

## Notes from the Chair

Michelle D. Deardorff • Jackson State University  
michelle.d.deardorff@jsums.edu

As you are well aware, I succeeded John Ishiyama as chair a year ago at the 2005 APSA meeting. It has been a busy and productive year; this report can only cover the highlights.

### UE Section Membership Numbers

After several years of great growth in section membership, we have stalled a bit. Please encourage colleagues to join. As John Ishiyama has said for years—at \$5.00 we are the best deal around!

### 2006, 2007 APSA Teaching and Learning Conferences

The Teaching and Learning Conference has continued to develop and improve in large part because of the work of members of the section. Attendance has stabilized at around 250; there are currently no plans to increase the size of the conference. This conference will be held February 9-11 in Charlotte, North Carolina. The move was largely predicated on the basis of cost and the response of previous years' participants regarding the problem with the previous dates of Presidents' Day weekend. We have added sessions on General Education and Graduate Education to draw more diverse presentations and participants. For more information and to apply to participate as a discussant, you can visit the conference webpage: [http://www.apsanet.org/section\\_236.cfm](http://www.apsanet.org/section_236.cfm). Papers have already been accepted, and a preliminary program should be appearing soon.

We have four UE members on the program committee: June S. Speakman (Roger Williams University), John C. Berg (Suffolk University), Juan Carlos Huerta (Texas A&M University—Corpus Christi), and myself. Many more UE members are participating as moderators, presenters, and discussants. As usual, we will have an informal section meeting at the conference—please check the program.

### The Political Science Educator Newsletter

This past year we produced three newsletters: December, April, and the conference edition in August. We will be following the same publication schedule in 2006-2007. We moved to an electronic format, but had a hard copy printed in February for promotional purposes and have a list of section members who receive a hard copy of each edition. Archived newsletters are on the section webpage. We hope to keep the extended format, but this means members need to submit their teaching ideas, articles and

## CONTENTS

### Improving Teaching

*The Political Science Brown-Bag Lunch* ..... 3  
Susan E. Grogan

*Encouraging Reading and Discussion in* ..... 4  
*Upper-Level Coursework*  
Maria Rost Rublee

### Featured Essays

*Developing Global Citizenship*:..... 6  
*Introducing a Teaching Toolkit*  
Henrike Lehnguth and Jenny Wüstenberg

*Developing Analytical Tools in Introductory* ..... 10  
*International Politics Classes: Different*  
*Perspectives are not for Entertainment Purposes*  
Mark Sachleben

*Public Administration with a Comparative* ..... 13  
*Focus: Comparison for the Purpose of Identifying*  
*Public Purpose*  
Nancy E. Wright

Section Announcements..... 16

About Our Contributors ..... 17

essays, debates with colleagues, and announcements and “notables.” The deadline for the next issue is March 15. I hope to have so many things submitted that we will be able to plan several editions in advance.

### APSA 2006 Short Courses / Working Group

This year at APSA we sponsored two short courses. First, “Making the Most of Assessment: Creating Outcomes from Departmental Assessment” with Kerstin Hamann, University of Central Florida; Michelle D. Deardorff; E. Fletcher McClellan, Elizabethtown College; and Candace Young of Truman State. Second, “Getting a Job at a Teaching Institution and Then Succeeding!” with Grant Reeher, Syracuse University; MaryAnne Borelli, Connecticut College; Bill Hudson, Providence College; Michelle D. Deardorff; Lanethea Mathews-Gardner, Muhlenberg College; and Glen Halva-Neubauer, Furman University. These two short courses were designed to encourage membership in the section and highlight the importance of teaching. We also co-sponsored a short

course entitled: “Integrating Civic Engagement into the American Government Curriculum” with Brigid Harrison, Monclair State University; Suzanne Samuels, Seton Hall University; Jean Wahl Harris, University of Scranton; and Susan Tolchin, George Mason University. If you are interested in designing or hosting a short course in 2007, begin planning early. All relevant information must be submitted by March.

This year the UE section sponsored our first working group on Undergraduate Education at the APSA. Greg Domin of Mercer University designed and coordinated a group that attended panels together and met collectively four times during the course of the conference. Ten people comprised this year’s working group; I hope this aspect of the program will continue to grow in the future.

#### Teachpol Listserv Co-Editors

After many years of service, Bob Trudeau has indicated his desire to step down as the editor of the section’s listserv, *h-teachpol*. Established in 1997, the *h-teachpol* listserv was designed to be a discussion list focusing entirely on the teaching of political science. The current membership in the list is about 570 email addresses, representing an international audience. [If you wish to join this listserv, visit to <http://www.h-net.org/~teachpol/> and click on Subscribe.] Bob has done a wonderful job keeping the listserv active, and his work is greatly appreciated.

After much deliberation and discussion, the Executive Board of the UE Section and *h-teachpol* representatives decided to ask two applicants to consider co-editing the list. David P. Dolowitz from the University of Liverpool and Scott Erb of the University of Maine at Farmington have agreed to work together on this task. The Board is excited by the potential of this international collaboration. They will assume editing duties in January 2007.

#### Section Name Change

One of the major remaining tasks for the section that I inherited from John Ishiyama was to work through the renaming of the section with our membership. The chair and section board struggled with this issue for many years. Our section began as the “Experiential Education” section, morphed into the “Undergraduate Education” section, and has now broadened in scope again. One thing has remained central in all of these changes: we are focused on the endeavor of teaching and believe that the “classroom”—very broadly defined—is central to our personal identities of professors, academics, and political scientists. Much of my work this year was spent talking with and e-mailing the membership on this topic, pursuing many of our

most senior members who have been involved since the origination of the section, and seeking the views of some of our quieter members. The results of this probing were published in the August newsletter. The debate in the newsletter was very representative of what I heard. People are willing to change the name if it is needed, but not our mission or identity. The Board and UE membership concurred. Our name was unanimously changed at our board meeting to “Political Science Education Section.”

#### Thank You

I would like to thank the many individuals who have volunteered their time and energy working with the section. Colleagues served as: APSA program chair in Undergraduate Education (Charley Turner for this year and Scott Erb for 2007 in Chicago); the manager of our webpage (Johnny Goldfinger); the section’s *Journal of Political Science Education* editors (John Ishiyama and Marijke Breuning, and their editorial team); the section award committee for the Best Presentation (Bernard Bray, Talledaga College; Larry Chappell, Mississippi Valley State University; Kerstin Hamann, Bruce M. Wilson, and Phillip H. Pollock of University of Central Florida); and, new for this year, the first annual “McGraw-Hill Award for Scholarship and Teaching on Civic Engagement in Political Science.” Quentin Kidd served as chair of a committee that consisted of: Rick Battistoni (Providence College), Bruce Caswell (Rowan University), Brigid Harrison (Montclair State University), Chip Hauss, (“Search for Common Ground”), Alison Millett McCartney (Towson University), Elizabeth G. Williams (Santa Fe Community College), and Monica Eckman of McGraw Hill. This committee designed the structure of the award, and a subcommittee evaluated the submitted materials to name a winner.

I would also like to thank those of you who are currently serving as members of our Board. Transitions are never easy; this Board has been extremely supportive.

Vice Chair, Kerstin Hamann, *University of Central Florida*  
Secretary/Treasurer, Johnny Goldfinger,  
*Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis*  
Elizabeth Williams, *Santa Fe Community College*  
Quentin Kidd, *Christopher Newport University*  
Elizabeth Bennion, *Indiana University, South Bend*  
Jeff Bernstein, *Eastern University Michigan*  
Andrew Oros, *Washington College*

Thanks to all of you for your incredible engagement this first year. I have contacted many of you for help and have always been met with graciousness and much-appreciated assistance. I look forward to this next year. **PSE**

## The Political Science Brown-Bag Lunch

Susan E. Grogan • St. Mary's College of Maryland • [segrogan@smcm.edu](mailto:segrogan@smcm.edu)

Our department has instituted a monthly event for faculty and student majors—an informal, noontime discussion of political science and politics. We have had two of these discussions, with our third planned for this week.

St. Mary's College is a public liberal arts college, small (about 1800 students), and primarily residential. We emphasize that education here does not stop at the classroom door, noting that our size and accessible faculty encourage learning opportunities that go well beyond classes, seminars, and labs. We political scientists always welcome the students who drop by our offices to “talk politics” and get involved in such activities as our voter outreach program and our *Pi Sigma Alpha* chapter. These interactions, however, are limited in scope and sporadic.

At the department's retreat last May, we talked about steps we could take to develop a sense of community within the department for both faculty and students. The department's newest member said he had noted that none of us had classes scheduled at noon on Wednesdays in the fall, as opposed to past semesters when we had been scheduled into every time slot in the week. In addition to regular department faculty meetings, he suggested, perhaps we could get together more informally to talk about politics, teaching issues, or our research. The proposal grew to one that would bring students together with faculty to discuss the research projects in which we were involved, political events, or other issues we thought would help reach the oft-promoted, but not often achieved, beyond-the-classroom educational experience. Mindful of a limited department budget, we decided to make this a “brown-bag” lunch, in a room in the campus center building, so students could use their meal cards and faculty could buy or bring their own meals. Our junior colleague offered to reserve the room, the rest of us promised to keep our calendars clear, and we headed off to our summer research, teaching, and travel.

Near the end of September we realized that we had an inaugural brown-bag lunch in a couple of weeks with no topic set. Research ideas that in May held promise as thoughts to be shared now seemed too preliminary or too dense for lunchtime conversation. I had been curious, for some time, about how my colleagues felt about whether faculty members should disclose their ideological and partisan leanings to their classes, an issue recently debated

in this newsletter.<sup>1</sup> Would this topic, I e-mailed my colleagues, be something we could talk about with our students? Responses were immediate and positive. We invited students to the lunch using what we hoped was a provocative, but not over-the-top, email on “coming out of the (ideological) closet.” In the email we noted that, among other things, we were interested in knowing whether students felt uncomfortable taking a class with someone whose political preferences were different from theirs.

I was the first faculty member to arrive at the discussion. A reasonable number of students were already there, eating and chatting. When two more faculty members had arrived and settled in, I suggested we start the discussion. I told of my conversion from a strict ideological and partisan neutral to an identifiable liberal and Democrat. As a relatively new faculty member, I had been gratified when, near the end of the term, a student in my introductory level American politics class had told me, “I can't figure out what you are; you criticize everybody.” As I started using class exercises where students answered party ID questions or placed themselves ideologically, however, I decided it was only fair for me to disclose my values and beliefs as well. A colleague spoke of being a role model and providing a good empirical example of how demographic characteristics and ideology can be found together in ways that counter conventional wisdom. Another distinguished between rank partisanship (not to be disclosed) and general ideological tendencies (can't help but demonstrate). Still another faculty member strove for absolute neutrality, no disclosure at all. (I can verify his success, even outside the classroom; after many years in the same department, I am far from certain about his political leanings.) With five faculty members in the room, there were five different approaches to disclosure.

What about the students? Did they think faculty should be up front about their political attitudes and beliefs? Did they feel comfortable taking classes from faculty whose ideology or partisanship was markedly different from their own? Most of the students agreed with a claim by one of them that they were aware of our political leanings without explicit disclosure. Sometimes, they also said, it helped in class if they knew where a professor was “coming from.” One observed that we typically presented alternative

## Encouraging Reading and Discussion in Upper-Level Coursework

*Maria Rost Rublee • University of Tampa • mrublee@ut.edu*

My upper-level political science classes are focused on reading, discussion, writing, and presentations. I want students to grapple with material on their own, analyze it to produce their own insights, and come to class prepared to engage in thoughtful discussion. Sometimes my students fulfill my expectations, but more often than I'd like, they do not. Discussion is stilted as students avert their eyes so I can't meet their gaze. Hands are carefully kept at their sides so I don't see movement and think they might be raising their hand to participate. Only a few students contribute and discussion sounds more like a conversation among a few people.

The \$64-million-dollar question is how do you get students to read the material and come ready to discuss? As a relatively new faculty member (I began my tenure-track position in Fall 2004), I have grappled with this question for many months. I've found a few solutions that produce results, although none work all the time and none work as well as I would like. I'd like to share what steps I have taken to produce richer, more engaging class discussions and then ask for your ideas and opinions.

### Thorough Reading

The first problem is that if students do not read, they will not be able to discuss, so I decided to tackle this first. I required my students to bring two discussion questions to class with them from the reading. Of course, students quickly realized they could scan the main headings and come up with a few questions without doing any readings. I went back to the drawing board and came up with the idea of having students write reactions to the readings in the form of journals. Each Monday, students turn in 500 words they have written about the readings we will cover that week. Even though the editor inside me cringed to say it, I told the students I would not consider punctuation or grammar in grading the journals—rather, I just wanted them to show me that they read the material. Some students tried to write reactions based on the first few pages of the readings. I found that warnings not to do so were ignored, and I had to give very low grades to persuade some students to react to more than just a few pages. Now that I have assigned journals for a few semesters, I have learned to encourage students to simply write their reactions to the text as they read it. For my Nuclear Proliferation class, a reaction might read, “I had no idea the US still had over

6000 nuclear weapons on alert, plus an additional 6000 in storage. Why do we need so many?” For my East Asia class, a student might write, “I knew the Chinese feared instability, but now I know why as I see what Mao did to institutions during the Cultural Revolution.” The point is not for students to create cohesive analytical arguments. Instead, I just want them to read and react to the material in an intelligent fashion. Is this a cop out? Potentially, but since my goal is to get them to read and grapple with the material on their own (as opposed to me spouting the information in lecture), it's worth it. Journals are normally 20% of the students' grades, and typically students who don't do well on the journals do poorly in the rest of the assignments.

If journals seem like they work so well, why am I asking for suggestions? First, students really dislike the journals and complain it's too much work. That by itself would not bother me. But it is a lot of work for me to grade—if I have 70 students in a semester, that's 70 students writing 13 journals each. That does not include their 3 short analytical papers, their presentation handouts, and their research papers. Finally, some students are always trying to find short cuts to do the journals—talking about a page in the beginning, in the middle, and the end—and not reading the rest. It's obvious and I give them low grades, but isn't there some method that students do not try to find easy ways to escape?

Some have suggested quizzes to me for the weekly readings—10-question multiple-choice quizzes each week would be much easier to grade than journals. If my goal is to get students to read, a weekly quiz might be just the answer. However, I hesitate to do this because I fear a 10-question quiz could ask for arbitrary items—I want students who have done the readings to do well and not miss questions just because they didn't remember certain specific facts. I suppose I could make sure the questions addressed broad themes, but then I remember that I was trying to get away from tests as a form of evaluation since I want my political science majors to develop their reading, writing and discussion skills.

What I may try next semester is to have short analytical papers on the readings, as well as journals, so that if a student writes a short analytical paper on the readings,

he or she will not have to do a journal. However, students currently write their short analytical papers on relevant newspaper articles, and they really like using current material for those.

### Thoughtful Discussion

Even if all my students read, getting them to participate in class discussion can be difficult. Sometimes the class mix is just right, and you've got a good number of extroverts who are willing to speak up regardless. Other times, the silence in the classroom is deadly, even when I know most students have done the reading.

Thankfully, I have a better answer to this problem than I do the reading issue: provocative questions. If a student is presenting on material, they must have three provocative questions to end the presentation with—and then they lead discussion. If I am leading discussion, I make sure to have a few thought-provoking questions to use if discussion falls flat. For example, in my World Affairs class, students will ask if the U.S. should invade Iran or North Korea to prevent their acquisition of nuclear weapons—even though the U.S. has many thousands of nuclear weapons. In my Political Economy class, students ask how much extra you should pay to ensure your clothing wasn't made in a sweatshop. By directing the students to think of provocative questions, I find that discussion is almost always lively. (Of course, if students haven't done the reading, discussion is lively but misguided.)

My goal is to encourage students to sharpen their analytical, writing, and presentation skills so that they can succeed in government, law, or the private sector when they graduate. I also want them to think through issues thoroughly so they create informed, reasoned opinions—necessary to a healthy democracy. Yet, to enhance these skills, I need them to read and discuss. Your thoughts and opinions on better ways to do this are most appreciated! **PSE**

---

*“...Brown-Bag Lunch” continued from page 3*

approaches in our descriptions, analyses, and evaluations of political events, so what we felt and thought did not restrict what they learned. Another felt it was inappropriate for faculty members to disclose their political views; students were in college to learn from, not learn about, faculty. We were pleased to learn that students felt they rarely encountered difficulties in political science classes when their views differed from those of the instructor. None of the current faculty in political science insisted

on adherence to particular values. In the past, when there had been a faculty member with whom students did not feel they were able to differ, they dealt with the problem by avoiding classes with this faculty member, never disagreeing with the professor in discussions, and reciting the “party line” on exams and in papers. Some students had encountered problems in classes outside political science where they and their professors fell on different sides of an ideological divide.

We selected the outcome of the upcoming elections for the mid-October lunch and had a crowded table for this discussion. Most students from the first lunch came again and new students joined the group. The best aspect of this discussion was hearing from students in the “Maryland Politics” class, who were individually researching local elections. Some of them had accompanied their candidates in canvassing and other election activities; they were able to give us a sense of how people in the community were disposed toward local and national candidates. We also talked about polls, national trends, and the issues driving voter decisions in the fall races. We ended the lunch with predictions about which party would control the U.S. House and Senate, and the Maryland Statehouse.

As I write, we have announced the third brown-bag lunch topic. This time, the students will be the focus of discussion as we have asked them to talk about the pleasures and pains they are experiencing in conducting their “St. Mary's Projects,” our College's senior thesis. We are hoping the lunch will assist students in breaking out of what can be a lonely endeavor. We are encouraging junior political science majors to attend so they can start thinking about the kinds of research topics they might develop and see the benefits of starting early on the year-long project.

The Political Science Brown-Bag Lunch is a “Field of Dreams” experience: the faculty provided the venue and the students responded with enthusiasm. The lunches are no-cost, low-effort endeavors that have yielded significant returns. They are educational in the broadest senses of the term. Faculty and students meet on common ground to discuss shared interests. We are learning from each other in an environment that is stress-free and non-evaluative. **PSE**

### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Klase, Rebecca Tatman, and J. Michael Bitzer. (2006) “Cloaked or Uncloaked: Should Professors Reveal Their Political Ideology to Their Students?” *Political Science Educator* 10 (3, April):7-8.

## Developing Global Citizenship: Introducing a Teaching Toolkit

Henrike Lehnguth • University of Maryland, College Park • lehnguth@umd.edu

Jenny Wüstenberg • University of Maryland, College Park • jwustenberg@gvpt.umd.edu

Ask any college teacher about the global awareness and knowledge displayed by his or her undergraduates and you will likely receive a response rife with frustration. A common concern is that American undergraduates tend to display little knowledge, or even curiosity, about “the world out there.” At the same time, the social, economic, and political changes that are collectively termed “globalization” necessitate that our students develop new skills and competences in order to succeed. “Global learning” is the new buzzword that points to the significance of conceptually engaging our rising global interdependence in higher education. We view self-reflective, critical skills in intercultural communication as key to acquiring effective global competence.

In order to address these concerns with students on our home turf at the University of Maryland, we developed a toolkit for “Teaching the United States in a Global Context.” In this essay, we want to introduce our classroom exercises (which can be requested from us by email from anyone who is interested in using them). Of course, feedback and new additions are more than welcome! We also want to highlight the theoretical and cultural context in which these tools were developed because we feel that it offers an explanation to American readers of how international graduate assistants and faculty approach American undergraduates.

### Approaches to Intercultural Awareness Training

The toolkit—and our cooperation more generally—developed out of a discussion the two of us had about our experiences of teaching American undergraduates about American culture and politics and about the United States’ role in the world. Both of us are currently international graduate students at the University of Maryland: Henrike Lehnguth in American Studies and Jenny Wüstenberg in Government & Politics. American Studies interrogates how people make meaning in the cultures of everyday life and traces identity formations. Central to American Studies is the acknowledgement that “America” embodies a multitude of contested meanings that move conceptually far beyond rigid nation-state borders.<sup>1</sup> Global competences are, in other words, central to cutting-edge American Studies scholarship. In Political Science, concerns about

post-9/11 causes of conflict and the often conjured “clash of civilizations” has given the study of culture a more urgent flavor. Simultaneously, recent innovations in the study of political culture<sup>2</sup> mean that political scientists are now interested in the power relationships embedded in and perpetuated by cultural practices and symbols, rather than merely regarding it as a variable which can distort quantitative surveys. Therefore, a sophisticated understanding of global cultural processes has become pivotal to a comprehensive political science education.

In debating these issues as they emerge in our respective fields, we noted our frustration with the lack of knowledge and curiosity most students displayed about the rest of the world. Students lacked familiarity with effective (self)critical practices; and therefore often referred to one-dimensional clichés such as that America is “the best” and a role model for what other countries should aspire to. We began thinking about how to encourage students to develop skills that would encourage a differentiated understanding of their embeddedness in culture and their relationship with others. Because we viewed intercultural communication as central to global learning, we decided to examine ideas on intercultural competence training and found a wealth of material—both in English and in German (where we are both intellectually at home). However, we noticed that basic notions of culture underlying these training manuals were different.

During the 1960s and 1970s in Germany, an unprecedented number of immigrants—mainly from Turkey and other southern European states—arrived in the context of the so-called “guest worker program,” under which migrants were expected to fill important gaps in the labor market as long as needed and then return to the country from which they came. Of course this did not happen, and most guest workers brought their families and settled long-term. German citizenship laws were until recently highly restrictive, making it very difficult for immigrants, and even the second and third generations, to become naturalized. The German materials on intercultural training are very much a product of the realization of social workers and teachers that they had to deal with the new cultural diversity.

The first phase in this new “foreigners’ social work” was targeted at the immigrants exclusively and aimed at facilitating their integration into (a supposedly unchanging) German society.<sup>3</sup> In this context, social workers and pedagogues were informed about the ‘other’ cultures, and taught to be sensitive to customs and gender roles. This had the effect of promoting an essentialized and stereotypical understanding of *the Turks, the Italians* etc. Furthermore, with the diversification of countries of origin of migrants, the task to learn about all the places clients or students came from, became unfeasible. Emerging from this “foreigners’ social work,” one educational approach has been to break down differences between Germans and immigrants by fostering cultural exchange and making the foreign familiar. This approach, of course, does not actually promote competence in dealing with foreignness—it merely eliminates foreignness in a particular relationship or situation. Thus, the more recent literature tries to promote an understanding of what it means to be foreign and how to deal with situations which and persons who evoke feelings of foreignness. Put differently, the new German approach in intercultural training is to develop the social skills needed to master intercultural encounters as they arise.

This approach is indeed a great improvement upon previous ones. However, in analyzing German training exercises, we found a common tendency to essentialize German and other national cultures and use them to exemplify cultural difference in general. For example, exercises often will divide a group into bi-cultural (by which is meant German and non-German) pairs, or multi-national groups in order to discuss differences in language, cultural heritage, communication styles, and so forth. While this method is certainly useful when the group perceives these differences as meaningful, German training does not usually question the assumptions about the determinants of cultural identity which are implicit in such divisions. Further, these exercises do not generally call attention to cultural difference within “nationality” such as race, ethnicity, religion, gender, class, disability, or personal background. Here, we think German intercultural trainers can learn from the American approach.

In our experience most U.S. students and colleagues imagine “cultural difference” as diversity within the United States. So, unlike in the German *inter-cultural* awareness model that conceives German culture as monolithic vis-à-vis other national cultures, the American model acknowledges difference *within* the nation. However, the

United States is not considered in its relationship to other countries. Here the U.S. is presented as the only reference point to an “intercultural awareness.” This may fail to prepare students as global citizens who can conceive of culture beyond internal diversity. As cultural theorist Stuart Hall points out, “culture is the way we make sense, give meaning to the world.”<sup>4</sup> Thus, one significant way in which Americans make sense of the world is as *Americans*.

The importance of highlighting national culture despite internal diversity is best captured in Sonia Nieto’s *Language, Culture, and Teaching*, where she uses her personal experience as an example:

Even though I was born in this country and have spent my entire life here, even though I was formed and educated and lead a productive professional life in the United States, when I am asked the inevitable question, “What are you?” I always answer “Puerto Rican.” Why is it that for me being an American seems inherently to conflict with being a Puerto Rican? Ironically, I myself recognize that I am in some ways undeniably American; that is, my experience, tastes, and even values immediately define me to most onlookers as “American,” albeit with a deep connection to my Puerto Rican heritage. Several years ago, I was jarred speaking with an island-born Puerto Rican who commented that he could tell at first glance that I was born and raised in the United States simply by looking at my body language.<sup>5</sup>

Our toolkit aspires to combine this awareness of diversity within the United States with the recognition of the still prevalent nation-state identity. We hope to instill in students the idea that they are global citizens on an equal footing with other global citizens and that this entails a shared responsibility for the world. To this end, raising awareness about dominant perceptions of Americans and the United States in the world (whether accurate or not) and their role in global relationships is pivotal. More practically, we hope our ideas will help international faculty and graduate teaching assistants with diverse cultural backgrounds to maneuver the cultural clash experienced when teaching American undergraduates, as well as American instructors who wish to foster global citizenship.

### The Toolkit

We have approached global learning through the lens of intercultural awareness. We realize, however, that there are multiple ways of bringing global learning and/or intercultural—American/non-American—awareness into classrooms: for instance, through research projects that students engage in over the semester.

Our toolkit includes classroom exercises adapted and developed from intercultural awareness training manuals, as well as ones that emerged from our teaching at the University of Maryland. It kicks off with a few icebreakers, intended both for students to get to know each other and to introduce the subject of intercultural communication. They call attention to students' migratory background and sensitize them to the concept of the cultural specificity of greeting customs. Especially with new groups, we recommend using such exercises to ease into a subject that can at times be quite sensitive, particularly for students of ethnic minority background.

We include in the toolkit one activity which is expressively self-reflective: we suggest questions to be used on a questionnaire which encourages students to think intensively about their own cultural assumptions and identity and then discuss these, first in small groups, then with the whole class. This exercise works well prior to any of the more interactive and simulation-based ones, because it enables the instructor to compare students' early perceptions with insights emerging from later discussions, thus contributing to self-critical learning outcomes.

The majority of activities in our toolkit is organized around group work or simulations involving the entire group. One problematizes the latent prejudices class members hold ("Warrant"), two others simulate situations in which students are exposed to foreignness and cultural dissonance ("Minorities in Discussion" and "Card Tournament"). These tend to trigger discussions about what it means to be an "outsider" in a social situation, how foreigners feel in the United States, and how a social setting can consciously be made more welcoming and accommodating to difference. Simulations, in our experience, are especially instructive because the students have fun while developing their own analysis without significant prompting from the instructor.

A final set of exercises explicitly addresses the image and role of Americans in the world ("Representative American" and "Statements by Foreigners"). In one, students are asked to visually or theatrically represent what they view as "representative" and then think about how their simplified image impacts relationships with other cultures. We ask them to interrogate how they situate themselves vis-à-vis this simplified version of American culture and how such impressions are constructed. In another, we have collected statements about U.S. culture made by foreigners who have lived in the United States for extended periods. We

found that these provoke controversial and fruitful debates about American culture and misperceptions of "outsiders" and "insiders" alike.

Our toolkit suggests ideal group sizes and time needed to conduct exercises, as well as what is required in preparation. Further, we point out how activities can be fruitfully combined to achieve a more nuanced reflection on issues of cultural embeddedness, intercultural communication, and global responsibility. We would gladly share the toolkit with anyone interested in testing it. We welcome any feedback and ideas for improvement and extension. **PSE**

#### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> See Janice Radway, "What's in a Name? Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, 20 November 1998," *American Quarterly* Vol. 51, No. 1 (March 1999): 1-32; Amy Kaplan, "Violent Belongings and the Question of Empire Today: Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, Hartford, Connecticut, October 17, 2003," *American Quarterly* Vol. 56, No. 1 (March 2004): 1-18.; and Shelley Fisher Fiskkin, "Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies: Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, November 12, 2004," *American Quarterly* Vol. 57, No.1 (March 2005): 17-57.

<sup>2</sup> See Lisa Wedeen, "Conceptualizing Culture: Possibilities for Political Science," *American Political Science Review* 96/4 (2002). Marc Howard Ross, "Culture and Identity in Comparative Political Analysis," in *Comparative Politics—Rationality, Culture, and Structure*, edited by M. I. Lichbach and A. S. Zuckerman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); and George Steinmetz, ed. *State/Culture—State-Formation after the Cultural Turn* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999).

<sup>3</sup> Gudrun Jakubeit and Karl Schattenhofer, "Fremdheitskompetenz—Ein Weg zum aktiven Neben- und Miteinander von Deutschen und Fremden," *Neue Praxis* 5 (1996):389-408.

<sup>4</sup> *Stuart Hall: Representation and the Media*, directed by Sut Jhally, (Northampton, MA: Media Education Foundation, 1997).

<sup>5</sup> Sonia Nieto, *Language, Culture, and Teaching: Critical Perspectives for a New Century* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc., 2002): 104.

## EXERCISE: A REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN

### Description

In this exercise, participants are asked to divide into small groups and draw a representative American. Their results are then presented to the whole class and compared with each other. This exercise is meant to encourage students to reflect on their embeddedness in American culture.

Ask the students to divide up into groups of 4 or 5. Distribute materials and remember to ask them to take notes and designate a presenter. Instruct them first, to brainstorm about what characteristics are representative of American culture—they can be positive and negative. Second, they are to discuss and agree which five characteristics are most important. They then draw an American representing those characteristics. Encourage them to be creative. (20-25 minutes for group work).

Gather the entire class and have group leaders present their posters. Ask presenters (or another group member) to remain at the front holding their poster to facilitate comparison between them. Here are some suggestions to stimulate discussion:

- Depending on the nature of the posters, problematize differences and overlaps between them.
- Would other Americans agree with your portrayal of what is representative? (Here, you should take into account the make-up of your class—is there diversity of class, race, religion, gender, regional origin?)
- While selecting positive and negative “representative” characteristics of Americans, what did you use as a reference to determine what is “representative” and what is “American”?
- What are the cultural assumptions behind your own assessment of American characteristics?
- Where do you locate yourselves (as a group or as individuals) within these statements? Do these statements correspond to your idea of the United States AND your own identity? Which statements correspond to your idea of the U.S. but NOT your identity?
- Whose definition of “American” is most trustworthy and why?
- What’s your stake/how important is it to you to be seen in a certain way as an American? What does this mean for the U.S. role in the world and for those studying international affairs (foreigner’s views, our awareness of their views, can we find common ground)?

Time: At least 50 Minutes

Group size: At least 10

Materials: Large sheets of paper and colored markers

Option: Instead of drawing, have students prepare a skit or pantomime representing an American. With sufficient time, this exercise can fruitfully be combined with “Statements by Foreigners.”

Source: Adapted from Helga Losche. *Interkulturelle Kommunikation: Sammlung Praktischer Spiele Und Übungen*. (Alling: Sandmann Verlag, 1995).

## CALL FOR ARTICLES

For upcoming issues of *The Political Science Educator* we are currently seeking the following features:

- Debates between members on pertinent topics
- “Lessons Learned”—a continuing column on how the teaching of participants in the Teaching and Learning Conferences has evolved as a result of the TLC (approximately 500-1000 words)
- Feature articles that are “think pieces” about teaching and the discipline, discussions of teaching experiences and approaches, or preliminary research under development (@ 1000 words)
- “Teaching tips” and suggestions—including approaches and experiments that have been less successful
- “The New Professor”—essays designed to help graduate students and new faculty who are navigating the job market and early years of careers at undergraduate institutions
- “Research and Resources: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning”—a column including literature reviews on specific topics, research notes, examination of new research threads
- “Technology and the Professor”—a column examining current options available for the classroom and classroom management, including resources available on the web

Items for the “Notables” and “Announcements” sections.

The deadline for the next issue is March 15. If you are interested in submitting an article, essay, or announcement (or a suggestion for other items to be included in the newsletter), please contact:

**Michelle D. Deardorff, Editor**  
*The Political Science Educator*  
 Jackson State University  
[michelle.d.deardorff@jsums.edu](mailto:michelle.d.deardorff@jsums.edu)

## Developing Analytical Tools in Introductory International Politics Classes: Different Perspectives are not for Entertainment Purposes

Mark Sachleben • Shippensburg University • MDSachleben@ship.edu

As Scott Erb pointed out in a previous issue of this publication, students often become angry with themselves for being ignorant of international situations.<sup>1</sup> I also have found that students are bemused and embarrassed by the lack of knowledge and understanding of most Americans about issues of international politics and foreign policy. As educators of a discipline in which many of our students have little background, we have a difficult but important task. Across the discipline, whether in international relations or other parts of political science, many of our students believe that all that constitutes politics is well-groomed people on television contradicting each other and trying to insert the best zinger. Whether we are teaching at a diverse or homogenous institution, getting students to seriously think about different perspectives is very difficult.

My goals in an introduction to international politics class are four-fold: I want the students to have a basic understanding of how international politics works, specifically who are the actors and how decisions are made; to practice their analytic skills; to consider alternative perspectives to complex problems facing the international community (in other words, critical thinking);<sup>2</sup> and to practice professional writing. All four categories are crucial to the development of political science and social science majors. Even in general education classes, which is where the described assignment takes place, our duty is to provide an introduction and practice to each of these four areas. While the technique I describe was used in an international relations class, it can be modified for use in other political science courses.

After the introductory section of the course, in which basic terms, major theoretical schools and major historical events are introduced, students are asked to consider the future of the international system. Students are introduced to four articles that have been touted as important treatises on the future of international politics, particularly in the next ten to twenty-five years: a major neo-realist work<sup>3</sup> (most recently Kenneth Waltz's "Globalization and American Power"); Francis Fukuyama's "The End of History?"; Samuel Huntington's "Clash of Civilizations?"; and Benjamin Barber's "Jihad vs. McWorld."<sup>4</sup> I explain to students that since they are better educated than the

average American on issues related to international politics (even only four weeks into the semester) they are able to analyze these works and determine who has the better argument. This is particularly important because there is always a great deal of reluctance among first and second year college students to criticize important thinkers who have spent a lifetime studying politics. My statement is intended to build self-confidence, to encourage students to think about starting the process of analysis.

This section of the course begins with students reading the four articles, while I lecture (or provide information) on the world since the end of the Cold War. In my lectures, I focus on how many wars have occurred, that the vast majority of the wars have been intrastate conflicts, the dissolution of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, the formation of the European Union and the associated introduction of the Euro, the economic advances of China, and the increase in the number of failed states. Meanwhile, the students are instructed to read the four articles over the course of two weeks.<sup>5</sup> In the third week, I turn my lectures to a discussion of the four perspectives on the future of international politics. I urge students to discuss the main points of the articles, what the authors are predicting, and what the policy implications might be. I make sure that the students understand how the articles might interpret the current international system and how others have criticized the authors. In recent semesters, I have shown the film, *Searching for the Roots of 9-11*, in which Thomas Friedman chronicles his trips to the Middle East to try to discern causes of the September 11, 2001 attacks on the United States. Over the course of the final two weeks of the assignment, students read other accounts of international politics that help to provide more evidence for their papers. These articles, which I term "additional" readings, are all post-September 11 (in fact, I try to find articles that are as current as possible) and are related to different aspects of current international politics.

In the final week before the assignment is due, I set aside an hour of class time for students to meet in small groups, usually four to six students in each group. I provide a table for the group to fill out collectively. For each of the four articles the students are comparing, I ask the group to determine what the authors' ideas might be. For example, I

have students deliberate over the basic thesis, the author's perspectives on the likelihood of conflict, the author's view of globalization, and the role of poverty. Encouraging students to consider the evidence provided from the more recent articles, the in-class films and lectures, I ask the groups to identify significant evidence and counter-evidence for each of the authors as well. Finally, I ask students to consider what kind of policies could be derived from each of the perspectives. By giving students an opportunity to discuss each of the articles in small groups, they can help each other discern the major points of the articles, while at the same time consider alternative interpretations. This also allows me to visit each of the groups to have a chat and answer questions that students might be reluctant to voice in front of the entire class.

For the written assignment, I instruct students to identify the perspective that they think most closely resembles their own thoughts on the future of the international system. After they identify their preferred perspective, I asked them to explain why they are not choosing the other three perspectives. I stress the latter point as being the most important part of the assignment. This allows me to make sure students are reading all the material, instead of the just the perspective that sounds "best" to them. In my grading rubric, I make it clear that in order to receive an "A" on the assignment, students must incorporate a discussion of all of the articles, as well as at least some of the additional readings.

As students begin to delve into the assignment, their apprehensions grow. It is not uncommon for me to counsel students that they have the ability to complete the assignment. Students often worry that there is a "right" answer and that they are unable to discern it; they also are intimidated that they are offering criticisms about well-known, and important, political scientists. Another common concern is that each of the perspectives sounds very logical and they have difficulty choosing among the perspectives. I remind the class many times, that each of the authors is making an argument about the most important factors, not all of them. Thus, the question becomes who makes the most convincing argument. If it helps, I tell students, imagine that I am their boss; we have four very convincing proposals on how to direct our company. None of the proposals are perfect, yet all of them are very sound. The students, as analysts, are supposed to give me their recommendation about which makes the most sense. In doing so, they need to provide their audience with some evidence as to why they think it makes the most sense.

This assignment elicits a great deal of comment from students. Despite its brevity, no more than seven pages, students often say it is the hardest paper they have ever written. At the same time, despite it being only about one month into the semester, comments, usually positive, show up on evaluations. In my summation at the end of semester, I often provide a somewhat faux statement that I am considering altering or eliminating the assignment.<sup>6</sup> Students respond by arguing that the assignment has helped them better understand how and why international politics work and how policymakers make decisions. Thus, I always add the assignment to my syllabus for the next semester.

In assessing the four areas I attempt to cover in an introduction to international politics class, the assignment creates the condition to accomplish these tasks. First, the assignment covers four major perspectives on current and future politics. By introducing terms and concepts in the first month, and then applying these concepts in the paper, students reinforce what they have learned. Second, the assignment also becomes a point of reference for the rest of the semester; for instance, if later in the semester there is a topic in which students are having a difficult time appreciating different approaches, I can say, "How would Huntington interpret this?" This allows students to consider an argument, which is not necessarily their own. Occasionally, I will receive an email from a former student telling me that they have seen an editorial or television appearance by one of the authors they have read for this assignment. Long after the assignment, the authors and their perspectives appear to remain in the minds of students.

Third, students practice dissecting arguments to help develop their analytical skills. As stated above, students often perceive television and radio talk shows as political debate and discourse. By delving into the background of arguments, and by considering analytical perspectives, students begin to see how different policy options emerge. I remind students that none of these scholars are "crazy"; their prioritization of information leads to differences among them. By breaking down arguments, students begin to analyze problems more. There is no doubt that students are reluctant to do this; but I have found this assignment helps to build self-confidence in their abilities. Students begin to understand that the course has helped to develop tools to help them interpret international politics.

Finally, as the old adage goes, "writers write." If we are to

produce graduates who have skills that are marketable, we must provide opportunities for students to write. It is daunting to assign a great deal of writing to an introductory-level class; however, there is good evidence to suggest a real need for college-level students to improve their writing.<sup>7</sup> While all written assignments take time to grade and evaluate, this particular assignment has the advantage of having a structure that makes it easier to evaluate. Since there is no need for additional research, the instructor is familiar with the material, and the students know what is required, grading is often straightforward. It becomes very obvious which students have done the reading, and most of my comments are reserved for making their writing stronger rather than critiquing their arguments.<sup>8</sup>

I would suggest that this assignment could be used as a template for other areas of political science, not just international relations. In an era in which there are multiple pressures on instructors, the benefits of such an assignment are multifaceted. Administrators and employers want students who are well trained, especially in critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and writing. Increased class sizes sometimes mean that there is a temptation to dispense with writing assignments. Access to online paper-mills means that students are tempted to buy instead of *write* papers. Taking all of these factors into account, instructors need to develop assignments that accomplish our goals as well as address the concerns listed above. I, by no means, suggest that one should incorporate my assignment as written. In fact, I will change the articles I use from semester to semester. I tell students that I get bored reading the articles over and over again. In reality, this is to help prevent plagiarism; but there is a degree of truth to the point that I would like some diversity in what I read as well. Also, this gives me an out when on the day the assignment is due a curious student will ask which of the four articles I would have selected, I say that it would have been one of the articles I no longer assign. **PSE**

#### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Scott Erb, 2006. "Transformation and Assessment of the Introductory International Relations Course." *The Political Science Educator* 11 (1): 10-12 (August 2006).

<sup>2</sup> For background into the concept of critical thinking, see Diane F. Halpern, 2003. *Thought and Knowledge: An Introduction to Critical Thinking*. Fourth Edition. Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates, especially pages 2-5. Colleges and universities have begun to incorporate the

term into their dialogues on better teaching practices; see for example, <http://www.senate.psu.edu/curriculum/resources/guide/glossary.html>.

<sup>3</sup> In the past I have also used, John Mearsheimer's "Why We Will Miss the Cold War" as a realist in this assignment. I often switch articles to provide different experiences and to counter the temptation for plagiarism, see below.

<sup>4</sup> A copy of the assignment for the fall semester 2006 can be downloaded at: <http://webspace.ship.edu/MDSachleben/ip-assignment.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> Depending on the size of the class, I have students write a paragraph summary of the article on the day it is assigned to force them to read and write about the article immediately. Usually, I return these assignments ungraded; the student either receives credit or not. Even without grading the short paragraphs, it can be burdensome to handle many of these paragraph summaries depending on the class size.

<sup>6</sup> At the end of any semester, reducing one's workload always seems like a good idea.

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, Dillon, Sam, 2004. What Corporate America Cannot Build: A Sentence, *New York Times*, 7 December 2004; and, Henry, Julie, 2006. 'Catastrophe' of Undergraduates Who Cannot Write a Basic Sentence, *The Sunday Telegraph*, 12 March 2006, page 5.

<sup>8</sup> The most common editorial comment I make is that some students have a tendency to engage in red herring or straw man arguments. Since students are directed to write to an audience familiar with the arguments of each of the authors, I usually point out that such arguments weaken, rather than strengthen, their own arguments.

## Public Administration with a Comparative Focus: Comparison for the Purpose of Identifying Public Purpose

Nancy E. Wright • Long Island University - Brooklyn • [nwright1014@yahoo.com](mailto:nwright1014@yahoo.com)

American university students typically have two paths by which to take courses in public administration—through a department or school awarding degrees in public administration or through a political science department. The former offers the student a template of theories, concepts, and terms used in the public sector. The latter also offers these; however, public administration courses offered through political science departments also connect public administration to the political scientist's most succinct description of public policy as "who gets what, where, when and how." While most public policy comparisons are addressed in advanced comparative policy seminars, introductory courses in public administration also lend themselves to comparative analysis, though instructors tend not to adopt this approach as often as they might.

This article describes two public administration courses which I taught using a comparative approach in the Spring and Fall 2005 semesters at Long Island University's Brooklyn campus. For both I used a combination of public administration and political science texts. The first was an undergraduate course entitled "Introduction to Public Administration with a Comparative Focus on Kansas City, Missouri, and Nunavut, Canada," and the second was a graduate seminar entitled "Decision-Making for the Public Purpose." This essay describes the origin and structure of each course, the assignments given, student response, and conclusions about the effectiveness of teaching public administration comparatively, both at introductory and at more advanced levels.

### Introduction to Public Administration

The introductory course in public administration combined a presentation of case studies in management with an introduction to Kansas City as a bi-state city and Nunavut as Canada's newest territory. I assigned two basic public administration texts: Jay M. Shafritz and E. W. Russell (2005) *Introducing Public Administration* (Fourth Edition; Pearson-Longman) and Robert Watson (2002) *Public Administration: Cases in Managerial Role-Playing* (New York: Longman). The former text introduced students to basic public administration concepts, and the latter presented a compendium of case studies designed for simulation and discussion. The midterm focused exclusively on these texts, including a closed-book portion of 15 questions requiring short answers (e.g., definitions

or brief explanations), and an open-book portion based on the Watson text, which asked the students to choose three cases and explain key facts, principal actors, major and secondary problems, and their recommendations. I replicated the open-book portion for the take-home final exam, using case studies not covered before the midterm.

The semester also included a trip to Kansas City, Missouri, during which time the students visited the Truman Presidential Museum and Library in Independence, Missouri; saw key examples of Kansas City boulevards, parks, and other open space; and attended a worship service at a bi-racial church deeply involved in community outreach and development. Several native and long-time residents provided overviews of Kansas City governance and civic life and served as guides for the weekend.<sup>1</sup>

To my students, many of whom were second-generation immigrants to New York City, the mention of Kansas City had conjured visions of cattle and cornfields, as well as remnants of antebellum Southern segregation and other discrimination against people of color. Our brief but intense sojourn revised their perspective entirely, as they discovered a Midwestern city rich in performing and visual arts, community outreach and development, and African-American history, as well as the home region of one of the United States' most celebrated and controversial presidents, Harry S. Truman. The visit to the Truman Presidential Museum and Library expanded the students' perspective to encompass public administration and public service at the national level in a pivotal chapter in United States history. Furthermore, Truman's self-education and motivation by personal conviction stood in sharp contrast to the dominance of public opinion polls and other media involvement in contemporary presidential campaigns and in policy initiatives. This juxtaposition prompted discussion on the role of conscience in public service and in political campaigns, including how it can serve for the good, as in Truman's integration of the American military, or for ill, as in his decision to use the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

From the discussion that followed emerged the question of whether or not a true public purpose actually exists. A comment had been made regarding the notion of public purpose as primarily a smokescreen for exploiting the

public through taxation. While extreme, this foreshadowed a null hypothesis that launched rich discussions for the remainder of the semester and in the course taught subsequently, namely, perhaps there is no such thing as a true public purpose. The students readily refuted this hypothesis; nevertheless, explaining “public purpose” is much more difficult than one might have surmised.

The subsequent focus on Nunavut placed discussion of public policy and public administration into sharp relief due to the fact that this fledgling territory cannot exercise self-determination without the institutions that comprise the essence of governance and public life—namely, the products of public purpose. The section of the course devoted to examining Nunavut centered primarily on descriptive information about the territory’s governing institutions. In addition to completing their reading assignments, the students participated in a conference call conducted with Letia Cousins, Director of Aboriginal and Circumpolar Affairs for the Government of Nunavut, as well as her colleague Guy D’Argencourt, also of the Government of Nunavut. Again, the benefits to the students were twofold: their introduction to a part of the world previously unfamiliar to them, yet geographically and politically closer than they may have imagined such a different culture could be; and an introduction to the challenges of creating a civic infrastructure in a newly independent territory that is also part of a federal system of government. The combination of basic public administration concepts, role-playing in public management cases, the Kansas City experience, and the examination of Nunavut gave students a foundation in public administration from the political science vantage point and a comparative perspective from which to enhance their comprehension of the complexities of public purpose and public administration as responsible for carrying out that purpose.

#### **Graduate Seminar on Public Administration**

I augmented this comparative approach in the subsequent course. Entitled “Decision-Making for the Public Purpose,” this course for advanced undergraduates and entering graduate students afforded the opportunity to reintroduce as a null hypothesis the absence of public purpose, then examine its affirmation or negation by analyzing examples of public administration in several different regions with different forms of government, as well as international development assistance and military and humanitarian intervention. The first time this class convened, I opened discussion by asking if something called a public purpose in fact existed. Most of the students responded in the

affirmative but also expressed the belief that the definition was obfuscated by political interest. How, then, could public purpose and public interest be separated, if at all? The relationship between the two continued to be a *leitmotif* throughout the semester.

Required course texts were: Randall Baker (1994) *Summer in the Balkans: Laughter and Tears After Communism* (West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press); Martha Finnemore (2004) *The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs About the Use of Force* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press); Bun Woong Kim and Pan Suk Kim (1997, 1999) *Korean Public Administration: Managing the Uneven Development*; Laura Roper, Jethro Pettit, and Deborah Eade, eds (2003) *Development and the Learning Organization* (Oxford, UK; Oxfam, GB); and Ogwo J. Umeh and Greg Andranovich, (2005) *Culture, Development, and Public Administration in Africa* (West Hartford: CT: Kumarian Press).

Beginning the course with Baker’s book gave the students a humorous anecdotal look at the Balkan region following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the transition from communism to market society. Including chapters entitled “Slovenia: Socialism with BMWs” and “Zagreb: You Can Take a Bus to the Front from Here,” Baker’s narrative recounts his experiences as a visiting professor invited to assist the administrators of the New Bulgarian University to establish a program for the teaching of public administration. Finnemore examines the history and changing nature of the beliefs that drive states’ decisions to intervene militarily. Roper, Pettit, and Eade present an analytical compendium of learning by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) engaged in international development. Kim and Kim provide a detailed account of public bureaucracy in Korea, including the cultural context in which the bureaucracy has evolved and the present and future challenges it faces. Umeh and Andranovich present examples of public administration in the countries of the Southern African Development Conference to illustrate the vital need to incorporate local cultural elements into international development and public administration in areas where Western models dominate, even to the point of defining public administration and superimposing that definition on very different cultures.

Regarding the last book, the students had the opportunity to interview co-authors Umeh and Andranovich in a video conference. Besides raising substantive questions and comments about the text, the students asked about the authors’ collaboration in researching and writing the book, as well as on their career paths, with both aspects

enhancing the students' comprehension of the social sciences as a profession.

The midterm assignment consisted of a six-part essay involving three countries, two of each student's choosing from those covered in the texts, plus the Republic of Korea.<sup>2</sup> The perspective was that of a public administration educator who had been invited to establish a one-year certificate program in public administration. How did they propose to proceed? What would be their priorities? They were permitted to focus either on one public sector topic, e.g., health care or elementary education, or to adopt a more general approach. The students unanimously stressed the importance of observing and to the greatest extent possible, experiencing the local cultures of their selected countries prior to developing proposed curricula.

The final assignment consisted of analysis of a selection of essays from each section of *Development and the Learning Organization*, including to what extent they believed that each organization addressed had engaged in learning that contributed to a public purpose in their respective host countries. From Finnemore's book the students were asked to cite one example from each chapter and explain whether or not they believed intervention was connected to the public purpose. They were also asked to present and explain three things learned from the course. Many of the students stated that prior to taking the course, they had not understood the way in which some development organizations operated as much to sustain themselves and further their own organizational goals as to assist those in their host countries. As part of this realization, however, they also acknowledged the tensions between the need of such organizations to survive in order to fulfill the purposes for which they were created and the need to be responsive and responsible toward their intended beneficiaries. The students also noted the value of Finnemore's book on intervention as introducing them to the multiple and shifting purposes of intervention. They were divided on the question of whether or not intervention serves a public purpose in the recipient countries, with some students considering intervention strictly in the national interest, and others seeing a blurring of this national interest with a larger public purpose.

In summary, both courses had traditionally been taught as courses in domestic public administration and public policy decision-making, respectively. Incorporating a comparative dimension introduced the students to parts of the United States, Canada, and other regions of the world

with which many had little familiarity. In the introductory public administration course, students were able to understand more clearly the distinct challenges of public administration in Kansas City and in Nunavut, while also identifying broader similarities, namely the need for institutions that establish and maintain jurisdiction over societal functions. In Nunavut such institutions were fledgling, and in Kansas City they encompassed two states; nevertheless, the fundamental need was the same. The course entitled "Decision-Making for the Public Purpose" enabled students to reappraise certain assumptions about the definition and characteristics of public purpose through analysis of development assistance in the war-torn Balkan region, the largely impoverished countries of the Southern African Development Conference, and in the Republic of Korea.

One note of caution is in order. The exposure to the other cities, countries, and regions the students received in both courses was by practical necessity rudimentary and somewhat superficial. Nevertheless, this exposure both augmented their understanding of public administration, public purpose, and other parts of the world and whetted their intellectual appetites to use a comparative approach to learn even more. Those whom I have taught and otherwise encountered in subsequent courses have demonstrated this persistent intellectual curiosity that inspires and drives scholars and enlightened citizens. **PSE**

#### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> These were: Judith Brougham, native resident well-versed in Kansas City housing and real estate; Ann McFerrin, Archivist for the Kansas City, Missouri Department of Parks, Recreation, and Boulevards; and Douglas Shafer, owner of a real estate company dedicated to fair and integrated housing in Kansas City and former Deputy Director of the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development's Brooklyn Planning Division, where he was instrumental in establishing Nehemiah Homes, one of the largest community-based homeownership programs in the United States. Other resource persons joining the group for the luncheon discussion were Kansas City economist Brad Furnish and Jack Nesbitt, former mayor of Raytown, Missouri.

<sup>2</sup> From the Balkan region, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, and Slovenia. From the Southern African Development Community (SADC): Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and Angola.

**CALL FOR PROPOSALS 2007****The Eighth Annual Midwest Conference on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning**

The Eighth Annual Midwest Conference on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning will be held on **Friday, April 13, 2007** at **Indiana University South Bend**. We are accepting proposals on this year's theme: *"Building Learning Communities: Blueprints, Scaffolding, and Support for Success."*

The keynote speaker, Milton D. Cox, is the Project Director of the FIPSE Project on Faculty Learning Communities, and is also the Director of the Center for the Enhancement of Learning and Teaching at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio (<http://www.units.muohio.edu/flc/>). Dr. Cox, a foremost figure in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) movement and the leading innovator of faculty learning communities, will present a three-hour workshop in the morning on the history, purpose, development, and implementation of Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs). This will be followed by an afternoon of break-out workshops featuring presentations focusing on different types of learning communities (e.g. FLCs for faculty at different levels of the educational system and Student LCs).

Proposals for presentations are invited from individuals and groups who have, or are in the process of, implementing a learning community within their institution. Proposals addressing, but not limited to, experiences in the following areas will be considered:

- Issues involved in the decision to implement a Learning Community
- The process of designing a Learning Community
- Gaining support and approval and incentives for a Learning Community
- The trans-disciplinary nature of Learning Communities
- Moving from one LC to multiple LCs
- Sustaining LCs

The target audience will include:

- Individuals seeking to address issues of teaching, learning, and professional development in a structured and supportive way
- Department leaders who wish to increase faculty interest in SoTL activities
- Those curious about learning communities in general and who wish to learn more about them

Topics for presentations may include, but are not limited to, Teaching with Technology, Service Learning, Global Learning, Diversity and Teaching, E-portfolios, Millennium Students, Collaborative Teaching, Assessment of Students, Active Learning, and Faculty Mentoring. Accepted proposals will require a 30-minute presentation to be followed by a 20-minute Q&A period.

**To submit a proposal, please send the following information *for each presenter* to:**

The University Center for Excellence in Teaching, Indiana University South Bend—[ucet@iusb.edu](mailto:ucet@iusb.edu) (electronic submission only)

- |                             |                                  |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| • Name of presenter         | • Mailing and e-mail addresses   |
| • Institutional affiliation | • Phone number                   |
| • Position/title            | • Brief biographical information |

**Please submit the following proposal information *for each presentation*:**

- Title
- Short abstract (2-3 sentences for promotional materials)
- Presentation summary (for review committee, 500-1000 words). Please discuss how your project relates to previous SoTL scholarship.
- The number of 50-minute presentations that can be accepted is limited. Please indicate whether you would be interested in presenting a poster session in lieu of a presentation.

We will confirm receipt of your proposal via the "reply" email function and submit your proposal (with names removed) to the review committee. To be considered, the review committee will expect to see clear evidence that the presenters are informed and engaged in the LC process.

**Deadline for Proposals: Friday, December 15, 2006 Acceptance Notification: January 31, 2007**

**Midwest Regional SoTL Consortium:**

Andrews University, Bethel College, Indiana University South Bend,  
Ivy Tech Community College, Holy Cross College, Saint Mary's College

The **United States Institute of Peace** announces a **summer seminar** designed for **college and university faculty** to be held in Washington, DC from **July 15-20, 2007**. The seminar—*Global Peace and Security from Multiple Perspectives*—will examine the major issues surrounding conflict and peacemaking as well as specific cases illustrative of broad themes. Participants should gain substantive knowledge of contemporary cases of conflict and various approaches to building peace and security. They will also gain a better understanding of how to frame these issues in ways that make them interesting and relevant for today's students. Presenters will include leading scholars, analysts and practitioners drawn from the Institute's staff and the Washington academic and policy community. The Institute will cover lodging and contribute to travel and incidental expenses. The application process is competitive. Faculty from a variety of disciplines are urged to apply. **The deadline for applications is April 16, 2007.** For an application go to <http://www.usip.org/cufs.html>.

The **United States Institute of Peace** is now accepting applications for its summer seminar for community college faculty and administrators—*Global Peace and Security in Community Colleges and the Communities They Serve*—to be held May 29-June 3, 2007 in Washington, DC. The Institute of Peace is an independent nonpartisan national institution established and funded by Congress. Its mission is to help prevent, manage, and resolve violent conflicts by empowering others with knowledge, skills, and resources, as well as through direct involvement in peacebuilding efforts. The seminar will give participants the opportunity to carefully examine the nature of international peace and security and how community colleges can relate this to their students and local communities. Presenters will include leading authorities on global peace and conflict, as well as from the field of community college education.

The application process is competitive. The Institute will cover the costs of lodging, and contribute to travel and incidental expenses. Community college faculty and administrators from a variety of disciplines and backgrounds are urged to apply. The application can be found at <http://www.usip.org/ed/seminars/ccfs.html>. **The deadline for applications is March 16, 2007.**

## About Our Contributors

*Susan Grogan is Professor of Political Science at St. Mary's College of Maryland, where she has taught since 1983. Her research interests include American Indian and Canadian First Nations politics, judicial politics, and constitutional law. She teaches broadly within the American politics field, offering courses on the presidency, parties and elections, and the Supreme Court.*

*Henrike Lehnguth is a Ph.D. student in American Studies at the University of Maryland, College Park. She currently also works as Coordinator of Graduate Student Programs for the university's Center for Teaching Excellence. Henrike holds a Master's in American Studies from the University of Texas, Austin and an equivalent of a Bachelor's from the Free University of Berlin. She has published several articles on education in the Berlin daily newspaper Der Tagesspiegel.*

*Maria Rost Rublee is an assistant professor of government & world affairs at the University of Tampa. Prior to her appointment at UT, she taught classes as a teaching assistant and adjunct faculty member at the George Washington University. Rublee specializes in nuclear nonproliferation and currently teaches classes on international relations, nuclear politics, IR theory, and more.*

*Mark Sachleben is an assistant professor of political science at Shippensburg University in Shippensburg, PA. He teaches classes in international relations, comparative politics, global governance*

*and human rights. He is the author of International Human Rights: Considering Patterns of Participation, 1948-2000 and is the co-author of Seeing the Bigger Picture: Understanding Politics Through Film & Television.*

*Nancy E. Wright is an adjunct professor at Long Island University's Brooklyn campus, where she teaches courses in international relations, global ecology, comparative politics, and public policy and administration. She is completing her doctorate in political science at the CUNY Graduate Center in New York City, where her dissertation focuses on organizational learning by the United Nations in the post-Cold War era. Ms. Wright is also Director of Community and Business Outreach at the New York City Department of Transportation's Bureau of Traffic Operations/ Division of Alternative Modes.*

*Jenny Wüstenberg is a Ph.D. candidate in Government & Politics at the University of Maryland, College Park. Her dissertation examines the politics of memory and civil society activism for memorials in Europe. She is an active participant in the University of Maryland's Center for Teaching Excellence. Jenny received Master's degrees from the University of Maryland (Government & Politics) and Macquarie University, Australia (International Communication) and a Bachelor's degree from the University of Sussex, U.K. **PSE***