

cal Association, and the Association of American Geographers. With the support of professional societies, this initiative can be a step toward the creation of stronger international civil societies that create international communities.

As political scientists in the civil society that is APSA, it is our right and our responsibility to develop language for talking about the global context *across* cultural boundaries, and to train our students to do so as well. Strong disciplinary organizations that are attentive to the special conditions that globalization creates can constitute one element of a vibrant civil society of the sort Barber identifies as integral to “secure global democracy” (268).

And, as Barber notes, we need not start anew: “To re-create civil society . . . does not entail a novel civic architecture; rather, it means reconceptualizing and repositioning institutions already in place, or finding ways to re-create them in an international setting” (281–7). There are extensive networks already in place within the discipline to exchange ideas on internationalization in political science. Posting internationalized syllabi on the APSA web site and conversations, like the one we are beginning here, are means of developing this community.

Political science as a discipline can and should function as a global civic space within which to examine connections between cultures, a civic space that is not exclusively occupied by American scholars and scholarship. Connections between the International Political Science Association (IPSA) and APSA are especially important for the international conversations they foster; these, in turn, can create a community of knowledge that can then be transmitted to students, thereby increasing the cultural sensitivity of scholars and students alike.

References

- Dallmayr, Fred. 2002. *Dialogue Among Civilizations: Some Exemplary Voices*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Fahkry, Majid. 2004. *A History of Islamic Philosophy*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gandhi, Mahatma. 1939. *Hind Swaraj*. Ahmedabade: Navajivan Press.
- Keith, Ronald C. 2003. “Mao Zedong and his Political Thought.” In *Comparative Political Philosophy: Studies Under the Upas Tree*, eds. Anthony J. Parel and Ronald C. Keith. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 87–112.
- Meyer, Eduard. 1995. “Comment on Black Athena.” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56 (January): 125–7.
- Parel, Anthony. 2003. “Mahatma Gandhi's Critique of Modernity.” In *Comparative Political Philosophy: Studies Under the Upas Tree*, eds. Anthony J. Parel and Ronald C. Keith. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 163–84.
- Presby, Gail M. 2001. “The Wisdom of African Sages.” In *Explorations in African Political Thought: Identity Community and Ethics*. Oxford, UK: Routledge, 12.
- Rodgers, Daniel T. 1998. *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Shah, K. J. 2003. “Of Artha and Arthasashtra.” In *Comparative Political Philosophy: Studies Under the Upas Tree*, eds. Anthony J. Parel and Ronald C. Keith. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 141–62.
- Umar, Yusuf. 2003. “Farabi and Greek Political Philosophy.” In *Comparative Political Philosophy: Studies Under the Upas Tree*, eds. Anthony J. Parel and Ronald C. Keith. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Ware, Robert. 2003. “What Good is Democracy? The Alternatives in China and the West.” In *Comparative Political Philosophy: Studies Under the Upas Tree*, eds. Anthony J. Parel and Ronald C. Keith. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 113–140.

Notes

1. The Middle East Media Research Institute. TV Monitor Project. March 28, 2006. Clip #1090. memritv.org.
2. Ibid.
3. These include the Doctrine of the Just Sultan (which allows for the coexistence of religious and secular rule), Khomeini's Doctrine of the Trusteeship (which dictates theocracy), and the Doctrine of the Hidden Imam (according to which all political rule, and therefore reality, is illegitimate until the messianic return of the Twelfth Imam and which doctrine informs Wahdan's claim to have no relation to reality).
4. Gail M. Presby, “The Wisdom of African Sages”; Claude Sumner, “The Proverb and Oral Society”; Teodros Kiros, “Introduction: African Philosophy: A Critical Moral Practice” and “Zara Yacob: A Seventeenth Century Ethiopian Founder of Modernity in Africa”; D. A. Masolo, “Critical Rationalism and Cultural Traditions in African Philosophy”; Ali Mazrui, “Ideology and African Political Culture”; I. A. Menkiti, “Normative Instability as Source of Africa's Political Disorder.” In *Explorations in African Political Thought: Identity Community and Ethics* (Oxford, UK: Routledge, 2001).
5. Conversation with Stephen Wirls. Unpublished manuscript. August 18, 2006.

Internationalizing the American Politics Curriculum

—Deborah E. Ward,
Seton Hall University and
Columbia University

Why Should American Politics Internationalize?

The increasing recognition of a global interdependence among our economies and societies places a significant amount of pressure on educational institutions to prepare future citizens for successful participation in this “new world order.” While there might be general agreement that globalization or internationalization is a “major trend in education” or a “worldwide phenomenon,” there are barriers to internationalization, some of which can be individual—resulting from faculty and student attitudes; some institutional—caused by long-standing policies, practices, and traditions; and some reflecting the attitudes and culture of the wider American society (Green 2003, 11). There are different ways that institutions of higher learning can respond to this phenomenon most effectively, including, for example, changes at the curricular level, broad institutional policies that involve recruitment of foreign students, experiential partnerships with foreign institutions of higher learning, and the creation of campuses in other countries (see Altbach 2002).

American Politics is a significant subfield in political science, representing 20% of all APSA members as well as 20% of graduate student members.¹ It is a subfield that, by its nature, is immersed in America and has seemed particularly resistant to the trend to internationalize. Unlike other subfields that infuse an international perspective organically, American Politics can be insular in its view of how it fits within the larger, global political context. Clearly, this is related to the foundational circumstances and principles of our Republic, and some of the manners in which we have come to understand the U.S. government and politics (e.g., American exceptionalism).

The State of American Politics Courses

An examination of American Politics/Government syllabi was conducted to assess the extent of internationalization

in existing American Politics curricula and to begin to develop “best practices” or strategies to increase internationalization.² For consistency, only syllabi for introductory American Government and American Politics courses were collected,³ and only syllabi used in courses running from 2001 through the fall 2006 semester were included in the final sample. The final sample of 152 syllabi was derived by identifying 133 institutions, including universities (both private and state) and liberal arts colleges. The institutions were selected to be representative based upon the various categories/rankings in *U.S. News and World Report’s Ultimate College Guide 2006*. Of the initial 133 institutions, only 87 had syllabi that were sufficiently complete to be used in the analysis. Syllabi from different faculty at the same institution were collected. Only one syllabus per faculty member was included, so each syllabus represents a different faculty member.

I measured an “international” component in different ways. The first was the most rudimentary: the requirement of reading a national newspaper such as the *New York Times* or the *Wall Street Journal*. While not directly indicative of an international component, reading a national paper indicates some faculty member interest in exposing students to global news. Of the 152 syllabi, 40, or 26%, required the daily reading of a major national newspaper.

The syllabi were evaluated on whether an element of internationalization was apparent in the following: the goal/purpose of the course; required readings; individual learning units; assignments; and exams. Only 14 syllabi, or 9%, included one or more of these elements of internationalization. I then ranked these 14 courses in order of their degree of internationalization. Three of the syllabi were ranked “high” because there was an overall infusion of internationalization throughout the course. Four syllabi were ranked “medium” because there was a significant attempt to infuse an international element in some specific aspect of the course, as expressed in course objectives and/or in the existence of one or more learning units with an international perspective. For example, in one syllabus, the professor attempted to compare U.S. politics to that of Britain, Germany, and France.⁴ Another course explored the effects of U.S. politics on populations at home and abroad.⁵ Finally, another course examined the difference between American government and that of other democracies.

Seven of the syllabi were ranked “low,” as there was some acknowledgement of the importance of a global perspec-

tive, but this perspective was not infused throughout the course and was only apparent in either the course objective or in an isolated reading. For example, in one syllabus, one required reading compared racial purity laws in Nazi Germany with those in the U.S.⁶ Other courses contrasted the U.S. presidential system with the prime ministerial system. Another’s syllabus stated that the course would compare the U.S. system with “alternate ways of engaging in politics and government.”⁷

I also briefly surveyed the required texts for the courses, among which there was great diversity. Of the 51 different texts that I categorized, only two have a comparative or international element, and each was used by only one course, both of which were included in the list of 14 internationalized courses.

An Internationalized American Politics Course

At the risk of oversimplification, I propose that there are two ways to approach the internationalization of an American Politics course. The first is more or less superficial in nature, and involves the addition of an isolated “international” learning unit, assignment, or required reading to an existing course structure. While in this way, the professor is introducing his or her students to the idea that alternate political structures, processes, institutions, cultures, etc., exist, the superfluous addition of an international component is certainly not integrated with the overall learning objectives of the course. Nevertheless, this approach does offer an opportunity for faculty who are interested in internationalization, but who might lack the time, institutional support, or expertise to develop a more broadly infused course. The reality is that course redesign in many institutions is a complicated matter and not feasible for many faculty.

The second approach to the internationalization of an American Politics course is structural in nature and involves an overall course redesign. In this approach, learning about the American political system is contextualized throughout—the study of America’s political system is juxtaposed with that of other political systems. The nature of the infusion depends upon the particular interests and expertise of the faculty member, but the overall outcome is the same: students learn about American politics within the context of the global political system. Their exposure to different systems is part of the learning process and reflected in learning outcomes. These courses, readings, assignments, and student evaluations ensure that students’

knowledge about the American political system does not develop in a vacuum. In this way, students are able to compare and contrast their knowledge of, for example, democracy, political socialization, and the party system in the U.S. with that of another democracy, and can fully appreciate the dynamics of American politics. To be clear, I am not advocating the adoption of the Comparative Politics agenda within the American Politics subfield. The purpose of the American Politics course is to instruct students about the institutions and processes of the American political system; but this can be accomplished through putting the U.S. at the center of a “cross-national”⁸ perspective that enables a richer understanding of the U.S.

The following are guidelines for internationalization extracted from the approaches used in the syllabi examined, as well as those I’ve applied in my classroom.

- **Framing the Course/Course Objectives:** Structure the course so that the study of American politics is framed within a larger global context. Infuse in each learning unit a comparison of the U.S. case to others.
- **Internationalizing the Reading List:** Bring an international perspective to American Politics courses through required readings that expose students to non-U.S. political systems and non-U.S. scholars. The Resources section of this paper compiles a list of books with a comparative or international focus that were used in the examined syllabi.
- **Learning Units:** Bring an international element in specific learning units or modules by introducing concepts that transcend the American politics experience or by comparing and contrasting U.S. institutions and processes with those of other political systems.
- **Assignments:** Include assignments that require thinking about American politics from a global perspective. Require students to include a non-U.S. case in a paper, or role-play in activities that include an international perspective. Use film and other media materials in the classroom to provide exposure to global issues. Implement distance learning tools, service learning assignments, and other technologies to promote internationalization.
- **Exams and Evaluation:** Reinforce the importance of a global perspective by including questions in exams that require students to contrast significant differences and relative advantages

between the U.S. and other political systems.

- **Internships and Extracurricular Activities:** Require or award extra-credit for attendance or participation in certain global-oriented activities (such as a campus lecture by a visiting dignitary or membership in an international club) and by mentoring students to consider study abroad and internship programs.

A course that infuses some of the guidelines above will challenge students to think more critically about politics more generally, and the American political system more specifically. From this context, specific learning objectives can be developed that would help assess the success of an internationalized course.

References

- Altbach, Philip. 2002. "Perspectives on Internationalizing Higher Education." *International Higher Education* 27 (spring). Available at www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News27/text004.htm.
- Green, Madeline. 2003. "The Challenge of Internationalizing Undergraduate Education: Global Learning for All." Presented at the Global Challenges and U.S. Higher Education Conference, Duke University.
- Scales-Trent, Judy. 2001. "Racial Purity Laws in the United States and Nazi Germany: The Targeting Process." *Human Rights Quarterly* 23: 259–307.

Notes

1. As compiled and reported by the APSA 2004 Elections Review Committee, Chart 1.A.3., Distribution of Major Fields, Current APSA Members.
2. The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance of Linda Campbell and Brian Fox in collecting the syllabi used in this analysis.
3. Courses on American Political Development, advanced courses on Parties, Congress, the Executive, etc., and courses that combined American Politics and Foreign Policy were excluded from the sample.
4. Kenneth Janda, POLS 220, American Government and Politics, spring 2001, Northwestern University.
5. Jackie Palmer-Lasky, POLS 130, Introduction to American Politics, spring 2002, University of Hawaii.
6. See Judy Scales-Trent 2001, 259–307. This was used in Debra DeLaet's course, The American Political System, fall 2001, Drake University.
7. Robert B. Albritton, POLS 101, Introduction to American Politics, spring 2004, University of Mississippi.

8. Bruce Stinebrickner, POLS 110A and C, American National Government, spring 2006, DePauw University.

Challenging Hegemonic Paradigms and Practices: Critical Thinking and Active Learning Strategies for International Relations

—Steven L. Lamy,
University of Southern California

I argue in this paper that one possible way of addressing the critical issue of preparing students for their future role as citizens in a global society is to integrate active learning exercises such as case studies and problem-based learning scenarios that focus on international issues and events and significant global conditions. These provide an opportunity for students to practice the skills that are essential for participation in modern democratic societies. In this brief discussion paper, I present two very practical strategies for introducing students to global realities and exposing them to different cultural and ideological ways of "seeing the world." Both strategies emphasize skills that are essential for analysis, evaluation and, eventually, problem-solving.

The first "internationalizing strategy" introduces students to a worldview analytical model that challenges the dominance of the realist/neorealist and neoliberal theoretical paradigms taught in most U.S. international relations courses. This framework expands the narrative by presenting three broad worldview categories—maintainer, reformer, and transformer—and introducing students to theories in each category. Students are asked to consider how these worldviews contribute to our "construction of the world" and how it is critically important that we consider all three worldviews if we seek a complete picture of an international issue or major event.

Most U.S. students tend to look at issues from a *maintainer worldview* (i.e., realism, neorealism, or neoliberalism), the perspective or paradigm promoted by texts and the print and visual media in the U.S. In U.S. classrooms, the "internationalization" takes place when students are required to add *reformer* and *transformer* voices to their analysis (Lamy 1988; Golich and Lamy forthcoming).

The second "internationalizing strat-

egy" also emphasizes the development of skills and is based on a learner-centered philosophy of teaching. Again, I believe that internationalizing the curriculum is all about developing critical thinking and problem-solving skills. Two excellent active learning strategies are case-based teaching and problem-based learning. These approaches challenge the dominant teaching paradigm—the standard lecture. Although they recognize the importance and value of a good lecture, these approaches suggest that the "sage on the stage" needs to find ways of sharing the spotlight with his/her students. In an active learning classroom, students practice critical analytical and evaluative skills. They must learn to *describe*, *explain*, *predict*, and *prescribe*, but they must also consider alternative strategies for *participation*. In some sense, active learning may be a way to address the growing problem of political apathy. Active learning strategies require that students share responsibility for teaching and learning. In a case discussion they might be asked: If you had been advising the prime minister, which policy strategy would you have supported?

In a problem-based course, students engage in cooperative research to find out how best to respond to a critical problem, but they must also identify who can help them find such a solution. In both situations, students become advocates for positions and players in the policy process. In so doing, they become less intimidated with the complexity of the policy process, more informed about how other societies formulate and implement policies, and more familiar with possible strategies for participation in these areas. This may lead to more informed activism.

Challenging any paradigm is not easy. However, if we think carefully about how we teach, what we teach, and where we teach, and if we consider the skills and competencies our students will need to master in order to survive if not prosper in this era of globalization, some form of internationalization is critical.

Why the Push for Internationalization?

Globalization is the most powerful argument for internationalization today. By the 1990s, the concept of *globalization* supplanted *complex interdependence* as the term most frequently invoked to capture the complex set of processes crossing political, social, economic, and cultural borders. At a minimum, globalization is multidimensional, and includes the increasingly rapid and intense movement of