

iscte

INSTITUTO
UNIVERSITÁRIO
DE LISBOA

Inclusivity and Bias in the Teaching of International Relations

Xi Zhao

Master in International Studies

Supervisor:

Doctor Ana Lúcia Sá, Assistant Professor
ISCTE, University Institute of Lisbon

November, 2022



SOCIOLOGIA
E POLÍTICAS PÚBLICAS

Department of History

Inclusivity and Bias in the Teaching of International Relations

Xi Zhao

Master in International Studies

Supervisor:

Doctor Ana Lúcia Sá, Assistant Professor
ISCTE, University Institute of Lisbon

November, 2022

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor Ana Lúcia Sá for her support and encouragement during the making of this dissertation.

I dedicate this research to my family and everyone who has supported me to make this dissertation possible.

Abstract

This study focuses on a region beyond the West to add more information to this discourse of diversity and inclusion in the teaching of International Relations. More specifically, it focuses on China's universities that are not special administrative regions of China (not Hong Kong or Macau). My study assessed the geographic and gender bias using the reading lists (or syllabi) for analysis, expanding previous existent studies of the teaching of IR to more countries outside of the West, to see whether geographic and gender bias and special focus on the US also exists. The results show that clear gender bias exists when it comes to the authorship of assigned readings. The vast majority (96%) of all assigned readings on the syllabi are authored by men. The USA is the country in which most of the authors of the assigned readings were trained and a resident of. This supports the studies that show that US-trained, US-resident, male scholars dominate the field of International Relations and reading lists in undergraduate courses. However, on the three syllabi we can also see that a substantial number of assigned readings are authored by scholars that are Chinese residents and that were trained in China. The results show that while US-resident and US-trained scholars are the most represented on the syllabi, the majority of the authors are non-US-resident and not US-trained.

Key words:

bias, undergraduate teaching, syllabi, international relations

JEL classification:

F5: International Relations, National Security, and International Political Economy

F59: Other

Resumo

Este estudo concentra-se numa região além do Ocidente para adicionar mais informação a este discurso de diversidade e inclusão no ensino de Relações Internacionais. Mais especificamente, concentra-se em universidades chinesas fora das regiões administrativas especiais da China (Hong Kong ou Macau). Este estudo avaliou o viés geográfico e de género utilizando as listas de leitura (ou syllabi) para análise, expandindo estudos prévios existentes sobre o ensino de RI para mais países fora do Ocidente, para verificar se o viés geográfico e de género e foco especial nos EUA também existe. Os resultados mostram que existe um claro viés de género quando se trata da autoria das leituras atribuídas. A grande maioria (96%) de todas as leituras atribuídas nos programas são de autoria de homens. Os EUA são o país onde a maioria dos autores das leituras atribuídas foram treinados e residentes. Isto está de acordo com os estudos que mostram que académicos do sexo masculino residentes e treinados nos EUA dominam o campo de Relações Internacionais e listas de leitura em cursos de pré-graduação. No entanto, nos três programas, também podemos ver que um número substancial de leituras atribuídas é de autoria de académicos residentes na China e que foram treinados na China. Os resultados mostram que, embora os académicos residentes e treinados nos EUA sejam os mais representados nos programas de estudos, a maioria dos autores não reside nos EUA e não recebeu treinamento nos EUA.

Palavras-chave:

viés, ensino de pré-graduação, currículos, relações internacionais

Classificação JEL

F5: Relações Internacionais, Segurança Nacional e Economia Política Internacional

F59: Outro

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	7
2. Relevance	11
3. Objectives	12
4. Literature Review	14
5. Data Collection and Evaluation	22
5.1 Coding of the Variables - Geographic and Gender Biases in the Authorship of Assigned Readings	23
5.2 Geographic Biases in the Authorship of Assigned Readings	24
5.3 Gender Biases in the Authorship of Assigned Readings	27
5.4 Geographic and Gender biases in the Authorship of Assigned Readings: Most frequently assigned authors and coauthors	28
5.5 Summary - Geographic and Gender Biases in the Authorship of Assigned Readings	28
5.6 Regional Distribution of Required Readings with a Geographic Focus	29
5.7 Teaching of IR theory	30
5.8 Teaching of History and Current Events	31
6. Conclusion	33
7. Bibliography	35
Annex A: All universities included in Knight's (2019) study by continent	37
Annex B: All assigned readings included on all three syllabi	39

1. Introduction

Throughout my studies in the field of International Studies during my bachelor's and master's programs, I have noticed that there is a lack of diversity of accounts, perspectives, narratives, and voices when it comes to the telling of history, the producing of knowledge, and in the the academic study of International Studies or International Relations in general. Most of what is being taught comes from the predominantly Western and white, male perspective and Western history, experiences, and events. Curious about what diversity could look like in the teaching of International Studies in tertiary institutions, I set off my exploration on this topic, eventually deciding to choose a topic related to this question for my Master's thesis.

As International Relations (IR), a relatively young field of study in Western academia, grows and develops through time, more and more scholars have become aware of the Eurocentrism and lack of disciplinary diversity that exist in this field (Hoffmann, 1977; Tickner, 1992; Acharya and Buzan, 2007; Zondi, 2018, Fonseca, 2019; Knight, 2019; Acharya, 2020; Long, 2021, Frueh et al, 2022) . In fact, over the last four decades, strong statements about hegemony, insularity, and lack of disciplinary diversity have already repetitively occurred, especially increasing in intensity in the past few years (Maliniak et al., 2018, p. 449). Summarizing the academic articles included in the literature review I have surveyed, I have come up with several points of focus that scholars have addressed regarding this topic. Several issues regarding the lack of intellectual diversity and existence of bias “threaten” the discipline of IR which I will present in the following paragraphs.

First of all, US hegemony is evident in the IR discipline. To put it simply, US hegemony in IR means that in this field, there exists an unidirectional movement of ideas that flow from the US school to the rest of the world (Maliniak et al., 2018, p. 453). To explain this further, it means that this flow of ideas impact and influence other communities in ways over which the other communities have little control. For instance, the hegemon “trains and exports scholars” to other IR communities, and thus it “changes, or even defines, the relative value that smaller communities place on different publications, scholars, and universities”, and the hegemon shapes a well the epistemological, methodological, and theoretical choices favored in those non-hegemonic countries (Maliniak et al., 453). As some scholars put it, "the Eurocentric framing of world history" is weaved into much of mainstream IRTs (Acharya & Buzan, 2007, p. 14).

One can argue that hegemony goes hand in hand with insularity, which is the second issue to be discussed now. Insularity in the discipline of IR, meaning the tendency of the US

scholars to choose to primarily or almost exclusively engage with the work by other US scholars, almost ignoring the scholarship produced elsewhere (Maliniak et al., 2018, p. 453). Hence, it is the hegemon's academic production that continuously addresses itself, creating a very circular and insular dialogue with itself, which consequently causes bias due to the lack of intellectual diversity and overall inclusivity of other communities views, voices, and perspectives.

Insularity can be problematic for non-US and female scholars in IR, and for epistemological reasons. Insularity means that non-US scholars and female scholars have more difficulties to be heard, to be published, and to achieve "hallmarks of success" in academia. Insularity also means epistemological insularity. It has been shown that US, male scholars have a more positivist or scientific view of knowledge production, that they prefer it over nonpositivist, interpretivist epistemology more than female and non-US scholars do. That means that there is a constraint of epistemological diversity within IR. Furthermore, male IR scholars tend to focus on specific subfields of IR, such as international security, while female IR scholars tend to focus more on other areas, such as environmental issues. Additionally, Western and male depictions of core IR concepts such as anarchy, hegemony, war, globalization, are fundamentally different from non-Western and female depictions. Therefore, this insularity and bias in IR must be addressed (Knight, 2019, p. 206). Today, many scholars in the IR discipline believe in the importance of disrupting the Eurocentric monologue in the IR discipline (Zondi, 2018, p. 25). The bias that exists has many effects on the inclusivity diversity in academia. For example, the gender and geographic bias in the field of International Relations might hinder female scholars or non-Western scholars to publish in the most respected IR journals, and to have their publications cited in subsequent research (Colgan 2016; Knight 2019). Insularity, or a lack of diversity, an issue that will be mentioned in my literature review, exists in this discipline, because leading IR journals are from the US and Western Europe, and they mostly publish US and Western European male authors, and those in turn mostly cite other US and Western European scholars. It seems like a small group of researchers talking to each other (Knight 2019, p. 206)

To elaborate further the hegemony and insularity that exist in the discipline of IR, and the caused lack of intellectual diversity include a lack of diversity in theory, epistemology, methodology, and a unholistic, limited historical view. It is argued that the theory, epistemology, methodology and historical view that is in the IR mainstream are basically only representative of Western and male depictions of core IR concepts, and this "Western" IR doesn't include ancient civilizations in its "history of international relations" and molds the world view limited to the rise and dominance of the West, even today (Acharya, 2020). This specific paradigm that one is led to study and comply with in the IR discipline is not an universal one but a specific one to view

IR, although it has been treated as universal in the discipline. Bias leads to the shutting out of a wide range of alternative methodologies and topics, and it might endanger IR's relevance to academia, policymakers, and future students (Knight, 2019, p. 206) . It is important to bring to one's awareness the Eurocentrism of methodology, and calls for the unthinking of methodology and positionality in IR have been made (Zondi, 2018, p. 19).

Finally, it is possible to connect the aforementioned issues existing currently in IR to the issue of colonialism. Calls to decolonize the theory, methodology, epistemology, and the telling of history have been made. The coloniality of knowledge and its implications have been said to cause a "monoculture of Eurocentric knowledge" instead of "cultivating an ecology of knowledge" instead. A "fundamental rethinking and redoing of how knowledge is produced, taught and disseminated" is thus required, which are processes to which the university is central (Zondi, 2018, p.17).

Hegemony, insularity, and lack of intellectual diversity characterize the discipline of IR. However, what is the extent of which they influence the field of IR in regards to the training of students in higher education? This is a question central to the aforementioned issues in the IR discipline. Not only are higher education institutions central places to the interpretation of information and production of knowledge, they are also central in the teaching and dissemination of that knowledge, influencing the generations to come and how they see and interact with the world and their studies of International Relations. A recent study from 2019 examines the course material being taught by several universities through an analysis of course syllabi. In this research article titled "Even Today, a Western and Gendered Social Science: Persistent Geographic and Gender Biases in Undergraduate IR Teaching", Sarah Cleeland Knight shows through the analysis of 48 course syllabi of 10 mainly Western countries the geographic and gender biases that are firmly in place, reaffirming the strong claims of bias made by other scholars in this field. The assigned readings predominantly from US resident, US trained male authors (Knight, 2019, p. 203). Furthermore, assigned readings focus overwhelmingly more on the US, more than any other country. This leads Knight to conclude that the IR discipline is self-reflective, and geographic and gender biases persist despite large awareness of it in the universities surveyed.

2. Relevance

One can argue that the relevance of this issue is manifold. First and foremost, the information that one has on the world forms and shapes one's opinion and beliefs about the world. Although one will question those opinions and beliefs, however, the first information one receives about a given topic is arguably quite influential in the way one perceives additional information on the same subject matter and maybe even on other related subject matters. So, in this sense, the information on what International Relations is, how it works, and how one goes about to study it is pretty much determined by what one is taught, and what one is taught, in turn, is determined by what information is available. As academia is, in one way or another, about the pursuit of truth and intellectual enlightenment, it is extremely relevant and of utmost importance that the field needs to work on its inclusivity and diversity to approach maximum inclusivity and diversity to occupy the position of maximum truth. This way, the field of this study, as well as what is being taught, can also be as advanced as possible. With that in mind, let us look more closely at the reasons why it is important to clear bias in International Relations.

This gender and geographic bias and exclusivity also has epistemological implications for the field. Male IR scholars and IR scholars from the US are found to be more likely to use and support a positivist view of knowledge production compared to female IR scholars and non-US scholars, turning away from nonpositivist, or interpretivist epistemology (Knight 2019, p. 206). What is important is that given the gender and geographic insularity, a focused effort needs to be made in the widening of alternative methodologies and topics in the field. As international studies is such a diverse and all-encompassing study itself, dealing with the history and current occurrences that have global implications, it only makes good sense for as many perspectives and voices to be included in the study of it.

It is also important to mention that there are scholars that are concerned about the field of IR's relevance to the academy, policymakers, and to people interested in studying this field due to the biases that are currently existent in this field. The Western and male depictions and interpretations in IR, for example anarchy, hegemony, globalization etc., fundamentally differ from non-Western or female depictions (Tickner, 1992). With no doubt, this sets certain limitations to the discipline, and might render this discipline obsolete and outdated in the future (Knight, 2019).

Arguably, this widening of the area also needs to be reflected in the teaching of International Relations, as the classroom is the place where future professionals in this field are trained. An exposure to a larger gender and geographic variety gives the students inspiration

and impetus to explore different possibilities that exist in the development of the unique field of International Relations. Henceforth, the stronger inclusivity in the area will need to be extended to the training of students of international relations so that both are mutually reinforcing, in order to create an optimal and flourishing academic environment.

3. Objectives

Given the relevance and importance of the understanding of the extent of bias in university classrooms, my study aims to assess the current status of inclusivity in IR courses taught. Currently, there is a lack of studies on how the field's biases extend into the pedagogical choices made in higher education institutions. The few existing studies on this subject have a narrow focus on only courses taught in Western Europe and the US (Knight, 2019, p. 207). Sarah Cleeland Knight published a study on gender and geographic bias in undergraduate IR courses. Altogether, she included 48 universities in her study, out of which three universities are located in Asia, two in Australia, and the remaining 43 in the US and Western Europe. The universities she chose for Asia are the Chinese University of Hong Kong, the University of Hong Kong, and the National University of Singapore.

With my study, I aim to focus on regions beyond the Western world to add more information to this discourse of diversity and inclusion in the teaching of International Relations. More specifically, I focus on China's universities that are not special administrative regions of China (not Hong Kong nor Macau). Just like Knight's study, my study assesses the geographic and gender bias using the reading lists (or syllabi) for analysis, expanding her study of the teaching of IR to more countries outside of the Western world, to see whether gender and geographic bias, and special focus on the US also exists there as it does the West.

Initially, I wanted to do a global assessment of universities, using 5 universities per global region, analyzing the Introduction to IR courses of the top 5 universities that offer the course Introduction to International Relations in Africa, Asia, Europe, the Middle East, North and South America, and Oceania. However, it turned out to be not viable since virtually none of the reading lists are public information freely accessible on the internet. Therefore I decided to narrow my focus and to choose one region - Asia. However, I was only able to find some reading lists from Chinese universities. My advantage is that I am fluent in Chinese and have relatives that are familiar with doing internet research on Chinese search engines. I was able to find three syllabi from three different Chinese universities for the course Introduction to International Relations. Thus I decided on analyzing the information using these syllabi from Zhejiang University, Fudan University, and Nankai University.

The specific focus on Chinese universities of this research allows for an in depth study at the teaching materials in a geographic region in which such a study hasn't been conducted before. This can give a glimpse into the current situation of the inclusivity in the teaching of IR to undergraduate students in China, and this study can be used as a point of comparison to

previous studies done that exclusively focus on Western universities. Also, this study can be seen as building onto previous studies done on this subject.

The explanation of why choosing to use syllabi for analysis, using the one stated by Knight in her study, is as follows: Syllabi offer direct insight into what students are being taught. Syllabi represent what is taught and learned in the classroom better than textbooks, because not all faculty use textbooks. The weakness of using syllabi as a data source is that syllabi don't indicate the nuances of the professor's teaching of the material, or how the professor leads discussions. Furthermore, the level of detail provided on the syllabus also varies (Knight 207). These are the weaknesses of using syllabi for analysis. However, for this subject, gathering data from the syllabi is the most accurate way that one can use for analysis. Therefore, my research will add another piece to the entire picture of the teaching in the discipline, and it will contribute to the assessment of the current overall situation in the teaching of International Relations globally.

4. Literature Review

The literature review that I have here presents a collection of academic work that has been done on the subject matter of bias in International Relations, and includes one analysis on the gender and geographical bias in the teaching of International Relations in selected universities, as well as one analysis on the gender bias of one chosen university, the only two analysis on this subject matter that were available to me at the point of my research. These two are quantitative research analysis, and they provide important data on the current status in the IR teaching of universities. They are a good starting point to have, as they could be used as anchors for comparison in the development of diversity in IR teaching. These studies add proof to the claims that gender and geographic bias exists in the IR reading lists.

I think that before I dive into the main body of the literature review, it is important to mention some thoughts of mine. Initially, I wanted to write my thesis on alternative theories in International Relations that differ from the mainstream theories. What interested me was to look at the new emerging Buddhist Theories, basing it on the work of William J. Long, namely his book “A Buddhist Approach to International Relations – Radical Interdependence” composed of his research papers, published recently in 2021 which, in my opinion, lays down a good cornerstone foundation of Buddhist Theory in International Relations. It was my initial idea to build on one of his arguments, expand it, and create new insight from an ontological or epistemological angle. However, I also realized that it would require a certain foundation and training in philosophy to make such an expansion. Therefore, I took a step back and decided to shift the focus on how the teaching of International Relations looks like today in a region where Buddhism is ingrained in its culture, to see whether such a theory has been incorporated, or what is being taught in general to students who first get into contact with International Relations.

The works in my literature review are mainly concerned with the existent gender and geographical bias in the academic field of International Relations and by extension in the teaching of it in higher education institutions. It looks at previous analysis done on the teaching in this field, and also surveys academic papers that make this claim and that zoom in onto certain topics, such as the cause and effects and possible ways to mitigate or dissolve such bias. While the works of syllabi analysis mainly focus on whether gender bias or geographic bias exist, the other works show and explain the extent in which hegemony, insularity, a lack of intellectual diversity, the coloniality of knowledge in IR. Also, there is the discussion of the potentials and limitations of a “Global IR” project, the possibilities to cause epistemic change

through engagement of scholars from geographically diverse regions, and the importance of adjusting the pedagogical contents, for example reframing the Global South as agents in their own right, and not only in terms of their relations with the Global North.

In 2007, a paper published by Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan in the academic journal *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* called “Why is there no non-Western IRT? An Introduction” investigated the question of why all established theories in International Relations had Western origins. This was considered, at least by the the authors of this article, the “opening move of a global debate” regarding this matter (Acharya & Buzan 2007, p. 26). While this paper mainly focuses on the question of why there aren’t any non-Western IRT, it nonetheless explores and presents the reasons that have led to Western dominance in this field, and the hegemony and coloniality of knowledge that exist in IR.

First and foremost, the authors establish that theories in International Relations are certainly by no means universal standing theories, but are products of cultural contexts (Acharya & Buzan, 2007, p. 7; Qin, 2016, p. 34), and therefore it always matters which culture it is that generates the International Relations Theory (IRT) as it can vary from culture to culture. It is important to be conscious of the dominance of the West, in particular Anglo-American voices in IRT, and this dominance needs to be viewed critically (Acharya & Buzan 2007, p. 8). In this sense, the dominating culture establishes the theories and produces the knowledge according to its own culture. The authors state that as of now, Western IRT, which originate from Western political and philosophical thought (Vitalis, 2015) has “acquired a Gramscian hegemonic status that operates largely unconsciously in the minds of others (...) regardless of whether the theory is correct or not” (Acharya and Buzan, 2007, p. 8). Taking the Realist IRT as an example, it asserts that the absolute verities and “objective laws” of international relations is the will to dominance, and that the human nature is inherently violent, but in reality this view was only one of the many possible depictions of the world, reflecting a distinctive history, geography, and consciousness (Long, 2021, p.3). When it comes to IRTs, many scholars have called for greater diversity and pluralism that includes non-Western voices and ideas previously excluded as a source of IR theory (Hoffmann 1977; Acharya and Buzan, 2007; Long, 2021).

Epistemic justice is composed of different aspects including epistemological structure, methodological frameworks, theoretical outlines, and the teaching in the discipline (Zondi, 2018). How to best transition from the “monoculture of Eurocentric scientific knowledge towards the ecology of knowledge” remains to be discussed and discovered (Zondi 2018, p. 16). However, one can argue that the Eurocentrism of methodology must be questioned, and an unthinking of the current methodology and positionality in IR is required. To do that, the

coloniality at the heart of epistemological making of IR needs to be acknowledged by the IR community (Zondi 2018, p. 20). Epistemic justice in International Relations needs methodological diversity. It is important to recognize, for example, that the methodology of contrasting perceptions with evidence subscribes to a Eurocentric research methodology “in which the perception of the subject under research is canceled out when it does not meet the evidence (Fonseca, 2019, p. 58). In a research paper titled “Is International Relations a Global Discipline? Hegemony, Insularity, and Diversity in the Field”, the scholars Maliniak, Peterson, Powers, and Tierney pose three research questions, and one of these questions is whether the IR discipline is theoretically, methodologically, and epistemologically diverse? And if yes, to what extent? The result of this research shows that the discipline lacks diversity in including different epistemological and methodological approaches (Maliniak et al, 2018, p. 470). It is crucial to recognize ontological parities between the US/Western world and the non-US/non-Western world in order to shift hegemony to engagement, and to bring in more freedom of discovery and creativity (Ling 2013, p. 549).

To illustrate, we can look at the Buddhist approach to international relations. In his book “A Buddhist Approach to International Relations: Radical Interdependence”, the author William J. Long presents a Buddhist approach to international relations as a genuine alternative IRT (Long 2021, p. 1). He states that a Buddhist perspective provides a systematic alternative to Western models because it is founded on distinctive first-order philosophical principles or substructures that differ from those that dominate in the West (Long 2021, p. 19). The concept of “radical interdependence” is a basic “truth” about the nature of human existence are different from the Western understandings of reality and interdependence (Long 2021, p. 19). This truth of radical interdependence is a key to imagining a different vision for IR and politics in general (Long 2021, p. 19). In the Buddhist belief, the universe is a network of interconnected and interdependent web of nodes, each of which reflects all other nodes in the web (Yeh, 2013, p. 92). Everything is interrelated even in the most remote sense (Yeh, 2013, p. 92).

Aside from the epistemological and methodological lack of diversity, scholars in this field call for the awareness that there exists an Eurocentric framing of world history (Acharya & Buzan 2007, p. 14). This Eurocentric narrative fundamentally influences International Relations, and it definitely is weaved into much of mainstream IR theories (Acharya & Buzan, 2007, p. 14). Taking a very focused view of IR, IRT is “almost the ideology of a Western state system that has been imposed, with varying degrees of success, on the rest of the world” (Acharya & Buzan, 2007, p. 14). The Puerto Rican scholar Melody Fonseca writes in her academic article “Global IR and Western Dominance: Moving Forward or Eurocentric Entrapment? (2019)” that History,

as it is rather a retelling and 'reconstruction' of the past, has major epistemic limitations. Every retelling is an ideological construct, and hegemonic narratives of history do produce hierarchised relations between events in history. Thus, mainstream scholarship is built on the reproduction of coloniality of knowledge. One example is the subjection of a non-Western event to the West's historical narratives, or the silencing of it (Fonseca, 2019, p. 51). Thus, it is necessary to wrestle with the archive upon which the IR discipline is built and sustained (Zondi, 2018, p. 22).

"Almost all major pieces of IR literature are meditations of Western men in the main, sold to the whole world as universal texts" is a statement made by the South African scholar Siphamandla Zondi in her 2019 article "Decolonising International Relations and Its Theory: A Critical Conceptual Meditation" which she wrote to join the growing call for a decolonial turn in knowledge and power in IR (Zondi, 2018, p. 22). The idea to include ancient texts about the world that were excluded from world history (Zondi, 2018, p. 24) is one that not only she urges to be called into action. What Zondi calls the "European usurpation of world history" (Zondi, 2018, p. 24) is the Western dominance in the narration of world history. The power of narrative and the power of representation that the West holds in the IR discipline are silencing the past, and also silencing the present (Fonseca, 2019, p. 52). The effects of colonialism and the coloniality of knowledge causes bias and underrepresentation of non-Western and female scholars (Fonseca, 2019, p. 52).

The world of international politics is a masculine domain (Tickner, 1992). Masculinity and politics have been closely associated for a long time, and characteristics associated with manliness, this is shown for example in the glorification of the male warrior. The hegemonic masculinity is sustained through its opposition to various subordinated and devalued masculinities and through its relation to devalued femininities. The traditional works in the discipline of international relations has been based on an hierarchical distinction that those with accumulation and rational use of power are placed higher hierarchically than the "other", such as women, or other cultures that are depicted as irrational and unstable. According to Tickner, nowhere in the public realm are the stereotypical gender images more apparent than in the realm of international politics, where the characteristics associated with hegemonic masculinity are projected onto the behavior of states whose success as international actors is measured in terms of their power capabilities. The traditional Western academic discipline of international relations privileges issues that are from men's experiences, and people are socialized into believing that war and power politics are activities that men are better at and that therefore their voices are more authentic in describing and prescribing for this world (Tickner, 1992). A non

gendered perspective could offer a more inclusively human way of thinking about a collective future in which women and men can share equally in the construction of a safer and more just world (Tickner, 1992). Female IR scholars face more difficulties than men in publishing in the most established IR journals and in having their publications cited in subsequent research (Monroe & Chiu, 2010).

In 2015, Amitav Acharya brought the Global IR Project, which is an initiative for the pluralization and decolonisation of the IR discipline, into existence in an institutional setting. Its aim is to achieve greater inclusiveness and diversity in the discipline. Acharya's text "What 'Intro to IR' misses out: Civilizations, World Orders, and the Rise of the West", published in 2020, states that Global IR advocates a perspective in which no civilization is viewed as an island, or has the monopoly of wisdom or virtue (Acharya, 2020, p. 29). A global historical perspective of IR means including the history of non-Western civilizations into the mainstream discourse, such as the ancient civilizations of the Islamic world, China, and India. A broader perspective would include, for example, anarchic and hierarchical structures, as well as material and ideational interactions (Acharya, 2020, p. 1). Going beyond a Westphalian and state-centric approach and presenting a global history can lead to questioning the "universality" of concepts and practices that IR scholars have been automatically accepting. It would reveal the diverse global heritage of IR as a field of study (Acharya, 2020, p. 2). Then, similar to the sciences, all theories and thesis are awaiting to be disproved, all paradigms are open to be shifted, revealing fundamentally new ways of perception.

In their 2017 article "Why is there no non-Western IRT? Ten years on" which is a follow up article on the one published in 2007, the authors Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan survey and assess relevant literature since 2007 and present the authors' own understanding on this issue. It also includes an explanation of the Global IR Project (Acharya & Buzan, 2017, p. 341). They have found that from 2007 to 2017, awareness of the narrow epistemology and self-reference of the American IR have increased. There is a decline in the legitimacy of American hegemony, although its material power remains dominant (Acharya & Buzan, 2017, p. 348). More and more attempts are made by scholars to draw on classical traditions and civilizations to challenge Western IRT, proposing alternative and indigenous concepts and theories (Acharya & Buzan, 2017, p. 359). The creation of a Global IR would be a new way of understanding and reshaping the IR discipline, and would achieve the expansion of Western-dominated IR knowledge into a body of knowledge that accepts the ideas, experiences and insights from the non-Western world (Acharya & Buzan, 2017, p. 355).

With Global IR, Acharya and Buzan hope to bring IR theory and world history together in a more systematic and open way (Acharya & Buzan, 2017, p. 351). The resulting Global IR theory should then be resting on the foundations of world history and not just Western history (Acharya & Buzan, 2017, p. 352). Global IR would be about pluralization within theories, rather than just between them (Acharya & Buzan, 2017, p. 355). Although promoting voices coming from non-West is a step towards globalizing and decolonising the discipline (Fonseca, 2019, p. 55), Global IR also has received critique that it reproduces similar frameworks, methodologies, and inquiries to Western scholarship (Fonseca, 2019, p. 54). In their 2007 article, Acharya and Buzan also reflected on whether the term non-Western IRT itself would be considered an oxymoron (Acharya & Buzan, 2007, p. 15). Other critiques of Global IR underline its limitations stemming from its conceptual pertinence and Eurocentrism, its making of only an epistemic turn but not an ontological turn (Fonseca, 2019, p. 55). How Global IR will develop awaits to be observed. Nonetheless, the Global IR project is still an initiative towards increased diversity in the discipline.

As mentioned earlier, the Global North holds the power over the narrative in the IR discipline because of the effects of colonialism and the colonality of knowledge. While striving for a just inclusion of female scholars and scholars from the Global South, it is definitely necessary to not underestimate the influence material inequalities, the influence of economic gatekeepers, the legacies of imperialism, colonialism, racism, patriarchy in the reproduction of the colonality of knowledge (Fonseca, 2018, p. 55). One must keep in mind the material inequalities regarding global higher education and the studies of Global South scholarship (Fonseca, 2018, p. 55). As an example of the complexities of the colonality of power and knowledge, she recounts how much stress she is under while reading, thinking, and writing in English for a Global North audience as a Global South scholar, though there is no evident to measure this emotional distress and increased input of time for producing academic texts (Fonseca, 2018, p. 58). In her opinion, the materiality of the colonality of knowledge is a "major stumbling block" for the process of decolonisation (Fonseca, 2018, p. 50). Another instance is that references to Global South scholars' works are very limited. Only around 3% of published articles in peer-reviewed European and US journals from 2008 to 2017 were written by global South scholars (Fonseca, 2018, p. 52).

A committed epistemic change in the field of IR would mean going beyond deconstruction, and using different research practices, teaching, and writing that recognise the richness of engaging in debates with scholars from the Global South (Fonseca, 2018, p. 52). There are multiple approaches and starting points in which one can adjust or change pedagogic

approaches. For example, as mentioned before, the history of ancient civilizations may be included into the teaching of world history in IR. Many pre colonial societies had greater agency in world affairs which they lost during colonialism. Pre Colonial agency needs to be stressed (Frueh et al., 2020, p. 155). The way actors from the Global South's representation in Introduction to IR textbooks may be reframed to be defined as agents in their own right, instead of only in their relationship with the Global North (Frueh et al., 2020, p. 149). A large issue for the educators in the Global South is the lack of locally produced, high-quality textbooks (Frueh et al., 2020, p. 152). A mitigating solution is to seek to include writings of Global South scholars Behera (Frueh et al., 2020, p. 153). To achieve epistemic justice, a fundamental transformation of pedagogy is necessary. How to teach IR, world history and foreign policy (Zondi, 2018, p. 24). Zondi takes her contemplation on the teaching IR one steps further as she raises the question and asks herself whether to unmask moral questions that hang over the discipline of IR and its claims, and teach students to think critically and question established concepts should be questions every IR educator needs to think about (Zondi 2018, p. 24).

In recent years, many articles appeared that debate the state of the IR and its geographic cleavages (Colgan, 2016). Sarah Cleeland Knight's article "Even Today, a Western and Gendered Social Science: Persistent Geographic and Gender Biases in Undergraduate IR Teaching " was published in 2019 in "International Studies Perspectives" . The aim of her study was to evaluate the claims that the field of IR focuses disproportionately on the US and Europe and contains gender bias in terms of ignoring issues of particular concern to women. Furthermore, it is infamous for its difficulty for female scholars to publish and have their publications cited (Knight, 2019, p. 203). In this study, Knight collects and analyzes a dataset of 48 "Introduction to International Studies' ' syllabi from 10 countries. Where these universities are located are presented in the following table:

Table 4.1 Universities included in Knight's study (Knight 2019)

	North America	Europe	Asia	Australia
Total	31	12	3	2

With her research, she wants to find out whether the claims that international relations focuses mostly on the United States and Europe and that it contains a gender bias are true in the area of undergraduate international relations teaching (Knight, 2019). For this, she analyzes

three features: the required readings, the teaching of theory, and the teaching of history and current events. For the first feature, the required readings, she conducts her analysis based on the author's gender, country of residence, and the country in which the author completed the PhD training. For the second feature, teaching of theory, Knight analyses the level of diversity in the theories taught, and the level of inclusion of feminist theory. Lastly, for the third feature of the teaching of history and current events, Knight looks at the inclusion and consideration of events that took place or that are taking place outside of the US and Western Europe, as well as whether topics that overwhelmingly involve women are being included.

The results of this research show that the teaching in the IR discipline shows gender and geographic bias. Professors from the universities included in this study tend to mainly assign required readings are male, US-trained, and US-residents. 23 of the reading lists analyzed don't mention any theory, 13 reading lists include the three Western traditional IR theories, and 12 include more than the three traditional theories (Knight, 2019, p. 217). Historical and current events focus mainly on the US and Europe. Latin America, the Caribbean, South Asian, and Sub-Saharan Africa are given the least attention (Knight, 2019, p. 222).

In the same year, in 2019, an academic research article called "Gender and bias in the International Relations curriculum: Insights from reading lists" was published in the *European Journal of International Relations* written by Kiran Phull, Gokhan Ciflikli, and Gustav Meibauer. This study solely focuses on the gender bias found in the International Relations curriculum at the London School of Economics. The findings of this study show that most of the texts on reading lists are written exclusively by men, and that more female authors are included as the level of study progresses. More male authored texts are assigned to undergraduates than to PhDs, which can be due to the persistence of a traditional International Relations canon at the start of IR studies. Furthermore, the subfields of International Organisation and International Law assign more female-authored readings than the subfields of Security or Regional Studies. The subfield of Gender/Feminist Studies mainly feature readings from female authors. Lastly, the study shows that readings written by female scholars are less assigned by male and/or more senior course conveners (Phull et al., 2019, p. 384). Another study conducted by Colgan on gender bias in international relations graduate education shows that male instructors select and assign more research written by men than female instructors (Colgan, 2017).

5. Data Collection and Evaluation

I use an original dataset of 3 undergraduate IR course syllabi from Mainland Chinese universities, excluding universities located in special administration areas (Hong Kong and Macau). Every attempt was made to find any available syllabi. The 3 syllabi in this study were the only undergraduate syllabi that I was able to find on the internet. It was a long process, since syllabi are usually not publicized online in China. I used both Google.com and the most popular Chinese search engine Baidu.com. With the help of relatives, who had gone to school in China and were thus more literate with Chinese search engines and websites, I was finally able to find three undergraduate syllabi for the course Introduction to International Relations.

The 3 syllabi I use are from Nankai University in Tianjin, Fudan University in Shanghai, and Zhejiang University in Hangzhou.. According to the ShanghaiRanking Consultancy, which is known for the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), one of the most influential ranking of global higher education institutions¹ which it publishes every year, these 3 Chinese universities are amongst the best universities in the nation. Amongst 590 Chinese universities that the ShanghaiRanking Consultancy has taken into consideration for its ranking published in 2022, Zhejiang University is ranked number 3, and Fudan University's ranked number 5, Nankai University is ranked number 20. Thus, the three universities are all in the top 20 universities of China, out of 590 institutions evaluated².

This sample of three universities in my study has been constructed from including all syllabi I could find in my internet research. However, these universities represent the most established and academically rigorous universities in China. The course title stated on the syllabi are 国际关系导论教学大纲 (Introduction to International Relations Syllabus) for Fudan University, and 国际关系概论教学大纲 (Introduction to International Relations Syllabus) for Nankai University and Zhejiang University.

The range of years included is 2009–2016. These years are within the past 13 years, and therefore can be seen as recent years. Nankai's syllabus is for an academic semester in 2009, Fudan's for the academic year of 2012-2013. Zhejiang University did not specify the year in which its syllabus was used, but the latest published reading assigned has the publishing year of 2016 so it is safe to assume that the course was taught in 2016 or later. The information

¹ <https://www.shanghairanking.com/about-arwu>

² <https://www.shanghairanking.com/rankings/bcur/202211>

on the syllabi was translated by myself from Chinese to English, since I am a native speaker of Chinese.

5.1 Coding of the Variables - Geographic and Gender Biases in the Authorship of Assigned Readings

For the analysis of a possible geographic and gender bias in undergraduate IR teaching in Chinese syllabi, I made a table with all readings of all three syllabi, noting the assigned authors names, country of residence, country of PhD training, and gender. The coding procedure for the author's country of residence, country of PhD training, and gender variables is as follows: First, I research online to code for an author's country of residence. The coding shows the country in which the author resided at the time of this research (2022). In case the author is no longer alive, then the coding reflects the author's last country of residence. If there was no information found on the country of residence, the coding is "unknown". If the piece of reading included more than eight texts from different authors, the coding is "divers" (such as in the case of "The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia"). Next, I also did online research to code for the country of PhD training. If the author did not receive PhD training (for example in the case of Friedrich Engels) , the coding is "no PhD training". If it couldn't be found out whether the author has received a PhD, the coding is "unknown". Again, if the reading assigned is a work that included more than eight texts from different authors, the coding is "diverse". Lastly, to code for gender by the use of gendered pronouns by the author on official websites. If no gendered pronouns were found, I looked at any available photographs. The last resort was to rely on gender-specific first names. This procedure is taken from the TRIP coding methodology, which Maliniak, Powers, and Walter use for their article "The Gender Citation Gap in International Relations" (Maliniak et al, 2013).

The weaknesses of this coding procedure is that in some cases, the author has lived and moved around in multiple countries, and this data does not reflect that. Another weakness is that an author may not identify with the gender associated with his or her photograph or first name, or may identify with none or multiple genders.

5.2 Geographic Biases in the Authorship of Assigned Readings

In the presented table, the country of residence of all authors of assigned readings are presented. The most frequent country of residence is the USA, amounting to 30 authors out of 82, which is 37% of the total number. The second most frequent country of residence of all authors is China. 24 authors reside in China, which makes up 29% of the total. The third most frequent country of residence of authors assigned is the Netherlands. 4 authors reside in the Netherlands, making up 5% of the total. Then follow the UK, Taiwan and Germany with 4% each. France and Japan each make up 2%. Australia, Brasil, India, the Philippines, Russia, and Sweden each make up 1%. The resident country of 6% of the total authors could not be found, therefore they are coded “unknown”. This data shows that the majority, 37% of assigned authors reside in the USA.

What I can conclude from this is that Chinese universities, which are non-Western universities, may include authors from more countries and regions into the Introduction to International Relations course in comparison to Knight’s top 20 most assigned authors in her analysis. This makes the introductory course in China comparatively more geographically diverse. However, US-resident scholars still make up the majority of the assigned authors in Chinese Introduction to International Relations courses. Geographic bias, then, exists since the majority of scholars are from the USA. This is supportive of the arguments mentioned in the literature review that the field of IR by extension the training in the field of International Relations is US-dominated in regions outside of the West.

Table 5.2.1. Country of residence of all authors and co-authors by university

Country of Residence	Fudan University	Nankai University	Zhejiang University	Total	Totals in %
Australia	1			1	1%
Brasil	1			1	1%
China	21		3	24	29%
France	2			2	2%
Germany	3			3	4%
India	1			1	1%
Japan	2			2	2%
Netherlands	4			4	5%
Philippines	1			1	1%

Russia	1			1	1%
Sweden	1			1	1%
Taiwan	3			3	4%
UK	1		2	3	4%
USA	18	2	10	30	37%
unknown	5			5	6%
Totals	65	2	15	82	100%

The results for the country of PhD training show that the majority of authors received their PhD training in US universities. 35 out of 82 authors are US-trained, which is 43% of the total. Only 14 authors received their PhD in China, which amounts to 17%. This is due to the fact that some Chinese scholars received their PhD training in the USA. 12% did not receive any PhD training. We can see that the majority, almost half of the assigned authors were trained in the USA. The second most frequent country is China, with 17% of the total. Here we can see that the USA dominates over any other country by a substantial amount in terms of being the country in which assigned authors reside and are educated.

From this I can conclude that for the Chinese universities analyzed, the country in which the authors of assigned readings from the Introduction to International Relations course are trained the most is the USA. Geographic bias, then, exists. This is supportive of the arguments mentioned in the literature review that the field of IR by extension the training in the field of International Relations is US-dominated in regions outside of the West.

Table 5.2.2 Country of PhD training of all authors and co-authors by university

Country of PhD Training	Fudan University	Nankai University	Zhejiang University	Total	Totals in %
Austria	1			1	1%
Brasil	1			1	1%
China	13		1	14	17%
France	2			2	2%
Germany	1			1	1%
Italy	1			1	1%

Japan	2			2	2%
Netherlands	1			1	1%
Sweden	1			1	1%
UK	2			2	2%
USA	21	2	12	35	43%
no Phd training	10			10	12%
diverse	3			3	4%
unknown	6		2	8	10%
Totals	65	2	15	82	100%

The takeaway for the geographic bias in the authorship of assigned readings in these three Chinese universities is that the majority of the assigned authors are US-resident and US-trained. 29% of the authors reside in China, and 17% of the authors were trained in China. It is interesting to mention that in Knight's analysis of the "Most frequently assigned authors and coauthors of all syllabi" and "Most frequently assigned authors and coauthors for readings in non-US syllabi", all but one author are US-resident and US-trained, and the one remaining author is UK-resident and UK-trained. Thus, her data shows that 95% authors are US-trained, US-resident, and 5% are UK-trained and UK-resident. Although the list of authors in this study is a list of all assigned authors, and Knight's list is a list of most frequently assigned authors, and one cannot directly compare these two lists, it is still interesting to see the results side by side for the results in this study give a glimpse into the authored assigned in the syllabi of top Chinese universities outside of Hong Kong and Macau, which are special administrative regions in China, which Knight's study does not include. Furthermore, it is important to mention that Knight's study also does not include any universities from the Global South. In that regard, this study can be seen as complementary to her study.

5.3 Gender Biases in the Authorship of Assigned Readings

Next, we look at the gender distribution of all assigned readings in the three syllabi. Altogether, there are 82 readings, out of which three are authored by women. This means that 96% of the total assigned readings are authored by men, and 4% by women. The detailed gender distribution is presented in Table 5.3.1. It is interesting to mention that the female author from

the readings of Nankai University and Zhejiang University is the same person, Karen A. Mingst, who is also the only one female scholar in the top 20 most frequently assigned authors in Knight's study (Knight, 2019, p. 211). In Knight's study, out of the 20 most frequently assigned authors, 95% are male and 5% female (Knight, 2019). This percentage is almost the same as in this study. This supports the claims that IR is a "male domain" and the key topics in international relations are those of special interest to men (Tickner, 1992).

Table 5.3.1 Gender of all authors and co-authors by university

Fudan University	Nankai University	Zhejiang University	Totals	Totals in %
Male: 64	Male: 1	Male: 14	79	96%
Female: 1	Female: 1	Female: 1	3	4%
Total: 65	Total: 2	Total: 15	82	100%

Here I will mention that since my study only includes three syllabi, and one of them does not specify the teaching professor, I will, unlike in Knight's study, not conduct an analysis on the gender of the teaching professors.

5.4 Geographic and Gender biases in the Authorship of Assigned Readings: Most frequently assigned authors and coauthors

This list is being included in order to enable a direct comparison to Knight's study, which uses the most frequently assigned authors and coauthors.

Unlike Knight's study, I cannot examine the top 20 most frequently assigned authors, as there are only three authors that occur more than once. Nonetheless I will still present them here. The overlapping readings are as follows:

Table 5.4.1 Most frequently assigned authors and coauthors

Name	Frequency	Residence	PhD	Gender
Andre Gunder Frank	2	Netherlands	USA	male

John T. Rourke	2	USA	USA	male
Karen A. Mingst	2	USA	USA	female

The table presents the three authors whose readings are assigned more than once. Two of the authors are male, and two reside in the USA. All of the three authors received their PhD training in the USA. Hence, the majority of the most frequently assigned authors are US-resident, US-trained, and male. The result, then, is the same as in Knight's study that the most frequently assigned authors are US-resident, US-trained, and male.

5.5 Summary - Geographic and Gender Biases in the Authorship of Assigned Readings

IS the majority of assigned readings on these three Chinese syllabi authored by US-resident, US-trained, male authors? The answer is Yes. However, the second most frequently assigned authors are China-resident, China-trained. Unlike Knight's research, which only shows the most frequently assigned authors from 48 universities (out of which 43 are from the USA or Western Europe) and therefore can only show the "most popular" or "most widely spread" texts that are being assigned in the courses she surveyed, this study only focuses on a single country, China, and includes all authors assigned into the analysis. This puts a country-specific focus on a country not belonging to the Global North, and shows that Chinese universities do include a substantial amount of China-resident, China-trained scholars in their course syllabi.

5.6 Regional Distribution of Required Readings with a Geographic Focus

The majority of the readings (65%) does not have a regional focus. Here, I analyze the remaining 35% of readings that focus on a region or an area in a specific region. Regarding the coding procedure, readings that focus on more than one region have been coded for all the regions that the reading focuses on. For example, a reading that focused on the US and Europe has been coded for both the US and Russia. This is done the same way in Knight' study (Knight 2019).

The majority of the readings with a geographic focus have that focus on Asia. Within Asia, 36.7% of the readings focus on China, 13.3% on Southeast Asia. 6.7% focuses on the entire Asian continent, and 3.3% focus on India and East Asia each. Altogether, 63.3% of the

readings with a regional focus are focused on Asia. Sub-Saharan Africa, Europe, and the USA all account for 10% each. 3.3% of the readings are focused on Russia, and 3.3% on the Middle East and North Africa.

Table 5.6.1 Regional distribution of required readings with a geographic focus

Region	Frequency	Percentage
Sub-Saharan Africa	3	10%
Asia (general)	2	6.70%
Asia (China)	11	36.70%
Asia (East Asia)	1	3.30%
Asia (India)	1	3.30%
Asia (Southeast Asia)	4	13.30%
Europe	3	10%
Middle East and North Africa	1	3.30%
Russia	1	3.30%
USA	3	10%
Total	30	100%

In Knight's study, she ranks the geographic distribution by region for all readings with a geographic focus. In comparison, Knight's analysis shows that 38.1% of the readings with geographic focus are on North America, and 30.1% are on Europe, 13.7% on the Middle East and North Africa, 9.5% are on East Asia and Pacific, 4% on Sub-Saharan Africa, 3.1% on Latin America and the Caribbean, and 1.5% on South Asia. The Chinese universities in my analysis put more emphasis on the Asian Continent with 63.3% of total readings with regional focus, whereas in Knight's study, which is mainly composed of US and UK universities, 68.2% of the readings with regional focus are on North America and Europe.

In Knight's study, the most frequently assigned region outside of North America and Europe is the MENA region (13.7%) and East Asia and the Pacific (9.5%). In my study, the most frequently assigned regions outside of Asia are Sub-Saharan Africa (10%), Europe (10%), and the USA (10%). This shows that Chinese universities, aside from Asia, put the most emphasis on these three regions, whereas Western universities, aside from Europe and the US, put the most emphasis on the Middle East and North Africa.

5.7 Teaching of IR theory

To touch upon the teaching of IR theory, I looked at if the syllabi mentioned any IR theories that would be taught in class. Fudan University mentions IR theories on its syllabus, but does not mention specifically which theories will be taught. Nankai does not mention any IR theory on its syllabus. Zhejiang University mentions five theories which are Realism, Liberalism, Constructivism, English School, and Radicalism. It is interesting to observe that there is no mention of non-Western IR theories, nor the feminist theory. This could be seen as supportive of the claim that Western IRTs are holding a hegemonic status in the field of IR (Acharya & Buzan, 2007). Since IRTs are products of cultural contexts (Acharya & Buzan, 2007, p. 7), the Chinese universities that teach them are subjected to the dominance of the Western theories.

This perhaps could also show that a deconstruction of Western IR theories and non-Western theories have not been included into these courses, and if it has, that it is not seen as substantial enough to mention it on the syllabus. Perhaps this strengthens the argument made by Acharya and Buzan that a theory becomes established once it is substantially acknowledged by others in the IR academic community as being one (Acharya & Buzan, 2007, p. 6), and Chinese IR theories at that time did exist, but weren't seen as established enough to be put onto the syllabus. Acharya and Buzan wrote extensively about a potential Chinese Confucian IR theory in their paper "Why is there no non-Western IRT? 10 years on" published in 2017, and about Confucian hierarchical rhetorics, which do not occur in any of the three syllabi analyzed.

According to Acharya and Buzan, non-Western IRTs are "hidden" from the Western discourse because of language barriers, or are in other areas than what is seen as the Western-define IR realm (Acharya & Buzan, 2007, p. 8). In the three syllabi of this study, we can see that these three courses do not teach non-Western IRTs in the introductory course, or they are not seen as important to be put onto the syllabus.

This can also be seen as supportive of Acharya and Buzan's claim that an Asian school of IR is unlikely given the developments in Asian IR in the past decade (Acharya & Buzan, 2017, p. 359), given the limited exchange and interactions between scholars from different countries in Asia, as well as the varying institutional support mechanisms for the field of IR in different countries in Asia (Acharya & Buzan, 2017, p. 360).

Since there are only three syllabi in this analysis, it is not possible to conduct an analysis of the gender and geographic biases in IR theory in the same scope as in Knight's study.

5.8 Teaching of History and Current Events

The empirical topics that the professors select to teach in an introductory course can tell a lot about what is considered as fundamental to the training. This warrants a closer look at the most frequently included topics on the syllabi. Again, these three syllabi cannot be analyzed as in Knight's study due to the scope of the available data. Nonetheless it is interesting to take a look at the most frequently taught topics in these courses. For evaluation, each syllabus was coded according to the topic assigned to each class session. Whenever a topic was mentioned, the syllabus was coded as including the topic.

From the table, we can see that Globalization and International Political Economy are the most frequent topics, appearing on every syllabus included in this study. The second most frequent topics are Unipolar Power Structure in the 21st century, Intergovernmental Organizations, International Law, the International System, and War. No gender-related topics are mentioned, such as how certain phenomena in IR, for example war, impact women.

Table 5.8.1 Most common empirical topics

Event / Topic	Nankai University	Fudan	Zhejiang	Frequency
Globalization	Yes	Yes	Yes	3
International Political Economy	Yes	Yes	Yes	3
Unipolar Power Structure in the 21st Century (US as the dominant power)	Yes	Yes		2
Intergovernmental Organizations	Yes	Yes		2
International Law	Yes	Yes		2
International System	Yes		Yes	2
War	Yes	Yes		2
Cold War / Bipolar System	Yes	Yes		2

It is interesting to see that Globalization, Cold War, and Unipolar Power Structure in the 21st Century (US as the dominant power) (here evaluated to be equal to Knight's "US Hegemony") are in the top 11 the most common empirical topics in Knight's study, and that none of the remaining 5 topics are on her table. The topics on her table that are focused on the US or Europe are 9/11 and War on Terror, European Union, US Invasion of Iraq. The remaining 5 topics are World War I, World War II, Ancient Empires, Rise of China, and Climate Change.

Thus, the syllabi she analyzed have a more topical focus on specific countries, namely the USA, whereas the syllabi I analyze here do not mention any specific countries in their topics.

6. Conclusion

With this study, my aim was to focus on regions beyond the West to add more information to this discourse of diversity and inclusion in the teaching of International Relations. More specifically, I focused on China's universities that are not special administrative regions of China (not Hong Kong or Macau). My study assessed the geographic and gender bias using the reading lists (or syllabi) for analysis, expanding previous existent studies of the teaching of IR to more countries outside of the West, to see whether geographic and gender bias, and special focus on the US also exists. The results show that clear gender bias exists when it comes to the authorship of assigned readings. The vast majority (96%) of all assigned readings on the syllabi are authored by men. The USA is the country in which most of the authors of the assigned readings were trained and a resident of. This supports the studies that show that US-trained, US-resident, male scholars dominate the field of International Relations and reading lists in undergraduate courses. However, on the three syllabi we can also see that a substantial number of assigned readings are authored by scholars that are Chinese residents and that were trained in China. The results show that while US-resident and US-trained scholars are the most represented on the syllabi, the majority of the authors are non-US-resident and not US-trained.

When it comes to the readings with geographic focus, the most readings are on the Asian continent, and the most frequent country is China. Out of the three syllabi, one includes the teaching of International Relations theories, one mentions five Western theories, and one does not mention theories at all. The most frequent empirical topics mentioned on the syllabi are Globalization and International Political Economy. This shows that when it comes to readings with a geographic focus, Chinese universities put an emphasis on the Asian region and on China especially, and not on the USA. Non of the courses mentions any non-Western IRT, or feminist-IRT. This might imply that IRTs do not hold much importance, or that non-Western IRTs have not been included or gained an established status as Western-IRTS in Chinese academia. Globalization and International Political Economy are the most frequently taught topics in introductory courses. This might show that these two subjects are seen to be the most fundamental topics in the teaching of IR of Chinese universities. A recommendation for further research might be doing this type of analysis of courses with a wider scope in different regions or countries.

The conclusion is that gender bias in the authorship of assigned readings is very present and apparent. Professors mostly choose works authored by men and only very seldomly include works authored by women into the reading lists. The country in which most assigned authors

reside and received their training is the US, which shows that the non-West use a comparatively large percentage of works produced by US scholars in the classrooms. However, the majority of the readings are from non-US-resident and non-US-trained authors. Readings with geographic focus are focused predominantly on China, or on Asia as a region. There is no mention of non-Western IRTs on any of the syllabi. The three syllabi included in this study show that in Chinese Introduction to International Relations undergraduate courses, there exists strong gender bias in the authorship of required readings, and there exists a mild geographic bias in the authorship of required readings.

7. Bibliography

- 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.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/irap/lcm012>
- 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.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/irap/lcx006>
- Acharya, A. (2020). What “Introduction to International Relations” Misses Out: Civilizations, World Orders, and the Rise of the West. *World Orders, and the Rise of the West*.
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3750112
- Colgan, J. (2016). Where Is International Relations Going? Evidence from Graduate Training. *International Studies Quarterly* (2016)60, 486–498. doi: 10.1093/isq/sqv017
- Colgan, J. (2017). Gender Bias in International Relations Graduate Education? New Evidence from Syllabi. *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50(2), p. 456 - 460
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096516002997>
- Fonseca, M. (2019). Global IR and Western Dominance: Moving Forward or Eurocentric Entrapment? *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 48(1), 45–59.
doi:10.1177/0305829819872817
- Frueh, J., Diehl, P.F., Li, X., Gorcek, G., Kalpakia, J., Vlcek, W., Bower, A., Espinoza, R. S., Carranco, S., De Matos-Ala, J., Behera, N. C., & Acharya, A. (2021) Forum on Pedagogy: The Introductory Course in International Relations: Regional Variations. *International Studies Perspectives* (22)2, p. 125–159. doi: 10.1093/isp/ekaa009
- Hoffmann, S. (1977). An American Social Science: International Relations. *MIT Press* 106(3), P. 41-60. <https://www.amherst.edu/system/files/media/0084/Hoffman.pdf>

Introduction to International Relations Course Syllabus. Fudan University. (2012, November 2). Docin. Retrieved September 19, 2022, from <https://www.docin.com/p-514357495.html>

Knight, C. K. (2019). Even Today, a Western and Gendered Social Science: Persistent Geographic and Gender Biases in Undergraduate IR Teaching. *International Studies Perspectives* 20(3), p. 203–225. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isp/ekz006>

Ling, L. H. M. (2013). Worlds beyond Westphalia: Daoist dialectics and the 'China threat'. *Review of International Studies* 39(3), p. 549-568. doi:10.1017/S026021051200054X

Long, W. J. (2021). *A Buddhist Approach to International Relations: Radical Interdependence*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Maliniak, D., Powers, R., & Walter, B. F. (2013). The Gender Citation Gap in International Relations. *International Organization* 67, 889–922. doi:10+10170S0020818313000209

Maliniak, D., Peterson, S., Powers, R., & Tierney, M. (2018). Is International Relations a Global Discipline? Hegemony, Insularity, and Diversity in the Field. *Security Studies*, 27(3), 448-484. DOI: 10.1080/09636412.2017.1416824

Monroe, K. R., Chiu, W. F. (2010). Gender Equality in the Academy: The Pipeline Problem. *Political Science and Politics* 43(2), p. 303 - 308. DOI:10.1017/S104909651000017X

Nankai University: Introduction to International Relations Course Syllabus. (n.d.). Baidu Wenku. Retrieved September 19, 2022, from https://wenku.baidu.com/view/3bf73bc2e309581b6bd97f19227916888486b988.html?_wks_=1669827320718

Phull, K., Ciflikli, G., & Meibauer, G. (2019). Gender and bias in the International Relations curriculum: Insights from reading lists. *European Journal of International Relations* 25(2), 383–407. doi: 10.1177/1354066118791690

Qing, Y. (2016). A Relational Theory of World Politics. *International Studies Review* 2016 (18), 33–47. doi: 10.1093/isr/viv031

Tickner, J. A. (1992). *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. Columbia University Press.

Vitalis, R. (2015). *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations*. Cornell University Press.

Yeh, T. D. (2006). The Way to Peace: A Buddhist Perspective. *International Journal of Peace Studies* 11 (1) https://www3.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/vol11_1/11n1Yeh.pdf

Zhejiang University. (n.d.) *Introduction to International Relations*. Zhejiang University. Retrieved November 15, 2022, from http://jwbinfosys.zju.edu.cn/html_kc/251L0030.html

Zondi, S. (2018). Decolonising International Relations and Its Theory: A Critical Conceptual Meditation. *Politikon. South African Journal of Political Studies*, 45(1), 16-31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02589346.2018.1418202>

Annex A: All universities included in Knight's (2019) study by continent

Continent				
Count	North America	Europe	Asia	Australia
1	American University	Free University of Berlin (Freie Universität Berlin)	Chinese University of Hong Kong	Australian National University
2	Brown University	Humboldt University of Berlin (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin),	National University of Singapore	University of Sydney
3	College of William & Mary	Leiden University (Universiteit Leiden)	University of Hong Kong	
4	Columbia University	London School of Economics and Political Science		
5	Cornell University	Sciences Po		
6	Dartmouth College	Trinity College Dublin		
7	Duke University	University of Cambridge		
8	Georgetown University	University College London		
9	George Washington University	University of Amsterdam (Universiteit van Amsterdam)		
10	Harvard University	University of Edinburgh		
11	Johns Hopkins University	University of Oxford		
12	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	University of Warwick		
13	New York University			
14	the Ohio State University			
15	Pennsylvania State University			
16	Princeton University			
17	Stanford University			
18	Swarthmore College			
19	Tufts University			
20	University of			

- California–Los Angeles
- 21 University of California–San Diego
- 22 University of Chicago
- 23 University of Michigan
- 24 University of Rochester
- 25 University of Virginia
- 26 University of Wisconsin–Madison
- 27 Williams College
- 28 Yale University
- 29 McGill University
- 30 University of British Columbia
- 31 University of Toronto
-

Annex B: All assigned readings included on all three syllabi

University	#	Author	Reading Title	Country of residence	Country of PhD training	Gender
Fudan University	1	Karl Marx	Karl Marx and Frederick Engels- Selected Works	Germany	Germany	male
Fudan University	2	Friederick Engels	Karl Marx and Frederick Engels- Selected Works	Germany	none	male
Fudan University	3	Vladimir Lenin	Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism	Russia	none	male
Fudan University	4	Enlai Zhou	Zhou Enlai on Diplomacy	China	none	male
Fudan University	5	Zedong Mao	Mao Zedong on Diplomacy	China	none	male
Fudan University	6	Wentian Zhang	Collected Works of Zhang Wentian	China	none	male
Fudan University	7	Xiaoping Deng	Selected Works of Deng Xiaoping	China	none	male
Fudan University	8	Party History Research Office of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China	History of the Chinese Communist Party	China	unknown	unknown
Fudan University	9	Information Office of the State Council	China's Foreign Aid	China	unknown	unknown
Fudan University	10	Information Office of the State Council	Progress in China's Human Rights Series	China	unknown	unknown
Fudan University	11	Information Office of the State Council	China's Peaceful Development	China	unknown	unknown
Fudan University	12	Shenming Li	Study of the Marxism Fundamental Principles on International Issues	China	China	male
Fudan University	13	Mahatma Gandhi	Gandhi: an autobiography	India	none	male
Fudan University	14	Giovanni Arrighi	The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power and the Origins of Our Times	USA	Italy	male
Fudan University	15	Leften Stavros Stavrianos	Global Rift: The Third World Comes of Age	USA	USA	male

Fudan University	16	Andre Gunder Frank	Dependent accumulation and underdevelopment	Netherlands	USA	male
Fudan University	17	Andre Gunder Frank	ReOrient: Global Economy in the Asian Age	Netherlands	USA	male
Fudan University	18	Alexander Gerschenkron	Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective	USA	Austria	male
Fudan University	19	Theotônio dos Santos	Imperialismo y dependencia	Brasil	Brasil	male
Fudan University	20	Zhang Peigang	Agriculture and Industrialization	China	USA	male
Fudan University	21	Walden Bello	China and the Global Economy: The Persistence of Export-Led Growth	Philippines	USA	male
Fudan University	22	Roel van der Veen	What went wrong with Africa?	Netherlands	Netherlands	male
Fudan University	23	Yang Baorong	liabilities and development african debt issues and international relations	China	China	male
Fudan University	24	Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein	The Modern World-System	USA	USA	male
Fudan University	25	Chen Mingming	All Bullets have Destinies	China	China	male
Fudan University	26	Dambisa Moyo	dead aid : Why Aid Is Not Working and How There Is a Better Way for Africa	USA	UK	female
Fudan University	27	Chen Qiren	History of Colonial Economic Analysis and Contemporary Colonialism	China	China	male
Fudan University	28	George Cœdès	The Indianized States of Southeast Asia	France	France	male
Fudan University	29	Franklin Hiram King	Farmers of Forty Centuries; Or, Permanent Agriculture in China, Korea, and Japan	USA	USA	male
Fudan University	30	Fredric Jameson,	Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism	USA	USA	male

Fudan University	31	Zhu Jieqin	A History of Overseas Chinese in Southeast Asia	China	China	male
Fudan University	32	Karl Gunnar Myrdal	Asian Drama: An Inquiry into the Poverty of Nations	Sweden	Sweden	male
Fudan University	33	Khalid Koser	International Migration	Netherlands	unknown	male
Fudan University	34	Fernand Braudel	The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II	France	France	male
Fudan University	35	Anthony Reid	Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce, 1450-1680	Australia	UK	male
Fudan University	36	Quan Hansheng	A Study of Chinese Economic History	unknown	China	male
Fudan University	37	divers	The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia	divers	divers	divers
Fudan University	38	divers	The Cambridge Economic History of Europe	divers	divers	divers
Fudan University	39	Philip K. Hitti	History of the Arabs	USA	USA	male
Fudan University	40	Dietmar Rothermund	A history of india	Germany	USA	male
Fudan University	41	Zhang Xiaoming	The Cold War and its Legacy	China	China	male
Fudan University	42	Walter LaFeber	America, Russia and the Cold War, 1945–2006	USA	USA	male
Fudan University	43	John Lewis Gaddis	The Long Peace	USA	USA	male
Fudan University	44	Liu Jinzhi	History of Cold war	China	China	male
Fudan University	45	Daniel Bell	The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism	USA	USA	male
Fudan University	46	Shen Zongling	Study of Comparative Law	China	China	male
Fudan University	47	John H. Wigmore	Panorama of the World's Legal Systems	USA	USA	male
Fudan University	48	J. M. Blaut	The Colonizer's Model of the World Geographical	USA	USA	male

			Diffusionism and Eurocentric History			
Fudan University	49	Owen Lattimore	Inner Asian frontiers of China	USA	none	male
Fudan University	50	Samuel P. Huntington	The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order	USA	USA	male
Fudan University	51	Zhang Jinfan	Review and outlook of Chinese Legal Systems	China	China	male
Fudan University	52	Takeshi Sasaki	Public and private in Euro-American context	Japan	Japan	male
Fudan University	53	Yūzō Mizoguchi	Public and Private in the Chinese context	Japan	Japan	male
Fudan University	54	Chun-Chieh Huang (co-author)	New explorations in the public and private sectors - A comparative study of East Asian and Western Perspectives	Taiwan	USA	male
Fudan University	55	Jiang Yihua (co-author)	New explorations in the public and private sectors - A comparative study of East Asian and Western Perspectives	Taiwan	USA	male
Fudan University	56	divers	Introduction to World Religions Book Series	divers	divers	diverse
Fudan University	57	Yun Shan	Cultural self-awareness, cultural self-confidence, and cultural self-reliance	unknown	unknown	unknown
Fudan University	58	Zhang Guangzhi	Six Lectures on Archaeology	Taiwan	USA	male
Fudan University	59	Zhao Tingyang	World System	China	China	male
Fudan University	60	Wang Hui	China from Empire to Nation-State	China	China	male
Fudan University	61	John Bordley Rawls	The Law of Peoples	USA	USA	male
Fudan University	62	Thomas L. Friedman	The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-first Century	USA	none	male
Fudan University	63	Yu Zhengliang	An outline of postwar international relations	China	China	male

Fudan University	64	Gerry Simpson	Great Powers and Outlaw State	UK	USA	male
Fudan University	65	Jeremy Rifkin	The European Dream	USA	none	male
Nankai University	1	John T. Rourke	International Politics on the World Stage	USA	USA	male
Nankai University	2	Karen A. Mingst	Essentials of International Relations	USA	USA	female
Zhejiang University	1	Joseph Nye	Understanding international conflicts	USA	USA	male
Zhejiang University	2	Conway Henderson	International Relations: Conflict and Cooperation at the Turn of the 21st Century	USA	USA	male
Zhejiang University	3	Li Shaojun	Introduction to International Politics	China	unknown	male
Zhejiang University	4	John T. Rourke	International Politics on the World Stage	USA	USA	male
Zhejiang University	5	James E. Dougherty	Contending Theories of International Relations A Comprehensive Survey	USA	USA	male
Zhejiang University	6	Robert L. Pfaltzgraff	Contending Theories of International Relations A Comprehensive Survey	USA	USA	male
Zhejiang University	7	Karen A. Mingst	Essentials of International Relations	USA	USA	female
Zhejiang University	8	Robert Gilpin	synopsis of global political economy: understanding the international economic order	USA	USA	male
Zhejiang University	9	David Held	A globalizing world?: Culture, economics, politics	UK	USA	male
Zhejiang University	10	James Rosenau	Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics	USA	USA	male
Zhejiang University	11	Christopher Coker	Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics	UK	unknown	male

Zhejiang University	12	Gary Schmitt	Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics	USA	USA	male
Zhejiang University	13	David Shambaugh	The future of U.S.-China relations	USA	USA	male
Zhejiang University	14	Yang Yuan	International Relations Analysis	China	China	male
Zhejiang University	15	Yan Xuotong	International Relations Analysis	China	USA	male