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/S1049096508330893 Published online by Cambridge University Press

about the precise definition of new wars, the actors involved, and developing a consensual framework of analysis. Some participants asserted that contemporary wars are actually a return to pre-nation-state wars with added themes of arms trade, transnational influences, etc.

One participant noted the irony of the present states of Sierra Leone, Liberia, and more recently Kenya, all states for whom democratization seemed to have taken a relatively firm hold. The reversal signals the need for further analysis about the conditions that lead to long-term democracy.

Participants noted that we need to overcome limitations of area and subfield specializations, as these may prevent us from capturing a comprehensive view of developments around the world. The panelists also discussed the challenges posed by the rapidly changing nature of world events and the need to employ innovative concepts and technologies to address this phenomenon in the classroom.

Ranjan Bandyopadhyay (San Jose State University) presented his paper "Tourism as Neo-colonialism: Teaching Students Politics of Power Relations Using Visual Ethnography" on the politics of tourism and its relationship to neo-colonialism. Bandyopadhyay suggested new tools like the use of visuals, stories, etc. to engage students and examine Western tourism discourses regarding Eastern destinations conceived as exotic in many Western minds. He mentioned that Western media and literature often present non-Western societies as unchanged, unrestrained, and uncivilized. He explained this using a theoretical framework of imperial nostalgia and also commentary on the attitude of first world tourists who generally either look down on non-Western societies, or consider non-Western societies places of primitive spiritual retreat. In the follow-up discussion participants suggested that the process of internationalization needs to change the perspectives of students, as well as of society at large.

Nancy Wright's (Long Island University-Brooklyn) paper "Exploring the Big World of Small States, the United Nations, and International Politics" noted the traditional tendency to focus primarily, if not exclusively, on larger key players in the international system. Wright stressed that we need to focus equally on small states, and that a course on small states, the United Nations, and world politics, such as the one she recently taught, is one way to accomplish this. The introduction of states that are relatively unfamiliar to students, due to their often low profile in the media, provides a challenging environment for students, as does the struggle to identify what characterizes a small state, including but not limited to land area, population, global influence, perceived or actual vulnerability, and economic strength. Follow-up comments from other participants included recognition of the need to include small states as well as minority cultures and small groups and institutions in course discussions and analysis.

Kay G. Wolsborn (College of St. Benedict) emphasized in her paper "Teaching Intro Comparatively" the need for revision of curricula across the board, making them more internationally focused. Drawing on her experience as a teacher and as an administrator, she recalled the quotation, "It takes a village" to change the perspectives. Her emphasis was on taking a comparative approach and seeking people with comparative interests when hiring faculty for the American politics subarea. She also mentioned that we should avoid hiring "our duplicates."

Sean Costigan's (ETH Zurich)[1] paper "Informing the World: International Affairs Education in the Age of Information" focused on the globalization trends and the information and communication revolution. He asserted that we need to focus on a multitude of global factors for a better understanding of the security environment in which we live. In so doing we can become, as he cited, "specialists of the whole." The panel found it interesting to look beyond simplistic explanations and agreed to use such innovations to provide a broader picture to our students.

The session ended with some common areas of agreement. These included recognition of the need to expend the extra effort to make our students aware of the changes around the world and how these influence our lives in the United States. There was also a broad consensus that we need to transcend conventions and focus on our students' intellectual growth, curiosity, and critical thinking. There is no single route to internationalize our curriculum and offerings; therefore, we must try a variety of new and innovative methods to achieve our goals.

Note

1. Christopher Pallaris, Costigan's co-panelist from the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, was unable to attend.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096508330893 Published online by Cambridge University Press