Globalize IPE, not just the syllabi! Virtual classrooms interactions and the making of the Atlantic Diagonals glossary

Jean-Christophe Graz, Jean-Marie Chenou, Carolina Urrego-Sandoval & Sylvain Maechler

View supplementary material ☐

Published online: 19 Jan 2024.

Submit your article to this journal ☐

Article views: 20

View related articles ☐

View Crossmark data ☐

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

PEDAGOGICAL INTERVENTION   OPEN ACCESS   Check for updates

Globalize IPE, not just the syllabi! Virtual classrooms interactions and the making of the Atlantic Diagonals glossary

Jean-Christophe Graz[a] (ID), Jean-Marie Chenou[b] (ID), Carolina Urrego-Sandoval[b] (ID) and Sylvain Maechler[a,c] (ID)

[a]Centre d'histoire internationale et d'études politiques de la mondialisation (CRHIM), University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland; [b]Department of Political Science and Global Studies, Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia; [c]Institute of Political Science, Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Frankfurt, Germany

ABSTRACT

How do we as scholars and instructors globalize International Political Economy (IPE) teaching beyond the syllabi? This pedagogical intervention proposes a concrete way to globalize IPE teaching in the classroom and through student-led activities based on courses taught during two semesters at the Universities of Lausanne (Switzerland) and Los Andes (Bogota, Colombia). We present the making of a multilingual glossary of IPE drafted by groups of students based in different universities in very different geographical, political, economic and cultural contexts. We argue that such a pedagogical intervention is not only about globalizing and decolonizing the teaching of IPE; it also helps develop important competences by students, especially their engagement and criticality. We review the literature on globalizing and decolonizing IPE before providing background on the idea of 'global competence' as part of the objectives of higher education and its relevance for recent calls to globalize IPE. We then present a toolbox for the pedagogical intervention that we used in such a way to be reused by anyone wanting to build upon it. Lastly, we further reflect on the contribution and challenges of such interventions regarding current attempts to globalize and decolonize IPE.

Introduction

The traditional IPE syllabus has been increasingly questioned over the last decade. The catalog of canonical approaches (both mainstream and critical) and classical

domains of production, trade, and finance are no longer deemed sufficient to explore the richness of the field. Therefore, IPE scholars are constantly looking for ways to broaden the perspectives and to include new problems and approaches (Katz-Rosene et al., 2021). More disturbingly, the traditional syllabus is not only criticized for its narrow scope, but is also accused of reproducing structures of domination and the privileging of some voices and exclusion of others (Cochrane & Oloruntoba, 2021; Kvangraven & Kesar, 2023). Such calls to globalize IPE and decolonize curricula have prompted a critical reflection on how we teach IPE.

In this context, a discussion started between IPE professors at the Université de Lausanne, Switzerland, Université du Québec à Montreal, Canada and Universidad de los Andes, Colombia, on how to engage students in a pluralist and global IPE course. While the globalization, feminization or even decolonization of IPE syllabi through the inclusion of diverse readings are necessary steps (Chen & Petry, 2023; Mantz, 2019), we tried to develop a pedagogical intervention aimed at enacting a globalization of IPE *in* the classroom and *through* student-led activities. We opted for a multilingual glossary of IPE written by groups of students based in different universities in very different geographical, political, economic and cultural contexts because it addressed different dimensions of the globalization of IPE: Students engage actively in the production of multi-situated knowledge (Sunder Rajan, 2021); they experiment with group work in a multilingual environment; and they bring their own experiences and perspectives to a field dominated by worldviews from the anglosphere.

This discussion started in 2018, and a pilot activity was carried out that same year. Based on this first experience, we developed the project *Atlantic Diagonals* during two different semesters and with two different classes in 2019 and 2022. Since *Atlantic Diagonals* involves online interactions, the fact that the first iteration occurred before the COVID-19 pandemic meant a lot of technical challenges. The second iteration built upon the first experience and the online teaching expertise acquired during the lockdowns.

This article presents the pedagogical intervention within the context of a rapidly evolving IPE field. It is meant as a reflection on the contribution of student-led pedagogical activities to the globalizing of IPE, but also as a critical reflection on the technical, logistical and pedagogical challenges of global IPE teaching. While we value the efforts toward the decolonization of curricula, we acknowledge their limitations beyond large and resourceful universities that can teach several courses on both traditional and decolonial IPE. Our pedagogical intervention is designed as a course module within a single IPE course (as part of a Political Science Bachelor's and an International Studies Master's program) that combines the teaching of mainstream and critical IPE with active learning within the confines of the classroom and self-reflective activities to stress the situated character of knowledge and the need for pluralism. Notably, while the online glossary of IPE draws inspiration from the I-PEEL website,[1] the content and actual drafting processes of the entries differ significantly. *Atlantic Diagonals* results from a pedagogical intervention with students; entries for I-PEEL are orders to, or propositions from, well-established scholars in the field.

The article is organized as follows. We first review the literature on globalizing and decolonizing IPE to situate the intervention within contemporary reflections on the field. Second, we introduce the historical development of the idea of global

competence as part of the objectives of higher education and relate this project to the recent calls to globalize IPE. Third, we present the toolbox of our pedagogical intervention and critically reflect on the latter, before briefly concluding.

Globalizing IPE

How can we invent pedagogical interventions likely to enact a globalization of the field of IPE within the confines of the classroom? Responding to such a demand might be more difficult than expected despite more than two decades of endeavors to (1) distinguish *global* from *international political economy*, (2) to overcome self-destructive divides in a field historically dominated by US scholarship and (3) to come to terms with the colonial legacy of the discipline of International Relations (IR) to which IPE remains closely related. We review existing scholarship on these three dimensions and situate our contribution within the effort to establish a global conversation in IPE aimed at connecting global knowledges and experiences (Moulin et al., 2015). *Atlantic Diagonals* ultimately aims to reinforce pluralism and complement existing classroom exercises rather than take sides in the debates outlined below. We hope that such a pedagogical intervention stressing the plurality of experiences and worldviews provides prospects to open up narrow definitions of IPE and further advance the globalization of the field.

The consolidation of IPE scholarship included from its outset debates regarding its core concepts and the very name of the field of study. Some scholars considered that defining the field as *Global*, rather than *International Political Economy* would provide additional guarantees for keeping distance from studies based on a narrower ontology and orthodox epistemology. In one of the pioneer textbooks in the field, Palan (2000, p. 2) points out that from this perspective Global Political Economy (GPE), rather than IPE, is a 'frontiered discipline' whose main division lines 'no longer trail International Relations' controversies, but reflect broader issues and contemporary debates in political economy and the social sciences.' In the Global South as well, IPE reflects a 'tendency to have an insufficient dialogue with inadequate or lack of access to global, regional and developmental voices' (Vivares, 2020, p.10). In contrast, GPE is viewed as better able to support 'pluralistic debates, problematizing realities and widening global inquiries' (ibid.). While this might have contributed to opening up the scholarship to critical thinking, non-Western standpoints, and engagement with enduring hierarchies of disciplinary fields, labeling exercises remain insufficient to overcome power relations affecting academic knowledge and practices.

The second dimension is related to divisions within the field. Cohen's (2007) seminal analysis of the transatlantic divide opposing American and British schools of IPE epitomizes the enduring lines along which the field has been structured. Responding to some of his early critiques assembled in two special issues of *Review of International Political Economy* and *New Political Economy* in 2009 (Editors, 2009; Weaver, 2009), Cohen has since nuanced his intellectual history of IPE with a broader and more fine-grained geographical typology. Yet, institutionalized practices of intellectual reproduction still reflect opposed and rival factions. Seabrook and Young (2017) provide empirical evidence of a global divide between, at best, a prominent Anglosphere, let alone an increasingly insular American school, and the

rest. Their study is based on a large corpus of English-speaking material, including 645 articles derived from how the field is taught in 170 IPE syllabi in 16 different countries, as well as systematic information on four different major specialized conferences in the field. Their mapping of the intellectual and social spaces of IPE shows that the core American legacy still dominates in the classroom. Yet, scholars show more pluralistic practices in their attempts to seek recognition by ways of a 'niche proliferation' of publications and face-to-face intellectual engagement.

Similarly, the Teaching, Research, and International Policy (TRIP) project developed by Maliniak and colleagues draws from surveys of IR faculty in different countries and articles published in leading journals to discern the major characteristics of the field. A first study focused on IPE in the United States (US) confirmed Cohen's analysis of an American school as increasingly positivist, quantitative, and liberal in orientation (Maliniak & Tierney, 2009). A more recent study based on 32 countries and 12 top journals – yet focused on the discipline of IR as a whole – also substantiates Cohen's view on an evolution toward an increasingly parochial American prominence in the field. As Maliniak et al. (2018, p. 478) point out, their findings 'paint a picture of a discipline characterized by US hegemony and insularity, but also one in which there are robust differences in how scholars practice their craft.' Their conclusions are similar to Cohen's: The divide is now more global along regional schools and not just transatlantic. However, the positivist and quantitative American school remains prominent, even if such prominence 'does not necessarily translate into practical *influence*' (Cohen, 2019, p. 136). As a result, the American hegemony of the field is viewed as progressively giving way to parochialism, with increasing plurality and dialogues of the deaf between academic traditions. Against this background, a global conversation including peripheral contributions is necessary to overcome geographical and epistemological divisions (Deciancio & Quiliconi, 2020; Tussie & Riggirozzi, 2015).

Disciplinary debates and empirical studies on how enduring divides impede the globalization of IPE thus show some evolution in terms of research and peer interaction, yet much less in knowledge reproduction in the classroom. More importantly, such discussions have generally remained disconnected from the ongoing debate about decolonizing curricula in higher education and the discipline of IR more particularly. This is the third dimension we look at below.

Critical scholars have emphasized insights to be drawn from non-Western thought to study IR and engage the field for several decades (e.g. Bilgin, 2008; Chan et al., 2001; Cox, 1992; Gruffydd Jones, 2006; Ling, 2002; Tickner & Blaney, 2013). Yet, a new landmark has been reached since the 2010s. Non-Western approaches to IR embraced other ways of thinking the international and how the discipline of IR is enacted in higher education institutions outside core Western countries. Built upon Gayatri Spivak's concept of 'worlding' which describes the discursive power of knowledge able to set apart certain areas of the world from others, the Routledge book series 'Worlding beyond the West' set the pace with three opening titles challenging western core dominance of the field and alternative possibilities to think about international relations (Tickner & Blaney, 2012, 2013; Tickner & Wæver, 2009).

The drive also gained momentum with Amitav Acharya's presidential address to the Annual Convention of the International Studies Association in 2014. While not advocating for a radical decolonial turn, Acharya criticized a discipline 'too deeply

rooted in, and beholden to, the history, intellectual traditions, and agency claims of the West [reproducing the] hegemonic status of established IR theories' (Acharya, 2014, p. 649). Considering the IR community as 'complicit in the marginalization of the postcolonial world in developing the discipline' (ibid., p. 648), he outlines several dimensions along which reimagining IR as a global discipline would constitute 'an aspiration for greater inclusiveness and diversity' (ibid., p. 649), echoing the aforementioned efforts to globalize IPE.

A flurry of studies has emphasized the hidden Eurocentric, imperial, colonial, racialized and gendered origins of IR theory (e.g. among 'classics': Shilliam, 2011; Hobson, 2012; Vitalis, 2015). Fewer, however, include non-Western perspectives with an explicit IPE focus. Among existing studies, one can nevertheless point out Bhambra's analyses of the fictitious and racialized construction of modernity and the contemporary nation-state, in which colonial processes remain central to the emergence and development of capitalism (Bhambra & Holmwood, 2018; Bhambra, 2021). From a different perspective, Lobo-Guerrero and colleagues (2021) also historicize the epistemological practices used to create imaginaries of connectivity of the global political economy right from the making of European empires. Helleiner (2015, 2021, 2023) traces the history of IPE classical foundations back to its diverse and global origins beyond Europe. The contribution of indigenous thought has also been the subject of increasing attention, for instance, in studies on ecological struggles, prompting new thinking about knowledge underpinning such struggles (Green, 2013). In recent years, numerous studies have reoriented their analytical frameworks by drawing on concepts, such as 'coloniality of power', 'border thinking' and 'pluriverse' found in the writings of Anibal Quijano, Walter Mignolo, Ashish Kothari and others (Mignolo, 2000; Quijano, 2000; Kothari et al., 2019). These approaches reveal the diversity of GPE not only on the epistemological level, but also ontologically. For example, the recent turn to non-Western relational ontologies in international studies illustrates the contribution of pluriversal thought to better acknowledge the variety of ontological understandings of the world likely to nurture fruitful dialogues with critical approaches in IPE (Kurki, 2020, 2022; Querejazu, 2022; Trownsell, 2022).

Yet, the focus remains on the intellectual history of such and such (sub-)field of study and its colonial legacy regarding geographical origins, ontological objects of reference, and the idea of a 'canon', reproduced through reading lists included in syllabi (e.g. Haffner, 2018). A recent 'Pedagogical Intervention' in *RIPE* advanced such a decolonial reading of an IPE Master's program in a UK university; it inferred from such teaching that Eurocentrism and coloniality remain a 'pervading issue in IPE' (Mantz, 2019, p. 1363). Another *RIPE* 'Pedagogical Intervention' showed that China, despite its fundamental importance in the contemporary GPE and its increasing centrality in IPE research, remains 'curiously absent in IPE teaching' (Chen & Petry, 2023, p. 802). Such critiques, mainly focused on globalizing the syllabi, overlook teaching practices and skills acquired by students as a result of defined teaching objectives. Yet, Mantz draws on Sousa's epistemologies of the South (Sousa Santos de, 2014, p. 205) to call for 'epistemological pragmatics', 'whereby the concrete interventions particular knowledges can make in the world are constantly reassessed, leading to context-dependent hierarchies among knowledges' (Mantz, 2019, p. 1374). Such a perspective emphasizes not only the need for a plurality of knowledge, but also a knowledge moving

away from a mere 'knowing-about' to a more active 'knowing-with' (Sousa Santos de, 2018).

On a more prosaic basis, this brings us back to Cohen's (2019, p. 146) remarks in conclusion to his analysis: 'Above all, the diversity of IPE should be celebrated in the classroom. Instructors should resist the temptation to present just a single version of the field, simply because it is convenient or corresponds to their own priors. Students deserve the whole truth, not just a half-truth.' As Grayson (2015, p. 163) points out regarding the distance between research programs and the work of scholars as educators when teaching about popular culture and world politics, 'Of course, it is one thing to claim the importance of a topic area and quite another to demonstrate that importance to students through pedagogical practice' (Grayson, 2015, p. 163).

Putting GPE into practice: fomenting global competence and inclusivity

The recent urge to globalize IPE, as reflected by the debates on the name of the field and on its intellectual roots, echoes a longstanding effort to promote a global perspective in education. Depending on the forum and historical context, this effort has been more or less critical of global structures of domination. However, it constantly advocated for the acquisition of multidimensional competence to better understand diverse worldviews and experiences.

In the 1970s, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) envisioned the future of education in a changing world with the publication of the Faure report (UNESCO, 2013 [1972]). Among other trends, such as lifelong education, the report promoted international understanding as a key objective. It denounced that national curricula remained 'dangerously provincial' (UNESCO, 2013 [1972] p. 240) and proposed international mobility, agreements and diploma equivalence as well as the elimination of discrimination to overcome provincialism. The international dimension and global perspective in education were presented as a way to promote international understanding, world peace and cooperation, but also to contribute to the struggle against (neo-)colonialism, racialism, fascism and all ideologies 'which breed national and racial hatred' (UNESCO, 1974, art. 6).

In the 1990s, a more market-oriented version emerged. In 1996, UNESCO published another milestone report titled 'Learning: The treasure within', also known as the Delors Report (UNESCO, 1996). The report explored the tension between the global and the local. It recommended an education that allowed people to gradually 'become world citizens without losing their roots and while continuing to play an active part in the life of their nation and their local community' (UNESCO, 1996, p. 16). The Delors Report was inspired by a social democratic liberalism 'coloured by neoliberalist tints' (Lee, 2007, p. 32). UNESCO later became more critical toward the market-oriented conception of the 1990s. However, this conception of global competence as an individual asset in the international job market remains highly influential (Hunter, 2004).

In the wake of SDG 4.7, 'Education for Sustainable Development and Global Citizenship', the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) developed its own indicators for a global competence framework included since 2018 in its Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) (OECD, 2018). As most competence-based frameworks, the OECD global competence draws on

education literature and includes different dimensions beyond the transmission of knowledge, such as skills, attitudes and values.

The globalizing of IPE syllabi described in the previous section responds mostly to the knowledge dimension of the OECD framework. In contrast, *Atlantic Diagonals* seeks to address more directly other dimensions as well. The reflection on the need to educate globally competent citizens reinforces and complements the project of a more global IPE.

As Robertson (2021) points out, the OECD framework highlights the influence of US corporate interests and a culture of globalized capitalism. One way to move beyond such a utilitarian definition of the global competence to support a critical perspective is to adopt a more inclusive and reflexive understanding of competences. The objective of the Atlantic Diagonals is to develop the global competence of students while cultivating a critical perspective. As discussed by Steger (2016), a critical perspective should complement the global competence with social responsibility and global civic engagement, in this case through a reflection on the field of GPE and on students' participation in the reproduction and diffusion of knowledge, worldviews and experiences. *Atlantic Diagonals* also aims at supporting a globalization of knowledge in GPE with a more inclusive notion of competence. Such advancement of global competence includes several aspects of the above-mentioned narrative of intergovernmental organizations. The Diagonals thus emphasize students' and others' roles in producing knowledge about specific GPE issues. The skills are supposed to be gained as a result of the activities that involve the ability of producing publishable material on local, global and intercultural issues. As we will see below, this opens up a wide range of issues to which students may be particularly concerned due to the socio-political environment they are most familiar with. Regarding inclusive and reflexive attitudes, the constraints in undertaking such an activity prompt an ability to demonstrate openness, respect for people from different cultural backgrounds and global-mindedness. This also relates to the values students should harness for engaging in open, appropriate and effective interactions across cultures during all groupwork sessions organized for decision-making and entry drafting.

Beyond such competences in knowledge, skills, attitudes and values as emphasized by intergovernmental organizations, *Atlantic Diagonals* makes the case for two additional competences needed when understood inclusively and reflexively. The first is *criticality*. Students develop such a competence to systematically reflect on the underpinning of their own knowledge production process. The fact that they work in groups twinned from two far-away countries whose members have experienced highly different everyday student life contributes to reinforcing such need for criticality. The second is *engagement*. Being involved in an activity designed to have a concrete, global and publicly available outcome, students develop a sense of engagement as they realize that the drafting of bilingual entries of a glossary to be published in French and Spanish on the Internet may eventually contribute to shaping the world by producing and diffusing new, pluralist and decentred knowledge beyond the anglosphere. Table 1 below summarizes those six competences.

Such inclusive competences supported by our pedagogical intervention are reflected throughout the drafting process led by students, its evaluation by professors and the publication of the final product.

Table 1. An inclusive view of the global competence in the Atlantic Diagonals.

Knowledge	Include your own and others' knowledge in producing new knowledge
Skills	Produce publishable material on local, global and intercultural issues
Attitudes	Demonstrate openness, respect for people from different cultural backgrounds and global mindedness[2]
Values	Engage in open, appropriate and effective interactions across cultures during groupwork
Criticality	Reflect on the underpinning of your own knowledge production
Engagement	Shape the world by producing and diffusing new, pluralist and decentred knowledge beyond the anglosphere

Source: Authors.

The diagonal's toolkit

We now outline the concrete methodology used for drafting the entries of the *Atlantic Diagonals* glossary of IPE during the one-semester IPE course[3] taught in 2019 and 2022 at the Universidad de los Andes in Bogotá, Colombia (hereafter, UniAndes), and at the Université de Lausanne, Switzerland (hereafter, UNIL). We specifically focus on the pedagogical intervention that supports the writing of collaborative bilingual IPE entries for publication online as a glossary (see Appendix 7 for a list of entries, Online Supplementary Data).[4] This intervention is considered an entry point for fomenting students' IPE global competences. This section aims to provide a toolkit for anyone interested in reproducing this exercise. We, therefore, focus here primarily on the 2022 edition, which not only gained experience from the intervention carried out in 2019, but also benefited from the online tools made available during the COVID-19 crisis and the related ability of teachers and students to use them.

Background

The whole course was taught for fourteen weeks at UNIL, and sixteen at UniAndes. At UniAndes, the class was made up of seventeen master's students as part of the Master in International Studies. At UNIL, the class was made up of twenty-five second or third-year bachelor's students in Political Science. In both cases, this was the first time students encountered the field of IPE for a whole term. The main reason for this is that IPE is taught within Political Science, International Relations and International Studies, not as an independent program.

For both editions, the teaching team planned classes weeks in advance during online meetings. The teaching team includes two professors, one or two graduate students, and one or two pre-graduate students. The syllabi (see Appendices 1 and 2, Online Supplementary Data) detail the organization of the whole semester. The syllabi are not exactly the same in both universities as both classes also included more conventional courses on theories and thematical issues. This part of the curriculum included a strong critical and global perspective and thus responded to the 'knowledge dimension' detailed in Table 1. It supported students to develop a theoretical and empirical understanding of IPE. The reading list was not coordinated between the two universities except for some relevant overlaps (e.g. Acharya, 2014, and more generally, classical authors, such as Diana Tussie, Susan Strange or Benjamin Cohen). This lack of coordination was intentional and in line with the spirit of the Diagonals. It reinforces a diversity of perspectives between students

and thus their complementarity when it comes to the thinking about and writing entries for the glossary.

In contrast, there was thorough coordination of the course objectives detailed in the syllabi regarding the specificities of the pedagogical intervention. Three objectives are particularly relevant to the global competences referred to in Table 1. At the end of the course, students should be able to:

1. *Conduct and organize collaborative research, writing, and communication of glossary entries, integrating a variety of viewpoints developed by peers in Switzerland and Colombia as well as feedback from teachers (Appendix 1, p. 2; Appendix 2, p. 2, our translation).*
2. *Develop interpersonal skills to function in an international environment, negotiate linguistic or cultural constraints, decentralize and develop a reflexive view on the construction of knowledge from different socio-political and historical contexts, and broaden their international and intercultural communication skills (ibid).*
3. *Mobilize transversal skills to develop content for an external audience in the form of a permanent publication on an Internet portal (ibid).*

As students are held as equal peers, their collaboration is also nurtured by the diversity of the two groups in terms of nationalities, cultures, education, professions, socioeconomic backgrounds and overall positionality and world views. Language competence is an obvious case in point: Students speak French at UNIL and Spanish at UniAndes, and only a few master both. While English could be used as a communication tool, which evidences the dominance of this language in academic settings, the teaching team instructed students to submit their work in French and Spanish. This directive aims to transcend the anglosphere's influence in the writing of this IPE glossary. Ultimately, the knowledge built by students during classes is used and adapted in exchanges with peers in the writing process of the entries. They can thus draw from such evolution of *knowledges* to foster the necessary *skills* to write three glossary entries for an online publication.

The students were busy writing the glossary for most of the semester and a bit over for final editing before publication online. The progress in the drafting process was punctuated around five ninety-minute meetings – called 'Atlantic Diagonals'. The practical organization of the intervention was also prepared in advance and summarized in a guideline – which is *not* the syllabi (Appendices 3 and 4, Online Supplementary Data). This guideline details each step of the Diagonal, including means of communication. For the five meetings, we used Adobe Connect in 2019, and Zoom in 2022. As experienced worldwide since the COVID-19 pandemic, Zoom is now considered one of the best online synchronous meeting tools for immersive communication, interaction and teaching. While the work was sent by e-mail, students collaborated and submitted their entries through the online whiteboard Conceptboard in 2022, which has been promoted as a tool to 'enhance student engagement and collaboration, enable real-time group interaction, and promote active learning' (Bonner et al., 2022, p. 263). More importantly, this is the only tool we found that fulfills the Swiss Data Protection Ordinance (inspired by the European GDPR).[5] This is not the case, for instance, of the online whiteboard Google Drive. However, Conceptboard has shown many practical limitations that will be discussed in the section 'reflecting on the pedagogical intervention'.

Setting groups and selecting entries

A methodology workshop entitled 'Building a glossary entry and brainstorming on the choice of entries', and taught separately at the two universities, sets out to organize groups of around four and six students according to their own preferences. Depending on their interests, knowledge and discussions with the teaching team, each group first proposes a long list of ten potential glossary entries. As stated in the guidelines: 'At this stage, the number of entries is higher than the final number in order, on the one hand, to be able to manage possible duplications and, on the other hand, to have a sufficient base to make the most promising choice with the partners' (Appendix 3, p. 1, our translation). Students are free in their choices as long as the choice can be related to IPE and does not overlap with existing entries from the previous exercise.

Before the first Diagonal, the teaching team matches groups from both universities by trying to consider gender diversity and language skills, according to which at least two members from each university could communicate preferably in French or Spanish, otherwise in English. During the first Diagonal, these groups are distributed into Zoom rooms. At this stage, students primarily introduce themselves and get to know each other. We have also suggested that students exchange their phone numbers to continue their discussion through a WhatsApp group. They then present and discuss their choice of potential glossary entries (ten for each university group) before starting to negotiate how to narrow it down to four according to their take regarding relevance, individual interests and sensibilities. Some students prioritise issues related to their domestic contexts. For instance, Colombian students proposed the concept of 'orange economy', which refers to the creative economy, which was very popular in the country at the time due to its inclusion in former President Ivan Duque's economic plan. Others directly echoed the concerns and interests of Colombian and Swiss students, for instance, because they were linked to current events. This was the case of 'vaccines'[6] after the COVID-19 pandemic.

Later on, the four selected entries are shared with the teaching team, who checks for possible duplicates, and overall global relevance. During the second Diagonal, the list is brought down to three, with a brief explanatory note including potential thematic coverage and empirical examples. The making of an IPE glossary entry – or, more specifically, three entries per group – can then start.

The making of an IPE glossary entry

The main instruction is that at least one person from each university must participate in a glossary entry. Indeed, the entries not only have to be written in French *and* in Spanish, but also, they must reflect the transatlantic dialogue detailed above, not only regarding language differences but also the distinct socio-cultural, political and personal sensibilities of students. This is why in the end, the whole group is responsible for the quality of each entry, with a common evaluation.

The first step is to find as much information as possible about the chosen concept. Students employ academic reading material from the reading lists, and diverse sources, such as academic journals, government publications, national and

international newspapers and news reports available on YouTube, United Nations and other international organizations' reports and publications, among others. They use English, French and Spanish sources.

This review of academic and policy literature helps students draft a first working definition of their entries, identify the lexical controversies related to it and determine its scope and problematique. The entry 'green economy'[7] chosen by a group in 2022 is a good case in point. It is a key example of a concept that is hotly debated among researchers in varied disciplines, but also a major policy concept whose definitions vary greatly depending on the actors who mobilize it. Students must come up with their own definition for the glossary entry. These issues are discussed with the teaching team, based on previous feedback, during the third Diagonal. At this stage, students have reviewed a varied basis of interdisciplinary and policy literature, and must put into practice the IPE theoretical foundations taught at the beginning of the course. The fourth Diagonal has this purpose to show 'the value-added elements of an IPE perspective for each selected entry' (Appendix 3, p. 2, our translation).

Students then submit the first version of their glossary entries, which is discussed during the last (and fifth) Diagonal. A final entry comprises approximately 1000 words written both in French and Spanish, with around ten bibliographic references. Most groups initially provided around 20 bibliographic references, which we found excessive for a glossary entry. We requested them to narrow down the list to only the most relevant ones. At this stage, students must also find three images that best illustrate their entry, using either the platform Dreamstime for which UNIL has a license or royalty-free images from elsewhere. Finally, they must find two video records of around ten minutes to be referenced to as 'further information' – one in French, and one in Spanish. YouTube is the main source of this material.

The teaching team evaluates each submission before the Diagonals take place. This evaluation includes comments for discussion during the Diagonal (see evaluation grids in French and Spanish in Appendices 5 and 6, Online Supplementary Data). Each entry is followed in priority by a rapporteur chosen among the teaching team. The entire teaching team then discusses during a coordination meeting the day before the next Diagonal and sends its assessment directly afterwards. All three assessments made before the final submission allow for incremental improvement. All members of the teaching team carefully evaluate the final submission as it decides whether the quality of the entry is sufficient for it to be considered for online publication. Should an entry not be of high enough standard for publication, this may not necessarily be detrimental to passing the course. The entries considered for publication are further edited, including a close reading of a strict equivalence between the Spanish and French versions. Once published online, all members of the group are recognized as co-authors of the entry.

Reflecting on the pedagogical intervention

This section reflects on the Diagonals' original and concrete grounds for developing students' global competences in critical, inclusive and reflective ways to achieve the course objectives as illustrated by the six interdependent and overlapping competences (described in Table 1 and summarized in Table 2). Finally, we discuss students' evaluations and the teaching team's self-reflection as takeaways for future pedagogical exercises.

Table 2. Atlantic Diagonals' competences and activities.

	Competences	Activities
Knowledge	Include your own and others' knowledge in producing new knowledge	• Gain new theoretical and empirical knowledge about IPE approaches and issues employing sources in English, French and Spanish. • Discuss and share acquired knowledge to create Diagonals entries, including designing original images. • Learn from each other's knowledge and experiences. • Learn to use Conceptboard and Zotero.
Skills	Produce publishable material on local, global, and intercultural issues	• Planning activities. • Writing, drafting, editing and proofreading the glossary entries in French and Spanish. • Use of digital tools.
Attitudes	Demonstrate openness, respect for people from different cultural backgrounds and global mindedness	• Develop openness and respect for people from different cultural backgrounds. • Understand how different world regions are interconnected through the commonality of shared experiences. • Identify themes and examples globally relevant to the study of IPE. • Strengthen communications skills. • Negotiate linguistic and cultural constraints.
Values	Engage in open, appropriate and effective interactions across cultures during group work	• Conduct appropriate and effective interactions during and after the sessions. • Acknowledge and understand the particularities of their counterparts. • Engage in conflict resolution.
Criticality	Reflect on the underpinnings of your own knowledge production	• Develop a reflexive view on knowledge construction from different socio-political and historical contexts. • Engage in critical discussions and negotiations regarding the concept's meaning and origins. • Develop awareness of the production and positionality of knowledge. • Recognize one's own knowledge perspectives and biases toward specific concepts and places.
Engagement	Shape the world by producing and diffusing new, pluralist and decentred knowledge beyond the Anglosphere	• Provide definitions of key IPE concepts in French and Spanish to be published online. • Contribute to others' understanding of IPE from a decentred perspective. • Diffuse knowledge for Spanish and French-speaking audiences worldwide.

Source: Authors.

Knowledge

To produce new knowledge, students had to establish concrete ways to collaborate and learn from each other. The Diagonals facilitated such processes in two main ways. First, through the acquisition of new knowledge about specific IPE theoretical approaches, issues and lexical controversies. Second, through sharing media literacy regarding collaborative platforms and communication mechanisms. For example, Colombian students were initially reluctant to use Conceptboard, as they found it 'complex and inefficient'. Despite the different data protection regulations in Colombia and Switzerland, both teams collectively decided to use Google Drive to overcome this difficulty. Students also gained and shared knowledge regarding the process of designing and creating their own images for the glossary entry. This showcases their commitment and engagement with the activity, as well as the development of their creative skills.

Skills

To produce publishable material for the glossary entries on local and global IPE issues, students had to develop skills, such as research, writing, editing, proofreading and the ability to use technology to create new online content. Such activities facilitated active learning and promoted knowledge creation. The teams also had to establish concrete ways for collecting the documentation, iconography, and video records to be used. In the writing process, students discussed concepts in English but had to write them in French and Spanish while maintaining the coherence of the text in both languages. Even though we pointed out that translating texts was not the purpose of the exercise, they often used online translating tools. Furthermore, finding a common understanding at a level high enough to draft written outcomes deemed worthy of publication required continuous critical engagement. It also required students to iteratively revise successive rounds of drafting stages, distinguishing it from the typical approach to class assignments. In most cases, the exercise worked well after some adjustments. Nonetheless, a small number of entries were considered not publishable.

Attitudes

The inherent diversity of the two groups in terms of nationalities, cultural, educational, professional and socioeconomic backgrounds has been a crucial element of the Diagonals' success. Throughout the course and in all interactions, students built and strengthened their openness, respect for people from different backgrounds and global-mindedness. We can observe this in two dimensions and activities. First, in students' ability to respect different ideas, perspectives and beliefs. Second, in their ability to overcome interpersonal and linguistic challenges. Students faced difficulties in social interactions and discussions in English. As a result, they were shy during the first sessions and suggested that the language barrier affected the pace and depth of their debates. However, they overcame this as interactions increased and they built confidence. At the end of the semester, UNIL and UniAndes participants indicated they enjoyed the Diagonal experience. They strengthened their English communication skills and gained confidence to work in diverse international academic environments.

Values

Effective and appropriate interactions between the two groups during and after online sessions and discussions were essential for building this competence. This included deepening their understanding of each other's particularities. Although students appreciated the opportunity to interact with peers in Colombia and Switzerland, there were limitations. For instance, students' time availability and commitment outside the virtual classroom varied greatly due to the 7-h time difference between Switzerland and Colombia. Additionally, many UniAndes students had full- and part-time jobs, making it difficult to arrange meetings after class. Therefore, they needed understanding, negotiation and flexibility to find alternative means of communication to surmount this issue.

Engagement

The outcome of the *Diagonals* is the glossary entries published online. They provide definitions and IPE discussions. In addition, they include further readings, illustrative images and online resources, such as short videos. Each entry is the result of students' diverse worldviews and ideas. It allows for exploring concepts and approaches that might not be widely analyzed beyond the dominant Anglophone scholarship, thus making IPE more linguistically inclusive and accessible. While there is obviously a paradox in the English-language communication used in the classroom, we hope that this exercise and its outcome – the bilingual online glossary reflecting diverse perspectives – helped 'to disrupt and destabilize' the hegemonic status of both 'English language as the lingua franca of academic communication', and the 'Anglo-American hegemony' in terms of knowledge production (Kitchin, 2005, p. 1). By diffusing this knowledge online, it is accessible to large Spanish and French-speaking readerships – notably in Latin America and French-speaking African countries. This contributes to a decentred understanding of IPE for new students and people interested in such issues.

Criticality

The criticality competence results from questioning information rather than simply absorbing, describing, and mindlessly reproducing it (Dunne, 2015). In this way, the *Diagonals* provide students with a first approach to GPE from different geographical, social, cultural, and political spheres beyond the Anglosphere. This approach includes questioning assumptions and analyzing power relations that influence mainstream approaches to specific concepts and issues. In doing so, the courses achieve the promotion of international understanding while fostering a reflexive view on knowledge construction from different worldviews. Transatlantic lively peer discussions and negotiations on concept meanings, lexical controversies, approaches and examples have enriched the research and writing, enhancing the quality of students' contributions. As a result, criticality and engagement were achieved as students developed awareness of their diversity and knowledge production and positionality. For example, UNIL students reported they realized that sometimes they write from a very Eurocentric perspective and found the interactions with Colombian students valuable for exchanging ideas. Furthermore, according to the students' evaluation of both universities, 80% of UNIL students and 88% of UniAndes students agreed that the course stimulated reflective analysis.

For teaching teams

Atlantic Diagonals has been a rich international collaboration to globalize IPE beyond diversifying syllabi content toward students' active learning and knowledge creation in the classroom. This challenging international research, teaching and writing cooperation process did not go without a hitch though. When planning and organizing similar exercises, teaching teams should pay attention to the following points. 1) Coordination: there are limits in coordinating feedback to students. Both groups

received detailed guidelines in French and Spanish, indicating that the two professors would evaluate all entries. However, various students perceived their evaluations depended on professors' views and language. One student reported, 'knowing that it is not necessarily our teacher who comments is sometimes complicated to understand'. 2) Workload: some students felt that the Diagonals took a considerable portion of the course, limiting the exploration of other elements. 3) Selection: the choice of glossary entries suitable for publication sometimes rests on difficult trade-offs. Some proposals were too narrow or dependent on local issues, while others were too broad. We addressed these concerns throughout all processes and critically reflected on our pedagogical strategies to improve further implementation.

Conclusions

Globalizing IPE teaching has become a crucial part of the curricula. Yet, such a globalization remains often limited to the syllabi. Here, we propose that globalizing IPE starts in the classroom. Consequently, this article offers a critical reflection on the importance of innovative pedagogy and presents a detailed methodological toolkit. Our pedagogical intervention is based on student-led activities that integrate approaches from diverse geographical, social, cultural and political spheres beyond the Anglosphere. Our efforts focused on students encountering IPE for the first time in higher education institutions beyond core Western countries. We argue that a pluralist and globally oriented introduction to the field can broaden the students' intellectual horizons, enhance their engagement with IPE, and potentially foster a more inclusive discipline in the future.

The online encounters during each Diagonal and the drafting of entries for publication on the glossary facilitated the development of students' global competence. The pedagogical intervention did not just deliver a valuable online teaching tool that French- and Spanish-speaking audiences can access worldwide. It spurred virtual classroom interactions actualizing a globalization of IPE on-the-ground. Somehow, it echoes what higher education scholars describe as the Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL), conceived to enable faculty and students to collaborate with global peers through co-taught, culturally focused online learning environments to achieve intercultural awareness, knowledge in discipline-specific content, and skills in communication and group collaboration (Vahed & Rodriguez, 2021). Such active learning fosters the production of multi-situated knowledge. It encourages students to question mainstream assumptions and analyze power relations in specific concepts and issues they may be particularly concerned about due to their positionality. In doing so, students bring their own experiences and perspectives into an exercise numerous students have enjoyed.

While the intervention includes logistical and pedagogical challenges, we hope that professors and researchers elsewhere can build upon Atlantic Diagonals to eventually produce and diffuse new, pluralist and decentred knowledge beyond the anglosphere and spark interest in further collaborative teaching avenues.

Notes

1. See: http://i-peel.org/ [Accessed 8 February 2023]. I-PEEL has also been turned into a book, see: Brassett, J., Elias, J., Rethel, L., & Richardson, B. (2023). *I-PEEL: The International Political Economy of Everyday Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2. Global mindedness is 'a worldview in which one sees oneself as connected to the world community and feels a sense of responsibility for its members' (Hett, 1993, cited in OECD, 2018).
3. Respectively, *Economía Política Internacional* and *Économie Politique Internationale*.
4. https://sepia2.unil.ch/wp/diagonal/ [Accessed October 9 2023].
5. https://www.kmu.admin.ch/kmu/en/home/facts-and-trends/digitization/data-protection/new-federal-act-on-data-protection-nfadp.html [Accessed October 9 2023].
6. https://sepia2.unil.ch/wp/diagonal/vaccins/ [Accessed October 9 2023].
7. https://sepia2.unil.ch/wp/diagonal/economie-verte/ [Accessed July 25 2023].

Acknowledgments

Disclosure statement

Notes on contributors

Jean-Christophe Graz is Professor of international relations at the University of Lausanne, Switzerland, co-founder of the Centre of International History and Political Studies of Globalization (CRHIM), and Vice-Dean for research, ethics and doctoral schools at the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences. He has worked for the last twenty years on regulation issues in global political economy. His research focuses on transnational private governance, international standards, service offshoring, and more recently on labour and sustainability standards, risk and uncertainty, and platform capitalism. His most recent book is *The Power of Standards: Hybrid authority and the Globalisation of Services* (Cambridge University Press, 2019 – Open Access), for which he received the Joan Robinson Prize for the best monograph from the European Association for Evolutionary Political Economy (EAEPE).

Jean-Marie Chenou is an Associate Professor at the Political Science and Global Studies Department of the Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia, where he has worked since 2016. He is also

the director of the GlobAL research group. He holds a PhD in Political Science from the University of Lausanne in Switzerland, and an M.A in International Relations from Université Panthéon-Assas (Paris II). Before joining Los Andes, he was a lecturer at the University of Lausanne and a visiting researcher at the Department of Business and Politics at the Copenhagen Business School in Denmark. His research interests include the Global Political Economy of the Digital Age, Cybersecurity, and Internet Governance. His work has been published in journals such as *Colombia Internacional, International Journal of Transitional Justice, International Relations*, and *Globalizations,* among others.

Carolina Urrego-Sandoval is an Assistant Professor at the Political Science and Global Studies Department of the Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá, Colombia. She holds a PhD in International Political Economy from King's College London, and an MA in International Studies from Aarhus University in Denmark. She has taught at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) and King´s College London and was a visiting researcher at El Rosario University. She has worked at the Colombian Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Tourism, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in Geneva, and Standard Chartered Bank in Mumbai. Her research interests include trade and investment relations between Latin America and Asia Pacific, Aid for Trade, and Colombia´s participation in the Korean War.

Sylvain Maechler holds a PhD in Political Science from the University of Lausanne. He currently holds a Swiss National Science Foundation Postdoctoral Fellowship for visiting scholar positions at Goethe University of Frankfurt and the University of Ottawa for a research project on how central banks cope with ecological challenges. He is also research fellow at the University of Lausanne. His research lies at the intersection of global environmental governance and international political economy and focuses on how contemporary capitalism faces the global ecological crisis, particularly through the economic and financial valuation of nature and other measuring, accounting, and market-based instruments. His research has been published in leading journals, including *New Political Economy, Review of International Political Economy*, and *Global Environmental Politics*.

ORCID

Jean-Christophe Graz http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5583-8332
Jean-Marie Chenou http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6271-0740
Carolina Urrego-Sandoval http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7157-7363
Sylvain Maechler http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4107-2698

References

Acharya, A. (2014). Global International Relations (IR) and regional worlds: A new Agenda for International Studies. *International Studies Quarterly*, *58*(4), 647–659. https://doi.org/10.1111/isqu.12171

Bhambra, G. K. (2021). Colonial global economy: Towards a theoretical reorientation of political economy. *Review of International Political Economy*, *28*(2), 307–322. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2020.1830831

Bhambra, G. K., & Holmwood, J. (2018). Colonialism, postcolonialism and the liberal welfare state. *New Political Economy*, *23*(5), 574–587. https://doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2017.1417369

Bilgin, P. (2008). Thinking past 'Western' IR? *Third World Quarterly*, *29*(1), 5–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590701726392

Bonner, R., Desa, G., Petkova, A. P., & Baack, S. (2022). Teaching with Conceptboard: A professional online tool for student engagement and collaboration. *Management Teaching Review*, *7*(3), 263–275. https://doi.org/10.1177/23792981221098382

Chan, S., Mandaville, P., & Bleiker, R. (Eds.). (2001). *The Zen of International Relations: IR Theory from East to West*. Palgrave.

Chen, M., & Petry, J. (2023). What about the dragon in the room? Incorporating China into international political economy (IPE) teaching. *Review of International Political Economy*, *30*(3), 801–822. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2023.2175711

Cochrane, L., & Oloruntoba, S. O. (2021). Whose voice matters in the teaching and learning of IPE? Implications for policy and policy making. *Policy and Society*, *40*(4), 545–564. https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2021.1975220

Cohen, B. J. (2007). The transatlantic divide: Why are American and British IPE so different? *Review of International Political Economy*, *14*(2), 197–219. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290701288277

Cohen, B. J. (2019). *Advanced introduction to international political economy* (2nd ed.). Edward Elgar.

Cox, R. W. (1992). Towards a post-hegemonic conceptualization of world order. Reflections on the relevancy of Ibn Khalun. In J. N. Rosenau & E. O. Czempiel (Eds.), *Governance without government order and change in world politics* (pp. 132–159). Cambridge University Press.

Deciancio, M., & Quiliconi, C. (2020). Widening the 'global conversation': Highlighting the voices of IPE in the Global South. *All Azimuth: A Journal of Foreign Policy and Peace*, *9*(2), 2. https://doi.org/10.20991/allazimuth.726271

Dunne, G. (2015). Beyond critical thinking to critical being: Criticality in higher education and life. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *71*, 86–99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2015.03.003

Editors. (2009). Reflections on the 'British School' of international political economy. *New Political Economy*, *14*(3), 313–314. https://doi.org/10.1080/13563460903087425

Grayson, K. (2015). The challenges of teaching popular culture and world politics. In F. Caso & C. Hamilton (Eds.), *Popular culture and world politics: Theories, methods, pedagogies* (pp. 160–168). E-International Relations.

Green, L. (Ed.). (2013). *Contested ecologies: Dialogues in the South on nature and knowledge*. HSRC Press.

Gruffydd Jones, B. (2006). *Decolonizing international relations*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Haffner, D. (2018, March 21). *Contesting coloniality in international relations' reading lists*. LSE Department of International Relations. https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/internationalrelations/2018/03/20/contesting-coloniality-in-international-relations-reading-lists/

Hett, E. J. (1993). *The development of an instrument to measure global mindedness* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of San Diego.

Helleiner, E. (2015). Globalising the classical foundations of IPE thought. *Contexto Internacional*, *37*(3), 975–1010. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-85292015000300007

Helleiner, E. (2021). *The neomercantilists: A global intellectual history*. Cornell University Press.

Helleiner, E. (2023). *The contested world economy: The deep and global roots of international political economy*. Cambridge University Press.

Hobson, J. M. (2012). *The Eurocentric conception of world politics: Western international theory, 1760–2010*. Cambridge University Press.

Hunter, W. D. (2004). Got global competency? *International Educator*, *13*(2), 6–12. https://globallycompetent.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Hunter-2004-Got-Global-Competency.pdf

Katz-Rosene, R. M., Kelly-Bisson, C., & Paterson, M. (2021). Teaching students to think ecologically about the global political economy, and vice versa. *Review of International Political Economy*, *28*(4), 1083–1098. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2020.1748092

Kitchin, R. (2005). Commentary: Disrupting and destabilizing Anglo-American and English-language hegemony in geography. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *6*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/1464936052000335937

Kothari, A., Salleh, A., Escobar, A., Demaria, F., & Acosta, A. (2019). (Eds.). *Pluriverse: A post-development dictionary*. Tulika Books and Authorsupfront.

Kurki, M. (2020). *International relations in a relational universe*. Oxford University Press.

Kurki, M. (2022). Relational revolution and relationality in IR: New conversations. *Review of International Studies*, *48*(5), 821–836. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210521000127

Kvangraven, I. H., & Kesar, S. (2023). Standing in the way of rigor? Economics' meeting with the decolonization agenda. *Review of International Political Economy*, *30*(5), 1723–1748. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2022.2131597

Lee, M. (2007). Opening up the ideologies in 'Learning: The Treasure Within. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, *4*, 17–36. https://www.kedi.re.kr/eng/kedi/cmmn/file/fileDown.do?menuNo=200067&atchFileId=FILE_000000000003510&fileSn=1&bbsId

Ling, L. H. M. (2002). *Postcolonial international relations: Conquest and desire between Asia and the West*. Palgrave.

Lobo-Guerrero, L., Lo Presti, L., & Re, F. dos (Eds.). (2021). *Mapping, connectivity, and the making of European empires*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Maliniak, D., Peterson, S., Powers, R., & Tierney, M. J. (2018). Is international relations a global discipline? Hegemony, insularity, and diversity in the field. *Security Studies*, *27*(3), 448–484. https://doi.org/10.1080/09636412.2017.1416824

Maliniak, D., & Tierney, M. J. (2009). The American school of IPE. *Review of International Political Economy*, *16*(1), 6–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290802524042

Mantz, F. (2019). Decolonizing the IPE syllabus: Eurocentrism and the coloniality of knowledge in International Political Economy. *Review of International Political Economy*, *26*(6), 1361–1378. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2019.1647870

Mignolo, W. (2000). *Local histories/global designs. Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking*. Princeton University Press.

Moulin, C., Sajed, A., Leander, A., & Yamato, R. V. (2015). Towards a global conversation. *Contexto Internacional*, *37*(3), 835–837. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-85292015000300001

OECD. (2018). Preparing our youth for an inclusive and sustainable world. *The PISA global competence framework*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. https://www.oecd.org/pisa/aboutpisa/global-competency-for-an-inclusive-world.pdf

Palan, R. (2000). New trends in global political economy. In R. Palan (Ed.), *Global political economy: Contemporary theories*. Routledge.

Querejazu, A. (2022). Cosmopraxis: Relational methods for a pluriversal IR. *Review of International Studies*, *48*(5), 875–890. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210521000450

Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. *International Sociology*, *15*(2), 215–232. https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580900015002005

Robertson, S. L. (2021). Provincializing the OECD-PISA global competences project. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *19*(2), 167–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2021.1887725

Seabrooke, L., & Young, K. L. (2017). The networks and niches of international political economy. *Review of International Political Economy*, *24*(2), 288–331. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2016.1276949

Shilliam, R. (Ed.). (2011). *International relations and non-western thought: Imperialism, colonialism and investigations of global modernity*. Routledge.

Sousa Santos de, B. (2014). *Epistemologies of the south: Justice against epistemicide*. Paradigm.

Sousa Santos de, B. (2018). *The end of the cognitive empire: The coming of age of epistemologies of the south*. Duke University Press.

Steger, M. B. (2016). Reflections on 'critical thinking' in global studies. *ProtoSociology*, *33*, 19–40. https://doi.org/10.5840/protosociology2016332

Tickner, A. B., & Blaney, D. L. (Eds.). (2012). *Thinking international relations differently*. Routledge.

Tickner, A. B., & Blaney, D. L. (Eds.). (2013). *Claiming the international*. Routledge.

Tickner, A. B., & Wæver, O. (Eds.). (2009). *International relations scholarship around the world*. Routledge.

Trownsell, T. (2022). Recrafting ontology. *Review of International Studies*, *48*(5), 801–820. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210521000668

Tussie, D., & Riggirozzi, P. (2015). A global conversation: Rethinking IPE in post-hegemonic scenarios. *Contexto Internacional*, *37*(3), 1041–1068. https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-85292015000300009

Sunder Rajan, K. (2021). Toward a diasporic anthropology. In K. Sunder Rajan (Ed.), *Multisituated: Ethnography as diasporic praxis* (pp. 169–188). Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1zn1sz3.9

UNESCO. (1974). *Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13088&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

UNESCO. (1996). *Learning: The treasure within. Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century (highlights)*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000109590

UNESCO. (2013). *Learning to be: The world of education today and tomorrow*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000223222

Vahed, A., & Rodriguez, K. (2021). Enriching students' engaged learning experiences through the collaborative online international learning project. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *58*(5), 596–605. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2020.1792331

Vitalis, R. (2015). *White world order, black Power politics: The birth of American international relations*. Cornell University Press.

Vivares, E. (2020). Global conversations and inquiries. In E. Vivares (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook to global political economy: Conversations and inquiries* (pp. 9–25). Routledge.

Weaver, C. (2009). Reflections on the American school: An IPE of our making. *Review of International Political Economy*, *16*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290802541228