

https://dspace.org/

Putting the “international” into International Relations theory curricula: a global study

De Matos-Ala, Jacqueline

2022
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/34008

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

Master of Education (Higher Education)

Putting the "international" into International Relations theory curricula: A global study

Jacqueline de Matos-Ala

8808326R

Declaration

This research report is my own work and is submitted in partial fulfilment for the degree of Master of Education (Higher Education) at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

.



Jacqueline de Matos-Ala 1 October 2021

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the assistance of the following people in facilitating the writing of this research report:

Lynne Slonimsky who supervised this work, read numerous drafts, and offered profound insights in all her feedback.

My colleagues who generously gave of their time and knowledge by allowing me to interview them for this research report.

Zoë, Ché, Jennifer, Michelle, David and Timothy for your humour, patience, and support.

My sister Naefa and her family.

Carlos de Matos-Ala, editor extraordinaire and intellectual partner-in-crime.

Abstract

It is now rather well established that most International Relations (IR) theories are predicated on Western knowledges. This potentially limits their analytical capacity to explain international relations beyond Western ideological values or interests. However, in recent years there has been a substantial increase in scholarship not only critiquing the Western centric nature of International Relations theory but also exploring the contributions that knowledges from the global South make to the field of IR theory. Thus, the status quo is shifting, albeit slowly, towards a field characterised by knowledge plurality as opposed to knowledge exclusivity. Nevertheless, the impact as well as the implication of this shift toward knowledge plurality for the IR theory curricula has not been paid adequate attention. Consequently, this research report investigates whether the demand for knowledge plurality in the realm of IR theory research has made inroads into the arena of pedagogy resulting in the generation of knowledge plural IR theory curricula. Moreover, it examines the different choices and interpretations made by educators in endeavouring to create knowledge plural IR theory curricula in various global contexts. It explores the types of actors, agents and structures that may have motivated, facilitated, or impeded educators in their decision to adopt a knowledge plural IR theory curriculum. It has further endeavours to discern the factors that have informed and/or shaped respondents' curricula and pedagogical choices pertaining to the selection, structuring and transmission of IR knowledge at tertiary education institutions in different geographical contexts. In general, the research provides a deeper understanding of how respondents who have adopted knowledge plural curricula have conceptualised and implemented such changes, as well as the implications of a knowledge plural curricula for the development of greater knowledge plurality within the discipline.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 7
2. Research Questions 8
3. A Brief History and Overview of International Relations and its Theories. 9
4. Terminology 12
5. The Meta-theoretical Landscape of International Relations Theory 13
6. Literature Review 14
   6.1 The problem of an un-international discipline 14
   6.2 Moving toward increased knowledge inclusiveness in IR theories 17
   6.3 IR theory curricula and knowledge plurality 20
7. Theoretical Framework 23
8. Conceptual Framework 25
9. Methods of data collection 30
10. Method of data analysis 31
11. Limitations of the study 32
12. The Structure of the Analysis of Data Collected 33
13. Descriptive Analysis of Course Outlines 33
   13.1 Category Descriptors 34
      13.1.1 Country 34
      13.1.2 Level 34
      13.1.3 Duration 34
      13.1.4 Co-taught or Solo Taught 34
      13.1.5 Types of Knowledge Selected 34
      13.1.6 Types of Knowledge Sequencing 35
      13.1.7 Types of Reading Material Selected 36
      13.1.8 Assessment 36

Table One - Analysis of Course Outlines 37

   13.2 Descriptive Analysis of Course Outlines: Summary of Findings 38
      13.2.1 Country where the course is taught 38
      13.2.2 Level of Study 38
      13.2.3 Duration of Course 38

13.2.4 Co or Solo Taught 39
13.2.5 Type of Knowledge Selected 39
13.2.6 Types of Knowledge Sequencing 40
13.2.7 Types of Reading Material Selected 41
13.2.8 Assessment 42
13.3 Analysis of Course Aims or Objectives as State in Course Outlines 42
Table Two – Content Analysis of Semi-Structured Interviews 47
14. Content Analysis of Semi-Structured Interviews 48
14.1 Themes Emerging from Cross-section Content Analysis of the Data Set (see Table Two). 48
14.1.1 Teaching Western IR theories 48
14.1.2 Inclusion of knowledge beyond the West 49
14.1.3 Sequencing 51
14.1.4 Agency 52
14.1.5 Language 53
14.1.6 Pedagogical practice 54
14.1.7 Rationale for teaching IR theory 54
14.1.8 Skills and learner dispositions requiring development 55
14.1.9 Student Engagement 55
14.1.10 Student Demographics 56
14.2 Content Analysis of Semi-Structured Interviews: Summary of Findings 56
15. A Critical Realist analysis of the affordances & constraints to the creation of knowledge plural IR curricula as identified in the course and interview analyses 58
15.1 Affordances and Constraints in the Field of Knowledge Production 59
15.2 Affordances and Constraints in the Field of Knowledge Recontextualisation 60
15.3 Affordances and Constraints in the Field of Knowledge Reproduction 62
16. Conclusion 64
Appendix One 66
Bibliography 68

1. Introduction

The theoretical component of the discipline of International Relations (IR) is notoriously knowledge unidimensional, being comprised mostly of knowledge that has either originated in the West or been appropriated as Western by its scholars (see Waever 1998; Tickner 2003b, 2013, 201; Blaney & Tickner 2017; Blaney & Inayatullah 2008; Aydinli and Matthews 2000). The consequence of this is that IR's ontology and epistemology[1] has evolved to prioritize a Western political, economic, and social agenda in terms of what is deemed researchable, what counts as valid knowledge and the appropriate ways of conducting research. Furthermore, this situation has been used by members of the Western academy to set the research agenda for the study of IR in the global South. Their justification for this is that Western theories, being characterised by a broad ontological scope coupled with a strong emphasis on a positivist epistemology, are universally applicable irrespective of geographical space, social context, or time. Nevertheless, this attempt at setting a universal theoretical disciplinary agenda grounded in a narrow perspective of reality has not been without contest (Blaney & Tickner, 2017a).

Initially, criticism regarding this issue came from those within the Western academy itself who pointed out how this situation impinged on the study of IR in the West itself. However, with the proliferation of the discipline in the global South, the demand for knowledge diversity that takes account of realities, histories, cultures as well as philosophies beyond the West has increased. Consequently, there has been an exponential rise in scholarship that clearly shows the necessity of knowledge plurality in the theoretical component of the discipline (Acharya & Buzan 2007, Blaney & Tickner 2013, Smith & Tickner 2020, Qin 2020). Although this scholarship initially appeared on the peripheries of the discipline, it has come to populate leading mainstream journals and book series. The prominence this debate achieved necessitated that the International Studies Association (ISA), the largest association of international relations/studies scholars, establish a task force in 2016 to explore practical ways of realising these demands (ISA Report). Thus, academics within the discipline are actively working on setting agendas to make knowledge plurality within International Relations theory a reality.

[1] Ontology is a branch of philosophy that studies the nature of being and existence (Dunne. Kurki & Smith 2013, 356). In the context of this research report, it refers to realities postulated by IR theories including the objects that populate these realities and the way the interaction of these objects shapes this environment. Epistemology refers to how you gain knowledge about the world/s. In other words, what are the ways that are deemed valid for studying a particular reality/ies (Dunne, Kurki & Smith 2013, 353)

Most of the work in this regard is focused on establishing knowledge plurality within the field of IR theory (Qin 2020). Since it is theory that establishes the discipline's ontological and epistemological scope, achieving transformation here in terms of knowledge plurality can be seen as creating a tipping point. Once knowledge plurality is established as a disciplinary norm within in the field of theory, this should inevitably cascade into other areas of disciplinary study (Tickner & Blaney 2012). However, the implications for IR theory curricula of the work currently taking place in the realm of IR theory scholarship have not been expressly considered. In fact, based on the available scholarship, IR theory curricula globally have yet to engage with the pedagogical considerations related to the creation of knowledge plural curricula in a meaningful way.

This research report therefore investigates the establishment of knowledge plural IR theory curricula across the world. The study is located within the area of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, focusing on knowledge plurality in IR theory curricula. I am primarily interested in determining the extent to which these curricula have been realised by proponents of the development of knowledge plural IR theory. Moreover, through semi-structured interviews with colleagues teaching IR theory courses in different geographic locations, I aimed to identify the types of actors, agents and structures that may have motivated, facilitated, or impeded the decision to adopt a knowledge plural theory curriculum. I also wanted to gain an understanding of how these factors, or any other mechanisms, have informed and/or shaped interviewees' curricula and pedagogical choices pertaining to the selection, structuring, transmission, and assessment of IR knowledge at tertiary education institutions in different geographical contexts. This could enable a deeper understanding of how interviewees who have adopted knowledge plural curricula have conceptualised and implemented such changes, as well as the implications of knowledge plural curricula for the development of greater knowledge plurality within the discipline itself.

2. Research Questions

Main Question

Has the demand for knowledge plurality in the realm of IR theory research made inroads into the arena of pedagogy resulting in the generation of knowledge plural IR theory curricula?

Sub-questions

1. How has the demand for knowledge plurality in the area of IR theory been translated into knowledge plural IR theory curricula, in the context of the curricula reviewed for this study?
2. How have proponents of knowledge plural IR theory curricula worked within the discursive gap (as identified by the pedagogic device) to achieve this objective?

3. A Brief History and Overview of International Relations and its Theories.

International Relations as an academic discipline has its genesis in the West. The first school in International Relations was established in 1919 at the University College of Wales, United Kingdom. The 'traditional' account of the discipline's establishment was that this was borne out of a reaction to the unprecedented scale of human and material devastation caused to Europe by the First World (Brown & Ainley 2009, 21). Many believed that the industrialised nature of the War demonstrated that wars were no longer feasible strategies for states to use against each other (Brown & Ainley 2009, 21; Rosenberg 2016). Therefore, IR's founders believed it was necessary to prevent a repetition of the First World War. This necessitated understanding the causes of war though academic study. The discipline of IR proliferated at European and North American tertiary institutions in the early to mid-twentieth century. Yet, it was in the United States that IR's proliferation was most significant. This development coincided with the United States' post Second World War ascent as a superpower (Qin 2020). So dominant was the United States' influence on IR that it prompted scholar Stanley Hoffman (1977) to refer to it as "an American social science". What is notable about this account is not just its exclusive Western context but also that the discipline of IR was established to serve Western needs and interests (Blaney 2020, Qin 2020). More importantly, IR continues to serve those needs (Smith & Tickner 2020, Qin 2020). This has important implications for the IR theories that have been developed within and shaped by this Western-centric historical context.

Reus-Smith and Snidal (2008, 11-12) contend "our understandings of international relations are organised by theory and our multiplicity of understandings is reflected in the broad range of contending IR theoretical perspectives". Thus, IR is characterised as a discipline that has numerous theories, reflecting the enormous diversity that exists in how scholars perceive both the figurative and literal worlds the study of IR encompasses. Although the prominence of any theory within a social science discipline may wax and wane over time, this is not the case with IR. Since its inception and until the present, variants of the IR theories of Realism and Liberalism have been dominant. For Realists, International Relations revolves around

states' continual manoeuvring to secure their physical survival in an anarchical international system that has no supranational mechanisms to protect them from the expansionist ambitions of each other. As such, Realism focuses on the issues of international conflict and state security.

In contrast, Liberal theorists believe that the anarchical international system can be tamed, and security achieved by encouraging inter states cooperation, especially through trade and the creation of international political and economic institutions. In simple terms, Liberalism's approach to achieving global peace is founded on two pillars. The first concerns the spread of liberal democracy, as Liberal theorists believe it to be the best form of governance for promoting global peace and stability. In addition, Liberal theorists promote capitalist economies as the best means of ensuring global economic prosperity, with interstate interdependence facilitating cooperation through the establishment of international trade relations. Although the state is an important actor for proponents of Liberalism, non-state actors such as international organizations, multinational corporations and individual people are equally as significant in international interactions.

During the Cold War, Marxism joined Realism and Liberalism as the principal IR theories vying against each other as providing the most analytical relevance for the discipline. In contrast to Liberalism and Realism, Marxism focused on class struggle and the international implications thereof. In the post-Cold War era, the theory of Marxism retreated, mirroring its decline as state ideology in numerous countries at this time. Thus, Liberalism became the theory *de jour* in the immediate post-Cold War era as it seemed that capitalism and democracy had triumphed over Marxist ideology. However, this did not mean that Realism with its focus on the continuous strategic pursuit of power as a necessity to secure state survival in an anarchical environment, surrendered its prominent position. With the United States and its European allies continuing their military interventions in other regions in the post-Cold War era, Realism has had little problem maintaining its relevance. Significantly, the post-Cold War era also made intellectual space for the inclusion of what Keohane referred to as reflectivist theories (Dunne et al 2013, 357). These theories rejected rational choice methods and the positivist approach to knowledge construction that characterised the rationalist IR theories of Realism and Liberalism. The theories that formed part of this cohort of 'critical theories' were feminism, critical theory, queer theory, post-structuralism, postcolonialism and decolonialism. These critical theories have made a significant contribution to our understanding of the social and situated nature of knowledge which allowed for the generation of diverse perspectives of the world (Smith & Tickner 2020, 1). Moreover, the post-Cold World era witnessed the

introduction of Constructivism as an alternative to Realism and Liberalism and a via media between rationalist and reflectivist theories (Smith, 2013, 6). The theory of Constructivism contended that the international system was a social construct created through various actors sustained interaction with each other and the transmission of social meaning (Dunne et al 2013, 357). This theory's enormous popularity in IR has been further enhanced by it being perceived as asserting a degree of independence from the mainstream US theories of Realism and Liberalism (Brown & Ainley 2009, 48). However, Blaney and Tickner (2013) argue that Constructivism quickly chose to conform with mainstream positivist rationalist epistemology of the discipline and relinquished a critical stance to its study of IR.

It is evident from the above discussion that IR is a discipline that has a wide variety of theories. However, Smith (2013, 4) raises the point that these theories all have vastly different foci, despite all claiming to analyse the same ontological space. For example, Realism's focus is war and conflict, while Liberalism's is primarily political and economic co-operation. Thus, the two major IR theories have fundamentally differing perspectives on international relations that are in fact irreconcilable. This is equally true if we were to compare other IR theories. Hence, although each individual theory, particularly those subscribing to rationalism, may attempt to make universal, generalisable claims about the conduct of international relations actors and their environment, collectively they present disparate realities. Moreover, Tickner and Blaney (2012 & 2013) state that as a discipline whose epistemological and methodological gatekeeping actively functions to exclude non-conforming categories of knowledge (particularly knowledges from the global South) IR cannot claim to be inclusive or universal in terms of the knowledges it embraces.

Theories and philosophies from the global South that elucidate IR phenomena do exist. For example, Dependency Theory as well as Postcolonial Theory include knowledges from the global South. However, these theories have existed on the periphery of the discipline and have failed to be included on an equal footing with the Western generated IR theories that dominate at the centre of the discipline. Nevertheless, there is a growing acknowledgement that the status quo needs to be disrupted and for knowledges from the global South to be integrated into the discipline's theoretical canon (Acharya 2014, Tickner 2003a, Blaney & Tickner 2013, Blaney & Tickner 2017b, Qin 2020).

4. Terminology

Given the centrality of the concepts of "curriculum" and 'pedagogy" in this research report, it is essential to define these for the purposes of clarification. Curriculum, pedagogy, and evaluation are the three message systems identified by Bernstein (1975, 77) through which formal educational knowledge is realized. The focus of this research report is the message systems of curriculum and pedagogy. According to Bernstein (1975, 77) curriculum defines what counts as valid knowledge. Thus, selecting knowledge for incorporation into a curriculum confers validity on it, privileging it above knowledge that has been excluded. Its inclusion in a curriculum designates it as being knowledge worth knowing. For Bernstein (1975,77) pedagogy defines what counts as the valid transmission of knowledge and determines the formal ordering principles for the transmission of knowledge. However, it should be noted that this research focuses more on the pedagogic choices made by educators than on their pedagogic practice.

I have chosen to use the term West instead of global North as it is still the one favoured by the literature that I have engaged with in conducting this research. The region also represents the site where IR theory knowledge has been predominantly produced. The use of the term global South not only references a geographic region but is also a metaphor for the oppression caused by colonialism and global capitalism. Additionally, it constitutes a site of resistance to Western oppression (Santos 2012, 51). This definition aligns well with the critical realist approach adopted by this research[2].

For the purpose of this research report references to 'Western IR theories will include Realism, Liberalism, Constructivism, the English School, Critical Theory, Normative Theory, Marxism, Western Feminist Studies and Poststructuralism (although certain schools of

[2] I am aware of the inherent complexities of employing the constructs of the 'West' and 'global South'. They have come to exist in juxtaposition to each other with the West seemingly embodying the near pinnacle of political, economic, and social sophistication and the global South political, economic, and social dysfunction. From a critical perspective these distinctions have emerged because of the continued exploitation of countries constituting the global South by those in the West through colonization and capitalist hegemony (Santos 2012, 51). However, making broad generalization about the political, economic, and social conditions of countries located within these two geographic regions is problematic. Notably, not all countries that are geographically situated in a particular region conform with its associated tropes. Thus, certain countries from the global South have more characteristic in common with those designated as 'Western' and visa-versa. Further Santos (2012, 51) argues that elements associated with the global South can be found within some regions of countries designated as Western and visa-versa. Moreover, the projection of Western hegemony is not confined to this geographic region but global in its reach (Smith & Tickner 2020, 5). There is also the concern that these concepts perpetuate stereotypes originating from colonial thinking. Despite these shortcomings, these constructs are still useful analytical tools if used carefully as they enable researchers to examine not only the interactions between the two regions and their inequalities but also the similarities, differences, and experiences among countries within a region.

Feminism and Poststructuralism do include knowledges from the global South). When 'critical IR theories' are referenced, this would refer to Marxism, Normative Theory, Critical Theory, Poststructuralism and Feminism as they all espouse an emancipatory agenda. Global South knowledge refers to concepts, theories or cosmologies derived from philosophies, theories, concepts, or practices located within this region.

5. The Meta-theoretical Landscape of International Relations Theory

From a basic ontological perspective, the dominant Western IR theories are situated within the abstract realm of the 'international system' and examine the interactions that takes place here between various actors (for example, state, international organizations, civil society, non-governmental organizations) and their environment as they engage in the activities of conducting international relations. As discussed above, IR theories will differ in the significance they assign to different actors and how environmental conditions constrain or expedite actors' interactions and the outcomes thereof. It is how these relations are imagined that gives the international system a distinct character for each theory. However, Blaney and Tickner (2017b) as well as Qin (2020) contend that the ontology of these theories is confined to Western perceptions of IR and thus cannot make universal claims.

In terms of epistemology, there is a distinct divide between the rationalist theories of Realism and Liberalism that subscribe to positivism and the reflectivist critical theories of Poststructuralism, Critical Theory, and Feminism that embrace post-positivism. This division has created a large debate within IR regarding the validity of knowledge claims. Rationalists/Positivists state that knowledge that is not generated by observation, empirical data and measurement cannot be regarded as valid. Moreover, Blaney & Tickner (2013) as well as Qin (2013) state that those who subscribe to rationalist positivism or neo-positivism within the discipline believe that it is their duty to convince reflectivists of the superiority of their epistemological position. This is evident in Keohane's statement that reflectivists theories could only be taken seriously when they had developed a research programme that conformed to the 'scientific method' (Kurki & Wight 2013 24, Smith 2013, Blaney & Tickner 2013). Thus, it was not enough that these theories critique and deconstruct the dominant theories of Realism and Liberalism, they needed to establish the validity of their claims by employing substantive research methodologies. In other words, reflectivist theories should comply with positivist knowledge standards, instead of challenging these if they wanted to contribute to the generation of knowledge for the discipline. Regardless of this stance, reflectivist theories have made

invaluable contributions to our understanding of international relations, irrespective of the refusal by rationalist positivist scholars from the two dominant theories to acknowledge this fact (Kurki & Wight 2013, 24).

Mirroring the epistemological divide between rationalist and reflectivist theories, distinct approaches in methodology are aligned with each perspective. Rationalist theories that are characterised by their desire to explain international relations tend to privilege quantitative research methods. Reflectivist theories that seek to understand international relations are more likely to adopt interpretive methods, namely, qualitative, discursive, or historical analyses thereby shunning the generalizing approach of the former's stance. Further, rationalist theories base their claim to knowledge validity on the fact that their methodologies emphasize observation whereas reflectivist rely on the interpretation of unobservable and thus immeasurable phenomena (Kurki & Wight 2013, 20-21).

The ontological, epistemological, and methodological implications of the inclusion of theories and knowledges from the global South has not yet been fully explored due to the infancy of this area of research. However, there is literature problematising IR's present ontology perspective as well as the limitations in accommodating such knowledge if it deviates from Western standards of knowledge validity. Blaney and Tickner (2012) contend that 'Western IR privileges itself by policing disciplinary boundaries that restrict what counts as legitimate knowledge and in so doing represses difference both inside and outside the West'. There is also research that considers how the incorporation of theories and concepts from the global South can potentially expand and diversify the ontology of IR (Acharya & Buzan 2007, Tickner & Blaney 2012, Blaney & Tickner 2013, Qin 2020). The literature review will address these issues further.

6. Literature Review

6.1 The problem of an un-international discipline

Despite the variety of IR theories, aside from postcolonialism as well as certain schools of feminism and poststructuralism, they are all populated with Western knowledges, derived from Western philosophers such as Thucydides, Hobbes, Machiavelli, Locke, and Kant. Moreover, they exclude philosophers from the global South such as Sun Tzu, Ashoka, Kautilya, Prebisch and Fanon who could be potential sources of additional knowledge (Acharya 2014, 648). These theories reflect the discipline's Western centric ontology and historical narrative. De facto, they have been designed to unpack and analyse a Western perception of international

relations (Qin 2020, Tickner & Blaney 2012). Their capacity is not universal but narrowly applicable to the construct of the Western world (Inoue & Tickner 2016, Querejazu, 2016, Blaney & Tickner, 2017). Further, the ontological stance of these Western IR theories is currently predicated on the notion of monistic universalism in that they conceive of a homogenous, global reality (Acharya 2014, 649, Blaney and Tickner 2017b, 301)[3]. Further, it is essential to note that the predominant Western interests these theories represent restricts their ontological scope to a Western reality (Querejazu, 2016, 2, Blaney & Tickner 2017b, Blaney & Tickner 2014, Qin 2020). Blaney and Tickner (2017b) also caution that the wide variety of Western IR theories should not be misconstrued as ontological pluralism, namely, that these theories represent a diverse range of realities. Instead, they are indicative of great epistemological diversity, in that they are actually depicting different ways of knowing the world (singular).

Acharya and Buzan (2007, 289) argue that currently International Relations theory is too narrow and dominant to assist academics understand the social world we live in. Moreover, by expanding Critical Theorist Robert Cox's statement that "theory is always for someone and for some purpose", Acharya and Buzan (2007, 290) claim that IR theories are not neutral, analytical tools but also offer an ideological vision of what the world looks like or should like. In this context Liberalism, particularly economic Liberalism advocates for capitalist ideals, while Realism promotes the interest of powerful states, which are mainly Western, and the maintenance of their dominance in international relations. They further argue that despite being presented as universal theories, these theories reflect and entrench the power, prosperity, and influence of the West (Acharya & Buzan 2007).

When examining knowledge production in the subfield of IR theory, a significant amount of scholarly research has established that knowledges from the global South are under-represented in comparison to that of the West in terms of journal publication (Tickner, 2003a 2003b, 2013; Barasuol & da Silva 2016, Hovey 2004, Blaney, 2002; Liu 2016, Behera 2016, Qin 2020). Scholars argue that this disparity has been largely maintained by delineating the ontological and epistemological grounds of the discipline to exclusively reflect evolving Western academic research interests. These are also aligned with dominant Western historical, political, social, and economic narratives. Santos (2009) contends that knowledges from the

[3] In other words, they espouse that all international relations actors operate in the same international system and share similar experiences in their interaction with this reality. One only has to contemplate the global division in wealth between states to realise that this premise is false.

global South that do not conform to this framework are either rendered invisible (or in his term "abyssal") or are disparaged and negated for not conforming to Northern ontology and epistemological parameters. Qin (2020, 2) adds that mainstream Western IR actively suppresses alternative views and visions in order to sustain its discursive hegemony which enables it to continue its monopoly in knowledge production. The domineering nature of mainstream Western IR entrenches the perception that only Westerners are capable of 'universal thought' as it designates non-Western experiences as parochial or particular and consequently non-universal (Qin 2020, Blaney & Tickner 2013).

Scholars state that the erasure of the global South and IR's colonial past is evident in the birth myth of the discipline (Qin 2020, Smith & Tickner 2020, 1-2). Vitalis' historical research now indicates that it was not the fallout from the First World War and the desire to secure lasting peace on the part of Western powers that initiated the study of international relations, but their need to manage and control their imperial conquests across the globe. However, as imperialism and colonization became less palatable after the Second War World, the issues of racial, gender and geo cultural differences were systematically erased as objects of inquiry (Blaney & Tickner 2017a, 73-73; Vale & Thakur 2020). Blaney and Tickner (2017a, 73) conclude that IR has sustained its modern, White, masculine, state, and Western centric identity by effacing or ignoring these differences.

In their analysis of the 2014 Teaching, Research, and International Policy (TRIP) project survey of International Relations faculty Wemheuer-Vogelaar et al (2016, 29) found that scholars irrespective of their geographic location attested to a Western or United States hegemony in the discipline. Interviewees from the global South supported the countering of this hegemony. However, those from the United States and elsewhere is the West were content with the perpetuation of this domination. Regarding the development of IR theory, the study found that scholars from the global South were frequently omitted from lists of the most influential scholars in this subfield, even by other scholars from the global South. Nevertheless, when examining scholars' self-reported research activity in the area of theory development, those from the global South were as active as their counterparts in the West. Further, more Latin American scholars believed that the development of local IR theories was important than those in the West. Ultimately, it was concluded that although the development of scholarship focusing on IR theory in the global South was occurring, it was undervalued as well as under-recognised in the discipline as a whole. The effect of this was the perpetuation of existing patterns of Western domination and global South subjugation in the field (Wemheuer-Vogelaar

2016, 30). Consequently, this study further confirms the continued marginalization of theories and knowledges from the global South.

6.2 Moving toward increased knowledge inclusiveness in IR theories

The majority of the literature falling within the category of the meta-theoretical debate focuses on issues related to a) the deficiencies of the universalist approach to the study of the discipline; b) knowledge universality in IR theory as a form of Western neo-colonialism and c) disciplinary gatekeeping. (Waever 1998; Tickner 2003b, 2013, 201; Blaney & Tickner 2017; Blaney & Inayatullah 2008; Chowdry 2007; Aydinli and Matthews 2000).

Acharya (2014, 649) believes that it is essential that IR theory discard its claim of monistic universalism or a homogenous reality as this has led to arbitrary standard setting, gatekeeping as well as the marginalization of alternative narratives, ideas, and methodologies. Instead, he advocates for pluralistic universalism that is premised upon comprehending and respecting diversity in an everchanging world. To substantiate this claim, he quotes leading IR scholar J Anne Tickner who stated that "rather than searching for one universal history, we need to uncover stories about forgotten spaces that respect difference, show tolerance and compassion and are sceptical about absolute truths" (Acharya 2014, 650). Thus, from the pluralistic universalist vantage the world of IR emerges as a large, overarching canopy with multiple foundations (Acharya 2014, 649). Acharya, Buzan and Qin encourage the development of new IR theories and methods from philosophies and historical practices accompanying the practice of international relations in the global South. They believe that the inclusion of marginalised voices in the disciplinary discourse will profoundly enrich IR knowledge allowing the discipline to realise proper diversity and would produce what could be accurately claimed as 'Global IR'. According to Acharya (2014) 'global IR' would not replace existing Western IR but would transcend the distinction between the West and the global South, opposing any binary and mutual exclusive categories (Qin 2020, 6). Further, this dispensation would be grounded in world history, not just Western history. Existing IR theories would be subsumed instead of supplanted. It would integrate regionalism and area studies, Further, it would eschew exceptionalism and recognise multiple forms of agency (Acharya, 648). Global IR envisages that knowledge irrespective of its origin and epistemological premise would be able to coexist.

In contrast to Acharya's desire to allow for knowledge diversity but within a commonly conceived reality shared with other Western IR theories, scholars such as Querejazu (2016), Blaney & Tickner (2017), Levine & McCourt (2018), Rojas (2016) and Law (2015) dispute

whether theories from both the West and global South could *de facto* all claim the same ontological space. Although Blaney and Tickner (2017b) praise Acharya's quest to incorporate theories and knowledges from the global South, they believe that these may not be at home within the universal ontological space dictated by Western IR theories. This mismatch means that they will either be discarded as unsuitable for not conforming to the ontological vision of Western theories or they would have to mutate in order to conform thereby losing their unique perspectives and resulting in their colonization (see Rojas 2016). Querejazu (2016) further challenges the notion of the universality of Western IR theory and argues that the ontological and epistemological stance it enforces prevents the inclusion of indigenous knowledges from the global South. This excludes these knowledges from contributing to expansion of the discipline's theoretical canon.

Adding complexity to the debate Blaney and Tickner (2017b) as well as Querejazu (2016), in their investigation of the politics of ontology within IR, argue that the automatic acceptance of a singular world or universe that characterizes Western IR theories occludes the fact that theories or knowledges, especially from the global South may represent multiple, co-existing realities/ontologies that do not align with Western IR theories. Thus, it is not that the incorporation of new knowledges means that they merely present different beliefs about the same reality/universe but that they refer to fundamental distinct and different realities. To quote Blaney and Tickner (2017b, 303):

> "it is not only that people believe different things about reality, but that different realities are enacted by different practices."

Consequently, greater knowledge inclusiveness and plurality entails not forcing knowledges from the global South to conform to the current ontological strictures imposed by colonial modernity but allowing their introduction to diversify understanding. Ultimately, the authors see this as the most conducive path to the decolonization of knowledge and the incorporation of knowledges or theories from the global South in a manner that ensures that they are not subsumed by those of the West. However, the desire for the greater knowledge plurality and decolonization within the field of IR theory does not necessitate the removal of Western IR theories. Rather, in the spirit of pluriversal IR these will be allowed to co-exist with a multitude of other theories and knowledges. Thus, enhancing our capacity to investigate the multiple realities that constitute the discipline. To quote Querejazu (2016, 4) this approach opens the "possibility of theorizing about the global in uncountable ways". Reference to knowledge plural IR theory curricula within this research report will thus refer to curricula that have

selected theories, concepts, philosophies, or knowledges from sources in both the West and the global South.

Another productive avenue of research in creating knowledge plural theoretical perspectives examines the incorporation knowledge from sources outside of the IR discipline. Chowdry (2007) uses a conceptual framework devised by Said in his study of various forms of Western cultural imperialism to evaluate received knowledge in IR. Querejazu (2016) further utilizes Mignolo's call to consciously challenge and restructure Western based conceptions of knowledge validity as a generative mechanism for affording knowledge from the global South equal status. Mignolo specifically calls for the practice of epistemic disobedience whereby Southern scholarship purposely chooses not to subscribe to Western knowledge standards. These approaches discussed by Querejazu (2016) shows how research on knowledge in other disciplines can contribute to establishing broader ontologies and alternative epistemologies for IR. Further, Querejazu, and Tickner (2021), Querejazu (2016) and Rojas (2016) show how incorporating relational ontologies into the realm of international relations can bring different insights to those offered by Western IR theories. Relational ontologies operate from the premise that the human, natural and spiritual domains are all interrelated and are prevalent in the thinking of many cultural groups in the global South such as Buddhist, Daoist, and Andean populations. Thus, according to the Andean worldview nature is a political entity endowed with human rights and agency. This shapes how populations engage with the environment and prioritize environmental protection over the exploitation of land and natural resources for profit. This introduces an alternative explanatory frame to nature-human interactions that would be in this context invisible to Western IR theories (Querejazu 2016).

Similarly, work like that of African philosopher Paulin Hountondji (1995) relating to rediscovering and modernizing endogenous knowledge from local culture can offer additional or alternative explanations of IR, especially within an African context. Hountondji argues that colonial or exogenous knowledge should be evaluated on its explanatory and analytical utility and not discarded out of hand, as it could fill gaps where endogenous knowledge is absent or insufficient. This work not only poses different ways for assessing knowledge validity but also can be used as a framework for the generation of new IR conceptual languages that better describes African realities, thus producing more appropriate or precise research findings. An example of this is Odoom and Andrews (2016) who demonstrate how Africa's interpretation of democracy as communal and collaborative can present alternatives to the individualist –

competitive nature of Western democracy. Thus, knowledge from the global South presents plural ways of theorizing international relations.

Despite the growth in the scholarship addressing the need to decolonize or de-Westernize as well as pluralize the knowledge that constitutes IR theory, the same amount of attention has not been given to the aspect of pedagogy. Nevertheless, some of the scholarship listed in this section helps us identify the agents and structures associated with maintenance of the Western knowledge status quo. The scholarship also gives insight into the role they play in constructing and shaping what Bernstein (2000) terms the field's knowledge structures.

6.3 IR theory curricula and knowledge plurality

The literature examining knowledge plurality within IR theory curricula is of varying usefulness to the research I sought to undertake. Tickner (2003a) considers whether endogenous Latin American IR theories were included in the curricula taught to Latin American IR students. The study concludes that Western based IR theory constituted most of the curriculum content across Latin America. Further critical IR theories were also largely absent. However, she found that Latin American scholars did incorporate endogenous Latin American knowledges when conducting their own research. They had also developed hybrid theories by merging select aspects from a range of theories to either explain or analyse their findings, as nothing suitable existed in the current cannon. Despite these innovations, the author states that almost none of these models had found their way into Latin American curricula.

More than a decade later Barasuol and da Silva (2016) repeated Tickner's 2003(a) study. Their aim is to ascertain if the growing demand for theoretical plurality in IR scholarship had produced more research either about producing or utilizing Latin American knowledges as well as whether more endogenous based scholarly knowledge has permeated into the curricula. Their study concludes that Latin American scholars tended to use Western IR concepts related to their field of research to formulate analytical frameworks. Minimal further development of theories derived from local knowledges had occurred in the interim between this and the Tickner study. In terms of curricula, the range of theories taught to students had expanded to include critical Western IR theory, but Latin American theories were still absent. Both Tickner's and Barusol and Silva's empirical studies indicate that despite the existence of theories derived from Latin American endogenous knowledges, these were still not being selected as curricula content. Further, these studies consider the problems that the exposure to a narrow range of Western based theoretical perspectives poses for students' academic capacity (which has numerous ramifications in terms of the knowledges they confine themselves to as

postgraduates) and their ability to understand and solve problems related to their context. However, they make no recommendations on the expediting of knowledge plurality in curricula especially through the inclusion of knowledge originating and developed in the global South. Whether similar situations exist in other regions or countries located in the global South cannot be ascertained as to the best of my knowledge there is currently no published research that explicitly investigates multiple locations in the global South.

Blaney (2002) and Hovey's (2004) analysis of IR curricula at US higher education institutions indicate that content that focused exclusively on the international relations of the West prevent students from developing awareness of IR beyond the borders of the United States. Consequently, even though these students studied International Relations, they remained largely ignorant in their knowledge of the rest of the world. Blaney (2002) advocates that curricula expose Western IR students to non-Western contexts, theories, and concepts as well as a range of epistemologies so as to displace this trend of privileging Western knowledge as it provides students with a distort and parochial perception of the world. Hovey (2004) problematizes the predominance of Western knowledge within IR curricula as failing to equip US students to be able to understand and function in a globalized world. To eliminate these problems, she proposes facilitating critical student engagement with knowledge from other cultures as well as promoting dialogue with students from other cultures and locations. This approach seeks to make the power dynamic within IR knowledge structures explicit to students, encouraging them to consider the possibility of establishing pluralist knowledge constructions.

Liu (2016) examines the teaching of IR in a Taiwan. He advocates for curricula content that is inclusive of diverse cultural contexts given the strong representation of foreign students in Taiwanese IR courses. Moreover, Liu argues that Western based IR theories have limited explanatory and analytical capacity for the study of Taiwanese international relations. Moreover, they tend to provide reductionist solutions to problems. Hence, there is a need to either modify the ways in which students are required to use these theories or to develop more suitable alternatives. However, Liu's (2016) focus is on the selection and adaption of curricula content. Thus, the study fails to consider how larger issues such agency-structure, disciplinary knowledge, and knower structures as well as student dispositions that the course seeks to develop should shape these decisions.

Andrews (2020) conducted a review of the course outlines from sixteen postgraduate courses that contain IR theory – twelve courses from the United Kingdom and the United States and four from Africa. The analysis found that the majority of the Western courses excluded

critical IR theories, postcolonialism and theories or knowledges from the global South. These courses foci were predominantly Western-centric. However, the London School of Economics, Oxford University and Harvard University did include critical IR theories, scholarship that problematized the exclusion of the global South and research by scholars from the global South. Nevertheless, these scholars were only cited once or twice across the course outlines, and none made the list of the sixteen most cited authors in the course outlines of the Western and African universities examined (Andrews 2020, 10). Moreover, the four African courses surveyed devoted an equal amount of time to the triad of Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism as they did to Critical IR theories. Further the inclusion of Postcolonialism was taken to constitute knowledge and theories from the global South. Nevertheless, scholars from the West were still most cited as required reading in the course outlines (Andrews 2020, 10). Despite the under-representation of course outlines from the Africa, the study still concluded that Western theories and knowledges enjoyed pre-eminence in most of the courses reviewed.

Smith and Tickner (2020, 2) point out how the act of selecting specific textbooks and readings for inclusion in an IR theory curriculum confers validity on the knowledge contained therein. These choices convey to students what subject matter does and does not legitimately constitute part of the discipline. The authors also problematise the fact that despite acknowledging the exclusionary nature of the field and embracing the call for its de-centring, many academics still include mainstream Western texts in their curricula exclusively. This results in students continuing to be presented with a limited Western-centric account of IR. This situation is exacerbated by the fact that the majority of IR textbooks are American or Western-centric not only in terms of their content but also with respect to the nationality of their authors and the location of their publishing houses. IR introductory textbooks are usually devoid of views and scholarly voices from the global South (Smith & Tickner 2020, 3). This creates the perception that only the perspectives of Western scholars' matter in IR. Moreover, it confers exclusive agency on them as legitimate disciplinary theorists while relegating academics and students from the global South to being consumers of Western knowledge (Smith & Tickner 20202, 3).

In summary, current research primarily focuses on how the limited nature of knowledge diversity in IR curricula hinders students' capacity to develop a rich conceptualization of the study and practice of IR. Moreover, most scholars argue that students only exposed to Western IR contexts fail to acquire both the knowledge and related dispositions they require to function in a multicultural, globalized world. Further, these studies focused on the important role that

curriculum content plays in the development of student dispositions that allow them to become productive members of a globalized world. It is notable that these studies usually only consider one or two elements pertaining to the curricula or knowledge choices but do not consider larger curricula contexts (probably because most IR academics lack the necessary training in the field of education that would be required for a more comprehensive analysis). Further, articles that do consider the inclusion of knowledge from the global South in curricula examine a single country or region exclusively. In contrast, my research provides a three-phase analysis of knowledge plural IR theory curricula in a variety of global contexts.

7. Theoretical Framework

Critical realism is employed as a meta theory for this research report. From an epistemological point of view, critical realism constitutes a via media between positivism and interpretivism (Bryman, 2012). While critical realism holds that entities can exist independently of our knowledge and interaction with them, it also acknowledges that our interactions with the social world are mediated by personal and societal influences and are thus subjective. Critical realist approaches to the study of the social world arose as a response to the methodological fictions perpetuated by positivism. Bhaskar adopting what he termed anti-positivist naturalism argues that although natural and social sciences both adopt a relational approach, they agree that isolated entities should be the main unit of analysis (Jessop 2005). Moreover, he contends that even if principles that govern this production are similar in the two fields, social scientists will differ in respect of the predicates they identified as causing social phenomenon. Social scientist would also diverge in the procedures they use to identify these causes as they are "contingent upon and determined by the properties of the object being studied" (Jessop 2005).

Critical realism recognises the existence of both the natural world and the social world. The concrete nature of the natural world enables much of it to be studied through observation. However, critical realists contend that just because a structure is invisible or intangible does not mean that it does not exist, thereby contesting a fundamental precept of positivism. This stance opens the social world for more intensive investigation (Bryman 2012). For critical realists, the purpose of research is not the creation of grand theory but contributing to the knowledge of the social world by clarifying concepts; reflecting on and identifying causal mechanisms associated with specific outcomes thus clearing impediments to the development of knowledge (Bryman 2012).

Critical realists subscribe to ontological realism. They believe that the discourses and events that arise in the social world (the actual dimension) are generated by structural mechanisms (the real dimension) that have demonstrable effects or impacts on individuals (the empirical dimension) as well as society even though their operation is not discernible through observation (attributed to the fact that these three dimensions are often out of sync) (Rutzou 2016). What renders these structures real despite their occlusion is their capacity to produce outcomes or particularly patterns of events that are capable of being seen. The approach ascribes in general to ontological realism; epistemological relativism; judgemental rationality and methodological pluralism. Critical realists embrace epistemological relativism as they hold that investigation is always contingent, fallible, and corrigible. Thus, they argue that all representations have limitations. Despite this, critical realists argue that this does not exclude the development of knowledge regarding the social world rather it allows for the development of knowledge complexity in that we are able to derive multiple understandings of an event. As such, critical realism perceives of causality as contingent, complex, conjectural, and changing (Rutzou 2016). It adopts a retroductive approach to investigating social phenomena in that it moves from conclusion to premise by asking, what are the conditions of possibility necessary to produce the particular social phenomena being studied (Jessop 2005, Rutzou 2016). What prevents critical realism from sliding into an extreme postmodern relativist stance on knowledge is its emphasis not only on ontological realism (as discussed above) but also judgemental rationality. Simply put this involves a methodological rule geared toward grounding the research process. Essentially judgemental rationality enjoins the researcher to judge the validity of the explanations produced by a study against established criteria. Nevertheless, critical realists advocate methodological pluralism as different methods reveal different causal mechanisms, which in turn generate different understanding of social phenomena. Thus, the choice of research methodology will be decided by what researchers determine to be the most generative ways of investigating a specific issue (Jessop 2005, Rutzou 2016).

What makes the theory “critical” is the belief that identifying and understanding the generative mechanisms inherent in these structures will assist in transforming these structures in order to alter the social world to counter injustice and inequality. It is this requirement of explanatory critique that makes critical realism a valuable tool for this research. The ability to identify power as well as oppressive structures provides a base from which to critique and investigate the conditions of possibility responsible for creating; reproducing and maintaining an unequal status quo so that these might be reconstructed to bring about equity (Rutzou 2016).

In other words, critical realism unmasks these dynamics for the express purpose of challenging and removing them. Accordingly, this research report aims to identify the various structures and their related causal mechanisms that produce, reproduce, and maintain knowledge inequity within IR theory curricula. This will then form the foundation for a critique and deconstruction of these structures in order to establish the conditions of possibility that enable the construction of knowledge plural IR curricula.

8. Conceptual Framework

In probing the power relations that give rise to Western or knowledge plural IR theory curricula, the concepts of agents and structures as well as their interplay in producing particular curricula outcomes constitute vital components of the research's conceptual framework. Agency is recognised as the ability of individuals or groups to exercise free will in that they are not constrained by the influences of external variables in making choices. From this vantage point, agents can affect social changes by their decisions (Hay, 1994). Structure is defined as patterned social arrangements that have an impact on agency. Structures are comprised of social arrangements that govern and influence the action of agents. Hay (1994) argues that culture should be understood as a social structure as it is a "durable, layered patterned of cognitive, normative systems that are at once material and ideal, objective and subjective, embodied in artefacts and embedded in behaviour, passes about in interaction, internalised in personalities and externalised in institutions" (Hay 1994). Structure has both the ability to enable and constrain human choice and actions depending on the context. Moreover, human beings have the capacity to reconstruct or remove structures through their engagement with these structures and the agents that uphold them. It is important also to recognise that the casualty between agency and structure is bi-directional. Further power dynamics encompassed in agency-structure relationships are fluid depending on the context. The dominant knowledge structure within IR theory that favours Western discourses is a construct of Western academic agents and structures. A key mechanism for entrenching the dominance of Western knowledge is by means of IR theory curricula. This dominance is maintained and preserved globally because it is reproduced in the IR curricula of the global South as well as the West. In terms of agency and structure, this research seeks to determine the extent to which counter-hegemonic agents and structures are being developed that allow for the generation of knowledge plural IR theory curricula. Further, it seeks to identify not only why but also how lecturers who have generated knowledge plural IR theory curricula have navigated, engaged, and challenged the Western hegemonic discourses within the discipline.

As noted earlier in the theoretical framework, although one can observe the outcomes produced by these structures, their internal functioning is largely invisible. Accordingly, this research report employs Basil Bernstein's concept of the pedagogic device as it is designed specifically to render the knowledge dynamics within academic discipline visible as it charts the process through which knowledge is selected, pedagogised and delivered to students. This enables the investigation of how these dynamics influence the selection, sequencing, pacing and evaluation of knowledge for curricula. According to Shay (2013, 317) the pedagogic device 'explains how curriculum choices are shaped by, among other things, the norms of the prevailing socio-political order, as well as the contestations for legitimacy in the field of knowledge'.

Bernstein's purpose for constructing the pedagogic device was to reveal the usually occluded generative mechanisms as well as conditions of possibilities at play when knowledge is pedagogised in different instances and to use these findings to confront inequities within education systems. Consequently, the pedagogic device is well suited to the critical realist theoretical stance of this research report in that it facilitates the study of the conditions influencing the incorporation of knowledge into curricula that are not openly apparent. Further, its ultimate purpose embraces the same desire for transformation and fairness as critical realism.

For Bernstein, the pedagogic device represents the ordering and disordering principles brought about by the pedagogising of knowledge. It "constitutes the relay or ensemble of rules or procedures via which knowledge is converted into pedagogic communication" (Singh 2002, 573). In other words, it models the process of creating educational knowledge (Shay 2013, 317). The pedagogic device depicts the movement of knowledge from the field of 'knowledge production' to the 'field of knowledge recontextualisation' and then finally to the 'field of knowledge reproduction' (Shay 2015, Singh, 2002, Luckett, 2009). The field of 'knowledge production' refers to where knowledge is created, usually in the form of academic scholarship. The field of 'knowledge recontextualisation' refers to where knowledge is adapted and integrated into the content of a curriculum. Finally, the field of 'knowledge reproduction' relates to where knowledge is presented to the learner. Put differently, the field of knowledge reproduction is where the content and skills are delivered from the educator to the learner. As there is a hierarchical interrelationship between these fields, the forces that influence the research agendas of scholars, together with their ontological and epistemological dispositions in the field of knowledge production will determine the range of knowledge available for

selection in the fields of knowledge recontextualization and reproduction. Additionally, there are rules within each of the three fields that determine what knowledge gets privileged as well as what occurs to it as it is selected, recontextualised into a curriculum and then transmitted to learners through pedagogy and assessment (Shay 2011, 316).

Bernstein (2000, 31) notes that the field of knowledge production is subject to distributive rules. These determine "who may transmit what kind of knowledge, to whom and under what conditions" as well as setting the limits of legitimate discourse (Lim 2017, 356). Moreover, they control who has access to what Bernstein (2000, 114) term the 'unthinkable' meaning the production of new knowledge and the 'thinkable' or official knowledge. The control and management of the 'unthinkable' is confined to agencies of higher education (Bernstein 2000, 29). Agents operating in the field of knowledge production would include universities, research centres and professional bodies that regulate research. Knowledge production in the area of IR theory is dominated by Western academic institutions and predominantly features Western knowledge in mainstream journals and books (Blaney & Tickner 2013; Qin 2020). Further this situation is maintained by Western imposed epistemological constraints that define what types of knowledge produced counts as "valid" and thus worthy of mainstream dissemination and publication. It is Western IR's preference for "positivism" that constrains the epistemological range of knowledges produced that are allowed entrance to the mainstream arena (Blaney & Tickner 2013). This skews what knowledge is deemed as valid and therefore available for recontextualization into curricula.

The recontextualization of knowledge that occurs within the 'field of knowledge recontextualization' is not a neutral undertaking that merely entails the mechanical selection, editing and repackaging of the requisite information into bite-sized pieces that are deemed to be most suitable for intellectual consumption by students. Learning not only involves the acquisition of knowledge but concomitant skills, values and personal characteristics that allows the knowledge to be of practical use to the individual student and the rest of society. Consequently, part of the recontextualization process is merging these two components. Thus, there is an interlinkage here with agency-structure and student knowing, being and becoming. Bernstein (2000) identifies the two pedagogic discourses, which emerge from the process of recontextualization, namely, instructional, and regulative discourses. Instructional discourse refers to specialized knowledge and content skills while regulative discourse refers to considerations pertaining to social and moral order (Luckett, 2009). Within instructional discourse, knowledge structures inform the range of choices available in the selection,

sequencing, pacing and evaluation of knowledge. It is within the instructional discourse that contestation over what constitutes valid discipline specific knowledge occurs (Bernstein 2000, 32). Regulative discourse often informs debates on the aim and purpose of the curriculum. This introduces questions regarding the aim and purpose of studying International Relations theory as well as what would constitute the "ideal IR knower" which in turn is related to the issues of knowing and becoming. It is important to note that the regulative discourse is the dominant discourse, and the instructional discourse is embedded within it (Bernstein, 2000, 32) Thus, we can conclude that the regulative discourse can be used to shape the instructional discourse to serve the curriculum's overall aim and purpose.

In the field of the recontextualization of knowledge, the process of the selection, relocation, and reassembly of knowledge from its "purest" form to a form which is suitable to be taught results in the "discursive gap" (Bernstein 2000, 32). The discursive gap allows for the personal interpretations, values, beliefs, and ideologies of the curriculum designer to influence which elements encapsulated in the instructional and regulative discourses are included in a curriculum as well as the form they should take. It also creates an opportunity for the ideological, the social and the political milieu of the moment to influence the content and form of a curriculum (Bernstein 2000, 33). In this space, curriculum designers have the agency to reproduce or challenge the knowledge of their discipline and incorporate or address relevant issues arising both inside and outside the academy. Practically this will also influence how designers select, sequence, pace and evaluate knowledge in their curriculum. Agents operating in the field of knowledge recontextualization would include state educational regulatory bodies, university teaching and learning bodies, social movements such as "fees must fall", curricula designers and textbook authors. However, it can be argued that IR academics who design and lecture theory courses are the primary recontextualizing agents. The choices they make in selecting specific knowledge for inclusion in curricula gives them agency to determine what constitutes legitimate objects of study. They further get to decide on the most logical way of sequencing the order in which knowledge will be presented to students. Lastly, they are responsible for setting the evaluative criteria that defines what counts as legitimate performance.

Shay (2011, 317) states that even though academics at universities usually have greater autonomy over their curricula choices than schools, these choices are still always constrained by ideological, social, and political factors, together with competing agents as well as structures that vie to influence the knowledge selection choices made by curriculum designers. Using the

pedagogic device's ability to reveal the complex interactions that occur within the field of knowledge recontextualisation enables one to model the conditions for constraint (Shay 2011, 317). Thus, by applying the pedagogic device as an instrument of analysis researchers are able to identify affordances and constraints related to the pedagogising of knowledge that operate within the field of knowledge recontextualisation.

The field of knowledge reproduction is where the content and skills are delivered from the educator to the learner. How this is accomplished is largely up to the lecturer's discretion. However, this discretion is constrained by internal and external factors. These are the lecturer's perception of their role as educator, the process of pedagogy and the role of students in the learning process Contained in this field are evaluative rules that regulate what counts as the valid acquisition of the knowledge ascribed in the curriculum. This is particularly evident in assessment regimes contained in curricula that define what counts as legitimate knowledge and knowers (McClean, Abbas & Ashwin 2013). Agents operating in this field include lecturers, students, teaching and learning experts and individual teaching teams.

It is evident from Bernstein's writing that agents operating in the three fields examined above may either seek to maintain or challenge the ordering and disordering principles of the pedagogic device (Singh 2002, 573). Bernstein states that "between power and knowledge and power and consciousness is always the pedagogic device" (as quoted in McClean, Abbas & Ashwin 2013, 269). This is due to the fact that there exists within the pedagogic device both the ability to maintain or alter the status quo pertaining to what knowledge is distributed as well how and to whom this is taught, depending on how agents within the three fields utilize these spaces to disrupt or reinforce particular knowledge narratives. (Bernstein 2000, 28). Consequently, Bernstein (2000, 114) argues that there is a continuous struggle between social groups for ownership of the device as this enables them to perpetuate their power through discursive means as they endeavour to establish their own ideological representations.

This research has used selected aspects of the pedagogic device to frame its investigation into how lecturers (recontextualising and reproducing agents) have chosen to develop their IR theory curricula. Firstly, I investigated the range of knowledges selected (privileged) by interviewees for incorporation into their curricula and the motivations for these choices. Secondly, I examined whether interviewees used the regulative discourse as well as the discursive gap to produce knowledge plural curricula and if so, how these were employed. Finally, I explored what affordances and constraints, interviewees encountered in designing and executing their curricula. From section 13 onwards I assess how the selection, sequencing,

and evaluation of knowledge have resulted in either enforcing or disrupting the dominance of the Western IR theoretical canon in the curricula sample.

9. Methods of data collection

To collect data for this research report I conducted semi-structured interviews with nine colleagues who teach IR theory courses or courses containing IR theory. University ethics clearance was required before any interviews could take place. This process entailed the completion of a participant risk analysis form as well as the submission of my research proposal; participation information sheet and participant letter of consent to be interviewed for approval by the university's Ethics Committee. Ethics clearance was granted by the Wits Ethics Committee in July 2020. I have undertaken to keep the identity of interviewees anonymous. Consequently, only the country within which each academic institution is located is given. Identifying the geographic location of each course is necessary as the political, social, and political milieu within which a curriculum is situated is a potential variable that influences the selection of knowledge as reflected in the discussion in section 8 on the pedagogic device. Moreover, there are numerous of academic institutions in each of the countries represented in this study, making the identification of the interviewees highly unlikely.

The interviewees were purposively selected because they have a public acknowledged interest in the inclusion of knowledge from the global South in mainstream IR as demonstrated in, among others, their publications, conference presentations and professional reputations. They also all teach an IR theory course or a course containing IR theory. The interviewees teach at universities in various locations across the globe. Three interviewees are geographically located in the West, namely, the United States, the Netherlands and Germany, and six across the global South, namely, Colombia, Morocco, India, Taiwan, and South Africa. Moreover, seven of the nine interviewees are involved in researching various aspects related to realisation of knowledge plurality within the field of IR theory.

The sample is representative of both undergraduate and postgraduate courses as well as different years of study within either of these two categories. The interview questionnaire (Apendix One) was structured to elicit responses on the selection, sequencing, and evaluation of knowledge within the interviewee's curriculum, as well as the rationale for these choices. This structure would allow the researcher to make inferences as to how each interviewee was working within the discursive gap to achieve their curriculum objectives. Once the interview process was completed, the interview responses were transcribed and then a content analysis

was performed on them. In addition to giving an interview, each interviewee provided me with a copy of their course outline for analysis. A content analysis was then also conducted on the course outline received. The semi-structured interviews also allowed the observations emerging from the content analysis of the course outlines to be further explored and elaborated on in greater detail.

10. Method of data analysis

I have selected content analysis as the method of data analysis for this research report[4]. Content analysis enables researchers to systematically analyse the content contained in a variety of forms of information, including among others, diaries, speeches, images, interviews, and letters (Pashakhanlou 2017, 449). Krippendorff (2019, 24) defines content analysis as a research method "for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use". This research method aligns with the critical realist stance of this research in that content analysis goes "outside the immediate observable physical vehicles of communication and relies on their symbolic qualities to trace the antecedents, correlates or consequences of communication, thus rendering the (unobserved) context of the data analysable" (Krippendorff 2019).

Content analysis is interested in a) the reality of the data and b) the reality within which the study's research questions are located. As these represent two distinct realities, this necessitates the use of analytical constructs or rules of inference to allow the researcher to draw conclusion from the text and apply this to the context thereby providing answers to research questions. Practically, this is achieved by breaking texts down into concepts or ideas that are discerned by the researcher. Similar ideas or concepts are then grouped into categories created by the researcher. This process in formally termed "coding" which Krippendorff (2019, 407) defines as "the process of categorising, describing, evaluating, judging, or measuring descriptively undifferentiated units of analysis thereby rendering them analysable".

Using the categorised text to answer a study's research questions necessitates that a researcher presents clearly articulated criteria as to what would constitute suitable evidence to answer these questions. These criteria are termed 'analytical constructs' and are usually drawn either from academic experts, previous studies or existing theories and practices (White and Marsh 2006, 27). Condensing of the text into themes, concepts or words of interest allows this

[4] I acknowledge that discourse analysis could be an equally effective method of data analysis for this research report, but I felt that content analysis would provide a richer analysis in this instance.

data to be explored in a more focused and rigorous way (Pashakhanlou 2017, 449). As context plays a vital role in situating a researcher's inferences, analyses and findings, the chosen context of the study must be explicitly stated to readers. Not doing so makes it difficult to validate the research conducted. Moreover, the central role of the researcher in selecting the context within which to frame the research question, together with the fact that the data/text is read within this context, means that what emerges from the analysis is one of many possible interpretations of the data. In other words, interpretations will vary from researcher to researcher (Krippendorff 2019, 42; Pashakhanlou 2017, 449).

Although content analysis can be performed either by quantitative or qualitative means, this research will employ qualitative content research. The main distinction between these two methods is that the former privileges manifest meaning while the later latent meaning (Pashakhanlou 2017, 449). Consequently, qualitative content analysis demands a close reading of its chosen texts as well as detailed investigation of background information relevant to the context of the study. These activities facilitate the identification of concepts and patterns within the texts that are eventually grouped according to selected characteristics into categories (White & Marshall 2006, 34). The researcher will then interpret the data by relating or applying it to the context of the study's research questions. Thus, interpretation is central to this approach. Qualitative content analysis is an inductive research method and is valuable in answering "how" or "why" research questions (Pashakhanlou 2017, 449). To ensure that interpretations and inferences have sematic validity these must be plausibly related to the original text (Krippendorff 2019, 410).

11. Limitations of the study

As this research only evaluates nine course curricula, its findings cannot be taken to be reflective of broader trends pertaining to the degree of knowledge plurality or exclusivity within IR theory curricula in general. For such claims to be made a substantially larger sample of curricula would be needed. Hence, I have been careful to frame my research questions within the context of this research.

This research report may be accused of "cherry picking" interviewees who were most likely to created knowledge plural courses because of their acknowledged interests in incorporating knowledge from the global South within IR. However, the studies executed by Tickner (2003a) as well as Barasuol and da Silva (2016) demonstrated that even though academics utilized knowledge from the global South in their research, this did not result in

the incorporation of this knowledge in their teaching with their curricula continuing to be populated by Western knowledge. These finding indicate that it cannot be assumed that academics' research will automatically influence their choices related to knowledge selection for their curricula.

12. The Structure of the Analysis of Data Collected

This research report undertakes three phases of analyses in order to generate answers to its research questions. Firstly, it conducts a descriptive analysis of the course outlines provided by the interviewees. Secondly, it undertakes a content analysis of the ten semi-structured interviews conducted. Finally, it performs a critical realist analysis for the purpose of identifying the affordances and constraints to establishing knowledge plural IR theory curricula drawing on both the course outline analysis and the interview content analysis.

13. Descriptive Analysis of Course Outlines

I analysed the course outlines collected for this study according to eight categories that emerged from the data which I felt would provide the necessary information to assist in answering my research questions, namely, "Country", "Level", "Duration", "Co Taught or Solo Taught Course", "Type of Knowledge Selection", "Type of Knowledge Sequencing", "Types of Reading Material Selected", and "Assessment. The purpose of analysing the course outlines was primarily to determine:

- Firstly, what types of knowledges populated each curriculum.
- Secondly, how these knowledges were sequenced.
- Finally, whether a plurality of knowledges was incorporated in each course's assessments

To facilitate the analytical process as well as the ability to compare and contrast categories between courses I created a table contain the data gather from the reviewed course outlines from the above eight categories. In addition, for easy reference I also have inserted an individual table of the data for each category before discussing my findings from the data.

Once I have concluded the above analysis I then turn to an examination of the aims or objectives of each course as laid out in their course outline. Here I wish to determine whether courses specifically a) problematise the exclusiveness of Western knowledge as it pertains to the area of IR theory; b) identify the critical engagement of knowledge from the global South or knowledges from the West and global South in their course aims or objectives. The rationale

for the analyses of each course's stated aim or purpose is that by applying components of the pedagogic device, located within the field of knowledge recontextualization, the way in which interviewees as recontextualising agents have navigated the regulative discourse in making these decisions is made transparent. Moreover, these decisions reflect how each course has used the discursive gap to either challenge or conform with the status quo of Western centric IR theory curricula.

13.1 Category Descriptors

13.1.1 Country

"Country" refers to where each curriculum is geographically located. This category has social implications regarding external forces, which interact with and shape the curriculum (see Bernstein 2000, McLean et al 2013) and allows me to determine whether geographic location may influence choices regarding knowledges selected for curricula.

13.1.2 Level

"Level" refers to where in the curriculum the course is situated. I have divided this category between undergraduate and postgraduate courses. I have also specified where the course is located within the undergraduate or postgraduate programme.

13.1.3 Duration

"Duration" indicates the length of time the course is taught. I have used a half-year semester as a standard measurement. I have also specified the number of lectures presented in each course. This category speaks to the time available to curriculum designers and refers to the issue of pacing in curricula. Moreover, I wished to determine whether there was a correlation between having more lecture time and having a greater range of knowledge plurality.

13.1.4 Co-taught or Solo Taught

I was interested in ascertaining the extent to which co-teaching or solo teaching impacted on lecturers' agency in constructing and/or teaching a curriculum that was more diverse in terms of the range of theories and knowledges included. This was an issue that was investigated in greater detail in the semi-structured interviews.

13.1.5 Types of Knowledge Selected

Here I sought to categorise the extent to which the knowledge that populated the reviewed curricula was inclusive of a multiple range of knowledges from both the West and the global South or whether they exclusively focused on Western or global South knowledges.

If curricula covered the main triad of Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism plus critical IR theories and theories from the global South as well as addressed issues of knowledge exclusion in IR theory, I labelled these as "knowledge plural". Curricula that only covered the Western IR theoretical triad of Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism without any critical IR theories were labelled as "exclusive Western knowledge". If curricula included the Western theoretical triad of Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism as well as Western critical IR theories, these would be labelled as "inclusive Western knowledge". Were curricula to include only theories or knowledges from the global South, these were labelled as "exclusively global South knowledge". This exercise in itself should give a clear indication as to whether there is a trend for or against embracing knowledge plurality in the curricula evaluated in this study. As this analysis of the course outlines was conducted by extracting the data directly from these documents it is unable to offer any explanations as to why particular choices were made. Fortunately, the semi-structured interviews allowed for the interrogation of this issue.

13.1.6 Types of Knowledge Sequencing

I was interested in determining whether the way in which knowledge is sequenced in curricula conforms with the traditional chronological sequencing that occurs in most introductory IR and IR theory textbooks. I have observed that the dominant theories of Realism and Liberalism or visa-versa usually appear at the beginning of IR theory textbooks or sections on Theory in introductory IR textbooks. This is often followed by Marxism or Structuralism, although these may be included with other critical IR theories. If present, the English School[5] and/or Constructivism usually follows the two dominant theories acting as a bridge between the positivist theories of Realism and Liberalism, and critical IR theories. Critical IR theories consistently comprise the later chapters or sections of IR textbooks. If theoretical perspectives from the global South are included, they are always placed after critical IR theories. I contend that continuously having Realism and Liberalism at the front of textbooks serves to entrench their theoretical dominance in the minds of students. For this research, I wished to observe the extent to which this format has been replicated or disrupted. Disruption may be indicative of the discursive gap being utilised by designers to achieve their goals of knowledge plurality. In categorizing the different choices made in knowledge sequencing, I labelled those that taught the IR theories, more or less chronologically as described above as "chronological", noting important variations when these occurred. Curricula where the placement of Realism

[5] Like Constructivism, the English School is seen as representing an epistemological via media between positivist Realism and Liberalism and post-positivist critical IR theories.

Liberalism and Constructivism had been interspersed with critical IR theories and theories and/or knowledges from the global South I have classified as "eclectic". As with knowledge selection, the semi-structured interviews provided a detailed elaboration on why particular sequencing choices were made.

13.1.7 Types of Reading Material Selected

I wished to determine what the types of reading material courses had selected for inclusion. I distinguished between textbooks (where the process of the recontextualization knowledge has already begun in terms its selection and sequencing) as well as chapters from books and journal articles which represent knowledge directly located in the field of knowledge production. Further I examined whether the reading material selected represented scholarship pertaining to the West or global South. By selecting specific reading material and omitting others, curricula designers delineate for students what they believe counts as valid knowledge.

13.1.8 Assessment

Within the field of knowledge reproduction assessment plays a crucial role in demarcating what counts as legitimate knowledge and knowers. Therefore, I wished to investigate the extent to which course assessment allowed students to engage with a plurality of knowledges, especially from the global South. In courses where the assessments had students engage with knowledge from the West and global South, I classified these as "knowledge plural assessments. I labelled courses as "potentially knowledge plural" where students exposure to knowledges from both the West and global South was determined by either their choice of assessments or what assessments they were assigned by the lecturer. This was because some assessments options engaged exclusively with knowledges from either the West or global South. Thus, whether students were required to engage with knowledges from both the West and the global South, or only one of these regions exclusively, depended on the combination of assessments they selected. Where course assessments only included knowledge from the West or global South, these were categorised as "exclusively Western knowledge" or "exclusively global South knowledge" respectively.

Table One - Analysis of Course Outlines

	Course One	Course Two	Course Three	Course Four	Course Five	Course Six	Course Seven	Course Eight	Course Nine
Country	Colombia	Colombia	Germany	India	Morocco	Netherlands	South Africa	Taiwan	United States
Level	Undergraduate Intermediate	Undergraduate Introduction	Postgraduate Masters	Postgraduate Masters	Postgraduate Masters	Postgraduate Masters	Undergraduate Introduction	Postgraduate Masters	Undergraduate Advanced
Duration	One Semester = 16 classes	One Semester = 26 classes	One Semester =16 classes	One Semester = 17 classes	One Semester = 32 classes	One Semester = 12 classes	One Semester = 14 classes (2 classes of which are devoted to IR theory)	One Semester = 18 classes	One Semester =22 classes
Co- or Solo Taught course	Solo taught	Solo taught	Solo taught	Solo taught	Solo taught	Solo taught	Co-taught	Co-taught	Solo taught
Type of Knowledge Selection	Knowledge Plural	Knowledge Plural	Knowledge Plural	Knowledge Plural	Knowledge Plural	Knowledge Plural	Exclusively Western Knowledge	Exclusively Western Knowledge	Knowledge Plural
Type of Knowledge Sequence	Mainly Chronological but has dependency theory included here. Global South in last lecturer. Problematises the absence of knowledges for the global South	Eclectic	Chronological approach, global South in last lectures	Chronological but inserts scholar knowledge from India and China, global South addressed in second last unit	Eclectic	Eclectic	Chronological	Chronological	Eclectic
Types of Reading Material Selected	Articles and book chapters from dominant Western IR theorists as well as global South scholars.	Western IR theory textbook as main source, as well as articles and book chapters from both Western and global South scholars.	Articles and book chapters from dominant Western IR theorists as well as global South scholars.	Articles and book chapters from dominant Western IR theorists as well as global South scholars	Western IR theory textbook as main source, as well as articles and book chapters from both Western and global South scholars.	Articles and book chapters from both Western and global South scholars but global South scholarship is most dominant	Western general introduction to IR textbook	Western scholarship	Background readings are a mixture of both Western & global South scholarship. Reading for lectures is global South scholarship
Assessment	Potentially knowledge plural	Potentially knowledge plural	Potentially knowledge plural	Knowledge plural	Potentially knowledge plural	Knowledge plural	Knowledge Plural	Western knowledge	Knowledge plural

13.2 Descriptive Analysis of Course Outlines: Summary of Findings

13.2.1 Country where the course is taught

Course One	Course Two	Course Three	Course Four	Course Five	Course Six	Course Seven	Course Eight	Course Nine
Colombia	Colombia	Germany	India	Morocco	Netherlands	South Africa	Taiwan	United States

As stated in the section entitled "methods of data collection", three of the courses reviewed are located geographically in the West and six in the global South. I found there to be no correlation between geographic area and a course's propensity for a knowledge plural curriculum. It is evident from Table One that all three Western countries have knowledge plural curricula in terms of knowledge selection, as did four out of the six countries from the global South.

13.2.2 Level of Study

Course One	Course Two	Course Three	Course Four	Course Five	Course Six	Course Seven	Course Eight	Course Nine
Colombia	Colombia	Germany	India	Morocco	Netherlands	South Africa	Taiwan	United States
Undergraduate Intermediate	Undergraduate Introduction	Postgraduate Masters	Postgraduate Masters	Postgraduate Masters	Postgraduate Masters	Undergraduate Introduction	Postgraduate Masters	Undergraduate Advanced

Four of the courses were taught at the undergraduate level with two being introductory courses (in one of these, theory is just one of many topics covered); one is at an immediate level, and another is an advanced theory course. All five postgraduate courses are taught at the Masters level.

13.2.3 Duration of Course

Course One	Course Two	Course Three	Course Four	Course Five	Course Six	Course Seven	Course Eight	Course Nine
Colombia	Colombia	Germany	India	Morocco	Netherlands	South Africa	Taiwan	United States
1 Semester = 16 classes	1 Semester = 26 classes	1 Semester =16 classes	1 Semester = 17 classes	1 Semester = 32 classes	1 Semester = 12 classes	1 Semester = 14 classes (2 classes of which are devoted to IR theory)	1 Semester = 18 classes	1 Semester =22 classes

All nine courses were taught over a semester. Again, there appeared to be no correlation between course duration and whether a course had knowledge plural content selected. However, the number of classes given in a semester, varied widely between courses.

Nevertheless, half of the courses fell within the range of 12 – 18 classes. The courses that had twenty-two, twenty-six and thirty-two respectively covered a wider range of theories; they all had theories or knowledges from the global South and had eclectically sequenced this knowledge.

13.2.4 Co or Solo Taught

Course One	Course Two	Course Three	Course Four	Course Five	Course Six	Course Seven	Course Eight	Course Nine
Colombia	Colombia	Germany	India	Morocco	Netherlands	South Africa	Taiwan	United States
Solo taught	Solo taught	Solo taught	Solo taught	Solo taught	Solo taught	Co-taught	Co-taught	Solo taught

Only two of the courses reviewed were co-taught. Nonetheless, I wished to further ascertain in the semi-structured interview whether lecturers in solo taught courses have greater freedom and less impediments than those in co-taught course in being able to construct knowledge plural curricula.

13.2.5 Type of Knowledge Selected

Course One	Course Two	Course Three	Course Four	Course Five	Course Six	Course Seven	Course Eight	Course Nine
Colombia	Colombia	Germany	India	Morocco	Netherlands	South Africa	Taiwan	United States
Knowledge Plural	Knowledge Plural	Knowledge Plural	Knowledge Plural	Knowledge Plural	Knowledge Plural	Exclusively Western Knowledge	Exclusively Western Knowledge	Knowledge Plural

Seven out of the nine courses were knowledge plural in terms of content selected. Interestingly, Course Five allowed students to select the course content themselves from a list of options. Thus, students had a say in the extent to which they wished to have a knowledge plural course. Course Seven contained Realism, Liberalism and Structuralism exclusively. Course Eight included Realism and Liberalism as well as Constructivism. Based on this analysis, with seven out of the nine courses demonstrating knowledge plurality in their content selection, it can be concluded that in terms of the curricula studied in this research report the majority were knowledge plural

13.2.6 Types of Knowledge Sequencing

Course One	Course Two	Course Three	Course Four	Course Five	Course Six	Course Seven	Course Eight	Course Nine
Colombia	Colombia	Germany	India	Morocco	Netherlands	South Africa	Taiwan	United States
Mainly Chronological but has dependency theory included here. Global South in last lecturer. Problematises the absence of knowledges for the global South	Eclectic	Chronological approach, global South in last lectures	Chronological but inserts scholar knowledge from India and China, global South addressed in second last unit	Eclectic	Eclectic	Chronological	Chronological	Eclectic

Five courses had sequenced their knowledge in a chronological fashion, with three of these placing knowledges or theories from the global South at the end of the course. What complicated the process of classification slightly is that Course One started by problematising the issue of knowledge exclusivity in IR theory. It then covered Realism and Liberalism but after this turned to examine Dependency Theory which is a Latin American theory. However, aside from this anomaly, sequencing reverted to being chronological as described above. Course Three's lecturer sequenced theoretical perspectives from the global South at the end of the course. In an innovative departure from all the other courses reviewed, Course Four weaved the work of Indian scholar Kautilya and Chinese philosophers into the sections covering Realism so that it was not exclusively based on Western knowledge, as is usually the norm. Despite this, the course's sequencing remained chronological with perspectives from the global South placed at the end of the course. Course Three also followed the chronological sequencing of Western theories with knowledges from the global South placed at the end. Course Seven was sequenced chronologically but only included Realism, Liberalism and Marxism.

The knowledge sequencing of four courses were eclectic. All four of these courses included knowledge and theoretical perspectives from the global South interspersed with that of the West throughout the course. There was no discernible West-global South division in the sequencing of the content in any of these four courses. Course Five's outline stated that it chose to cluster the discussion of theories around selected themes to prevent any one theory gaining supremacy over others. In summary, slightly over half of the curricula reviewed favoured chronological sequencing with some having slight variations or supplementations. It is also important to note that the decision to sequence theories chronologically did not

necessarily prevent curriculum designers from supplementing this arrangement with knowledges from the global South, usually included at the end. More details on curricula designers' thinking regarding the sequencing of knowledge for their respective courses were elicited in the semi-structured interviews and added more depth to this analysis.

13.2.7 Types of Reading Material Selected

Course One	**Course Two**	**Course Three**	**Course Four**	**Course Five**	**Course Six**	**Course Seven**	**Course Eight**	**Course Nine**
Colombia	Colombia	Germany	India	Morocco	Netherlands	South Africa	Taiwan	United States
Articles and book chapters from dominant Western IR theorists as well as global South scholars.	Western IR theory textbook as main source, as well as articles and book chapters from both Western and global South scholars.	Articles and book chapters from dominant Western IR theorists as well as global South scholars.	Articles and book chapters from dominant Western IR theorists as well as global South scholars	Western IR theory textbook as main source, as well as articles and book chapters from both Western and global South scholars.	Articles and book chapters from both Western and global South scholars but global South scholarship is most dominant	Western general introduction to IR textbook	Western scholarship	Background readings are a mixture of both Western & global South scholarship. Reading for lectures is global South scholarship

Only two courses used a Western IR theory textbook (Course Two - Colombia and Course Five – Morocco) but neither did so exclusively. Course Two provided additional reading to the assigned textbook chapter. The lecturer of Course Two stated that the decision to use a textbook was unusual in Colombia as articles and book chapters were preferred. However, they opted to use a textbook because each chapter was designed to give a coherent, compact overview of each theory perfectly suited as an introductory text for a novice student. Nevertheless, this course's sequencing of knowledge did not exactly follow that of the textbook and included theoretical perspectives not covered by the textbook. Course Three only used the first two chapters of the textbook for the first two lectures, respectively. In subsequent lectures it selected a variety of different types of texts from different sources. Thus, the textbook was used strictly to introduce the subject of IR theory and to provide students with a condensed overview of Realism and Liberalism. Course Seven (South Africa) used two Western introductory IR textbook. Both textbooks sequenced the Western IR theory they contained chronologically which was the sequence the course itself followed. All the other courses used a combination of journal articles and chapters from academic books. The reading material for Course 8 (Taiwan) was exclusively comprised of Western derived knowledge. The remainder of the courses reviewed included reading material that presented knowledge from both the West and global South. All courses that chose not to use a textbook stated that their decision was based on the fact that the knowledge they had selected, as well as their sequencing of this,

differed substantially from that found in the majority of IR textbooks available. This was identified as being particularly problematic by courses that wanted to incorporate knowledges from the global South beyond that of post-colonialism.

13.2.8 Assessment

Course One	Course Two	Course Three	Course Four	Course Five	Course Six	Course Seven	Course Eight	Course Nine
Colombia	Colombia	Germany	India	Morocco	Netherlands	South Africa	Taiwan	United States
Potentially knowledge plural	Potentially knowledge plural	Potentially knowledge plural	Knowledge plural	Potentially knowledge plural	Knowledge plural	Knowledge Plural	Western knowledge	Knowledge plural

Investigating the types of knowledge that students were required to engage with in their course assessments, it was found that assessments in four of the courses required students to work with a plurality of knowledges. Another four of the courses had assessments that were potentially knowledge plural because students were allowed to choose from a selection of topics. Depending on the students' choices, it was possible for the assessment to encompass a variety of knowledges but also it was equally possible to choose to focus only on one type. Only in Course Eight was the knowledge students were exposed to in their assessments exclusively Western. Interestingly, Course Seven which exclusively contained Western knowledge in terms of content, nevertheless had knowledge plural assessments. This may also indicate that dynamics are at play in the discursive gap resulting in this specific outcome. Thus, I decided to investigate this issue further in the semi-structured interviews.

13.3 Analysis of Course Aims or Objectives as State in Course Outlines

Course One's (Colombia) outline stated that its main objectives were to provide an understanding of the main theories of IR and equip students with critical tools through which to interrogate the scope of these theories. Further it sought to enable students to critically reflect on the theories developed in the Latin American region. The course wanted to develop students' capacity to use different theories to analyse international political events. Thus, it is evident the course desired to develop students' abilities not only to understand a wide range of theories but also to engage with them critically. Moreover, students were required to apply theories as tools of analysis. Although the course was inclusive of a wide range of theories, it placed an emphasis on theories derived from Latin America thereby validating this knowledge from the global South as worth knowing.

The outline for Course Two (Colombia) gave its primary objective as critically analysing the most recent theories and debates within the discipline of International Relations, including perspectives from the global South. It informed students that this process necessitated that they understand the main political, economic, and social concerns associated with the post -Cold War period as well as the critical self-reflection that has occurred within IR because of their influence. Consequently, the course further validated knowledges from the global South by listing students' engagement with these as a key objective. Moreover, it expressly framed its critical analysis of various IR theories within the regulative discourse of the post-Cold War era.

Course Three (Germany) did not set aims or objectives in its outline but instead provided students with guiding research questions to enable an analysis of the overall characteristics of each the theories examined. The questions sought to determine a) the distinct features of the theory; b) how these features were similar or different to other theories? c) how the theory envisaged the issue of international cooperation and the prospects for achieving this? d) what was the theory's epistemological or ontological premise? and e) the implications of using the theory in empirical research? These questions seemed designed to facilitate students' critical engagement which each theory. Further, the course outline stated that the course gave attention to the controversy between rationalist/neoliberal institutionalism and constructivist/sociological institutionalism. It further included critical theory-based approaches as well as post-colonial and non-Western theories. Thus, the course's objectives included students' engagement with knowledges from both the West and the global South.

Course Four's (India) outline defined its main objective as introducing Masters students to a diverse range of IR theories that include explanatory and normative paradigms. Further, it desired to provide a thorough background on the different schools of IR theory as well as the debates between them on the nature of international politics. It then intended to depict how international politics is conceptualised, understood, and judged by these theories bearing in mind their geo-cultural specificities. Students were also required to learn how to apply IR theories and related concepts as analytical tools to a range of global and regional issues. This was designed to develop skills that students can use in the workplace once they have graduated. Foregrounding geo-cultural influences on each theory selected, allowed the course to present the work of global South scholars related to the theories of Realism and Liberalism. Doing this also gave alternative readings as well as outcomes to those of Western scholars. Moreover, this

act validated the knowledge generated by global South scholars who are usually omitted from mainstream discussions on Realism and Liberalism as well as in curricula.

Course Five's (Morocco) objective was to introduce students to the contemporary debates and schools of IR theory. It further sought to create opportunities for students to reflect on these theories and approaches as well as their practical utility when applied to the real world. The course did not expressly make mention that it covered theories and concepts from the global South in addition to mainstream Western ones.

Course Six's (the Netherlands) outline stated that it aimed to provide students with an overview of the intellectual genesis and development of IR. It further sought to problematise the Western-centric nature of the field of IR as well as initiate a critical discussion on the benefits of incorporating previously marginalised voices. As part of this objective, it undertook to familiarise students with a range of non-Western contributions to IR. The course provided students with the opportunity to assess the explanatory capacity of different theories when applied to real-world phenomenon. Ultimately the course wanted to enable students to think creatively about different ways though which they could broaden their understanding of world politics. Additionally, it desired to develop students' abilities to read and think critically as well as analyse real-world problems in an abstract way. The objectives of this course were intrinsically linked to its critical engagement with decentring the disciplining and exploring theories and concepts from the global South. Problematising knowledge exclusivity as well as engagement with knowledges from the global South were key objectives of this course.

The theory section of Course Seven's (South Africa) outline stated that its objective was to develop students' understanding of the fundamental tenets of the theories of Idealism/Liberalism, Realism and Marxism. The course also wanted students to be able to describe the concepts of power and the international system. Related to these objectives would be the development of students critical thinking, analysis, and evaluation skills. As the course is an introductory course which only devotes two classes to IR theory, its objectives were understandably limited. They were also centred on Western IR theories exclusively.

Unfortunately, the course outline provided for Course Eight (Taiwan) did not set out any course objectives.

Course Nine's (the United States) outline listed its purpose as both narrowing and broadening the focus on international relations theory in comparison to those courses students

may have attended in previous years of study. It stated that the course's scope was narrow as it was entirely organised around post-colonial critiques of IR and the varying responses to these. This was to allow students time to digest the material in the seven and a half weeks assigned to the course. Further, it stated that the readings provided were designed to reinforce key points and deepen students understanding of the limited range of issues presented. However, the course was deemed to be broad in that it drew on a more geographically diverse range of authors encompassing philosophic knowledge beyond the Anglo-European. The engagement with this subject matter it was hoped would allow participants to better understand who they were in the world and who they may be in relation to others. The course's objectives placed emphasis on its focus being postcolonial critiques of IR, responses to these as well as philosophical knowledge from the global South.

Out of the eight courses that were analysed above, only two courses, namely Course Five (Morocco) and Course Seven (South Africa), did not identify the engagement with either knowledge from the global South or both the global South and West as a course aim or objective. Although this was not unexpected for Course Seven as it focused exclusively on Western IR theories, Course 5 contained knowledge from both the West and global South in its lectures yet this engagement with diverse knowledges was not identified as a course objective. Course 6 (the Netherlands) was the only course that expressly problematised the Western centricity of IR knowledge in its stated objectives even though Courses One and Two (both Colombia) devoted an entire lecture to this issue. Nevertheless, the fact that most of the courses did identify the engagement with knowledges from the global South or those of the global South and the West as a course aim was significant. As mentioned previously, assigning the engagement with knowledges from the global South as a course aim designates this knowledge as valid. In addition, it was evident that the regulative discourse in these courses has been responsive to the substantial shift currently occurring within the discipline in acknowledging the necessity of knowledge pluralism in the field of IR theory (Smith & Tickner 2020, Qin 2020). Further, in these six courses, the discursive gap seemed to facilitate the decision to deviate from the norm of the Western-centric IR theory course. Further, most courses also included as objectives the development of students' critical reasoning capacity as well as their ability to use theories to analyse real world scenarios. Thus, the 'ideal knower' in this context appeared to be a student who can interact critically with and apply a diverse range of knowledges beyond what they are familiar with.

Table Two – Content Analysis of Semi-Structured Interviews

Course One – Colombia	Course Two – Colombia	Course Three- Germany	Course Four- India	Course Five- Morocco	Course Six – The Netherlands	Course Seven - South Africa	Course Eight - Taiwan	Course Nine – The United States
*Classical Western programme. *Problematising Western dominance. *Dependency theory *Knowledge sequence and dominance especially with Realism becoming a foil to other theories *Dominance of English texts *Access to well translated Spanish texts. *Innovative, reflective pedagogy *Explanatory utility *Critical engagement *Challenge to get students enthusiastic *Relevance of theory *Practical application and analysis	*Interspersed Western canon, global South, critical IR theory. *Latin American theory *Global south theory epistemological divide. *Seeing the international & relations of power & domination on a global level. *Large amount of agency regarding curriculum design *Dominance of English in IR text *Access to well translated Spanish texts. Reflective pedagogy *Explaining versus understanding *Widening of students' intellectual horizons *Lack of students' enthusiasm for subject *Need to show relevance of subject to students *Theory as a lens through which to observe the world. *Queer IR theory engaged students the most	*Lecturers own experience as student – preference for germinal texts. *Traditional approach to teaching IR theory. *Content diversification to include global South *Reflective pedagogical practice. *Continuous curriculum review and development. *Relevance to students. *Exposure to wide range of ontologies & epistemologies *Relational thinking – connections between theories & concepts. *Critical engagement required *Challenge in getting students to enjoy course. *Heterogeneous student. cohort *Very engaged and active participation in seminars.	*IR canon. *Kautilya *Global South knowledge inclusive. *Dominance in sequencing of topics. *Dominance of realism's appeal *Redesigned and focused *Bureaucratic hindrances *Language and texts *Reflective pedagogical practice. *Enrichment of discourse *Theory as tool for understanding the world. *Developing abstract thinking *Critical/analytical Thinking *Challenge of keeping students engaged. *Link between theory and lived realities. Large class	*Canon importance. *Inclusion beyond canon. *Popularity of theories beyond the canon. . *Student selected content. *Sequencing determines value assigned to content. *Reflective pedagogy *Show alternative ways of thinking. *Enable students to draw own conclusions. *Critical engagement with content *Critical engagement with primary sources *Getting students to read *Field work – theory meets practical world. *Getting students to enjoy course is challenging. *Subject not seen a practical *Diversity	*Greater student engagement with non-Western IR theory *Critical engagement with Western theories *What is Western centric IR? *Difference *Universal *Alternative ways of looking at IR *African & Chinese contributions *Regional division in course structure – relational IR *Uniqueness *Cultural practice in domestic & foreign policy. *De-centre focus on Realism *Diverging from first year course curriculum. *Freedom in course design. *Re-telling of IR theories. Reflective pedagogy *Historical context. *Well educated student demographic	*Need to make course knowledge plural. *Large in terms of content. SAQA rules allowing for difference within a course. *American centric textbook. *Staff dispositions *Constrained by set curriculum *Deviation from set curriculum *Resequencing topics. *Assessment innovation Introducing new global South textbook. Reflective pedagogy *Reading intensive. *Initially hard to get students engaged. *Marginalised student cohort.	*Traditional course practice. *Dominance of Western IR theories of Realism and Liberalism in Taiwan. *Constructivism & Critical theory *Older staff members *Reluctance to introduce new topics. *Language *Text- access to good translations into Chinese – *"lost in translation problem." Reflective pedagogy *Deconstructing and reconstructing IR concepts *Hard to get Thinking & engaging critically was difficult for students. students engaged in classes. *Diverse class	*Carte blanche to design the course *Require familiarity with the vocabulary of IR *Need to understand language and concepts. *Reflective pedagogical practice. *Teaching from texts *Read better *Freedom to experiment *Critical reading *Trendiness in use of language. *Teaching from current events/issues *Globalised class context. *Small elite class teaching.

14. Content Analysis of Semi-Structured Interviews

Conducting a content analysis of my semi-structured interviews entailed multiple readings and attempts at synthesising a system of categorization that accurately reflected either points that were emphasized or repeated by the interviewee as well as content that resonated with the literature reviewed or directly addressed a key aspect of the research questions. I found that the most efficient way to do this was to create a table (see Table Two above) wherein I summarised the key points of each of the ten interviews. Key points were identified as issues that were emphasized, highlighted specifically, or repeated by interviewees. Placing the key points of each interview side-by-side in a table facilitated the identification of common themes across the data set. These were then labelled and assigned a colour code and are listed below.

14.1 Themes Emerging from Cross-section Content Analysis of the Data Set (see Table Two).

- Teaching Western IR theories
- Inclusion of knowledge beyond the West
- Sequencing knowledge
- Lecturer Agency
- Language
- Pedagogical practice
- Rationale for teaching IR theory
- Skills and learner dispositions requiring development
- Student engagement
- Student demographics

A detailed discussion of each identified theme identified from the semi-structured interviews follows below.

14.1.1 Teaching Western IR theories

As is evident from Table One, all the curricula reviewed engaged with Realism and Liberalism, and perhaps other Western IR theories in some way. When probed about their choices about the selection of Western IR theories some interviewees felt that the Western IR theories especially Realism and Liberalism constituted an important component of IR theory

and thus students' education would be incomplete if they omitted these theories. To do so they felt would negate the whole ethos of a knowledge plural IR theory curriculum. It was felt that instead of excluding these theories, they should instead be placed alongside or integrated with theories from the global South. Course Three's interviewee stated that the central place the IR canon occupied in their curriculum was influenced by the theory curricula that they had been exposed to as a student. Many of the curricula adopted a critical approach to Western IR theory, using it as a platform for initiating discussions of the Western-centric nature of IR theory and its shortcomings thereby raising the issue of IR theorising from the global South.

The interviewee from Taiwan (Course Eight) stated that at most Taiwanese Universities, the theories of Realism and Liberalism usually comprised the entire theory curricula because of the dominance of American thought in its academia. Thus, their course's introduction of Constructivism was seen as a radical move, breaking with this traditional dominance. A similar reason was given by the lecturer of Course Seven (South Africa) for its focus on the Realism, Liberalism and Structuralism. The lecturer, who was not the curricula designer, stated that this was the product of IR academics at their institution strongly subscribing to a traditional Western ideological vantage with respect to the study of the discipline.

14.1.2 Inclusion of knowledge beyond the West

In the analysis of course outlines performed in the previous section it has been established that eight curricula had elements of knowledge plurality, even if this was limited to its inclusion in course assessments. However, as the elements present in the discursive gap were usually unique to each course context, the types of knowledges from the global South as well as way in which they were incorporated were extremely varied.

Both curricula from South America (Course One and Course Two - Colombia) included dependency theory due to it having originated in the region. It was noted by both interviewees that this theory was now usually omitted from IR theory curricula in Latin America, as it was perceived as being dated and irrelevant having been developed in the 1960s. Its prominence has largely been usurped by Wallenstein's World System theory. Nevertheless, the lecturers of these courses felt that Dependency Theory still had enormous analytical value even beyond the context of their geographic region. For these reasons, they felt that it was paramount to include it in their curricula. The lecturer of Course Two stated that their research interests in knowledge pluralism in IR theory, theorising from the global South and critical IR theories was responsible

for the inclusion of these perspectives in the curriculum and made the teaching experience enjoyable. Although Course One dealt primarily with Western IR theories, the lecturer stated that their first class problematised the fact that IR was de facto an "American Social Science" and included Dependency Theory as well as Postcolonialism. The lecturer argued that these two theories were included to make students aware of other ways of conceiving of IR outside of Western IR theories. In addition, they felt that it was important to include these theories as they were more relevant for students from Latin America and the global South. Further, they wanted students to understand that most current IR theories have been developed from the experiences and vantage of the United States and that they should critically interrogate the abilities of these in helping explain or understand the international relations of Latin America. Inclusion of theories from both the global South and the West allowed students to appreciate that all IR theories have strengths and limitations and that they must be selected according to their utility within specific contexts.

In Course Four (India) the lecturer fused the work of Kautilya, an Indian Realpolitik scholar, with Western Realism to offer a different perspective on the implications of an anarchical international system. This curriculum further included Chinese philosophical slants on Neo-Realism. The lecturer stated, "the whole purpose of doing this was to show that IR theory does not by default mean Western IR theory only, even though this was where its academic roots originate". The course sought to introduces the idea that there were different ways of doing IR and not only one way of looking at IR theories.

The lecturer of Course Five (Morocco) chose to include the dominant Western IR theories of Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism because they had found that students had weak backgrounds in these theories. However, the lecturer also introduced critical Western IR theories. The second half of the course contained fundamentally different knowledge to that contained in traditional IR theory. It considered the power of knowledge regarding how knowledge originates in IR; a range of indigenous populations in broadening the definitions of IR germinal concepts; ideas pertaining to identity and difference as well as the problem of having a knowledge exclusive Western IR canon. Further the course included Edward Said's concept of Orientalism as part of its discussion on postcolonialism due its relevance to Morocco as part of the Maghrib and its strong resonance with students' context. Moreover, students had input into the course content as there was a negotiation between the lecturer and them as to what should be covered for that academic year.

Interestingly in 2010, Course Three (Germany) was transformed from a traditional Western theory course to a non-Western IR theory course. The rationale for this was that the lecturer was assisting one of their graduate students who was undertaking a research project on teaching non-Western IR theory. However, when the project was concluded the course's focus in subsequent years, shifted primarily to Western IR theory with two classes devoted to non-Western IR. The lecturer stated that this was driven by their preference for designing the course to resemble the theory classes that they attended when they were a student as well as including classical primary texts of Western IR philosophers. Nevertheless, the course still had two lectures devoted to non-Western IR. Thus, it was apparent that the course did not remain unaffected by the 2010 curriculum change.

Even though Course Six (Netherlands) was titled "Decentring International Relations", Western IR history, concepts and theories are still included to purposely facilitate a critical analysis of disciplinary knowledge exclusivity. Subsequently, the lecturer included knowledges from various locations in the global South in order to formulate a knowledge plural approach to theorising as well as to interrogate the utility of doing so. The lecturer stated that they constructed this postgraduate course to be a contrapuntal to the undergraduate theory course that was constituted solely of Western IR theories. Thus, they sought to present students with a more holistic and complex view of the field.

An important observation to emerge from the semi-structured interviews was that of the seven lecturers who identified one of their research interests as being either, non-Western IR/theory, relational IR, identity, and IR as well as IR of the global South[6], six had chosen to developed knowledge plural IR curricula. The lecturer in the outlier (Course Seven) was unfortunately constrained from incorporating a wider variety of theories and knowledges into the curriculum content because they were not its designer. Thus, it may be inferred that an interest in knowledge production in the areas listed was an element that operates in discursive gap and influences the regulative discourse in terms of prioritising knowledge plurality as a fundamental aim when developing an IR theory curriculum.

14.1.3 Sequencing

The importance of sequencing in encouraging students to engage with the knowledge plurality of the curriculum was raised in four interviews (Courses One, Four, Five and Six).

[6] All these topics consider IR beyond the West, the complexities of identity and/or the interaction of different populations across the globe.

Interviewees argued that theories were assigned different value by students depending on where they were sequenced in the curriculum. Theories that appeared at the beginning of the course were deemed to be of more analytical value than those at the end. For this reason, the lecturer of Course Five sequenced Gender Theory in the middle of the course. Further, in problematising a chronological approach to sequencing, two of the interviewees indicated that making Realism the first theory that students encountered in the curriculum resulted in it becoming their theory of choice when asked to use choose a theory by which to analyse a scenario. Moreover, it became the default theory that every other theory was juxtaposed or measured against. The simplicity of its precepts gave it additional appeal. Such was the prominence acquired by Realism in the undergraduate theory course that the lecturer of Course Six, a Master level course, found it essential that they expressly decentred the focus on Realism through critical engagement with it as well as making theories from the global South the focal point. The other lecturers stated that they either did not sequence Realism as the first theory in the curriculum and actively encouraged students to choose other theories for their essays.

14.1.4 Agency

Aside from the two courses that were co-taught, all other interviewees stated that they had freedom in terms of being unhindered from governmental, university or discipline interference in designing their courses. This was a fact that was especially emphasised by lecturers in Courses Two, Four, Six and Nine. For Courses Two, Four and Six this gave them leeway to create curricula that blended knowledges from both the West and the global South. It was further clear from the interviews that the decision to create knowledge plural IR curricula was a conscious choice by lecturers to transfer the knowledge plurality currently being created in the field of IR theory knowledge production over into the field of knowledge recontextualization. The lecturer from Course Nine felt that the exponential rise in the societal focus on the issue of "race" resulted in this being an optimal time to be involved in incorporating such subjects into IR. This was even more imperative with the rise of social movements focusing on race in the United States. Moreover, the lecturer of Course Four stated that they wanted to convey to students the current "churning" taking place in the discipline as the centrality of Western knowledge was challenged by theories from the global South, especially research focusing on the development of relational IR.

Course Four had been revised four times to define and refine its focus. The lecturer stated that when they took the course over in 2002, despite its title being "International

Relations Theory" the majority of the course content was not IR theory. Thus, they had to implement numerous curriculum redesigns to achieve its current knowledge plurality in terms of IR theories. Although the lecturer had *carte blanche* in the curriculum redesign, they stated that the fact that this was an arduous twenty-stage process, requiring the approval of all fifty-one colleges at the university, disincentivised one from undertaking such a procedure. Thus, a bureaucratic university practice such as this one, could *de facto* limit a lecturer's agency in designing or redesigning curricula.

Both the lecturers of Courses Seven and Eight, which were co-taught, had extremely limited agency to innovate regarding what they taught because they had neither designed the course nor had a co-ordinating role in the course. The lecturer of Course Eight attested that the older, more senior members of staff who designed and coordinated the course were extremely reluctant to introduce new topics or theories. Thus, if it were not for them being available to teach Constructivism as well as their interest in Chinese philosophy that relates to this theory, the course would teach Realism and Liberalism exclusively. An interesting innovation in the use of agency was that the lecturer of Course Seven invoked a South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA) rule that states that only fifty percent of the content of co-taught courses need be the same. They used this clause to reclaim some agency in order to be able to re-sequence the course content and redesign the class assessments. They have used this as an opportunity to include knowledges from the global South in the class assessments partly to realise their personal belief that the curriculum should be knowledge plural. Further, they have also convinced the curriculum co-ordinators to switch from an American-centric IR textbook to one where the discipline was contextualised from the global South in 2021. This was an excellent example of the discursive gap being utilised to place a curriculum on a more knowledge plural trajectory.

14.1.5 Language

The interviewees from Colombia (Courses One and Two), India (Course Four) and Taiwan (Course Eight) raised language as an impediment to curricula knowledge plurality. The issue with language being an impediment to knowledge plurality stems from English being the primary language of publication of International Relations knowledge. In India, as the course was presented at a central (national) university it was taught in English. However, at least seventy percent of the class were first language Hindi speakers. There were also numerous foreign students who are second language English speakers. Thus, the English proficiency of

the class was extremely diverse. Taking cognisance of this has necessitated that the lecturer selects English reading material of different complexity to cater to the different English language abilities of students. What made this problematic was that there were no good quality textbooks or texts available in Hindi. This limited the range of knowledges that students who were not proficient in English could be exposed.

The lecturers of the courses in Colombia (Courses One and Two) and Taiwan (Course Eight) encountered the same problem. There was an extremely limited amount of IR texts, in the form of both books and articles, translated into Spanish or Chinese. In addition, the quality of translation was erratic with many texts being of a poor quality resulting in students acquiring a diminished understanding of the knowledge that it was attempting to impart. Consequently, students' ability to engage with diverse knowledge was ultimately dependent on their proficiency in English. Thus, this factor potentially limited the range of knowledge plurality in contexts where English was not spoken or was a secondary language. Significantly, it also had reverse implications, in that knowledge that was not published or translated into English was less able to contribute to the knowledge diversity of the discipline as the vast majority of IR publications are produced in English.

14.1.6 Pedagogical practice

In every interview conducted for this research report, interviewees demonstrated that they were strongly committed to reflective teaching practices. They constantly reflected on and reviewed their course content, how this was sequenced, their prescribed readings and assessments to ensure that they were meeting their defined learning objectives. Except for the two interviewees (Courses Three and Nine) who were retiring at the end of the academic year, most desired to add greater knowledge diversity to their curricula. Further, the interviews revealed that at least half of the interviewees expressed an interest in the pedagogical aspect of academia. Finally, all those surveyed stated that irrespective of the challenges encountered, they enjoyed lecturing their IR theory course.

14.1.7 Rationale for teaching IR theory

Interviewees emphasized the importance of teaching theory especially with a plurality of knowledges. They felt that it enabled students to appreciate and study an extremely diverse, complex world. Further, it resulted in students developing an analytical vocabulary through which to define, describe and analyse international relations. It widened their intellectual

horizons and necessitated them developing alternative ways of thinking. Studying theory required that students read intensively and engage with a wide range of content as well as develop relational thinking through their critical engagement with different ideas. Theories gave students the tools to analyse international relations in a coherent, structured process, culminating in the ability to draw conclusion. Knowledge plural theory curricula exposed students to a wide range of ontologies and epistemologies. Being exposed to a wide variety of knowledges gave students the flexibility to experiment with different ways of explaining and/or understanding international relations in particular contexts.

14.1.8 Skills and learner dispositions requiring development

Linked to the discussion above, interviewees stated that the development of specific skills as well as learner dispositions were essential parts of a successful IR theory curriculum. Critical thinking and engagement with knowledge were at the top of the list of skills that the courses reviewed wanted to get students to develop. Students were also required to function at a high level of abstraction given the nature of the subject. Further mastering new vocabularies and concepts needed to take place, in addition to learning to read complex texts critically. The interaction between theory and historical or cultural contexts also needed to be appreciated. Consequently, numerous opportunities were given in all the reviewed courses for students to develop these skills.

14.1.9 Student Engagement

Most interviewees noted that it was initially a challenge to get students to be enthusiastic about studying IR theory. This was due to the perception that theory was not practical and that it had no real-world relevance. Correcting this misperception entailed getting students to apply theories as analytical tools to real-life events, both everyday life occurrences as well as international relations events. Ultimately linking the theoretical to the practical facilitated greater student engagement and enthusiasm for these courses. Aside from this problem, students in Course 8 found being required by the course to think and engage with the material critically to be difficult as these were not skills that they had needed to use before.

The lecturer of Course Six stated that students found the knowledge plural curriculum with its focus on non-Western IR theory extremely interesting and engaging. After overcoming their initial reluctance to studying theory, it was claimed that students in Course Three became active, engaged participants in the course. For students in Course Two it was Queer IR theory, which draws from a diverse range of knowledges that sparked the greatest engagement.

14.1.10 Student Demographics

Reflecting the extent to which higher education institutions are globalised today, all the courses reviewed had diverse student populations in terms of ethnicity and socioeconomic indicators. This seemed to have an impact on how students engaged with the knowledge and skills encompassed in the curricula. It was noted that students from Course Six, particularly enjoyed the course on non-Western IR theory as they had already studied the theories of Realism, Liberalism and Marxism in their high school curriculum. Thus, they were happy not to be repeating this content for the third time, having been made to take an undergraduate theory course which re-covered this ground. They found the Masters course more interesting than those taken previously as it presented a holistic and contextual picture of IR theory. Students in Course Nine has a similar experience. The course was taught at a small, private college in the United States. Consequently, the well-educated student body enabled the lecturer to introduce sophisticated and complex topics drawing on a diverse range of knowledges. The course was designed to encourage students to become better thinkers and writers. In contrast, Course Seven was comprised of learners from socioeconomic marginalised populations. In this context, students found it harder to engage with the course content as well as master the necessary academic skills. While this course's assessments incorporated knowledge plurality, they had to be highly scaffolded to assist the students in completing them. The lecturer reported that students seemed ambivalent to this inclusion of knowledges from the global South, being more focused on developing the academic skills needed to complete the assessment task. Thus, in this context having knowledge plurality did not automatically make the skills required by the curriculum easier to master.

14.2 Content Analysis of Semi-Structured Interviews: Summary of Findings

From the semi-structured interviews there appeared to be a consensus that Western IR theories should still constitute part of an IR theory curriculum and that students would be at a deficit if they did not study these theories. However, in a knowledge plural curriculum, the central or exclusive position of these theories shifts, with them now co-existing with relevant theories or concepts from the global South. Further, the contexts within which the courses reviewed were situated, introduced important elements into the discursive gap, shaping the regulative discourse and culminating in unique ways of realising knowledge plurality. Participating in the field of knowledge production connected to non-Western IR theory or the IR of the global South seemed also to encourage academics in developing knowledge plural IR theory curricula, often integrating the knowledge they had developed.

Having the freedom to design a knowledge plural curriculum has been shown to be imperative for this objective to be achieved. This freedom may be constrained or facilitated by institutional forces that have a regulatory or oversight role over curricula design. Nevertheless, by engaging with these forces creatively, agency can be enhanced to the extent that the goal of a knowledge plural curriculum can be achieved, albeit in a limited way.

How knowledge was sequenced was found to play a role in determining the significance or importance it assumes for the student. Content sequenced at the beginning to the course was perceived by students to be more important than that scheduled at the end of the course. Sequencing theories chronologically, beginning with Realism and Liberalism, serves to reinforce the centrality of these in the minds of students. Thus, this may diminish the intended impact of a knowledge plural curriculum if knowledges from the global South are sequenced at the end of the course. Consequently, the issue of sequencing must be carefully considered if this phenomenon is to be mitigated.

Monolingual nature of IR particularly in terms of the publication of IR knowledge denies people who are not proficient in English access to the full range of knowledge. It also potentially excludes knowledges that are produced in other languages from being fully integrated into the field of knowledge production. Both these factors therefore limit the degree to with knowledge plurality can be realised. Rectifying this entails making publications available in a variety of languages and ensuring high quality translations. A more fundamental solution would be to develop a culture of multilingualism within IR academia.

All interviewees were actively engaged in reflective teaching practices, continuously reviewing the effectiveness of their pedagogy and curriculum. Further, interviewees believed that teaching IR theory was vital in developing students' ability to analyse, comprehend and engage with an increasingly complex globalised world in a systematic and structured way. Being exposed to a wide variety of theories further increased these abilities. The subject also cultivated students' capacity to read and think critically. However, students did not always have an automatic affinity for the subject, needing to be first convinced of its relevance and utility. The inclusion of theories beyond the Western IR canon seemed to encourage student engagement and participation. Student engagement also seemed to be linked to student

demographics with students from more privileged Western educational background demonstrating greater engagement with and enthusiasm for knowledge plural theory curricula.

15. A Critical Realist analysis of the affordances & constraints to the creation of knowledge plural IR curricula as identified in the course and interview analyses

This research report has chosen to employ Bernstein's pedagogic device as a generative mechanism that is able to reveal important elements that influence the construction and execution of curricula that normally remain occluded. Another utility of the pedagogic device is that it acts as a systematic guide for examining how knowledge is transformed and reconstituted and finally assumes its uniquely assigned purpose or role as it is pedagogised. The application of the pedagogic device brings into focus the individual components operating in this complex process and the respective roles that they play. Thus, from a critical realist perspective, the pedagogic device provides a way to study those elements that produce concrete outcomes but are not themselves automatically visible to researchers. Significantly, in the context of this study, the pedagogic device unveils the affordances and constraints to delivering knowledge plural IR curricula. Evaluating these affordances and constraints provides an opportunity to determine what agents and structures give rise to these as well as whether the Western knowledge status quo is being maintained, challenged, or supplanted by the curricula examined in this study thereby engaging with the 'critical' component of critical realism. Thus, I will now collectively examine the affordances and constraints to the construction of knowledge plural curricula which emerged through the application of the pedagogic device as an analytical tool to the findings of my content analyses of course outlines and semi-structured interviews. This exercise will not only satisfy the application of the critical realist stance adopted by this research to my data but also provide the answers to my two research sub-questions which were:

1. How has the demand for knowledge plurality in the area of IR theory been translated into knowledge plural IR theory curricula, in the context of the curricula reviewed for this study?
2. How have proponents of knowledge plural IR theory curricula worked within the discursive gap to achieve this objective?

15.1 Affordances and Constraints in the Field of Knowledge Production

The literature review indicated that there is currently a concerted movement demanding that knowledge from the global South be recognised as valid knowledge within IR, especially by being published by mainstream Western publishers. Although progress in this area has been slow, momentum towards achieving this goal is increasing (Qin 2020). Thus, in the field of IR theory knowledge production there is growing body of published research from the global South that is available for selection and incorporation into curricula from mainstream academic publications. This is an important step in conferring validity on this knowledge.

Language was identified as a constraint in being able to access knowledge for inclusion in curricula. English being the dominant language of publication meant that this knowledge was only available to students who were proficient in English. Moreover, the quantity and quality of academic literature translated from English into other languages was extremely limited. Conversely scholars who did not publish in English would find it difficult to have their work included in mainstream Western publications thereby limiting the extent of its distribution. Thus, even though there has been a more opportunities for the publication of knowledges from the global South especially those that diverge from the dominant Western epistemology of positivism there are still constraints imposed by agents and structures that operate in the field of knowledge production - language being one of these. Moreover, one of the interviewees who assisted in editing a large Western IR journal still found peer reviewers to be extremely critical of articles containing knowledges from the global South that did not subscribe to mainstream Western ontological and epistemological practices.

It was further observed that most interviewees had a research interest in de-centring IR, global IR theory or IR theory knowledge from the global South and were producing knowledge by publishing in these areas. In contrast to the studies conducted by Tickner (2003) and Barasuol and Silva (2016) that found in a Latin American context that even though academics research interests included knowledge from their region (the global South), they did not include this knowledge in the curricula they taught, this research report had divergent findings. Most interviewees who had research interests pertaining to knowledges from the global South, had also included knowledges from the global South in their curricula. Thus, their commitment to knowledge plurality was not limited to their actions within the field of knowledge production but transferred across into the field of knowledge recontextualization.

15.2 Affordances and Constraints in the Field of Knowledge Recontextualisation

It was evident from the semi-structured interviews and the content analysis of courses' aims or objective was that the decision to include knowledge from the global South in curricula arose from the interviewee's express desire to disrupt the status quo of Western knowledge exclusivity in IR theory curricula. In addition, the six interviewees who had developed knowledge plural curricula chose to include Western IR theories as well. However, their motivation for doing so differed. Many argued that Western IR theory still constituted a significant component of IR theory. Thus, for students to have a firm grounding in IR theory they needed a curriculum that combined knowledges from the West and global South and included theories with different epistemological stances. This stance aligns with Acharya's (2014) vision of producing global IR theory where knowledges from different geographic locations would co-exist. Other courses used Western IR theory to frame a discussion problematising the current Western-centric nature of IR theory which then proceeded to critically examine alternative perspectives from the global South. Individual agency played an important role in the extent to which interviewees had freedom of choice in designing and executing their curricula. In the two curricula that were co-taught, interviewees lacked the capacity to introduce knowledge from the global South into the curricula as their assigned role of lecturer deprived them from being party to knowledge selection for the course. This was despite the fact that both personally felt that knowledge plurality in IR theory curricula was imperative.

Interviewees' decisions to create knowledge plural curricula were not made in isolation. They were shaped by social and disciplinary catalysts. As previously stated, the de-Westernization and decolonization of IR knowledge was an increasingly central academic concern. Further impetus has been provided by social movements such as 'fees must fall', 'Rhodes must fall' and 'black lives matter' that provide platforms for debates on racism, equity, colonialism, neo-colonialism, decolonisation, and social justice. Thus, the regulative discourse in which most of the interviewees are immersed was conducive to encouraging their knowledge plural curricula ventures. It is important to note the influence the development of these disposition have on determining how interviewees, as recontextualising agents, ultimately chose to use the discursive gap. Nevertheless, social, and disciplinary catalysts in specific contexts may also constrain freedom of choice. The strong influence of the American theoretical tradition at Taiwan tertiary institutions has resulted in curricula being confined to teaching Realism and Liberalism almost exclusively thereby reinforcing the Western

theoretical status quo. In addition, agency to develop knowledge plural curricula may be facilitated or hindered by structures guiding, overseeing, and certifying the design or re-design of academic courses at both tertiary institutions and at state level. Overly bureaucratic, time consuming and complex processes can act as disincentives for undertaking course or curricula design initiatives thereby perpetuating the knowledge status quo. In the quest to increase knowledge plurality in IR theory courses such situations would pose substantial constraints.

The opportunities provided by the discursive gap to imagine knowledge plural, critical IR theory curricula produced a myriad of innovations in how most interviewees selected knowledge. What was notable was the careful selection of reading material in introducing knowledges beyond the West. In Course Four (India) the lecturer mixed in marginalised Realist and Liberalist theorists from the global South with key Western Realist and Liberalist scholars. The lecturers of Courses One, Two and Six immediately problematised the Western-centric nature of IR theory, setting a critical tone for their course as well as demonstrating the necessity for incorporating knowledges from the global South. Courses One and Two's lecturers made the concerted decision to include Dependency Theory believing that it held special relevance for Latin American students even though it was usually excluded from IR theory curricula from the region. Course Five's lecturer expressly included Said's Orientalism due its relevance for students from Morocco. Further, this course let students select the topics that they wanted to study. Course Nine's lecturer chose to select and sequence knowledge around post-colonial critiques of IR in order to problematise the Western exclusivity of knowledge populating IR theories and then introduce knowledges from the global South. In course 8, even though the lecturer did not have the agency to include knowledge from the global South as part of the theory lectures, they used South African Qualification Authority (SAQA) rules guiding the extent to which different lecturers of the same course can diverge in their teaching to create knowledge plural assessments.

Interviewees from Courses One, Four, Five and Six indicated that the order within which knowledge was sequenced within curricula determined the degree of validity students ascribed to it. Knowledge sequenced at the beginning of the curriculum was deemed by students to be more important and relevant than that placed towards the end. Thus, decisions to teach IR chronologically, beginning with Realism and Liberalism and placing post-positivist Western theories or knowledges from the global South at the end, exponentially elevated the validity afforded to the already dominant theories of Realism and Liberalism. Consequently, it

appears that it is not just the inclusion in curricula that bestows validity on knowledge but also where it is situate in position to other theories.

The critical engagement with a diverse range of knowledges on the part of students emerged as a central feature of the instructional discourse in the majority of courses. This was clearly grounded in the regulative discourse of most of the courses that was strongly influenced by counter-hegemonic movements both within the discipline as well as society, as noted earlier in this section.

15.3 Affordances and Constraints in the Field of Knowledge Reproduction

All interviewees believed that teaching IR theory was an important undertaking and were actively committed to this exercise. They all practiced reflective pedagogy, constantly reviewing their teaching practices and curriculum composition, especially the reading material selected, to ensure that it was producing optimal student engagement and learning. Interviewees felt that they had the responsibility to facilitate students' critical engagement with the curricula's knowledge through their pedagogical practice as well as curricula and assessment design. Further, they sought to produce students who could think abstractly when exploring a theory but were also able to practically apply a theory to analyse a real-life case study. Exposing students to a wide range of theories and knowledges was seen as equipping students with the capacity to engage with the complexities of the current globalised international system. Aside for the two interviewees that were retiring, everyone else stated that wanted to incorporate more knowledge diversity in their curriculum. The fact that half of the interviewees acknowledged that they had an academic interest in pedagogic practice was a testament to how seriously they viewed their role as educators. All interviewees stated that they enjoyed teaching IR theory, viewing this as a positive undertaking which undoubtedly explains their commitment to this endeavour.

The choices made regarding what knowledge to assess as well as the ways in which this knowledge is assessed reinforces the validity of this knowledge as well as what constitutes valid ways of knowing. In all but one course (Course Eight) interviewees had the freedom to determine what knowledge to evaluate and the format this evaluation would take. Four courses assessed knowledge from both the West and global South. In the remaining four courses, assessments included both knowledge from the West and global South. However, the range of knowledges assessed depended on which assignments students chose to complete. Thus, most interviewees chose to assess a plurality of knowledges in their courses. Lecturers in Courses

One, Four and Five required students to apply theories to real-life scenarios so that students would appreciate theories as practical tools of analysis not abstract ideations.

Most interviewees identified students' lack of enthusiasm as a constraint when teaching their IR theory courses. Students initially struggled to see the relevance as well as the significance of studying theory in providing them with knowledge and skills that would assist them when leaving university. It took a concerted effort on the part of lecturers to convince students of the enormous benefits gained by studying theory not just in gaining knowledge but also the vital academic skills of critical reasoning and analytical thought. In Course 8 students found acquiring these new higher order academic skills challenging because they had not been demanded in other courses. As already stated, lecturers in courses One, Four and Five required students to practically apply theories to real-life situations so that students would develop an appreciation of the insights that this could provide. Ultimately, interviewees stated that the reluctance to learn IR theory was short lived with students quickly becoming active participants in seminars (Courses Three and Nine). The focus on knowledge from the global South in course Six was attributed as the reason for the high degree of student engagement and participation from its start.

On a related point, the socioeconomic environment within which students were located also played a part in affording or constraining student appreciation of and engagement with knowledge plural IR theory courses. In Course Six students had been exposed to IR theory in their schooling as well as in their first year of university. Thus, they had already familiar with Western IR theories and had acquired the capacity to think theoretically. Hence, they were equipped for the sophisticate level of engagement with unfamiliar knowledges from the global South. The small, well-resourced teaching environment within which Course Nine was situated together with its predominantly socioeconomically well-resourced student cohort provided a conducive for the delivery of a knowledge-diverse, critical IR theory course. Students were excited to engage with and critique a complex range of often unfamiliar knowledge from diverse sources. The socioeconomic vulnerability of students in Course Seven which had hindered their academic preparedness for tertiary, resulted in most students being ambivalent to the inclusion of knowledge for the global South in their assessment. Instead, their focus was directed to solely trying to master the academic skills that they believed they required to pass.

16. Conclusion

In conclusion, this research report has clearly demonstrated that the demand for knowledge plurality in the realm of IR theory research has made inroads into the arena of pedagogy resulting in the generation of knowledge plural IR theory curricula. Seven out of the nine courses examined had knowledge plural curricula. Moreover, the content analysis conducted on the course outline and semi-structured interviews with lectures indicated a strong commitment to the goal of knowledge plurality within these IR theory curricula. Using the pedagogic device as an analytical tool, this research report was further able to decipher the mechanism affording or constraining the shift toward knowledge plural IR theory curricula. It is now apparent that knowledge plurality is no longer limited to the production of IR theory knowledge. This knowledge is being pedagogised and included in curricula. Although, we cannot extrapolate from this small, qualitative study that a large shift to knowledge plural IR theory curricula is occurring across the globe, it indicates that there is indeed a concerted movement in this direction. Moreover, through the deployment of the pedagogic device, this study demonstrated that there is a definite counter-hegemonic shift against the status quo of Western knowledge exclusive IR theory curricula. Thus, the main research question, namely, 'Has the demand for knowledge plurality in the realm of IR theory research made inroads into the arena of pedagogy resulting in the generation of knowledge plural IR theory curricula?' can within the context of this research be answered in the affirmative.

Nevertheless, if the objective of knowledge plural IR theory curricula is to become the norm, then attention needs to be paid to the affordances and constraints identified by this research report. The affordances identified need to be encouraged and developed. Further the constraints that emerged need to be addressed and ameliorated. Specifically, the production of a wide range of knowledges from the global South need to be a priority, with greater access being afforded to this knowledge in mainstream IR publications and intellectual gatherings. Greater opportunities to produce and translate scholarship into a wide variety of languages would also expand the range of knowledge available.

In designing and teaching IR theory curricula, lecturers should be allowed the agency to create innovative, engaging learning environments that address the particular interests and needs of the unique student cohort they teach. Such agency allowed the lecturers interviewed for this study to use the discursive gap to challenge the Western knowledge status quo of IR theory. Moreover, this research has shown how agency is strongly is affected by the regulative

discourse that is shaped by the zeitgeist present in both education institutions and the wider societies within which they are situated. This milieu can either facilitate or impede the creation of knowledge plural IR theory curricula.

Further, this research report has provided some excellent exemplars of a variety of ways in which a knowledge plural IR theory curriculum can be developed. Hopefully these will spark an imagination for the possible among those educators who are contemplating a shift to this type of curricula as well as those that have yet to contemplate the importance of such curricula for the discipline.

As curricula plays a pivotal role determining the types of knowledges students are exposed to as well as reinforcing its validity, only through the global adoption of knowledge plural IR theory curricula will the current hegemony enjoyed by Western knowledge be truly displaced. Until such time that the equal co-existence of a plurality of knowledges in the field of IR theory exists, it cannot truly claim to be facilitating our investigation and understanding of 'international' relations.

Appendix One

Semi-structured In-Depth Questionnaire

Educational Biographic

- Where did you study for your undergraduate degree?
- Where did you study for your PhD?
- What are your current areas of research?

General Course Information

- How long have you been lecturing the course?
- Where is the IR theory course that you lecture situated within the entire International Relations curriculum at your institution?
- How long is the duration of the course?
- What are the texts or textbooks that you use for your course?
    - Why were these chosen?
- Were you asked to teach the IR theory course, or did you volunteer?
- Was it a course a pre-existing one or did you design the curriculum from scratch yourself?
    - If pre-existing where you allowed to make changes?
    - If "yes", what changes have you made to the course?
    - If "no", why were you not allowed to make any changes?
    - If "no", what changes would you make if you were allowed?
- What do you enjoy most about teaching this course?
- What are biggest challenges you encounter in teaching this course?

Course Content

- Can you briefly take me through the course content?
    - What are the aims or objectives of your course in terms the knowledge and academic skills you wish your students to develop in this course?
    - Are there any other characteristics or capacities that you would like your IR theory curriculum to instil in students?
    - What types of IR concepts and theories are included in your course?

- What factors have influenced your decision as to which concepts theories to include in course as well as when you introduce them?
- How have you sequenced the presentation of the concepts and theories contained in your course?
- What tasks, activities and assessments are given to students and what are their purpose? Are these different from the ones required of you when you were a student at this level?
- Are there any innovations or practices that you employ that students have responded to particularly well?
- How do students in general respond to the course in terms of interest and engagement with the material?
- Have you had any feedback from colleagues regarding this course?

<u>Future ideas for the course?</u>

- What you further goals, ideas or ambitions do you have for your IR theory course?

Bibliography

Acharya, A. (2014). Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds: A New Agenda for International Studies. *International studies quarterly*, *58*(4), 647-659.

Acharya, A., & Buzan, B. (2017). Why is there no non-western international relations theory? Ten years on. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, *17*(3), 341-370.

Acharya, A., & Buzan, B. (2007). Why is there no non-Western international relations theory? An introduction. *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, *7*(3), 287-312.

Andrews, N. (2020). International Relations (IR) Pedagogy, Dialogue and Diversity: Taking the IR Course Syllabus Seriously. *All Azimuth: A Journal of Foreign Policy & Peace*, *9*(2).

Aydinli, E., & Mathews, J. (2000). Are the core and periphery irreconcilable? The curious world of publishing in contemporary international relations. *International Studies Perspectives*, *1*(3), 289-303.

Barasuol, F., & Silva, A. R. D. (2016). International Relations Theory in Brazil: trends and challenges in teaching and research. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, *59*(2), 1-20.

Bernstein, B. B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control, and identity: Theory, research, critique* (No. 4). Rowman & Littlefield, Maryland.

Bernstein, B. (1975). *Class, Codes and Control. Volume 3: Towards a Theory of Educational Transmissions.* Routledge and Kegan Paul, London

Behera, N.C. (2016). Knowledge Production. *International Studies Review*, doi: 10.1093/isr/viv024, 153-155

Blaney, D.L. (2020*) "Where, when and what is IR?"* In International Relations from the Global South: Worlds of Difference. (eds) Arlene B Tickner & Karen Smith, Routledge, Oxon.

Blaney, D. L. (2002). Global education, disempowerment, and curricula for a world politics. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *6*(3), 268-282

Blaney, D. L., & Inayatullah, N. (2008). International Relations from below. In the Oxford Handbook of Relations eds C Reus-Smith & D Snidal, Oxford University Press, UK

Blaney, D. L., & Tickner, A. B. (2017a). Worlding, Ontological Politics and the Possibility of a Decolonial IR. *Millennium*, 45(3) 293-311

Blaney, D. L., and Tickner AB. (2017b)"International Relations in the prison of colonial modernity." *International Relations* 31, no. 1, 71-75

Blaney, D. L. & Tickner A.B. (2013). Introduction: claiming the international beyond IR. In *Claiming the International*, (eds) Arlene B Tickner, A. B. & David L Blaney, Routledge, Oxon.

Brown, C. & Ainley, K. (2009) Understanding International Relations. 4th Edition, Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke.

Brown, G. (2009) "The ontological turn in education: the place of the learning environment." *Journal of Critical Realism* 8, (1), 5-34.

Bryman, A. (2012) Social Research Methods. 4th Edition Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Chowdhry, G. (2007). Edward Said and contrapuntal reading: Implications for critical interventions in international relations. *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, *36*(1), 101-116

Dunne, T. Kurki, M. & Smith, S. (2013) International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures* (Vol. 5019). Basic books.

Hays, S. (1994). Structure and agency and the sticky problem of culture. *Sociological theory*, 57-72

Hoffmann, S. (1977). "An American Social Science: International Relations." Daedalus 106(3), 41-60

Hovey, R. (2004). Critical pedagogy and international studies: Reconstructing knowledge through dialogue with the subaltern. *International Relations*, *18*(2), 241-254.

Fairclough, N., Jessop, B., & Sayer, A. (2002). Critical realism and semiosis. *Alethia*, *5*(1), 2-10.

Hutchings, K. (2019). Decolonizing global ethics: thinking with the Pluriverse. *Ethics & International Affairs*, *33*(2), 115-125.

Inoue, C & Tickner A.B. (2016) Many worlds, Many theories. *Revista Brasileira de Politica Internactional* 59(2), 1-4.

ISA Report, ISA Task Force on The Global South –Resolutions accessed at https://www.isanet.org/Portals/0/Documents/GlobalSouth/2018_GSTaskForceReportforGC.pdf

Jessop, B. (2005). Critical realism and the strategic-relational approach. *New Formations*, *56*(56), 40-53.

Krippendorff, K. (1989). Content analysis. In E. Barnouw, G. Gerbner, W. Schramm, T. L. Worth, & L. Gross (Eds.), International Encyclopaedia of Communication Oxford University Press. New York

Krippendorff, K. (2019). Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology. 4th Edition Sage. California

Kurki, M. & Wight, C. (2013) "International Relations and Social Science". In in *International Relations Theory* (eds) Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki & Steve Smith. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Law, J. (2015). What's wrong with a one-world world? *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory*, 16(1) 126-139

Levine, D. J., & McCourt, D. M. (2018). Why does pluralism matter when we study politics? A view from contemporary international relations. *Perspectives on Politics*, *16*(1), 92-109.

Lim, L. (2017). Regulating the unthinkable: Bernstein's pedagogic device and the paradox of control. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, *26*(4), 353-374.

Liu, T. T. T. (2016). Teaching IR to the Global South: Some Reflections and Insights. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, *59*(2) 1-20.

Luckett, K. (2009). The relationship between knowledge structure and curriculum: A case study in sociology. *Studies in Higher Education*, *34*(4), 441-453.

Maruyama, M. (1981) Endogenous research: rationale, in P. Reason & J. Rowan (eds.) *Human Inquiry: A sourcebook of New Paradigm Research*, Chichester, UK: John Wiley.

Maton, K. (2006). On knowledge structures and knower structures. *Knowledge, power, and educational reform: Applying the sociology of Basil Bernstein*, 44-59.

McLean, M., Abbas, A., & Ashwin, P. (2013). The use and value of Bernstein's work in studying (in) equalities in undergraduate social science education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *34*(2), 262-280.

Mignolo, W. (2011). *The darker side of western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Duke University Press.

Mignolo, W. D. (2009) "Epistemic Disobedience, Independent thought and Decolonial Freedom." *Theory, Culture & Society* 26, 7(8), 159-181.

Moore, R., & Muller, J. (2002). The growth of knowledge and the discursive gap. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *23*(4), 627-637.

Odoom, I., & Andrews, N. (2016). What/who is still missing in International Relations scholarship? Situating Africa as an agent in IR theorising. *Third World Quarterly*, 1-19.

Pashakhanlou, A. H. (2017). Fully integrated content analysis in international relations. *International Relations*, *31*(4), 447-465.

Querejazu, A. (2016) Encountering the pluriverse: Looking for alternatives in other worlds. *Revista Brasileira Politica Internacional*, 59(2), 1-16

Qin, Y. (2020). Introduction: The global turn in IR and non-Western IR theory. In *Globalizing IR theory: critical engagement*. (ed) Yaqing Qin, Routledge, Oxon.

Reus-Smit, C. & Snidal, D. (2008) “Between Utopia and Reality: The practical discourses of International Relations”. In the *Oxford Handbook of Relations* (eds) C Reus-Smit & D Snidal, Oxford University Press, UK

Rojas, C. (2016). Contesting the Colonial Logics of the International: Towards a Relational Politics for the Pluriverse. *International Political Sociology* 10, 369-382

Rosenberg, J. (2016) "International Relations in the prison of Political Science." *International Relations* 30 (2), 127-153.

Rutzou, T. (2016) Critical Realism. Criticalrealismnetwork.org

Sousa Santos, B. (2015). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. Routledge.

Sousa Santos, B. (2012). Public sphere and epistemologies of the South. *Africa Development*, *37*(1), 43-67.

Santos, B. S. (2007) “Beyond Abyssal Thinking: From Global Lines to Ecologies of Knowledges.” *Review (Fernand Braudel Centre)* 30 (1), 45-89.

Shay, S. (2015). Curricula at the boundaries. *Higher education*, *71*(6), 767-779.

Shay, S. (2011). Curriculum formation: A case study from history. *Studies in Higher Education*, *36*(3), 315-329.

Singh, P. (2002). Pedagogising knowledge: Bernstein's theory of the pedagogic device. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *23*(4), 571-582.

Smith, S. (2013). Introduction: Diversity and Disciplinarity in International Relations Theory in *International Relations Theory* (eds) Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki & Steve Smith. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Smith, K. & Tickner, A.B. (2020) Introduction: International Relations from the global South. In *International Relations from the Global South: Worlds of Difference.* (eds) Arlene B Tickner & Karen Smith, Routledge, Oxon.

Tickner, A. B. (2003a). Hearing Latin American voices in international relations studies. *International Studies Perspectives*, *4*(4), 325-350.

Tickner, A.B. (2003b). Seeing IR differently: notes from the Third World. *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, *32*(2), 295-324

Tickner, A.B & Blaney, D.L. (2012). Introduction: Thinking difference. In *Thinking International Relations Differently* (eds) Arlene B. Tickner & David L. Blaney, Routledge, Oxon

Tickner, A.B. & Querejazu, A. (2021). “Weaving Worlds: Cosmopraxis as Relational Sensibility.” *International Studies Review*, 1-18

Vale, P. & Thakur, V. (2020) “IR and the making of the white man’s world”. *In International Relations from the Global South: Worlds of Difference.* (eds) Arlene B Tickner & Karen Smith, Routledge, Oxon.

Waever, O. (1998). The sociology of a not so international discipline: American and European developments in international relations. *International organization*, *52*(04), 687-727.

Wemheuer-Vogelaar, W. Bell, N.J. Navarrete Morales, M. & Tierney, M.J. (20016). The IR of the Beholder: Examining Global IR Using the 2014 TRIP Survey. *International Studies Review,* 18, 16–32

White, M. D., & Marsh, E. E. (2006). Content analysis: A flexible methodology. *Library trends*, *55*(1), 22-45.