Ursula Le Guin's *The Dispossessed* provides insight into the basic elements and limits of comparative politics, and Kurt Vonnegut's *Player Piano* introduces Weber's theory of bureaucracy. While novels cannot replace lectures, textbooks, and case studies, novels can effectively complement traditional teaching tools. Both presenters found that crossing the disciplinary line between political science and literature increased student understanding of the topic and the extent to which they actively engaged in class discussion.

All these innovative techniques involve risk taking and a labor-intensive time commitment by the instructor. Projects that involve student interaction with elites require careful preparation. Democratizing the classroom may cause anxiety among students who are unfamiliar with such responsibility. Student debate and competition can lead to a stressful classroom atmosphere and requires sensitive coaching and oversight. Teaching in an area outside one's specialty requires additional preparation and can require cooperation from other departments on campus. Faculty attempting to incorporate these innovations may sometimes encounter skepticism from other faculty and administration. All participants agreed that these risks and challenges are worth the great rewards to be had from incorporating techniques that engage, entice, and excite our students to learn.

Track Eleven: Internationalizing the Curriculum I

—Pam Bromley,
Princeton University
—Gloria Walker,
University of California, Davis

A Multi-Level Approach

The participants in Internationalizing the Curriculum I took a multi-level approach to considering the challenges of incorporating global issues into higher education. Our discussion—facilitated by track moderator Pamela Zeiser (University of North Florida)—focused primarily on the challenges of internationalizing the curriculum on four levels: the student, the course, the program, and the institution. Within this general framework the group addressed many related pedagogical issues, such as active learning, the role of technology, the effective use of distance learning, and how each complements or challenges the learning environment and the goal of internationalizing the curriculum.

At the student level the focus was on the study abroad experience and how it provides a deep and often intense way for students to engage with global issues while challenging their sense of self as well as their preconceptions and biases relating to other cultures. Hollis France and Kaylee Rogers (College of Charleston) examined the impact that an 11-week study abroad program in Cuba had on students and found that the study abroad experience forced them to consider, critique, and renegotiate their American identity. Elizabeth Sheppard (Sciences Po Paris) likewise found that students studying abroad in France reconsidered their assumptions and stereotypes about cultural and academic norms as well as alternative political systems. Study abroad exposes students to prolonged, active, experiential learning that encourages them to engage more deeply with international issues than they would at home.

At the course level discussion focused on the use of experiential and active learning techniques to help students engage with and improve their understanding and appreciation of international issues and crises. Niall Michelsen's (West Carolina University) approach to the introductory international politics course is to force students to move beyond passive learning by requiring them to participate in a group project in which they choose one of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals and then implement a plan to contribute to the achievement of the goal. Pam Bromley (Princeton University) incorporated a variety of active learning techniques into a required writing course focused on globalization, and demonstrated how the use of these techniques helped the course to appeal to students with different learning styles and levels of interest in international issues. David McNabb (Pacific Lutheran University) recounted how, while teaching Russian politics at the Stockholm School for Economics in Latvia, he was able to use the Internet to bring up-to-the-minute information into his courses, thus creating an interactive, collaborative, and learner-centered environment.

Track participants also approached internationalizing the curriculum from the programmatic and institution-wide levels. Sharon Gramby-Sobukwe (Eastern University) explained how at the program level—in this case in a group of masters programs geared toward adult learners—schools can combine the use of distance learning technologies and short-term residential and study abroad experiences to maximize the international awareness and engagement of their students. Michele Zebich-Knos (Kennesaw State University) described how her institution was working to achieve the internationalization of the curriculum at the institution-wide level. The goal of this mission is to increase the international awareness of the entire university community, regardless of position, major, background, or ability to study abroad. This approach involves integrating international content into core requirements and general education classes, as Bromley did through using globalization as the topic of a required writing class.

Regardless of the level at which internationalization of the curriculum occurs, it is a growing challenge to expand global learning beyond study abroad and the traditional global disciplines. However even the quintessential international experience of study abroad faces challenges. Students who participate in these programs presumably want to engage in global learning, but they often want to do so on their own terms while maintaining their own preconceptions and understandings. This behavior runs counter both to the goals of study abroad and the push to internationalize the curriculum more generally. One potential solution discussed by track participants was to require students to participate in a class that prepares them for their study abroad experience. Another concern was that once students return, many continue to process their study abroad experience, only to find that the friends and family who remained at home are not interested in hearing about it. Re-entry programs for these students would help them make the transition home and also support their (perhaps) new-found global engagement.

At the course level track participants identified other concerns. A common issue that we, as instructors, must be aware of is that ethnocentric or paternalistic language and attitudes can creep into course content. We also need to consider the underlying assumptions in the way we approach international issues; we, as teachers, may be pushing (perhaps unconsciously) an agenda and not giving opposing or alternate views fair treatment. Also at the course level instructors often face pressure both from administrators and students to use new technologies in effective ways. Technology enables online delivery of courses to nontraditional students as well as those living abroad, thereby maintaining a sense of classroom community. It also enables instructors to offer up-to-the-minute information to their students about course topics, which can be invaluable in helping them to make connections between the real world and course

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096508320897 Published online by Cambridge University Press

content. However, technology is also costly—in terms of time, effort, and resources—and the benefits are not necessarily certain.

Another problem we encounter, especially at the programmatic and institution-wide levels, is bureaucratic rigidity, or the tendency of entrenched bureaucracies and administrations to avoid risk, whether due to institutionalized policies, assessment procedures, or accreditation requirements. Such rigidity often serves as a deterrent to faculty or department attempts to experiment with innovative techniques. At all levels internationalizing the curriculum prompts reflection about societal attitudes. It is often hard for students to reconcile what it means to be a global citizen and also an American citizen. There is often a real tension between becoming a global advocate and still feeling like a good American.

As a result faculty and administrators face many difficulties, controversies, and challenges when seeking to bring international issues into the curriculum. This track provided many good strategies for accomplishing this at the university and program level, as well as through study abroad and individual courses. Although it raised as many questions as it answered, the goal is a worthy one: to help create more globally engaged and informed students, programs, and institutions.

Track Twelve: Internationalizing the Curriculum II

—**Maqsood Choudary,**
Northeast Lakeview College
—**Angela Gail Narasimhan,**
Syracuse University
—**Nancy Wright,**
Long Island University-Brooklyn

Recent technological changes, particularly in the field of communications, have brought the world much closer than ever in the history of humankind. These changes, sometimes called globalization, require a paradigm shift in our thinking, teaching materials, and methods of delivery. This quantum leap is required not only in the subfield of international relations, but rather in all subfields of political science. There is also a dire need to learn from each others' experiences and give new direction to our teaching subfields.

The APSA Teaching and Learning Conference provides a rare opportunity to convene in a professional setting to articulate diverse ideas, and pedagogical skills. The panel Internationalizing the Curriculum II developed the following suggestions at this year's conference:

- complete periodic revision of the course offerings at the departmental and institutional level;
- understand the global forces that shape our economic, political, and social structures and dynamics;
- emphasize international education with well-established goals that reflect institutional outcomes;
- integrate different fields of knowledge with a focus on international dynamics that enhance our understanding of the world and its complexities;
- emphasize developing students' cognitive skills for a better understanding of the world in which they live; and
- develop and enhance creative ways of learning and critical thinking with a focus on global dynamics.

The papers presented at Internationalizing the Curriculum II were quite interesting and provided a broad spectrum of the knowledge, challenges, and pedagogical approaches to achieve these goals.

Michael Kiraly's (Sonoma State University) paper "Model Capstone Exercise to Incorporate Global Perspective into American Government GE Courses" focused on incorporating a global perspective into American government general education courses. Kiraly focused on four waves of immigration to the United States with an emphasis on their impact on American political culture and institutions.

As a follow-up some participants noted that students lack knowledge and understanding of history. The panel also noted that immigration is an excellent way to bring international focus to American politics, but to broaden the students' learning horizons we need to do even more.

Maqsood Choudary's (Northeast Lakeview College) paper "Integrating Comparative and International Politics Concepts in a Traditional American Politics Survey" focused on the limits of existing textbooks and students' capacity to grasp and apply new delivery techniques that broaden the conceptual framework. Choudary's paper emphasized the development of critical thinking skills by incorporating concepts from international and comparative politics, particularly when teaching the institutional arrangements of the U.S. government. Several panelists suggested using political cartoons, clips from YouTube, and a brief presentation of news from across the world. The panel also suggested that group assignments can be helpful in attaining a better understanding of world issues.

In concluding this session there was a consensus that internationalizing the curriculum demonstrably improves students' understanding of American government. Incorporating a more interactive and international focus ostensibly can be time-consuming; therefore, instructors need to strive for a balance between effort and anticipated results. At the same time the additional energy that comes from motivated and engaged students frequently offsets the extra effort.

Gaye Christoffersen's (Sokra University of America) paper "The Challenge of the Introductory Course on the Pacific Basin" focused on the challenges of an introductory course on the Pacific Basin, taught from a more integrated perspective than is offered in the traditional Asian area studies curriculum. Christoffersen noted that there is a lack of focus on trans-nationalism and regional integration, coupled with overemphasis on Confucian and East Asian states at the expense of other states in the region. She also mentioned that there is disparity across courses as instructors focus on particular countries rather than on the region. Christoffersen suggested breaking away from land-based area studies and focusing on ocean-based issues and maritime history.

In evaluating Christoffersen's argument, some suggested that specialization can be a barrier to effective teaching and to reflecting on current events. Visual presentations, such as those Christoffersen used, were deemed crucial in conveying themes and points of relevance to students.

Sara Parker's (California State University-East Bay)'s paper " 'New Wars': The Sierra Leone Case" used Sierra Leone as a case study to emphasize changing theoretical perspectives on war, including interaction between states, categorization of wars, and explanation of different levels of analyses. Her argument that new wars are taking place between hitherto little-known actors that were rarely examined when the theoretical parameters were being constructed was well taken by the panel. Parker also suggested that our classroom activities need to be more focused and should include short summaries of different reports and resources, including those related to trials and commissions, videos, and other multimedia teaching resources. Professors should also use interviews in a classroom setting. The follow-up discussion was lively, including points

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096508320897 Published online by Cambridge University Press