BACKGROUND

A Global South Task Force (GSTF) was convened by past ISA President T.V. Paul (2016-2017). “In an effort to make ISA a more inclusive and globally representative academic body, the Association’s leadership felt that an examination into the issues facing Global South (GS) scholars of international studies disciplines was warranted”. At its meeting in Atlanta in March 2016, the Governing Council (GC) of ISA unanimously approved the creation of a presidential Task Force on the Global South, in collaboration with the Global South Caucus (GSCIS), to complement and expand on the work of the GSCIS. In 2017-18, the GSTF worked on gathering and analyzing information and produced the ISA Task Force on the Global South Report 2018 (TFGSR-2018), including a series of proposals and policy recommendations for ISA. These recommendations were presented as resolutions and put forth for the approval of the 2018 ISA Governing Council. Six action items were approved:

1. Create a permanent standing Committee on the Status of Engagement with the Global South;
2. Amend the Travel Grant Guidelines to include general norms and concrete selection criteria, to improve on the transparency and efficiency of the travel grant selection process;
3. Establish an Emerging Global South Scholar Workshop (with a budget line item of $2,500 per year);
4. Revise ISA’s guidelines for its Research and Workshop Grants to include specific provisions geared toward Global South scholars.
5. Institute a system for annual tracking of Global South data, including publication submissions, responses, acceptances, conference participation, governance participation, and travel grant awards.
6. Establish funding structures geared toward Global South members’ advancement within the ISA

With the approval of the 2018 ISA Governing Council of these six actions items, the Committee on the Status of Engagement with the Global South (CSEGS) was created and its members selected: Jorge A. Schiavon (Chair), Jason Strakes, Faten Ghosn, Kristina Hinds, Audie Klotz, Folashade Soule, and Pichamon Yeophantong. The last four members will be replaced by new members in March 2020, while the first three will continue until April 2021, when they will also be replaced.

REPORT

The members of the CSEGS met at the ISA 2019 Annual Convention in Toronto, Ontario, Canada. This report provides general information about the activities of the Committee pursuing objectives designed to increase the participation, status and visibility of Global South scholars in ISA.

Its activities are guided by the six action items approved by ISA’s Governing Council.
I. CREATE PERMANENT STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF ENGAGEMENT WITH THE GLOBAL SOUTH.

This action item has already been achieved with the creation of the CSEGS at ISA’s 2018 Governing Council meeting in San Francisco on April 3, 2018. Since then, the Committee has been working smoothly on achieving the other five action items.

The Committee has its web page at ISA’s website (https://www.isanet.org/ISA/Governance/Committees/Status-of-Global-South). In the web page, the Committee’s responsibilities, membership, and information is provided, as well as the report of the Task Force on the Global South (full report and condensed version) and our 2019 Annual Report.

The Committee organized three panels at the 2019 Annual Convention in Toronto. All of them were very successful in terms of attendance (all participants showed up and we had full rooms in terms of public) and discussion. The panels were:

1. Assessing the state of knowledge on global South IR and foreign policy: Special roundtable honoring the contributions of Jacquie Braveboy-Wagner

During the past 15 years, scholarly activity on the IR discipline, participation in global politics and foreign policy as observed in distinct settings in the global South has grown considerably. Given the creation and growth of the Global South Caucus, and more recently, of the Committee on the Status of the Global South, among whose mandates include assessing and promoting global South participation within the IR discipline and the International Studies Association, this roundtable will reflect on the state of knowledge on IR and foreign policy, as well as on the challenges that still remain. In so doing, it will also honor the contributions of Jacquie Braveboy-Wagner to the study of global South foreign policy and to the positioning of global South concerns and issues within the agenda of the ISA.

Participants

- Chair Arlene B. Tickner
- Participant Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner
- Participant Siba Grovogui
- Participant Amitav Acharya
- Participant Bahgat Korany
- Participant Jessica M. Byron
- Participant Andres Serbin
- Committee Chair Jorge Alberto Schiavon

2. Global South Scholars in ISA: What does the Data Show?

ISA is starting to keep track of data on GS scholar membership, participation in conferences, and publications. More systematic registration, monitoring and analysis of statistics in these areas is essential to understand GS scholars’ involvement in the association better. Tracking such data is vital for monitoring GS scholars’ publication and participation trends over time and can be used by ISA to design strategies for addressing some of the gaps in the involvement and representation of GS participants in its activities. In a follow-up from the ISA-Global South Dialogue
from 2018 San Francisco Meeting, this roundtable will analyze the preliminary data on GS scholar publication submissions/responses/acceptances and the number of GS peer reviewers/editors by ISA journal. Also, we look at the GS scholars’ ISA conference attendance, ISA governance participation, and receipt of ISA travel grant awards.

Participants

- Chair Fabricio H. Chagas-Bastos
- Discussant Jorge Alberto Schiavon
- Participant Darshan Vigneswaran
- Participant Aigul Kulnazarova
- Participant Lembe Tiky
- Participant Kristina Hinds
- Participant Fabricio H. Chagas-Bastos
- Committee Chair Jorge Alberto Schiavon
- Committee Chair Michael J. Bosia

3. Does the Global South need De-colonial/Postcolonial Theory? A Debate

The Northern, Anglo-American dominance of international studies, particularly as represented at ISA conferences, is by now a well-understood and well-recognised structure within the field. Increasing efforts are being made at an institutional level, particularly with the work of the Global South Task Force, led by scholars from /based in the Global South, to increase representation and recognition within institutional structures, as well as to create material opportunities for scholars from the Global South for further participation. The recent establishment of the Global South Caucus within the ISA has been instrumental in moving aspects of this forward. However, the intellectual questions posed by the exclusion of the Global South have long been a focus of work within the Global Development Section, with a particular focus on questions of colonial relations, postcolonial theory, race and indigeneity alongside questions of development, dependency and hierarchy. Scholars working on these questions are however based in a variety of locations. In this collaborative roundtable between the Global South Caucus and the Global Development Section, we ask whether and how de-colonial and post-colonial theoretical approaches should be the primary way in which Global South scholarship engages with questions of international studies.

Participants

- Chair Meera Sabaratnam
- Chair Arlene B. Tickner
- Participant Navnita C. Behera
- Participant Siba Grovogui
- Participant Imad Mansour
- Participant Amy Niang
- Participant Joao P. Nogueira
- Participant Cintia Quiliconi
- Participant Robbie G. Shilliam
- Committee Chair Jorge Alberto Schiavon
The Committee was allocated with two slots at the 2020 Annual Convention in Honolulu. Jointly with the Global South Caucus and the Global Development Studies Section of ISA, we presented two roundtables to discuss relevant issues for IR in the Global South, and both were included in the program:

1. **How to Succeed in Making IR Your Vocation: A Global South-North Conversation**

   This professional roundtable is structured as a ‘fireside chat’-style conversation that brings together senior scholars to share their experiences in navigating the, at times, challenging terrain of academia in the global South and global North, as well as their insights and advice on how early- and mid-career scholars might go about building a solid career in the International Relations field.

   **Participants:**

   - Chair: Pichamon Yeophantong
   - Discussant: Pichamon Yeophantong
   - Participant: Robert O. Keohane
   - Participant: John Ravenhill
   - Participant: Navnita C. Behera
   - Participant: Evelyn Goh
   - Participant: Jorge A. Schiavon
   - Committee Chair: Jorge A. Schiavon

2. **The Colonial International: Where are the Relations?**

   This roundtable continues the collaboration between the Committee on the Status of Engagement with the Global South with the Global South Caucus and the Global Development Section of the ISA. Taking the formation of the modern international system as an outcome of many intersecting colonial experiences, this roundtable asks on what terms might global relations at the scholarly, political, and grassroots levels undermine the colonial dimensions of the international? Can we forge inter-national relations that are separate from the hegemony of nation-state and system of states? What would it take to dislodge the homogenizing gaze of “the South” within the academic institutions of “the North” such that the diversity of scholarship on and from scholars working across the South are properly utilized so that international relations can take a “majority world” perspective instead of a narrow, Anglo-centric elite perspective on international relations? What kinds of radical transformations of both a scholarly and political nature might be possible if we dismantle the “Colonial” and embrace the “Relations”?

   **Participants:**

   - Chair: Jorge A. Schiavon
   - Participant: Himadeep Muppidi
   - Participant: Sharri Plonski
   - Participant: Jeanne W. Simon
   - Participant: Clifford E. Griffin
   - Participant: Michael H. Allen
   - Committee Chair: Jorge A. Schiavon
II. Amend the Travel Grant Guidelines

With the support of the Committee, ISA has been working to include general norms and concrete selection criteria to improve on the transparency and efficiency of the travel grant selection process. It has also revised its guidelines for Research and Workshop Grants to include specific provisions geared toward Global South scholars. Special consideration was given to participants in our first Workshop (Toronto, Canada, 2019) who requested travel grants, and will be provided for participants and mentors in our second Workshop in Ifrane, Morocco (2020).

III. Establish an Emerging Global South Scholar Workshop.

We had a very successful first Emerging Global South Scholar Workshop in Toronto (2019). It was a training, mentoring and networking program designed for emerging scholars of the Global South within the International Studies profession. This workshop was sponsored by the ISA’s Committee on the Status of Engagement with the Global South (CSEGS), in collaboration with the Global South Caucus (GSCIS).

For our first workshop, we received 108 applications and selected 33 participants, from which 20 attended the Workshop in Toronto.

| FIRST EMERGING GLOBAL SOUTH SCHOLAR WORKSHOP |
| Sheraton Centre Hotel, Toronto Canada: Room C |
| Tuesday, March 26, 2019 (9:00-17:00) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Abhishek Choudhary</td>
<td>Department of Political Science, University of Delhi, New Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ananya Sharma</td>
<td>Ashoka University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Carolina de Abreu Batista Claro</td>
<td>University of Brasilia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Claudia Alvarenga Marconi</td>
<td>Pontifical Catholic University of Sao Paulo (PUC-SP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Claudia Fuentes-Julio</td>
<td>Pontificia Universidade Catolica do Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Kanica Rakhra</td>
<td>Jawaharlal Nehru University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Li Li</td>
<td>China Foreign Affairs University (CFAU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Manuela Trindade Viana</td>
<td>PUC Rio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Marcela Lopez-Vallejo</td>
<td>Universidad de las Américas-Puebla (México)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Maria Tanyag</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Mariana Aparicio</td>
<td>International Relations Center, FCPyS-UNAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Samuel Oloruntoba</td>
<td>University of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Serkan Canbolat</td>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Srinjoy Bose</td>
<td>University of New South Wales, Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Vinu J. George</td>
<td>Mahatma Gandhi University, Kerala, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Rajiv Ranjan</td>
<td>Shanghai University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Srobana Bhattacharya</td>
<td>Georgia Southern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Gabriel Rached</td>
<td>Universidade Federal Fluminense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Odilile Ayodele</td>
<td>University of Johannesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Nemanja Dzuverovic</td>
<td>University of Belgrade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Established Global South scholars (and Northern scholars interested in the Global South) acted as mentors throughout a one-day workshop and beyond.
The workshop addressed issues such as publishing, proposal writing, networking and conducting research in challenging settings. The purpose of the workshop was to provide more comprehensive information about how to navigate academia, locally, regionally and globally, to create robust networks of emerging Global South scholars and to address current inequalities and asymmetries within the International Studies profession with respect to the Global South.

Special attention was given to the conditions that characterize academic work and IR communities in many Global South sites, including lack of resources, institutional barriers, unhelpful government policies, constraints on academic freedom, and limited support for social science and humanities programs (as compared to professional and trade fields).

Throughout the course of the full-day workshop, all attendees participated in question and answer sessions, break-out groups, and mentoring and networking activities.

The workshop included training seminars by established scholars in distinct areas of professional activity and sessions to provide feedback/advice on emerging scholar research. Additionally, mentoring efforts focused on how emerging scholars can build local and regional institutions for knowledge production and foster connections with northern institutions and across the Global South.

The program was:

### FIRST EMERGING GLOBAL SOUTH SCHOLAR WORKSHOP

**Sheraton Centre Hotel, Toronto, Canada**

**Sheraton C Room**

**Final Program**

**Tuesday, March 26, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00–9:30</td>
<td>Introductions and coffee Chaired by Arlene B. Tickner and Meera Sabaratnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30–10:30</td>
<td>The pressures of internationalization in the Global South Chaired by Jason Stakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30–11:30</td>
<td>Publishing strategies in peer reviewed journals Chaired by Laura Neack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30–12:00</td>
<td>Research proposals and fundraising Chaired by Pichamon Yeophantong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00–13:00</td>
<td>Lunch and networking (CAD$20.00 stipend provided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00–14:00</td>
<td>Teaching experiences and challenges Chaired by Eric Selbin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentors</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arlene B. Tickner Universidad del Rosario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chih-yu Shih National Taiwan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eric Selbin Southwestern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Folashade Soule-Kohndou University of Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jason Strakes OSCE Academy in Bishkek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jorge A. Schiavon CIDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kristina Hinds University of the West Indies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Laura Neack Miami University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Meera Sabaratnam SOAS, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Navnita Behera University of Delhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pichamon Yeophantong University of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14:00–15:00  Breakout sessions: Working at an institution in the Global South:  
General work conditions, job expectations, and getting a job  
(participants will be divided in three groups by regions)  
Chaired by Kristina Hinds, Chih-yu Shih and Folashade Soule-Kohndou

15:00–15:30  Coffee break

15:30–16:30  Local and global networking  
Chaired by Navnita Behera

16:30–17:00  Wrap up  
Chaired by Jorge A. Schiavon

17:00-   Informal happy hour meet up (Sheraton B room)  
Generously provided by International Studies Perspectives

In order to measure the quality and impact of the workshop, an anonymous survey (kindly designed by Committee Member Dr. Kristina Hinds) was sent to all participants via Survey Monkey; 13 of the participants answered it, evaluating very positively their experience and providing feedback to improve future workshops. When asked: “Overall, how would you rate the workshop?”, the answers were: Excellent (38.46%), Very good (46.15%), Good (15.38%), Fair (0.00%) and Poor (0.00%). When asked “How satisfied were you with the topics covered during the workshop?”, the answers were: Very satisfied (53.85%), Satisfied (38.46%), Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (0.00%), Dissatisfied (7.69%), and Very dissatisfied (0.00%).

In terms of “How would you rate the quality of presentations/mentorship?”, the evaluation was: Excellent (41.67%), Very good (33.33%), Good (16.67%), Fair (8.33%), and Poor (0.00%). About the time available, when asked “Overall, what did you think of the length of time available for discussion during each session?”, the answers were: Too short (7.69%), Too long (0.00%), About the right length (92.31%). When asked “Was the workshop length too short, too long or about right?”, the answers were: Too short (25.00%), Too long (0.00%), and About right (75.00%).

Very useful feedback was provided when asked “What did you like about the workshop?”. Some of the answers were: 1) “I like the variety of countries from which people came, as well as the contrasting perspectives resulting from it. I also enjoyed the selection of topics structuring the workshop.” 2) “The possibility of interaction with other researchers of the field and also the experience shared by the mentors (sic)”. 3) “The possibility of sharing experiences with distinct global south scholars; The chance of receiving mentorship.” 4) “The most exciting part of the workshop was that young researchers like us could well connect with our peers from the Global South. Appreciate ISA for this initiative. I earnestly hope the networking goes forward.” 5) “The opportunity to connect, learn and share information with other Global South scholars navigating the discipline and politics of IR.” 6) “Participation of ISA journal editors”; 7) “Selected mentors, excellent presentations, in-depth discussion, and furthering (sic) understanding about Global South countries and societies, especially ideas of scholars. Being selected into this workshop making me feel honored and I’ll cherish this network in my academic career!” 8) “Commitment of mentors and participants.” 9) “Opportunity to share different hardships and the ways to navigate those.” 10) “The enjoyed the sessions covered topics that ECRs from the global South would find very useful. The most interesting, because it is a particular point that most struggle with, are the sessions on funding as well as publication.” 11) “It was interesting to learn about the different research being done on the global south.” 12) “1. I enjoyed some of the mentorship 2. I enjoyed the opportunity to network with fellow early career researchers from the Global South.” 13) “Presentations on publishing in the journal, funding and candid discussion.”
However, there is always room for improvement. When asked “What did you dislike about the workshop?”, the answers were: 1) “In my view, the participants of the workshop would benefit from: i) a change in the dynamics of the sessions. All of the four sessions were ignited with a presentation, followed by an opened discussion. This resulted, firstly, in an often random brainstorming, with no development of the points raised by the participants; and, secondly, in a tiring schedule (in the last session, for instance, everyone seemed to be more attentive to their respective mobiles than to discussing a specific topic). In my opinion, the break of the whole group into smaller ones after lunch would have allowed for an impulse to the discussions and a continuous debate about specific topics. ii) the organization of the discussions, in 1 or 2 session(s), in small groups, formed not according to the regions the participants are from, but to the themes researched by the participants. As I see, the potential for synergies and networking across different regions of the Global South would be much greater in this case.” 2) “Nothing. If we had some more time would be nice, but considering what we had available it was really interesting.” 3) “The possibilities of drafting proposals in face of the problems/topics exposed could be a great opportunity to deliver something to the whole academic community coming from the workshop.” 4) “The workshop went really well. I wish the group stays connected with better interaction in the days ahead.” 5) “It was for me a bit short - one day seemed a bit inadequate. Perhaps the next workshop can be spread out for two days with opportunity for sharing reflections / lessons learnt on the last day and ‘problem-solving’ focused. For example, participants identify challenges they face and then group share strategies they apply/use.” 6) “1. The workshop did not address or dialogue with the main issue areas that Global South scholars, especially early career scholars, experience. 2. Relatedly, there was little dialogue with the issues that have been identified/raised in other forums within ISA that seek to negotiate challenges facing Global South Scholars, early career or otherwise. 3. Much of the focus of the workshop was on general issues pertaining to early career scholars and NOT specifically to Global South issues. In this sense, the workshop was somewhat confused about its identity and purpose. 4. In many of the mentor presentations, there was an element of mentors “lecturing” Global South scholars. This resulted in a somewhat top-down process and not bottom-up process where early career global South scholars can set the agenda and go about problem-solving the main issues.” 7) “Some people did not speak at all.” 8) “There were not enough breaks. Too much information was packed into each slot without enough time to process it.” The other five respondents said they disliked “nothing”.

Interesting feedback was provided when asked “What suggestions do you have for improving future workshops?”. The answers were: 1) “In addition to those mentioned above, I think the final session could have been dedicated to the creation of something by the group - a synthesis of what has been discussed, a joint work agenda, a follow-up strategy for the group to continue engaged throughout the following months, until the next ISA Convention. Secondly, I think it would be important to engage the group which has participated in the first workshop in a follow-up activity, in or outside the scope of the ISA Annual Convention. By doing so, the participants would have the opportunity to create something (a platform, a list, an agenda etc.) they could jointly work on in the future.” 2) If possible two (or at least one hour longer) would be nice to improve discussion and shared experiences. It was really nice, no complains, anyway time passed fast.” 3) “I guess peer interaction sessions may be given more time.” 4) “It would be great to have at least two days for the workshop, more opportunities to learn about each participant’s background and research interests, and more structured sessions on professional advancement, career advice, publication strategies and specific recommendations on challenges faced by emerging Global South scholars.” 5) “Maybe discussion on joint special issue or similar project.” 6) “Although we’re Global South scholars, maybe there are some scholars from the Global North who do Global South studies could also be engaged in. And for mentors’ presentation, maybe there could be one whose publication is pioneering could be invited to share experience.” 7) “Provide more funding for more participants to attend.” 8) “A time slot could be allotted only for the participants, the mentors would be just audience for that session.” 9) “The opportunity to break into smaller groups to engage with mentors personally would have been helpful. Also, the selection of mentors should have been a little bit more representative of the global South. The career landscape in each
region is different, and having someone speak to that nuance provides a better picture body what is needed to thrive. A form of research development framework could be developed, or perhaps even the UK RDF could be explained. Essentially, presenting a tool that ECRs from the global South can use to monitor and evaluate their progress would be helpful. That way there would be something for participants to use long after the workshop has ended.” 10) “I would suggest that scholars from different regions, who work on similar issues, should be brought together. For the next workshop, maybe the research topics of scholars could be noted and they could be paired for discussions. This would generate more work within the Global South by scholars of the region and also generate more opportunities for researchers.” 11) “1. Make it bottom-up and not top-down. 2. Interface better with the conversations on Global South elsewhere within ISA.” 12) “In my view, first half should be focus on general issues like funding, publication, teaching and second half should be dedicated to mentoring and networking within special grouping like if some one works on Latin America then it fruitful if he has mentor from experts in that field, if some one in IR theory then should be have in like minded group (sic). But for start it's was great idea to have this kind of workshop.”

In sum, the first workshop was, in general, very successful and all the comments and feedback will be used to improve the second workshop, which will take place the day before ISA’s Ifrane 2020 Conference at Al Akhawayn University, Ifrane, Morocco, on Monday, June 22, 2020. The call for this second conference is currently open. Interested participants should apply for the workshop by January 15, 2020 and the Committee on the Status of the Global South will evaluate these applications and invite 30 scholars (we expect to have 15-20 participants) to take part in the workshop by February 15, 2020. A limited amount of funding will be available for workshop participants through the ISA Travel Grant program, and inexpensive campus housing will be offered by Al Akhawayn University for workshop participants.

IV. Revise ISA’s Research Workshop Grant guidelines

With the support of the Committee, ISA is working to include general norms and concrete selection criteria to improve on the transparency and efficiency of the research workshop grant selection process. It has revised its guidelines for Research and Workshop Grants to include specific provisions geared toward Global South scholars, and some special consideration is given to participants in our workshops who request travel grants.

V. Institute system for annual tracking of Global South data.

In terms of developing a system for annual tracking of Global South data (including publication submissions, responses, acceptances, conference participation, governance participation, and travel grant awards), the Committee is working with the ISA’s Executive Director, Sara Mitchell and journal editors (specially FPA, ISP and ISQ) to advance on these issues. Work is still in progress, but there is a clear commitment from ISA headquarters (HQ) and some journal editors to systematically track and report this information.

The efforts on this issue have been kindly leaded by Committee Member Dr. Faten Ghosn. With her support, ISA HQ has been looking into ways to try to tackle the issue of tracking GS data and are working on building out a few mechanisms to help with self-reported data collection. However, any new data collection venture that relies on membership and participants to update their data generally takes a year to get useable data. ISA HQ are doing their best, but this is definitely a long-term project.

Missing data is a huge issue, but the biggest difficulty according to HQ in providing data lies in the ambiguity surrounding what defines a Global South scholar: which countries qualify as GS, whether GS scholars living/working in GN countries can be compared (even in the aggregate) to GS scholars living/working in GS countries, whether they are GS scholars if they are originally from the Global North but live and work in GS countries, etc.
With respect to ISA journals, a summary from the most recent ISQ report (2017-2018) states that ISQ received manuscripts from authors based in 67 countries, down slightly from a record 69 countries in 2016-2017. However, the data suggests that 256 (39%) of the manuscripts came from scholars based in the United States (a 12 p.p. decrease from the prior year and about an 11 p.p. decrease from the previous low in 2016). Moreover, submissions from English-speaking countries accounted for 52.4% of the total, a 16 p.p. decline from the previous year. The 10 countries other than the United States with the most submissions were Germany (48, 7.3%), the United Kingdom (42, 6.4%), Canada (29, 4.4%), the Republic of Korea (24, 3.6%), Turkey (19, 2.9%), Australia (18, 2.7%), China and Israel (15 each, 2.3%), and India and Japan (12 each, 1.8%).

Table 1: Submissions by Country of Submitting Author

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>n.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| United States                 | 256 | 38.8%
| Germany                       | 48  | 7.3%
| United Kingdom                 | 42  | 6.4%
| Germany Canada                 | 29  | 4.4%
| Korea, Republic of Turkey     | 24  | 3.6%
| Australia                      | 18  | 2.7%
| China                          | 15  | 2.3%
| Israel                         | 15  | 2.3%
| India                          | 12  | 1.8%
| Japan                          | 12  | 1.8%
| Norway                         | 11  | 1.7%
| Sweden                         | 10  | 1.5%
| Italy                          | 8   | 1.2%
| Switzerland                    | 8   | 1.2%
| Pakistan                       | 7   | 1.1%
| Spain                          | 7   | 1.1%
| Austria                        | 6   | 0.9%
| Denmark                        | 6   | 0.9%
| France                         | 6   | 0.9%
| Iran                           | 6   | 0.9%
| Ghana                          | 5   | 0.8%
| Netherlands                    | 5   | 0.8%
| Romania                        | 5   | 0.8%
| Russia                         | 5   | 0.8%
| Singapore                      | 5   | 0.8%
| Argentina                      | 4   | 0.6%
| Brazil                         | 4   | 0.6%
| Ireland                        | 4   | 0.6%
| Nigeria                        | 4   | 0.6%
| Taiwan                         | 4   | 0.6%
| Azerbaijan                     | 3   | 0.5%
| Belgium                        | 3   | 0.5%
| Tonga                          | 3   | 0.5%
| Austria                        | 2   | 0.3%
| Denmark                        | 2   | 0.3%
| France                         | 2   | 0.3%
| Iran                           | 2   | 0.3%
| Ghana                          | 2   | 0.3%
| Netherlands                    | 2   | 0.3%
| Argentina                      | 2   | 0.3%
| Brazil                         | 2   | 0.3%
| Ireland                        | 2   | 0.3%
| Nigeria                        | 2   | 0.3%
| Taiwan                         | 2   | 0.3%
| Azerbaijan                     | 1   | 0.2%
| Colombia                       | 1   | 0.2%
| Cyprus                         | 1   | 0.2%
| Ecuador                        | 1   | 0.2%
| Hungary                        | 1   | 0.2%
| Iraq                           | 1   | 0.2%
| Jordan                         | 1   | 0.2%
| Kuwait                         | 1   | 0.2%
| Lithuania                      | 1   | 0.2%
| Liechtenstein                  | 1   | 0.2%
| Malawi                         | 1   | 0.2%
| Mexico                         | 1   | 0.2%
| Portugal                       | 1   | 0.2%
| Portugal                       | 1   | 0.2%
| Saint Kitts & Nevis            | 1   | 0.2%
| Serbia & Montenegro South Africa | 1 | 0.2%
| Syria                          | 1   | 0.2%
| Viet Nam                       | 1   | 0.2%
| Egypt                          | 1   | 0.2%
| Zambia                         | 1   | 0.2%
| Zimbabwe                       | 1   | 0.2%
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Table 2: Manuscripts Accepted in 2016-2017, by Country of Submission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>n.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eleven countries are represented among the accepted manuscripts. However, 48 (72%) of the manuscripts accepted came from authors based in the United States. Manuscripts originating from the United States comprised 39% of all manuscripts submitted, suggesting, ceteris paribus, a significant "overrepresentation" of US-based scholars. The UK (4, or 6%), Canada and Norway (3 each, or 4.5%), and Australia and Denmark (2 each, or 3%) constitute the only other countries with more than one manuscript accepted. The five countries with only one manuscript accepted were Germany, Israel, Russian Federation, Sweden and Turkey.

VI. Establish funding structures geared toward Global South members

With the support of the Committee, ISA has included in its donation page (https://www.isanet.org/ISA/Donate) the possibility to designate specific contributions to be used for "Global South Initiatives", to “expand opportunities and enhance programming for ISA members from the Global South”. Donations can be of 25, 50, 100, 250, 500 or 1,000 USD.
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