explanation step, we took into account conceptual metaphors contextual and cultural considerations as well as metaphors’ pragmatic function, especially persuasion and evaluation (Charteris-Black 2004).

The approach we adopted for the analysis was inductive. Steen (2007) differentiates between a deductive and an inductive approach to metaphor research; a deductive approach is particularly suited for corpus analysis as it begins with conceptual metaphors and then the corpus is searched to find those specific conceptual metaphors. An inductive method instead starts with the sample and determines metaphors based on a thorough analysis of lexical units, as seen in Pragglejaz Group’s work (2007). Given the manageable

size of our sample and our focus on the ideological role of metaphors, the inductive approach was preferred.

Our sample included articles taken from online newspapers articles (e.g. The Guardian, The National) in which UK academics were interviewed and directly quoted, and blogposts and open letters written by academics themselves. We consider blogposts and open letters as public data, as they were written by academics as public servants. The blogposts were written purposefully and from academic organisations and project sites to reach a wider audience. No formal informed consent was required. The blogposts and articles included in our sample can be found by unravelling the following twitter thread: https://twitter.com/alison_phipps/status/1374585559067324416?s=12. The chosen timeframe was between 11 March 2021 (the date the announcement was made) and 30 April 2021. We chose this limited timeframe since we wanted to analyse the immediate reactions in the period during which academics stopped their work to focus on immediate issues emerging from the cuts and tried to make sense of what was being experienced both by ourselves as academics and by our peers and partners.

Analysis and discussion

In this section, we present our findings, our analysis and discussion. We first start with the CUTS AS ENTITY metaphor, then within this ontological metaphor we analyse CUTS ARE A THREAT, CUTS ARE ILLNESS and CUTS ARE VIOLENCE metaphors. Within the CUTS ARE ILLNESS metaphors we also discuss idioms of distress that we have identified. We then move onto metaphors related to research, as we identified RESEARCH IS HEALTH, RESEARCH IS CONNECTION and RESEARCH IS A JOURNEY.

In identifying and analysing the metaphors in the texts around cuts, it is first striking that ‘the cuts’ are often presented as active agents – *they abandon, expose, imperil, damage, hinder, destroy, hurt, undermine*. The UK government is often mentioned as responsible for the decisions that led to the cuts, and, similarly, so is the UKRI; however, ‘cuts’ are often used as the subject of sentences. We explain this as CUTS ARE AN ENTITY.

Funding cuts at the United Kingdom’s Global Challenges Research Fund *imperil* the Rights for Time Network.⁴

The cuts will *destroy* international partnerships with businesses, governments, and the third sector, as well as the UK’s reputation as a reliable and trustworthy business partner.⁵

The cuts *expose* the hollowness of the UK government’s vision of a ‘Global Britain’ centred on openness for prosperity, multilateral solutions to global issues, and positioning the UK as a force for good.⁶

Lakoff and Johnson (1980), in their chapter on Ontological Metaphors, talk about how we conceptualise things that are not bounded as entities and substances so that we can refer to them and quantify them in an attempt to better comprehend them. Even though ‘cuts’ are a number, and therefore a quantity, the experience of having a project cut is not something we can easily relate to as the consequences are unknown, and as such we might not know how to pin it down. Referring to cuts as entities allows us to identify a particular aspect of it. However, interestingly, using the CUTS AS AN ENTITY metaphor not only helps our understanding but it also allows academics to distance themselves

from it; since cuts are an entity of their own, they have their agency and are out of our control. It is the cuts as an entity that *destroy, damage, hinder, expose* and *imperil*, and we as academics have limited, if any, agency to stop them.

The favouring of nominalisation – that is in this context the preference for using the noun ‘cuts’ instead of the verb form ‘to cut’ – was explained by Fairclough (2000) in his study on the old and New Labour language where he discusses ‘exclusion’. He explains that adopting nominalisation (exclusion) instead of the verb form (to exclude) shifts attention from the causal process behind exclusion to the outcome; exclusion is ‘a condition people are in rather than something that is done to them’ (Fairclough 2000, 54). This is relevant to our analysis; again, we as academics are campaigning to reverse the cuts, but we are at the same time acknowledging that we have very limited agency as cuts were imposed on us, giving us little room for action.

Within the ontological metaphor of cuts as entity, we identify another metaphor: CUTS ARE A THREAT. Threat metaphors are often used in political discourse to strengthen divisions between groups and countries (Semino 2008). In the following, we can see how threat metaphors are used to convey ideas about an unknown, problematic future, and to evoke fear:

Abruptly truncating, or cutting research funding is *not consequence free*⁷

Most developing countries are now very nervous. *The clock is ticking*.⁸

This is an action from which *it will be hard to recover*.⁹

These rhetorical strategies suggest vagueness and opacity around the possible consequences of the cuts – as these are unknown; but at the same time, these are intimidating. The intimidating effect is also perhaps achieved because these metaphors are used in conjunction with health/illness metaphors, as for example the use of the word ‘recover’. Semino (2008) points out how these metaphors also implicitly encourage the audience to choose a side within the debate.

We identified another metaphor within the ontological metaphor of cuts as entity, namely the metaphor CUTS ARE ILLNESS. Charteris-Black (2011, 101) writes that the opposition health/illness has a strong ‘persuasive role in discourse’, since it is evocative of emotions first of all, and it covers an evaluative role. If there is an association, in our case between illness and cuts, then there is, first of all, the possibility of a political argument that favours those who are fighting against cuts – academics – since, by opposition, they are trying to restore ‘health’; second, there is also the possibility that the disease improves with an ultimate return to health. Health metaphors are rooted in the experience of life and death, and Charteris-Black (2011) writes that we associate anyone who is trying to restore health with someone who has the right intentions. Here lies the evocative and persuasive power of health/illness metaphors:

These cuts will not just affect researchers like us: they will *hurt* the marginalized communities with which we work. (12 April 2021, nature.com)¹⁰

This decision is the single worst *self-inflicted injury* in this kind of diplomacy that most of us have seen for a very long time.¹¹

The *decimation* of this *vital* funding stream will have drastic impacts.¹²

In these examples, we can see that metaphors are graded, since there are different degrees of health and illness (Charteris-Black 2011). Stronger evaluations are found in the opposition *decimation/vital*, whereas *hurt* may be a milder form of evaluation compared to the other examples on the health/illness spectrum. However, within the first example, *hurt* is used in comparison with *affect*, thus still showing a strong evaluation. In the following, we reach the extremes of the life/death spectrum:

Abruptly truncating funded projects *kills* that process *dead*.¹³

The relations on which health metaphors are based are relations of contrast, reaching a polarity between what is right (health) against what is wrong (illness), between who caused the disease, and those who try to restore health or are at least fighting for it (Charteris-Black 2011). Charteris-Black (2011, 181) notes that ‘the rhetorical effect of this contrast is to reinforce and heighten the differences between the two parties’, and we agree with his statement; academics are also campaigning to get the support of the wider audience.

It is also important to point out at the time of writing (summer 2021) and of the cuts, the world is re-emerging, or trying to re-emerge, from the COVID-19 pandemic. Thus, the crisis communication discourse in relation to the polarisation between life/death and health/illness has been omnipresent in the last year (see Wodak 2021). Using health/illness metaphors in this specific moment in time has a strong persuasive and evaluative function – even more so as some research projects that have been cut have a focus on health and medicine, including ‘vital coronavirus research’.¹⁴

Other types of health/illness metaphors are identified in our sample, where academics describe how cuts made them ‘sick’. In the examples above we have discussed a rather generic contrast between health and illness, whereas in the next section we identify ‘idioms of distress’, which are the ways in which academics expressed their own mental and physical distress as caused by the cuts.

Idioms of distress

As we described in the first section of this article, idioms of distress are ways in which people articulate distress. These are often metaphors that are culturally relevant, sometimes even contradictory, and used to express pain, physical and mental distress. We found abundant use of these forms in our sample:

People are *shocked* [by the aid cut].¹⁵

Hearing that the project is being cancelled was *heartbreaking*.¹⁶

I am *exasperated*. But what can we do?¹⁷

It's not easy to find the words when your life's work is *blown up* and those to whom you have a duty of care, and a heart of love, are to be the *first to suffer*, not easy to watch, with a sword to your head, and when asked to be the one to break the news, to wield a sword.¹⁸

Idioms of distress often use abstract descriptions to signify physical conditions and pain. We think that what academics are saying in the extracts above and through idioms of distress is that they have been suffering from some kind of distress as a result of the decision

to cut research funding. It is already well-known that academics often suffer from burn-out (for systematic literature reviews on this issue, see Watts and Robertson 2011; Khan, Din, and Anwar 2019), but the stress and anxiety caused by the cuts go beyond the distress that academics feel on an everyday basis. *Being in shock*, or when *something is heart-breaking*, are idioms often used to describe a traumatic experience – sometimes this can be associated with physical symptoms such as lack of sleep, lack of appetite, tachycardia (e.g. see Keys et al. 2012; Rechsteiner, Tol, and Maercker 2019). *Not being able to find words*, *worrying*, and *thinking too much* are often categorised as psychological idioms related to feeling helpless or sad – and research has linked these idioms to depression, anxiety and psychological health problems (e.g. Keiser et al. 2015; Thakur and Rangaswamy 2019). We, therefore, think that what the academics are saying – what we are saying – by using these idioms of distress is that we are deeply unwell, mentally and physically, and unable to work up to the standards we are used to, as significant work had to focus on re-profiling, re-working, re-organising the complexities of suspended research projects.

Other recurrent expressions used to express distress are related to physical violence:

We are all responding as though we have been *physically assaulted*.¹⁹

This is really *violent* information because we were not expecting it at all.²⁰

Like colleagues leading the many projects affected across Scotland I am *reeling* and feeling the full, *sickening savagery* of this *violent assault* on my person [...].²¹

In the literature on physical violence and idioms of distress, scholars demonstrated how the expression of violence, especially gender-based violence, can be culturally determined and are often delivered through metaphors (Thakur and Rangaswamy 2019; Kimmel et al. 2020). In our context, nonetheless, physical violence becomes a metaphor itself. This confirms perhaps Lakoff and Johnson (1980)'s work on the directionality of metaphors – where the source domain is experiential, while the target domain is abstract. We, therefore, categorise these expressions as within the entity metaphor, as CUTS ARE VIOLENCE.

Related to the example we reported above, we cannot omit to comment on the word *savagery*, used alongside the metaphors related to physical violence. Postcolonial scholars are particularly mindful of using the semantic field related to 'savage'. Edward Said (1978) and many others after him, understands the process of Othering as ultimately a process of self-identification by creating a polarised representation of Us/Them. 'Savage' is often an adjective used to describe 'Them'; the coloniser is wise and rational, while the colonized is exotic and savage (Said 1978; Moosavinia, Niazi, and Ghaforian 2011). The phrase 'sickening savagery of this violent assault', perhaps aims to build a wall between Us and Them, where Us and Them are respectively those fighting against the cuts and those who ultimately decided to cut the international development budget. This also confirms the polarisation that we identified in the health metaphors. However, we acknowledge that this term may cause a problematic association and as such it may convey an evaluative discourse – exactly what post-colonial studies scholars are trying to dismantle. We hence recommend close surveillance when using this term.

As opposed to cuts which are VIOLENCE, ILLNESS and THREAT, research is what allows us to break walls and barriers, and ultimately to return to health. We focus here on three

metaphors we identified related to research: RESEARCH AS CONNECTION, RESEARCH AS HEALTH and RESEARCH AS A JOURNEY.

Research is what can unite us and brings us back together to health through our networks and relationships. We interpret this metaphor as RESEARCH AS CONNECTION.

It calls into question the *longstanding relationships of trust* that we have *built* with the associations and public institutions around this project, that have raised so much hope.²²

The GCRF has enabled *UK-based researchers to develop new networks* and projects in low- and middle-income countries across the world.²³

Collectively we are bringing the hidden legacies of conflict directly into humanitarian protection, human rights policy and practice.²⁴

It's an amazing project and based on him spending two years *building trust with these indigenous communities*. That trust is now completely broken.²⁵

Such metaphors have a strong affective component, since the domain of physical connection is mapped onto the domain of research (Davidson 2010). Research can bring proximity as it builds networks and as its foundations are relationships of trust built over the years. Research links, while cuts separate.

Not only research connects, but research leads us to health, not just metaphorically. In the extract below, the reference to health is strong as research allows the development of a vaccine during a world-wide pandemic.

Research is about learning what works and amplifying success. Typically, we hear about the end point, but getting to the end point relies on *building networks*, pooling talent, *strengthening* capacity, *engagement* in discussion, and critical analysis along the way. This *process* has enabled UK research to lead and benefit from research in areas such as vaccine development [..].

UK's aid cuts hit *vital* coronavirus *research* around the world²⁶

Research is vital. We are here again within the health/illness opposition, on the other extreme of the life/death spectrum, with research being HEALTH. In the extract above, we can also see the metaphor of RESEARCH AS A JOURNEY, with expressions as 'the end point', 'getting to the end point', 'along the way', and 'process'. The physical domain of journey is used to better conceptualise research not in terms of outcomes but rather in terms of process. This is an evocative strategy that allows a non-expert audience to perceive what research entails.

We conclude our analysis and discussion by reflecting on the ideological role of the metaphors used. We see in these metaphors a strong evaluative and persuasive power, together with the ability to reach a wider audience to gain support with the campaign to reverse the cuts. As part of that, there is also the attempt to explain what research entails and what it can achieve. Academics protesting are trying to reach consensus in a crisis by exposing themselves publicly, without reservations. They also use idioms of distress to tell us how they are feeling, which may limit academics' productivity at full capacity. This may have consequences for the UK academy more broadly, and not only for the projects affected by the cuts: to give two examples, the mass resignations of peer reviewers and the integrity of the Haldane Principle.²⁷

Conclusion

In this article, we have analysed the metaphors used by UK academics to represent the research funding cuts decided by the UK government in March 2021, which saw hundreds of ongoing international research projects terminated, suspended, or significantly altered. The response of UK academics was strong and powerful, and we have analysed here some of the metaphors that were used: CUTS ARE AN ENTITY, and within that, CUTS ARE VIOLENCE, CUTS ARE ILLNESS, CUTS ARE A THREAT; and conversely, RESEARCH IS HEALTH, RESEARCH IS CONNECTION, and RESEARCH IS A JOURNEY.

Research is based on relations, on trust, and nowhere more so than research in international development, where paradigms of participatory work and co-design are the normative basis for working with and safeguarding partners worldwide. The implementation of the cuts has broken the trust that academics had in the UK Research and Innovation funding body. Cuts are perceived as violence, as an illness in that they break all that has been built over the years, and all the *vital* progress that has been made – not least during the already difficult times of the pandemic. Academics are suffering, and they use idioms of distress to describe how and what they are feeling: they, we, are angry, we are sick, we are heart-broken, we are in shock. These are ways to say we are deeply unwell, suffering anxiety, depression, lack of sleep, and we are unproductive as a result, and as a result, we cannot offer the services we are employed to offer to students, colleagues and to the wider society. This is a very concerning time for the UK academy.

During this period, we have also seen silences around the cuts. Namely two, the first is the silence of the UK government and of UKRI, which, a month after the announcement, had not provided any further statements and left academics to campaign against the decision without opening up communication with them. This was hard to accept. We, as academics, work to construct and share knowledge, we work through conversations that are supposed to be based on the Habermasian principles of truthfulness, transparency, and accuracy. This has been taken away from us, and we were left with a decision that had a horrible impact on our work, without having been heard, consulted, and without the chance to receive an answer to our protests. We as academics have also documented, repeatedly, within our multiple disciplines, the chilling consequences of such suppression of truthfulness, transparency and accuracy.

The second silence though, is within the academy, as we also need to reflect on how we represent and communicate our work. The experiences of early career researchers, who often are in precarious positions, and the experiences of the international partners, who are the ones most affected by the cuts, have not been spotlighted in the debate. There could be a protective feature here, to not expose those who are at the lowest levels of the hierarchy and those in the worst positions. However, this made us reflect further. The GCRF (Global Challenge Research Fund) was created to fund and develop 'equitable partnerships'. We did believe it, and we talked about equitable partnerships in our projects, in presentations, at conferences, in our articles. Moreover, we sought to change research and develop a more ethical approach that allowed partnerships to be considered equitable.

Perhaps this was an illusion. When someone comes with money, and others are at the recipient end, no partnerships can be equitable. When money is taken away, and only

some jobs are affected while others are not, partnerships are not equitable either. When the voices we hear are mostly the ones in powerful positions, again we wonder whether we can call these partnerships equitable. Perhaps then, we might need to change the discourse around partnerships; surely, we can call them ethical, but perhaps international development research is not and will not ever be equitable. But it definitely can be *healthy*, it can mean *connection*, it can be a *journey* undertaken together for the better.

Notes

1. <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/opendemocracyuk/uk-government-accused-of-grotesque-betrayal-as-full-foreign-aid-cuts-revealed/>
2. <https://www.researchprofessionalnews.com/rr-news-uk-research-councils-2021-3-ukri-cut-support-for-aid-funded-research-projects/>
3. As per convention, we present metaphors in capital.
4. <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-00955-7>
5. <https://www.watersecurityhub.org/news-events/news/unilateralism-wont-serve-uks-national-interests>
6. <https://www.watersecurityhub.org/news-events/news/unilateralism-wont-serve-uks-national-interests>
7. <https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2021/04/01/ten-reasons-to-restore-oda-research-funding/>
8. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/apr/12/boris-johnson-told-to-get-grip-of-uk-climate-strategy-before-cop26>
9. <https://reverseodacuts.wordpress.com/letter/>
10. <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-00941-z>
11. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/apr/12/boris-johnson-told-to-get-grip-of-uk-climate-strategy-before-cop26>
12. <https://reverseodacuts.wordpress.com/letter/>
13. <https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2021/04/01/ten-reasons-to-restore-oda-research-funding/>
14. <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2021/apr/30/uks-aid-cuts-hit-vital-coronavirus-research-around-world>
15. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/apr/12/boris-johnson-told-to-get-grip-of-uk-climate-strategy-before-cop26>
16. https://www.theguardian.com/education/2021/mar/19/this-happens-in-brazil-not-britain-academics-in-despair-as-global-research-funds-pulled?CMP=Share_iOSApp_Other
17. <https://www.heatherflowe.com/post/grcf-cuts-and-broken-promises>
18. <https://www.thenational.scot/news/19160115.uk-engaging-politics-death-trident-upgrade/>
19. https://www.theguardian.com/education/2021/mar/19/this-happens-in-brazil-not-britain-academics-in-despair-as-global-research-funds-pulled?CMP=Share_iOSApp_Other
20. <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2021/mar/19/this-happens-in-brazil-not-britain-academics-in-despair-as-global-research-funds-pulled>
21. <https://www.thenational.scot/news/19160115.uk-engaging-politics-death-trident-upgrade/>
22. https://www.theguardian.com/education/2021/mar/19/this-happens-in-brazil-not-britain-academics-in-despair-as-global-research-funds-pulled?CMP=Share_iOSApp_Other
23. <https://www.heatherflowe.com/post/grcf-cuts-and-broken-promises>
24. <https://www.heatherflowe.com/post/grcf-cuts-and-broken-promises>
25. <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2021/mar/19/this-happens-in-brazil-not-britain-academics-in-despair-as-global-research-funds-pulled>
26. <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2021/apr/30/uks-aid-cuts-hit-vital-coronavirus-research-around-world>
27. The 'Haldane Principle' is the principle, enshrined in UK Law which makes statute the absolute independence of research from political interference.

Acknowledgments

We wish to acknowledge the work of our Colleague Professor Ross White for first introducing us to the field of idioms of distress in psychotherapeutic settings and for the work undertaken on the grant AH/P009786/1. We are also thankful to the anonymous reviewers.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

This work was supported by Arts and Humanities Research Council [Grant Numbers AH/L006936/1 and AH/T007931/1].

Notes on contributors

Maria Grazia Imperiale is a Lecturer in Adult Education (University of Glasgow, School of Education). In her previous position, she was Academic Coordinator of the *Culture for Sustainable and Inclusive Peace Network Plus* and a member of the UNESCO Chair Refugee Integration through Languages and the Arts (UNESCO RILA, University of Glasgow). She coordinated research on peacebuilding and conflict transformation through arts-based and participatory methodologies in Ghana, Mexico, Morocco, Palestine, Zimbabwe and the UK. She holds a Ph.D. in Language Education (University of Glasgow) and a MA(Hons) in Applied Linguistics and Intercultural Communication (University for Foreigners of Siena, Italy). She conducted research on language education, multilingualism, intercultural education in several ODA contexts, including contexts of emergencies and protracted crisis such as Palestine, Lebanon, Ethiopia, using decolonising and participatory approaches. She teaches different postgraduate courses within the School of Education and is a research consultant for the British Council.

Alison Phipps is Professor of Languages and Intercultural Studies and UNESCO Chair in Refugee Integration through Languages and the Arts (University of Glasgow, School of Education). She has led numerous international development research projects, including the *Culture for Sustainable and Inclusive Peace Network Plus*, for which she is PI, and the MIDEQHub, for which she is CO-I and Co-Director. In 2017 she was appointed Adjunct Professor of Hospitality and Tourism at Auckland University of Technology. She is an elected Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts, and Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences. Alison chairs the New Scots Core Group for Refugee Integration in partnership with Scottish Government, COSLA and Scottish Refugee Council and she is an Ambassador for the Scottish Refugee Council. Alison is the author of several publications, including articles and books, and she is also a poet and has produced and directed theatre and performance in several countries.

References

- Barber, B. K., C. A. McNeely, E. E. Sarraj, M. Daher, R. Giacaman, C. Arafat, W. Barnes, and M. A. Mallouh. 2016. "Mental Suffering in Protracted Political Conflict: Feeling Broken or Destroyed." *PLoS ONE* 11 (5): e0156216. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0156216.
- Charteris-Black, J. 2004. *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. 2011. *Politicians and Rhetoric*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chouliaraki, L., and N. Fairclough. 1999. *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Cork, C., B. Kaiser, and R. White. 2019. "The Integration of Idioms of Distress Into Mental Health Assessments and Interventions: A Systematic Review." *Global Mental Health* 6: E7. doi:10.1017/gmh.2019.5.
- Cornwall, A., and D. Eade, eds. 2010. *Deconstructing Development Discourse. Buzzwords and Fuzzwords*. Warwickshire: Practical Action Publishing Ltd and Oxfam GB.
- Costa, B., and J.-M. Dewaele. 2012. "Psychotherapy Across Languages: Beliefs, Attitudes and Practices of Monolingual and Multilingual Therapists with Their Multilingual Patients." *Language and Psychoanalysis* 1 (1): 19–41. doi:10.7565/landp.2012.0003.
- Davidson, P. 2010. "Metaphor in Contemporary British Socialpolicy. A Cognitive Critical Study of Governmental Discourses on Social Exclusion." Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Bradford.
- de Jong, J. T., and R. Reis. 2010. "Kiyang-yang, a West-African Postwar Idiom of Distress." *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry* 34 (2): 301–321. doi:10.1007/s11013-010-9178-7.
- Della Faille, D. 2011. "Discourse Analysis in International Development Studies." *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 6 (3): 215–235.
- Fairclough, N. 2000. *New Labour, New Language?* London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. 2003. *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. 1992a. "Discourse and Text: Linguistic and Intertextual Analysis within Discourse Analysis." *Discourse & Society* 3 (2): 193–217. doi:10.1177/0957926592003002004.
- Fairclough, N. 1992b. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Fallah, N., and M. Moini. 2016. "A Critical Metaphor Analysis of Arab Uprisings in "The Washington Post" and "Keyhan" Editorials." *Metaphor and the Social World* 6 (1): 79–102.
- Footitt, H. 2017. "International Aid and Development: Hearing Multilingualism, Learning from Intercultural Encounters in the History of OxfamGB." *Language and Intercultural Communication* 17 (4): 518–533. doi:10.1080/14708477.2017.1368207.
- Hassan, G., L. Kirmayer, A. Mekki- Berrada, C. Quosh, R. el Chammay, J. B. Deville-Stoetzel, A. Youssef, et al. 2015. *Culture, Context and the Mental Health and Psychosocial Wellbeing of Syrians: A Review for Mental Health and Psychosocial Support Staff Working with Syrians Affected by Armed Conflict*. Geneva: UNHCR.
- Imperiale, M. G. 2020. "(In)articulability of Pain and Trauma: Idioms of Distress in the Gaza Strip." In *Multilingual Online Academic Collaborations as Resistance: Crossing Impassable Borders*. Vol. 4 Researching Multilingually, edited by G. Fassetta, N. Al-Masri, and A. Phipps, 131–146. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Johnson, M. 1987. *The Body in the Mind: The Bodily Basis of Meaning, Imagination and Reason*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kaiser, B. N., E. E. Haroz, B. A. Kohrt, P. A. Bolton, J. K. Bass, and D. E. Hinton. 2015. "'Thinking Too Much': A Systematic Review of a Common Idiom of Distress." *Social Science & Medicine* 147: 170–183. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.10.044.
- Keys, H. M., B. N. Kaiser, B. A. Kohrt, N. M. Khoury, and A. Brewster. 2012. "Idioms of Distress, Ethnopsychology, and the Clinical Encounter in Haiti's Central Plateau." *Social Science & Medicine* 75 (3): 555–564.
- Khan, A., S. Din, and M. Anwar. 2019. "Sources and Adverse Effects of Burnout among Academic Staff: A Systematic Review." *City* 9 (2): 350–362.
- Kimmell, J., E. Mendenhall, and E. Jacobs. 2020. "Deconstructing PTSD: Trauma and Emotion among Mexican Immigrant Women." *Transcultural Psychiatry* 58 (1): 110–125.
- Koch, S., and S. Deetz. 1981. "Metaphor Analysis of Social Reality in Organisations." *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 9 (1): 1–15.
- Koller, V. 2005. "Critical Discourse Analysis and Social Cognition: Evidence from Business Media Discourse." *Discourse and Society* 16: 199–224.
- Kövecses, Z. 2020. *Extended Conceptual Metaphor Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G., and M. Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Moosavinia, S. R., N. Niazi, and A. Ghaforian. 2011. "Edward Said's Orientalism and the Study of the Self and the Other in Orwell's Burmese Days." *Studies in Literature and Language* 2 (1): 103–113.

- Munro, M. 2018. "House Price Inflation in the News: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Newspaper Coverage in the UK." *Housing Studies* 33 (7): 1085–1105.
- Nichter, M. 1981. "Idioms of Distress: Alternatives in the Expression of Psychological Distress: A Case Study from South India." *Cultural Medicine Psychiatry* 5 (4): 379–408. doi:10.1007/BF00054782.
- Nichter, M. 2010. "Idioms of Distress Revisited." *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry: An International Journal of Cross-Cultural Health Research* 34 (2): 401–416. doi:10.1007/s11013-010-9179-6.
- Okello, E., and S. Ekblad. 2006. "Lay Concepts of Depression among the Baganda of Uganda: A Pilot Study." *Transcultural Psychiatry* 43 (2): 287–313.
- Pieterse, J. N. 2011. "Discourse Analysis in International Development Studies." *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 6 (3): 237–240.
- Pragglejaz Group. 2007. "MIP: A Practical and Flexible Method for Identifying Metaphorically Used Words in Discourse." *Metaphor and Symbol* 22: 1–39.
- Rechsteiner, K., V. Tol, and A. Maercker. 2019. "'It Should not Have Happened': Metaphorical Expressions, Idioms and Narrative Descriptions Related to Trauma in an Indigenous Community in India." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Wellbeing* 14 (1): 1667134.
- Rolland, L. D., J. M. Dewaele, and B. Costa. 2017. "Multilingualism and Psychotherapy: Exploring Multilingual Clients' Experiences of Language Practices in Psychotherapy." *International Journal of Multilingualism* 14 (1): 69–85.
- Said, E. W. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Penguin.
- Scarry, E. 1985. *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Semino, E. 2008. *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SteeN, G. 2007. *Finding Metaphor in Grammar and Usage: A Methodological Analysis of Theory and Research*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Thakur, A., and M. Rangaswamy. 2019. "Expressions of Women Survivors of Domestic Violence: Idioms of Distress." *Psychological Studies* 64 (4): 377–389.
- Van Dijk, T. A. 1993. "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis." *Discourse and Society* 4 (2): 249–283.
- Van Dijk, T. A. 2001. "Critical Discourse Analysis." In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, edited by D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin, and H. Hamilton, 352–371. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. A. 2009. "Critical Discourse Studies: A Sociocognitive Approach." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by R. Wodak and M. Meyer, 62–85. London: Sage.
- Watts, J., and N. Robertson. 2011. "Burnout in University Teaching Staff: A Systematic Literature Review." *Educational Research* 53 (1): 33–50.
- Weiss, G., and R. Wodak. 2003. "Introduction: Theory, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Discourse Analysis." In *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity*, edited by G. Weiss and R. Wodak, 1–34. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Wodak, R. 1996. *Disorders of Discourse. Real Language Series*. London: Longman.
- Wodak, R. 2021. "Crisis Communication and Crisis Management During COVID-19." *Global Discourse* 11 (3): 329–353.
- Wodak, R., and N. Fairclough. 1997. "Critical Discourse Analysis." In *Discourse as Social Interaction*, edited by T. A. Van Dijk, 285–284. London: Sage.
- Ziai, A. 2015. *Development Discourse and Global History: From Colonialism to the Sustainable Development Goals*. London and New York: Routledge.