

PEDAGOGY AND THE DISCIPLINE

Consensus and Divergence in International Studies: Survey Evidence from 140 International Studies Curriculum Programs

JONATHAN N. BROWN
University of Maryland

SCOTT PEGG
Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis

JACOB W. SHIVELY
Indiana University

There is a growing debate over the extent of consensus or divergence found within interdisciplinary International Studies (IS) programs. Unfortunately, with a few exceptions, this debate has taken place in the absence of empirical data. This article advances our understanding of the current state of IS curricula through an analysis of data generated from a survey of 140 interdisciplinary undergraduate IS majors across the United States. The surveyed programs comprise 63 Doctoral/Research institutions, 40 Master's institutions, and 37 Baccalaureate institutions found in 38 states and the District of Columbia. The 140 programs are analyzed in terms of six basic components: introductory course(s), research methods, capstone course(s), area and/or thematic concentrations, study abroad, and foreign language requirements. The findings demonstrate significant areas of both consensus and divergence in IS programs.

Keywords: International Studies, International Studies major, Global Studies, interdisciplinary

There is growing concern about the intellectual coherence of interdisciplinary International Studies (IS) programs. Rosow (2003:1), for example, observes that "Anyone who has attempted to establish an academic degree in International- or Global Studies has had to answer the charge from one of the 'traditional' disciplines that the new program is not rigorous enough; it is not a discipline, with common methods, and a distinctive field of inquiry." Ishiyama and Breuning (2004:134–135) highlight the fact that "Despite the increasing popularity of IS majors, there

Authors' note: The authors would like to thank Susan Sutton and the IUPUI Office of International Affairs for providing funding for this research and three anonymous referees for their many helpful comments on an earlier draft.

appears to be very little consensus regarding their features. . . . even a cursory survey of existing programs reveals wide variation in terms of how IS undergraduate majors are designed.”

While these concerns might be valid, IS scholarship suffers from a distinct lack of empirical data against which to examine them. Ishiyama and Breuning (2004:136), in one of the pioneering empirical studies on IS programs, point out that “there has been very little in the IS literature that has discussed the structure of the undergraduate international studies major.” Hey (2004:395) identifies the “much-needed task” of “beginning to catalog the occurrence and variation in IS programs. . . .” She further laments that “in spite of the explosion of interdisciplinary majors in U.S. universities, and the prominence of IS and Global Studies among them, there remains a glaring lack of support for and information about such programs” (Hey 2004:395).

This study represents an attempt to address Hey’s “much-needed task” by providing additional empirically based information on undergraduate IS majors through a survey of 140 such programs in the United States. In doing so, it contributes to the growing movement that demands that the scholarship of teaching and learning move away from anecdotal stories and instead embrace the standards of evidence-based scholarship that we expect from traditional fields of academic inquiry. Beyond its academic relevance, our data should also provide practical benefits to faculty reviewing existing IS programs or designing new ones (Hey 2004:395; Kelleher 2005:5).

Methodology and Limitations

We follow common practice (Rosow 2003; Hey 2004; Ishiyama and Breuning 2004; Kelleher 2005) and consider IS as separate and distinct from International Relations (IR). Whereas IR is a specific sub-field of Political Science, IS is conceived as an interdisciplinary approach to knowledge that commonly draws simultaneously from such disciplines as Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Political Science, and World Languages. Accordingly, all of the programs in our data set are interdisciplinary in nature. Most are identified specifically as IS majors, although other terms such as “Global Studies” or “Global and International Studies” are sometimes employed.

Our data set comprises a sample of 140 colleges and universities offering undergraduate IS majors found in 38 states and the District of Columbia. This sample was compiled in two stages. An initial sample of 104 institutions offering undergraduate IS majors was compiled in the fall and winter of 2004 to assist the International Studies Program Advisory Committee at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) in its effort to design a new undergraduate IS degree program. At the request of the IUPUI advisory committee, we were asked to ensure representation from three specific categories in our original sample: (1) leading or famous research universities (Brown, Chicago, Yale as examples); (2) Big Ten universities (to reflect IUPUI’s geographical location); and (3) schools that IUPUI regards as comparable peer group “urban research universities” (Alabama–Birmingham, Cincinnati, Wayne State, and Wisconsin–Milwaukee as examples). We then supplemented this list with a random sample of other colleges and universities, all of which were selected from a listing of U.S. colleges and universities offering undergraduate IS programs (*The College Blue Book* 2004). The second stage commenced in the spring of 2005 and consisted of compiling an additional random sample of 36 institutions selected from the above-mentioned list, for a total sample of 140 institutions.

In terms of the Carnegie Classification System, this sample is comprised of 63 (45%) Doctorate-granting institutions (Doctoral/Research Universities—Extensive or Doctoral/Research Universities—Intensive), 40 (28.6%) Master’s Colleges and Universities (Master’s Colleges and Universities I or II), and 37 (26.4%) Baccalaureate Colleges (Baccalaureate Colleges—Liberal Arts or Baccalaureate Colleges—

General). Broken down another way, 55 institutions (39.3%) in our data set are public while 85 (60.7%) are private. A full list of surveyed schools appears in the Appendix.

As with previous studies (Ishiyama and Breuning 2004; Kelleher 2005), these data were collected through surveying college and university websites. We have coded the IS programs in our dataset on the basis of publicly available information on the websites of the respective institutions. Our coding scheme centers around the presence or absence and specific form of six potential program characteristics: introductory course(s), research methods, capstone requirements, area and/or thematic concentration requirements, study abroad, and foreign language. The first three characteristics are selected because they feature prominently in discussions of what a “structured” major would entail (Wahlke 1991:54–55; Ishiyama and Breuning 2004:137–138). The question of whether or not to include research methods as one of the elements of a “structured” major has also sparked debate in the literature (Hey 2004; Breuning and Ishiyama 2004). The last three characteristics (concentration requirements, study abroad, and foreign language) have been assessed in previous studies (Ishiyama and Breuning 2004; Kelleher 2005).

Study abroad was explicitly recommended in the Wahlke Report (Wahlke 1991:55) and a recent *Chronicle of Higher Education* survey found that 56% of Americans believed that it was “important” or “very important” for colleges and universities to encourage students to study abroad (Selingo 2003). Dramatically increased support for study abroad and the acquisition of improved foreign language competency has also featured prominently in one highly publicized report on international education (Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad 2003). While we do not advocate all IS majors having these six program components or a specific version of them, we do believe that all six criteria are worthy of debate and consideration when designing, revising, or evaluating IS majors.

Our study builds upon the original work carried out in this field by Ishiyama and Breuning (2004) and Kelleher (2005). Our data set of 140 IS programs is approximately six times larger than the number of institutions (24) with IS programs in Ishiyama and Breuning’s (2004) sample and is much more diverse in terms of both geographical location and the types of institutions represented. It is also approximately twice as large as the data set recently presented to the annual meeting of the International Studies Association (ISA) (Kelleher 2005). In a field of inquiry suffering from limited empirical data, we believe that this work makes a major contribution to knowledge.

Although our coding simply reflects how the selected institutions advertise themselves, there are distinct limits to the data and analysis we present. Perhaps the biggest problem concerns foreign language requirements. As Burn (2001:180) noted in a previous study of foreign language requirements for study abroad programs “A number of institutions give their language requirement in terms of numbers of semesters, quarters, or years of prior language study, but do not specify if the study should be intensive or non-intensive.” IS majors frequently use terms like “intermediate” or “advanced” to describe their foreign language requirements and there is no way to know how one program’s definition of such terms compares with others.

Related to this, our data are limited to the de jure aspects of IS programs as listed on their websites and cannot assess whatever cultural or de facto elements of the program may exist. For example, we distinguish study abroad in terms of whether it is optional or required, but many IS programs list study abroad as “recommended.” In our coding scheme, these programs are classified as “optional.” What our data cannot reveal, though, is how strongly study abroad is recommended in those programs. Some of our optional programs might have participation rates approaching those of required programs. Whether or not an IS major is implemented as it is advertised is a question that would have to be resolved by a different type of investigation.

Finally, our data do not take account of broader school, campus, or university requirements. Some of the IS majors without a required research methods course might, for instance, be housed in schools that require such a course as part of their general graduation requirements. In our data set, these programs are coded as “no” when, in fact, their IS majors probably take a methods or statistics course. Similarly, our data set measures the level of foreign language requirements in IS majors but does not distinguish whether or not a given program’s foreign language requirement goes beyond general college or school graduation requirements.

We hope that the data presented below will be seen as descriptive rather than prescriptive. Rather than putting forward any kind of template that all existing or new IS programs should follow, we believe that given vast differences in size, mission, resources, student populations, and other such factors, IS programs will remain inevitably diverse. For instance, small well-endowed liberal arts colleges with largely upper-middle-class student bodies are probably better positioned to require a semester or a year of study abroad than large public institutions. Similarly, existing campus resources affect how IS majors are constructed. The foreign language requirement for Indiana University’s IS major, for example, is two semesters beyond the general College of Arts and Sciences requirement. One way this can be satisfied is by taking a beginning semester in each of two new languages. This option exists to take advantage of the fact that the Bloomington campus offers instruction in more than 40 languages. That such an option is seen to make sense at Indiana University does not mean that other institutions with fewer foreign language offerings will wish to incorporate something similar into their IS programs.

The specific content of any IS major is also influenced by practical and political considerations. Practically, one of the first decisions made in setting up the new IS major at IUPUI was that it would be either a 30 or 33 credit major, which was a response to the fact that almost every other disciplinary major in the School of Liberal Arts fell into this range. Politically, Rosow (2003:3) has described how SUNY Oswego settled on the name “Global and International Studies,” a decision made in part, he says, because of the feeling that Global Studies “would cause us political difficulties with ‘more conservative’ and traditional faculty as...Global Studies will sound to them too ‘trendy’ and too ephemeral...”

These caveats and qualifications aside, our data provide valuable insights into how IS majors have developed so far. While acknowledging diversity, our findings also highlight a couple of areas of seemingly strong consensus in the field.¹ We begin our analysis with introductory course requirements.

Introductory Course Requirements

Both the Wahlke (1991) report and Ishiyama and Breuning (2004) identify some form of introductory training as a core aspect of academic programs. Such training generally involves introduction to the main concepts, theories, and debates within a given field, and its inclusion as a course requirement for IS undergraduates seems to be widely accepted (Kelleher 2005:4). Virtually all the surveyed IS programs, 136 of 140 (97.1%), require some form of introductory course. Of these 136, however, only 58 (42.6%) require one or more interdisciplinary courses specifically designed for the IS major. Such courses are commonly titled “Introduction to International Studies,” although there exist several alternative titles such as “The World as a Total System,” “Introduction to the World System,” and “Our World Today.”

This variety of course titles and structures appears broadly to support the findings of a 1997 ISA panel paper titled “A Need for Definition Continues: A Study of

¹Whether this consensus represents a rational and conscious agreement or is merely indicative of “copying” or diffusion from one program to another, we cannot say.

TABLE 1. Sub-Disciplinary Distribution for Introductory Courses

Political Science	91/84.3%
Economics	73/67.6%
History	56/51.9%
Anthropology	38/35.2%
Geography	31/28.7%
Religion	15/13.9%
Sociology	15/13.9%
Communications	11/10.2%
English	8/7.4%
Philosophy	6/5.6%
Psychology	6/5.6%

Nineteen Core Courses Designed as Introductions to International Studies,” which noted the lack of common conceptual and topical themes in a survey of 19 interdisciplinary introductory course syllabi (cited in Kelleher 2005:3). Without a more detailed survey, however, one can only speculate about the curricular diversity of interdisciplinary introductory courses across programs. Further underscoring the potential divergence of course content, 51.7% (or 30 of 58) of the programs with interdisciplinary introductory courses also require at least one introductory course in one or more sub-disciplines of IS, such as Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Political Science, or Religion. Given the different configurations of interdisciplinary introductory requirements, the seeming lack of consensus concerning the desirability of such courses may be matched by a concomitant lack of agreement concerning their design.

The remaining 78 of the 136 (57.4%) programs requiring an introductory course simply offer one or more specific introductory courses in the aforementioned IS sub-disciplines. To determine the extent to which any given sub-discipline may dominate IS programs, we measured sub-disciplinary frequency by calculating the number of programs that require at least one introductory course in any particular sub-discipline. As can be seen in Table 1, Political Science recorded the highest frequency, with 84.3% of the 108 programs requiring at least one sub-disciplinary introductory course, followed by Economics (67.6%), History (51.9%), Anthropology (35.2%), and Geography (28.7%).

The data presented in Table 2 indicate that, among programs requiring introductory courses, there is little variation across Carnegie categories. Baccalaureate colleges (100%) are only slightly more likely to require any form of introductory course than Doctoral (96.8%) or Master’s institutions (95%). Similarly, public institutions (98.1%) are marginally more likely to require introductory courses than private institutions (96.5%), all of which basically mirror the general average of 97.1%. Little variation is also observed among programs requiring an interdisciplinary introductory course, with only Baccalaureate colleges (32.4% vs. 42.9% for Doctoral and 47.5% for Master’s) deviating significantly from the general average

TABLE 2. Introductory Course Requirements

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Any Introduction</i>	<i>IS Introduction</i>
Doctoral	63	61 (96.8%)	27 (42.9%)
Master’s	40	38 (95%)	19 (47.5%)
Baccalaureate	37	37 (100%)	12 (32.4%)
Public	55	54 (98.1%)	24 (43.6%)
Private	85	82 (96.5%)	34 (40%)

(42.6%). Likewise, public institutions (43.6%) are marginally more likely to require an interdisciplinary introductory course than private institutions (40%).

There is a clear trend (97.1%) in support of requiring some form of introductory course for IS majors; however, there appears to be no consensus (42.6%) on requiring an IS-specific interdisciplinary introductory course. These findings are broadly comparable with previous work. For instance, Ishiyama and Breuning's (2004:141) survey of 24 IS programs found that only eight (33.3%) required an interdisciplinary introductory course, whereas Kelleher's (2005:6) survey of 73 programs found that 37 (50.7%) required such a course. Rather than offering an interdisciplinary introduction to IS—that is, an introduction that actively integrates multiple sub-disciplines simultaneously—the majority of programs (57.4%) in our survey offers what can be called a “cross-disciplinary” or “multidisciplinary” approach (Beier and Arnold 2005:45), where students are introduced to one or more of the sub-disciplines of IS separately.

Research Methods

Methodology is a topic of much debate in IS/IR (Hermann 1998; Brecher 1999; Harvey and Brecher 2002), and a recent survey of articles published between 1975 and 2000 in the top IR journals indicates a sharp increase in the use of rigorous methods (Sprinz and Wolinsky-Nahmias 2004:5–8). Despite these research trends, there is comparatively little debate and even less data on the topic of methods training for IS undergraduates.

Although requiring a methods course was designated a “less common” feature of IS programs by a 2002 ISA panel paper titled “The International Studies Major—2002: Essential Elements” (cited in Kelleher 2005:4–5), Ishiyama and Breuning (2004) identify training in research methodology as a core feature of a structured IS curriculum. In their recent survey, 50% (or 12 of 24) of the schools offering an interdisciplinary IS program required some form of methods training, which they employed as empirical evidence against Hey's (2004:398–399) contention that methods training is likely often viewed as inappropriate for IS undergraduates (Breuning and Ishiyama 2004:401). Our survey, however, seems to broadly support Hey's proposition, for only 22.1% (or 31 of 140) of the IS programs require some form of methods training. That said, our findings only partially substantiate Hey's (2004:399) more specific claim that many IS program designers may not require a methods course as a means to avoid privileging one or more specific sub-disciplines. For example, IS program designers at IUPUI chose against requiring a methods course for three reasons: (1) uncertainty as to the nature or design of an interdisciplinary methods course; (2) to avoid privileging one or more specific disciplines; and (3) to avoid duplicating existing analytical skills requirements. Thus, program designers may also not require methods training because their respective schools or colleges already specify analytical skills training for all undergraduates.

At the outset of this study, the state of common knowledge on the topic of interdisciplinary IS methods courses for undergraduates was simply that none were known to exist.² Contrary to this presupposition, however, 16.1% (or 5 of 31) of the surveyed programs requiring methods training specify that students must attain competency in “international” research skills. Three of these programs—American University, the University of the Pacific, and Yale University—offer specific interdisciplinary methods courses titled, respectively, “Introduction to International Relations Research,” “International Research Methods,” and “Tools for International Analysis.”

²Question posed to a conference panel on IS programs at the ISA Annual Conference in Honolulu, March 2005. Jeanne Hey (2004:398) appears to hold a similar impression.

TABLE 3. Sub-Disciplinary Distribution for Methods Courses

Political Science	14/53.8%
Statistics	12/46.2%
Anthropology	9/34.6%
Sociology	9/34.6%
Economics	8/30.8%
Psychology	8/30.8%
History	4/15.4%
English	1/3.8%
Geography	1/3.8%
Philosophy	1/3.8%

Two other programs—California State University, Monterey Bay and the University of Richmond—cover international research skills in their interdisciplinary introductory courses. Interspersing methods training with interdisciplinary introductory or upper-level substantive courses may be a useful alternative approach for teaching interdisciplinary methods as well as for bridging some of the divides among faculty from the various sub-disciplines of IS (Hermann 1998:617; O’Mara et al. 1998). This raises another qualification on our data: some of the surveyed programs may not require a separate methods course but still provide methods training through introductory or upper-level substantive courses, whether disciplinary or interdisciplinary in content.

Of the 31 programs requiring methods training, the remaining 26 (83.9%) offer courses in sub-discipline-specific methods. As shown in Table 3, Political Science recorded the highest sub-disciplinary frequency (53.8%), followed by General Statistics (46.2%), Anthropology and Sociology (each with 34.6%), Economics and Psychology (each with 30.8%), and History (15.4%).

Table 4’s data indicate that, among programs requiring methods training, there is little variation across the Carnegie rankings. Baccalaureate (24.3%) and Doctoral institutions (23.8%) are generally more likely to require methods training than Master’s colleges and universities (17.5%). Similarly, private institutions (24.7%) are more likely to require methods than public institutions (18.1%). Yet all of these categories fall within five percentage points of the general average (22.1%). For the programs requiring training in international research skills, the three programs offering separate interdisciplinary methods courses are at Doctoral institutions, while the two programs covering interdisciplinary methods in their respective introductory courses are at Baccalaureate Liberal Arts Colleges.

There appears to be a clear trend against requiring methods training for IS majors, with only 22.1% of the surveyed programs requiring any form of training and only 3.6% requiring specific interdisciplinary training. Moreover, there seems to be consensus favoring a multidisciplinary rather than an interdisciplinary approach to methods instruction, with 83.9% of the programs with methods course requirements offering only sub-disciplinary analytical training. By comparison, a

TABLE 4. Methods Course Requirements

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Any Method</i>	<i>IS Methods</i>
Doctoral	63	15 (23.8%)	3 (4.8%)
Master’s	40	7 (17.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Baccalaureate	37	9 (24.3%)	2 (5.4%)
Public	55	10 (18.1%)	1 (1.8%)
Private	85	21 (24.7%)	4 (4.7%)

recent survey of U.S. undergraduate Political Science programs found that 64% require training in methodology (Thies and Hogan 2005). Although three times the general average for IS programs, 64% is still relatively low given Political Science's status as a well-established discipline as well as the centrality of methodological issues in the field (see Schwartz-Shea and Bennett 2003; Monroe 2005). Thus, the low percentage of IS programs requiring methods training may reflect a deficiency in methods training among undergraduate programs in the social sciences generally and in Political Science (the dominant methodological sub-discipline of IS) more specifically.

Our findings diverge significantly from those of earlier studies. As noted above, 50% of the IS programs in Ishiyama and Breuning's (2004) sample require methods training, whereas only 22.1% of the programs in our sample require it. We are confident in attributing this divergence to the significant difference in the sizes of the respective samples: 24 versus 140. However, given Thies and Hogan's (2005) finding that, among Political Science programs, Doctorate-granting institutions are less likely than Baccalaureate colleges to require methods training for undergraduates, one possible explanation for this variation is suggested by a key difference in the composition of the two samples: Ishiyama and Breuning's sample is comprised exclusively of liberal arts and sciences colleges and universities, whereas our sample includes nearly twice as many Doctorate-granting institutions as Baccalaureate colleges. Doctorate-granting institutions comprise 45% (or 63 of 140) of our sample, a figure that is comparable with their 43.8% (or 32 of 73) weighting in Kelleher's (2005) most recent sample. Thies and Hogan's sample differs significantly from ours and Kelleher's in that it contains over twice as many Baccalaureate colleges as Doctorate-granting institutions. Nevertheless, our data show almost no variation in the prevalence of methods requirements across Doctorate-granting institutions (23.8%) and Baccalaureate colleges (24.3%). This suggests that variation in institutional type does not significantly affect variation in the presence or absence of methods requirements among IS programs. Further examination of the divergences in our findings from those presented by Thies and Hogan would require a different type of study from the one presented here: namely, a comparative analysis of the development of degree requirements for undergraduate programs in Political Science versus those in IS.

Capstone Requirements

A capstone experience has helped define undergraduate learning for several decades and allows students "to integrate, apply and actively learn as an appropriate conclusion to the four-year model" (Levinson 1998:109). Ishiyama and Breuning (2004:137) generally agree with the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) in elevating this culminating experience to one of the three pillars supporting a "structured" major. Anecdotal surveys further suggest that capstones bolster certain emphases in higher education, such as student development, linking students to their communities and providing outcome assessment (Rhodes and Agre-Kippenham 2004:4; Rowels et al. 2004:1; Catchings 2004:7). However, little empirical work can be found on IS capstones specifically. Kelleher's (2005:7) survey of 73 IS programs indicates that 72.6% require a capstone experience, while Ishiyama and Breuning (2004:141) find that 45.8% of their sampled programs require a capstone. Furthermore, Kelleher uncovers a tendency to favor seminar formats.

This survey uses the concept of capstone loosely, for our coding scheme reflects the course descriptions provided by each program's website rather than any mainstream definition of a capstone experience. Five basic course categories are reflected in the 101 IS programs found to require a capstone: "unspecified" (reflecting a listing of "senior seminar," "capstone," or an unnamed upper-division

TABLE 5. Capstone Requirements

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Capstone</i>
Doctoral	63	48 (76.2%)
Master's	40	29 (72.5%)
Baccalaureate	37	24 (64.9%)
Public	55	38 (69.1%)
Private	85	63 (74.1%)

course), IS-specific, Political Science/IR, experience abroad, and thesis. One issue with this coding scheme involves the 20 programs that either require a combination of categories or offer a choice between them, which makes the number of capstone variables offered greater than the number of schools requiring capstones. Given our goal of assessing trends across programs, percentages have been taken from the number of schools rather than the number of total capstone variables. Additionally, after dividing the data into these five categories, we found that the seminar format appeared in all but one category (the experience abroad). Consequently, there are more “seminar” capstones than any of the other five categories.

Overall, 72.1% (or 101 of 140) of the surveyed schools require some capstone experience. As Table 5 shows, Doctoral institutions (76.2%) are slightly more likely to require a capstone than either Master's (72.5%) or Baccalaureate institutions (64.9%). Private institutions (74.1%) similarly seem slightly more disposed to require a capstone than public institutions (69.1%). Table 6 breaks down the capstone requirement according to the five-part classification scheme discussed above. By far the most common structural option for capstones is the seminar format, which appears 68 times (67.3%) across four of the five categories. Alternatively, 15 programs offer a choice between two categories, while five require a combination of two.

Among the five categories, IS-specific capstones appear to be the most popular option, recording the highest frequency (41.6% of the programs). A majority of these capstones follow a seminar format and are more prevalent at Doctoral and Master's universities. The second most popular capstone category is the thesis (29.7%), which presumably provides flexibility for addressing the sweeping questions inherent to interdisciplinary majors (Proctor 1998:34). Although a majority of thesis offerings are program requirements, students at a third of the relevant institutions are allowed to choose between a thesis and a seminar. The third most common category comprises the “undefined” capstones, recording a frequency of 27.7%. Here, schools draw heavily upon the interdisciplinary nature of IS to round out their programs. For example, although some schools require at least one upper division Political Science seminar, others ask for either some acceptable “senior seminar” or a thesis, while still others accept any “social science” senior seminar.

Little can be said of the remaining two categories owing to their relative infrequency and significant divergence from the other options. Eight programs, mostly

TABLE 6. Categorical Distribution for IS Capstones

IS specific	42/41.6%*
Thesis	30/29.7%
Undefined	28/27.7%
Abroad	8/7.9%
Political Science/IR	6/5.9%
Seminar	68/67.3%

*Percent greater than 100 due to double offerings.

occurring in conjunction with a seminar or thesis, require study abroad as a capstone experience. Only six programs (5.9%) require a Political Science/IR capstone, which runs counter to our earlier findings for sub-disciplinary distributions in the "Introductory" and "Methods" sections where Political Science appeared most frequently. This may ease concerns among some (Hey 2004:397) that Political Science dominates IS.

Concerning the seminar option, 35 are IS-specific, 21 are unspecified, and five are distributed among two of the remaining categories. For instance, one public Doctoral university's offering varies in order to "integrate concepts and analyses relating to the academic background of majors." When viewed in terms of the Carnegie classifications, 71% of Doctoral, 55% of Master's, and 67% of Baccalaureate institutions offer seminars, which represents an apparent consensus favoring this format across all institutional levels.

Area and/or Thematic Concentration Requirements

Based on a 1989 study of 1,308 4-year institutions, Lambert (1989:109, 125) concluded that "general education requirements . . . do not provide enough information about and insight into other countries." In the ensuing decade-and-a-half, however, "internationalization" has become a major concern on many campuses. Tessler, Nactwey, and Banda (2001:68) argue that there is significant agreement that scholarship is most effective when informed by a discipline and/or theory and grounded in specific area circumstances. Similarly, Bates (2001:56) sees grounding in both area and disciplinary concentrations as a necessary component of IS undergraduate programs, for, as Levinson (1998:109) points out, "Concentration studies ensure an understanding of the connection between domestic and international, and cross-national and global."

Area and thematic concentrations have become two primary avenues of organizing IS curricula (Kelleher 1996:425). In IS, area studies requirements generally involve assembling courses pertaining to a particular world region. Thus, for the purposes of our study, area studies courses are coded as those offering either detailed descriptions of a nation or region, the use of "deep and text-rich" area knowledge to make generalizations, or interdisciplinary teaching/research by a cluster of scholars focused on one region (Hall and Tarrow 2001:98). Capturing the concept of "thematic" is more problematic, however, given its susceptibility to individualized interpretations. For our purposes, it connotes either a disciplinary focus, a set of courses organized around a given international topic, or a topic/issue that can be addressed from an international perspective. As an example of the latter, one Doctoral university requires thematic concentrations in history, communications, religion, and/or philosophy. International topics are more common, though, including, for instance, one private Doctoral institution's requirements in "International Comparative History" and "International Political Economy, Development, and Environment," and one private Baccalaureate school's "Christian World Mission."

Reflecting an apparent consensus, 88.6% (or 124 of 140) of the surveyed programs require some form of concentration. For these 124 programs, distinctions are made between those requiring concentrations in both a thematic/sub-disciplinary topic and a geographical area (39/31.5%), either a thematic/sub-disciplinary topic or a geographical area (41/33.1%), only a thematic/sub-disciplinary topic (25/20.2%), and only a geographical area (19/15.3%).

As shown in Table 7, a number of trends emerge from these data. Doctoral universities (38.1%) are more likely to require both area and thematic concentrations than either Master's (12.5%) or Baccalaureate (27%) institutions. However, all three levels (Doctoral 30.2%; Master's 32.5%; Baccalaureate 24.3%) offer similar opportunities for students to choose one. Baccalaureate IS programs are marginally

TABLE 7. Concentration Requirements

	<i>Total</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Theme</i>	<i>Choice</i>	<i>Both</i>
Doctoral	63	7 (11.1%)	3 (4.8%)	10 (15.9%)	19 (30.2%)	24 (38.1%)
Master's	40	4 (10%)	11 (27.5%)	7 (17.5%)	13 (32.5%)	5 (12.5%)
Baccalaureate	37	5 (13.5%)	5 (13.5%)	8 (21.6%)	9 (24.3%)	10 (27%)
Public	55	4 (7.3%)	4 (7.3%)	11 (20%)	18 (32.7%)	18 (32.7%)
Private	85	12 (14.1%)	15 (17.6%)	14 (16.5%)	23 (27.1%)	21 (24.7%)

more likely to require a theme-only concentration (21.6% vs. Doctoral 15.9%; Master's 17.5%), whereas Master's institutions (27.5%) are significantly more likely to require an area-only concentration than either Doctoral (4.8%) or Baccalaureate institutions (13.5%). Alternatively, public institutions (92.7%) require a concentration more often than private institutions (85.9%). Private schools are more likely to require only area studies (17.6% vs. 7.3%), but public schools lead slightly in each of the three remaining categories. Ultimately, the Carnegie rankings appear to draw out more significant areas of consensus and divergence than the public-private bifurcation.

Waters and Macey (1998:40) maintain that IS programs must address the centripetal and centrifugal forces growing from tensions between an urge to focus upon either area studies or thematic concentrations. In fact, 57.1% of the surveyed schools, or 64.5% of the IS programs with a concentration requirement, require either both concentrations or a choice between them. Doctoral institutions (68%) are most likely to bridge this tension, followed by Baccalaureate (51.3%) and Master's (45%) institutions.

This survey supports the conclusions of both a 2002 ISA panel titled "The International Studies Major—2002: Essential Elements," which designated area and/or thematic concentrations as a "most common" aspect of IS undergraduate programs (cited in Kelleher 2005:4), and Kelleher's (2005:4) recent finding that a majority of IS programs require some form of concentration. However, it diverges from Kelleher (2005:7) in that we found a larger majority of IS programs (88.6% vs. 71.2%) with area and/or thematic concentrations. Furthermore, we found that general thematic concentrations are slightly more prevalent than area concentrations, which runs counter to Kelleher's finding that area studies are the leading category. This latter claim must be qualified, though, because Kelleher separates "discipline" from "issue" and "fields/topics" concentrations, whereas we lump the three together under "theme." Rather than split our thematic category along these lines, we suggest that the most interesting division is between school ranks, which reveals that area studies alone are most popular with Master's institutions, that stand-alone thematic concentrations are most popular with Baccalaureate institutions, and that offering either a choice or requiring both is favored at all three levels.

Study Abroad

The idea that more American students should study abroad has been widely circulated. While it was one of four experiential learning options advocated in the Wahlke (1991:55) report, one high-level task force recently compared the post-September 11th environment with "another Sputnik moment" and argued that it was time to launch a major national effort to ensure that all U.S. college students graduate with both an understanding of at least one foreign area and competence in at least one foreign language. For this to happen, the report argued that "study abroad must become the norm, not the exception" (Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad 2003:3).

TABLE 8. Study Abroad Requirements

	<i>Total</i>	<i>Study Abroad</i>
Doctoral	63	25 (39.6%)
Master's	40	12 (30%)
Baccalaureate	37	17 (45.9%)
Public	55	24 (43.6%)
Private	85	30 (35.3%)

There is evidence that such programs are gaining popularity. Bowman and Jennings (2005) show that the numbers of college and university students participating in study abroad have more than doubled in recent years, with the fastest growth in short-term programs lasting less than one semester. Since 1985, the number of students in short-term international programs has grown by 463% (Bowman and Jennings 2005:77); yet the reality remains that “students who study abroad amount to barely more than 1 percent of the 8 million full-time and 5 million part-time undergraduates” (Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad 2003:7).

The limited numbers enrolled in study abroad programs are perhaps unsurprising considering their burdens for both faculty and students. For faculty, who often confront few incentives to start such programs or limited resources to support them, study abroad programs result in significant administrative and time burdens and frequently entail losing valuable summer research time (Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad 2003:9; Bowman and Jennings 2005:78). Undergraduate students face equal if not greater challenges: study abroad is often an add-on expense beyond tuition,³ and students must begin planning very early to meet program and administrative deadlines. They may face health and/or safety issues, and, in some programs, it is difficult to fit study abroad into their institution's curricular demands. Often, this entails students needing an additional semester or year to finish degree requirements (Hopkins 1999; Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad 2003:9; Lewis and Niesenbaum 2005).

Given these costs and constraints, our study unsurprisingly finds that study abroad is not a required component of most undergraduate IS majors. Only 54 of 140 programs (38.6%) require some form of study abroad, while many programs, coded “optional” in our data set, “encourage” or “recommend” study abroad but do not make it a degree requirement. Broken down by institutional type, our study finds Doctoral/Research institutions (39.6%) almost even with the general average while Baccalaureate institutions (45.9%) are significantly above it and Master's institutions (30%) are significantly below it. Public institutions (43.6%) seem somewhat more likely to include study abroad requirements in their IS majors than private institutions (35.3%) (see Table 8).

For a couple of reasons, these data should be treated with caution. First, as noted in the introduction, it is impossible to know how strongly some of the “optional” programs recommend study abroad. In at least some of these programs, it could approach a *de facto* requirement. Second, and moving in the other direction, there is the question of how “required” study abroad is in some of the 54 IS majors coded as having a study abroad requirement. Nearly one-third of these programs (16 of 54/29.6%) also allow some form of internationally related domestic internship to fulfill their “study abroad” requirement. Arguably, these schools have

³Granted, on some campuses that have high levels of participation, tuition is applied to the costs of study abroad. Furthermore, depending upon the study abroad destination, for some institutions study abroad does not cost more than remaining on campus.

internationally focused experiential learning requirements rather than study abroad requirements per se. Again, without a more detailed survey, how many students in these programs actually take advantage of this domestic internship alternative is impossible to know. Subtracting these schools from our “required” list would, however, bring the number of programs with study abroad requirements down to 38 of 140 (27.14%).

Finally, there is the question of length in required study abroad programs. Study abroad traditionally meant studying overseas for a semester or year. Increasingly, however, it also includes short-term programs (lasting from 1 to 4 weeks) taught during the summer, over the semester break or around spring break. A number of scholars view these short-term programs as democratizing the study abroad experience and opening it up to first-generation and low-income college students. Many also see them as valuable prerequisites to giving such students the confidence to take advantage of semester or year abroad programs later in their academic careers (Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad 2003:10; Bowman and Jennings 2005:77; Lewis and Niesenbaum 2005). Critics, however, point out that shorter-term programs limit the prospects for foreign language acquisition (Burn 2001:183) and question how much difference going abroad for spring break really makes in terms of learning objectives.

Using a semester or more to operationalize a “traditional” study abroad experience, our data indicate that 19 of 54 programs (35.2%) require students to meet this benchmark in terms of program length. Excluding the programs that allow domestic internship alternatives brings this figure up to 19 of 38 programs (50%). The remaining 35 programs (64.8%) allow students the option of shorter-term study abroad, although some specify minimum length requirements such as 4- or 8-week minimums or one-quarter requirements. Breaking the 19 programs requiring a semester or more of study abroad down by institutional-type reveals that Baccalaureate programs are by far the most likely to do this. Of the 19 semester or longer requirements, 10 (52.6%) were found at Baccalaureate institutions, six (31.6%) were found at Doctoral/Research institutions, and three (15.8%) were found at Master’s institutions.

Our findings here are broadly comparable with previous work. Kelleher’s survey found 12 of 29 institutions (42.3%) requiring study abroad, while her 2005 survey found 26 of 73 institutions (35.6%) requiring study abroad (Kelleher 2005:3). All three studies indicate that a majority of IS programs do not make study abroad a required programmatic component. Whether this reflects a lack of consensus on the importance of study abroad or merely a reluctant recognition of some of the costs and difficulties involved in study abroad we cannot say.

Foreign Language

The comparative failure of American students to learn foreign languages is widely noted. As one recent report put it

It is the rare campus where anyone other than a language major is required to achieve proficiency in a second language—and the ranks of language majors are dwindling. Beginner’s language courses may be crowded, but enrollments beyond that are sparse. Is it any wonder that the U.S. State Department and our intelligence and security agencies are chronically short of analysts and diplomats with critical language skills? (Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad 2003:1)

Presumably, this is a subject of direct concern to anyone working in IS. It is also an area that IS programs might have a comparative advantage in addressing. Given the growth in international trade and foreign direct investment as well as the job shortages in the governmental sectors noted above, foreign language training may also directly help IS graduates to succeed in a competitive job market.

Perhaps more than any of the other areas considered in this study, collecting data on foreign language requirements is problematic. IS programs variously specify their foreign language requirements in terms of the overall number of courses taken, the number of courses required in addition to general school or university requirements, length of time (four semesters, 3 years, etc.), reaching specific levels of competency (200 level, "intermediate," "advanced," etc.), number of credit hours, or completing a minor in a foreign language. Many schools also allow for "competency" or "proficiency" equivalents to these requirements. Given differences in institutions and course design, it is difficult to know how one IS program's "intermediate" level compares with another's completion of the 200 level course sequence or to a third's 15 credit hours.

We divide our data on foreign language requirements into four categories. Our category "none" represents programs that do not have any specific foreign language requirements. Our "elementary" category includes programs that require completion of 1 year of language coursework, completion of 100 level courses, or up to 12 credit hours of language classes. Our "intermediate" category includes programs that require completion of 2 years of language coursework, completion of 200 level courses, or between 13 and 24 credit hours. Finally, our "advanced" category includes programs requiring completion of 3 years of language coursework, completion of 300 level courses, 25 or more credit hours, or a minor in a foreign language.

The data presented in Table 9 indicate that there is a high degree of consensus among IS programs about the importance of foreign language requirements. In our data set, 122 of 140 programs (87.2%) require at least some foreign language coursework. Perhaps more interestingly, 112 programs (80%) require either intermediate- or advanced-level foreign language proficiency. When broken down by institutional type, the data clearly reveal that Master's institutions have noticeably lower foreign language requirements than either Baccalaureate or Doctoral/Research institutions. Only 27 of 40 Master's institutions (67.5%) require intermediate- or advanced-level foreign language proficiency. This compares with 31 of 37 Baccalaureate institutions (83.8%) and 54 of 63 Doctoral/Research institutions (85.7%). Similarly, seven of 40 Master's institutions (17.5%) do not require any foreign language coursework versus five of 37 Baccalaureate institutions (13.5%), and six of 63 Doctoral/Research institutions (9.5%). When broken down another way, public institutions seem to have marginally higher foreign language requirements than private institutions. Forty-six of 55 (83.6%) public institutions require intermediate or advanced foreign language proficiency versus 66 of 85 (77.6%) private institutions. Private institutions (14.1%) were also marginally more likely not to have any foreign language requirements than public institutions (10.9%).

Our findings on foreign language are broadly comparable with those of two previous studies conducted by Kelleher. Her 1995 study of 29 IS programs found 90% of them requiring intermediate level or above foreign language proficiency while her 2005 study of 73 IS programs found 82.2% of them requiring

TABLE 9. Foreign Language Requirements

	<i>Total</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>Elementary</i>	<i>Intermediate</i>	<i>Advanced</i>
Doctoral	63	6 (9.5%)	3 (4.8%)	27 (42.9%)	27 (42.9%)
Master's	40	7 (17.5%)	6 (15%)	15 (37.5%)	12 (30%)
Baccalaureate	37	5 (13.5%)	1 (2.7%)	20 (54.1%)	11 (29.7%)
Public	55	6 (10.9%)	3 (5.5%)	23 (41.8%)	23 (41.8%)
Private	85	12 (14.1%)	7 (8.2%)	39 (45.9%)	27 (31.8%)

intermediate proficiency or higher (Kelleher 2005:3). There appears to be a strong consensus that IS majors should acquire intermediate or advanced foreign language skills.

Conclusion

The liberal arts claim a tradition in which the “goal of learning is to understand reality as a whole” (Proctor 1998:32). IS offers a unique interdisciplinary regimen embodying this ideal, yet a dearth of empirical data on program characteristics currently exists and questions abound about the field’s intellectual coherence. In surveying 140 IS programs, this study proposes six characteristics to delimit coherence and seeks to provide the kind of empirical analysis IS undergraduate programs have only occasionally received.

Our findings broadly suggest that IS has certain core elements of relative consensus against which some divergence can be observed. Specifically, introductory requirements are almost unanimous, occurring in 97.1% of our sample, though there is significantly less agreement (42.6%) concerning the requirement of an IS-specific interdisciplinary introductory course. Methods courses, in contrast, are universally rare, with only 22.1% of the surveyed programs offering any form of training and only 3.6% requiring IS-specific interdisciplinary training. Thus, in terms of introductory and methods requirements, IS programs tend to be more multidisciplinary, offering training in multiple sub-disciplines taken and then applied separately, rather than interdisciplinary—that is, providing training in multiple sub-disciplines simultaneously.

As with the introductory element, the capstone experience appears frequently (72.1%) but is most often offered as an IS-specific course (42% of capstones) or a thesis (30% of capstones). Whatever its categorization, the capstone involves a seminar format in over two-thirds of cases. Signaling simultaneous convergence and divergence, an area and/or thematic concentration is required in 88.6% of the surveyed programs, yet great configurative variability across programs defines this aspect of IS majors. Over half of the programs with concentrations either require both forms of concentration or allow a choice between them. Similar to the occurrence of methods training, study abroad requirements are relatively infrequent, occurring in only 38.6% of the surveyed programs. Of course, on-the-ground realities may in fact reflect higher levels of study abroad participation, but this low level is nevertheless unsurprising considering the costs and constraints of study abroad experiences. Finally, again echoing the levels of requirement found with the introductory, capstone, and concentration elements, some form of language competency was required in 87% of the surveyed programs. Although language training was perhaps the most problematic element for our survey to capture, this apparent consensus nevertheless confirms that at least an “intermediate” competency characterizes language requirements across most IS majors.

Still, many questions remain to be answered. For example, what patterns of consensus and divergence would arise from a focused comparison of various IS-specific courses? The IS major is becoming increasingly popular among undergraduates, but how do IS majors fare after graduation? For instance, are IS degrees widely recognized by disciplinary graduate programs? Debating these and related questions will help to clarify the identity and voice of IS in the minds of critics and supporters alike. As Hey (2004) suggests, an important step in this regard would be the establishment of a national association devoted to the study and dissemination of information about IS undergraduate programs. We have sought to contribute to this effort and hope this survey proves useful for faculty and administrators who may wish to design a new IS major or re-evaluate an existing program.

Appendix

TABLE A1. Survey Master List

<i>College/University</i>	<i>Car- negie</i>	<i>Intro- ductory</i>	<i>Method</i>	<i>Cap- stone</i>	<i>Lan- guage</i>	<i>Abroad</i>	<i>Con- centration</i>
Abilene Christian University	M/PR	Yes	No	Yes*	Adv.	Optional	Area
University of Alabama (Birmingham)	D/PU	Yes*	No	Yes*	Inter.	Optional	Both
University of Alabama (Tuscaloosa)	D/PU	Yes	No	No	Adv.	Optional	Both
American University	D/PR	Yes	Yes*	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Both
University of Arkansas	D/PU	Yes	No	Yes	Adv.	Optional	Area
University of Arkansas Tech	M/PU	Yes	No	No	Elem.	Optional	Area
Azusa Pacific University	M/PR	Yes	No	Yes	None	Optional	Thematic
Barry University	M/PR	Yes	No	Yes	Elem.	Optional	Thematic
Bellarmino University	M/PR	Yes	No	No	Inter.	Required	No
Benedictine University	M/PR	Yes	No	No	Elem.	Optional	No
Birmingham Southern College	B/PR	Yes	No	No	Adv.	Optional	Thematic
Bowling Green State University	D/PU	Yes*	No	Yes*	Adv.	Required	Both
Bradley University	M/PR	Yes*	Yes	Yes	None	Optional	Choice
Brigham Young University	D/PR	Yes*	Yes	Yes	None	Optional	Choice
Brown University	D/PR	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Adv.	Optional	Both
Butler University	M/PR	Yes*	Yes	Yes*	None	Optional	Area
University of California (Irvine)	D/PU	Yes*	No	No	Inter.	Required	Both
University of California (San Diego)	D/PU	Yes*	No	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Both
California Lutheran University	M/PR	Yes*	No	Yes*	Inter.	Optional	Both
California State University (Monterey)	B/PU	Yes	Yes*	Yes	Inter.	Required	Thematic
Capital University	M/PR	Yes	No	No	Adv.	Optional	No
Case Western Reserve University	D/PR	Yes	No	Yes	Adv.	Optional	Both
Central Connecticut State University	M/PU	Yes*	No	Yes*	Inter.	Required	Area
Centre College	B/PR	Yes	No	Yes*	Inter.	Optional	Choice
University of Chicago	D/PR	Yes*	No	Yes	Adv.	Required	Choice
University of Cincinnati	D/PU	Yes	Yes	Yes	Adv.	Optional	Thematic
City College of New York	M/PU	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Adv.	Optional	Choice
Colby College	B/PR	Yes	No	Yes	Elem.	Required	Choice
University of Colorado	D/PU	Yes*	No	Yes*	Adv.	Optional	Choice
Colorado Christian University	M/PR	Yes*	No	Yes*	Elem.	Optional	Area
Cornell College	B/PR	Yes	No	No	Inter.	Required	No
University of Dayton	D/PR	Yes	No	Yes*	Adv.	Required	Choice
University of Denver	D/PR	Yes*	No	No	Inter.	Optional	Choice
DePaul University	D/PR	Yes*	Yes	Yes*	Inter.	Optional	No
Dominican University of California	M/PR	Yes*	Yes	Yes*	Inter.	Optional	Area
Earlham College	B/PR	Yes	No	No	Adv.	Required	Both
Eckerd College	B/PR	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Inter.	Required	Both
Edgewood College	M/PR	Yes	No	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Choice
Emory and Henry College	B/PR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Area
University of Evansville	M/PR	Yes	No	Yes*	Adv.	Required	Area
Ferrum College	B/PR	Yes	No	No	Adv.	Optional	Both
University of Florida	D/PU	Yes	No	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Choice
Fordham University	D/PR	Yes*	No	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Thematic
Frostburg State University	M/PU	Yes*	No	No	Adv.	Optional	Thematic
George Washington University	D/PR	Yes	Yes	No	Inter.	Optional	Thematic
Georgia Institute of Technology	D/PU	Yes	Yes	Yes	Elem.	Optional	Thematic
Graceland University	B/PR	Yes*	No	Yes	Inter.	Required	Both
Hamline University	M/PR	Yes*	No	Yes*	Inter.	Required	Area
Hanover College	B/PR	Yes	No	Yes	None	Optional	Choice
Hawaii Pacific University	M/PR	Yes	No	Yes*	None	Optional	Area
Hendrix College	B/PR	Yes	No	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Area
Hollins University	B/PR	Yes*	No	Yes	Adv.	Required	Both
Hope College	B/PR	Yes	No	No	Inter.	Required	Choice

TABLE A1. Continued

<i>College/University</i>	<i>Car- negie</i>	<i>Intro- ductory</i>	<i>Method</i>	<i>Cap- stone</i>	<i>Lan- guage</i>	<i>Abroad</i>	<i>Con- centration</i>
University of Idaho	D/PU	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Adv.	Required	Both
Illinois College	B/PR	Yes*	No	Yes	Adv.	Optional	Choice
University of Illinois (Urbana)	D/PU	Yes	No	No	Inter.	Required	Choice
Illinois Wesleyan University	B/PR	Yes*	Yes	Yes	None	Optional	Both
Indiana University	D/PU	Yes*	No	Yes*	Inter.	Required	Both
IUPUI	D/PU	Yes*	No	Yes*	Inter.	Required	Both
University of Iowa	D/PU	Yes*	No	Yes*	Inter.	Optional	Choice
Johns Hopkins University	D/PR	Yes	No	Yes	Adv.	Optional	Both
Knox College	M/PR	Yes*	No	Yes	Inter.	Required	Both
Lake Forest College	B/PR	Yes	No	Yes	Adv.	Optional	No
Lawrence University	B/PR	Yes	No	No	Inter.	Optional	Thematic
Lewis University	M/PR	Yes*	No	Yes	Elem.	Required	Both
Lewis and Clark College	B/PR	Yes	Yes	Yes*	None	Optional	Both
Loras College	B/PR	Yes	No	Yes	None	Optional	Choice
Loyola University Chicago	D/PR	Yes*	No	Yes*	Elem.	Optional	Thematic
Macalester College	B/PR	Yes*	No	Yes*	Adv.	Required	Thematic
Marquette University	D/PR	No	Yes	Yes*	Inter.	Optional	Choice
University of Memphis	D/PU	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Inter.	Required	Choice
Miami, University of	D/PR	Yes*	No	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Choice
Miami University	D/PU	Yes*	No	Yes*	Adv.	Optional	Thematic
University of Michigan (Dearborn)	M/PU	Yes	No	No	Adv.	Optional	Thematic
Middlebury College	B/PR	Yes*	No	Yes*	Adv.	Required	Both
University of Minnesota (Duluth)	M/PU	Yes	No	Yes*	Inter.	Optional	Both
University of Minnesota (Twin Cities)	D/PU	Yes	No	Yes	Inter.	Required	Both
University of Mississippi	D/PU	Yes*	No	Yes	Adv.	Required	Both
Mount Mercy College	B/PR	Yes	Yes	No	Inter.	Optional	Thematic
Murray State University	M/PU	Yes	No	Yes	None	Required	Thematic
University of Nebraska (Lincoln)	D/PU	Yes	No	Yes*	Adv.	Required	Both
University of Nebraska (Omaha)	M/PU	Yes*	No	Yes*	Adv.	Optional	Thematic
University of North Florida	M/PU	Yes*	Yes	No	Adv.	Optional	Choice
University of North Texas	D/PU	No	No	No	Inter.	Optional	Both
Northwestern University	D/PR	Yes*	No	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Both
Oglethorpe University	B/PR	Yes	No	No	Inter.	Required	No
Ohio State University	D/PU	Yes	No	No	None	Optional	Choice
Ohio University	D/PU	Yes	No	No	Adv.	Required	Both
University of Oregon	D/PU	Yes*	No	No	Adv.	Required	Both
University of the Pacific	D/PR	Yes	Yes*	Yes	Inter.	Required	No
Pacific University	M/PR	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Adv.	Required	Area
University of Pennsylvania	D/PR	Yes	No	Yes	Adv.	Required	Both
Pennsylvania State University	D/PU	Yes*	No	Yes*	Inter.	Required	No
Pepperdine University	D/PR	Yes*	No	Yes*	Adv.	Optional	Choice
Pittsburg State University	M/PU	Yes	No	Yes*	Inter.	Required	Choice
Portland State University	D/PU	Yes*	No	Yes*	Adv.	Required	Both
Randolph-Macon College	B/PR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Both
Rhodes College	B/PR	Yes	No	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Both
University of Richmond	B/PR	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*	Adv.	Required	Choice
Ripon College	B/PR	Yes*	No	Yes	Inter.	Required	Thematic
Roosevelt University	M/PR	Yes	No	No	None	Optional	Both
Saint Louis University	D/PR	Yes*	No	No	Inter.	Required	Choice
Saint Norbert College	B/PR	Yes*	Yes	No	Adv.	Required	Thematic
Saint Xavier University	M/PR	No	No	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Thematic
The University of Scranton	M/PR	Yes	No	Yes*	None	Optional	Choice
Simpson College	B/PR	Yes	No	No	Inter.	Optional	No
University of South Florida	D/PU	Yes*	No	Yes*	Inter.	Optional	No
University of Southern Maine	M/PU	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Inter.	Required	Choice

TABLE A1. Continued

<i>College/University</i>	<i>Car- negie</i>	<i>Intro- ductory</i>	<i>Method</i>	<i>Cap- stone</i>	<i>Lan- guage</i>	<i>Abroad</i>	<i>Con- centration</i>
Southwestern University	B/PR	Yes	No	No	Adv.	Required	Area
Spring Hill College	M/PR	Yes	No	No	Inter.	Optional	No
Stanford	D/PR	Yes	Yes	Yes	Adv.	Required	Choice
Stephens College	B/PR	Yes*	No	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Thematic
Suny at Buffalo	D/PU	Yes	No	No	None	Optional	Area
Suny at Oswego	M/PU	Yes	No	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Choice
Syracuse University	D/PR	Yes	No	No	Elem.	Required	Both
Taylor University	B/PR	Yes*	No	No	None	Optional	Choice
University of Tennessee (Martin)	M/PU	Yes*	No	Yes	Adv.	Required	Choice
Towson University	M/PU	Yes	No	No	Inter.	Optional	Choice
Trinity University	M/PR	Yes*	No	Yes*	Adv.	Optional	Choice
Tufts University	D/PR	Yes	No	Yes	Adv.	Optional	Thematic
University of Utah	D/PU	Yes	No	Yes	None	Required	Choice
Utah State University	D/PU	Yes	No	Yes	Adv.	Required	Thematic
Virginia Commonwealth University	D/PU	Yes	No	Yes*	Adv.	Required	Choice
Virginia Tech	D/PU	Yes	No	Yes	Adv.	Optional	Thematic
Wartburg College	B/PR	Yes	No	No	Inter.	Optional	No
Washington College	B/PR	Yes	No	Yes*	Inter.	Required	Area
University of Washington	D/PU	No	No	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Choice
Washington University (St. Louis)	D/PR	Yes*	No	Yes	Inter.	Optional	No
Wayne State University	D/PU	Yes	No	No	None	Optional	No
Webster University	M/PR	Yes*	No	Yes*	Adv.	Required	Choice
University of West Florida	M/PU	Yes*	No	No	Elem.	Optional	Choice
Westminster College	B/PR	Yes*	No	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Both
West Virginia University	D/PU	Yes*	No	Yes	None	Optional	Choice
Wheaton College	B/PR	Yes	No	Yes	Inter.	Required	Area
Whitworth College	M/PR	Yes	No	Yes	Inter.	Optional	Area
University of Wisconsin (Madison)	D/PU	Yes*	No	No	Inter.	Optional	Thematic
University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee)	D/PU	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Adv.	Required	No
Wright State University	D/PU	Yes	Yes	No	Adv.	Optional	Choice
University of Wyoming	D/PU	Yes	No	Yes*	Inter.	Optional	Both
Yale University	D/PR	Yes	Yes*	Yes	Adv.	Optional	Area

*IS specific interdisciplinary course.

Inter., intermediate; adv., advanced; elem., elementary.

B, Baccalaureate; M, Master's; D, Doctoral/Research; PU, public; PR, private.

References

- BATES, ROBERT H. (2001) Area Studies and the Discipline: A Useful Controversy? In *Changing Perspectives on International Education*, edited by Patrick O'Meara, Howard D. Mehlinger and Roxana Ma Newman. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- BEIER, J. MARSHALL, AND SAMANTHA L. ARNOLD. (2005) Becoming Undisciplined: Toward the Supradisciplinary Study of Security. *International Studies Review* 7:41–61.
- BOWMAN, KIRK S., AND ASHLEY JENNINGS. (2005) Pura Vida: Using Study Abroad to Engage Undergraduate Students in Comparative Politics Research. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38:77–81.
- BRECHER, MICHAEL. (1999) International Studies in the Twentieth Century and Beyond: Flawed Dichotomies, Synthesis, Cumulation. ISA Presidential Address. *International Studies Quarterly* 43:213–264.
- BREUNING, MARIJKE, AND JOHN ISHIYAMA. (2004) International Studies Programs: For What Purpose and For Whom? A Rejoinder to Hey. *International Studies Perspectives* 5:400–402.
- BURN, BARBARA. (2001) Study Abroad and Foreign Language Programs. In *Changing Perspective on International Education*, edited by Patrick O'Meara, Howard D. Mehlinger and Roxana Ma Newman. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- CATCHINGS, BILLY. (2004) Capstones and Quality: The Culminating Experience as Assessment. *Assessment Update* 16:6–9.
- THE COLLEGE BLUE BOOK. (2004) *Degrees Offered by College and Subject*, Vol. 3, 32nd edition. Detroit: Thomson Gale.
- HALL, PETER A., AND SIDNEY TARROW. (2001) Globalization and Area Studies: When Is Too Broad Too Narrow? In *Changing Perspectives on International Education*, edited by Patrick O'Meara, Howard D. Mehlinger and Roxana Ma Newman. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- HARVEY, FRANK P., AND MICHAEL BRECHER, EDs. (2002) *Evaluating Methodology in International Studies*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- HERMANN, MARGARET G. (1998) One Field, Many Perspectives: Building the Foundations for Dialogue. ISA Presidential Address. *International Studies Quarterly* 42:605–624.
- HEY, JEANNE A. K. (2004) Can International Studies Research Be the Basis for an Undergraduate International Studies Curriculum? A Response to Ishiyama and Breuning. *International Studies Perspectives* 5:395–399.
- HOPKINS, J. ROY. (1999) Studying Abroad as a Form of Experiential Education. *Liberal Education* 85:36–42.
- ISHIYAMA, JOHN, AND MARIJKE BREUNING. (2004) A Survey of International Studies Programs at Liberal Arts Colleges and Universities in the Midwest: Characteristics and Correlates. *International Studies Perspectives* 5:134–146.
- KELLEHER, ANN. (1996) *Learning from Success: Campus Case Studies in International Program Development*. New York: P. Lang.
- KELLEHER, ANN. (2005) Does International Studies Have a Common Core? An Analysis of Seventy-Three Curriculum Programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of International Studies Association, Honolulu.
- LAMBERT, RICHARD D. (1989) *International Studies and the Undergraduate*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- LEVINSON, NANETTE S. (1998) A “Globaliberal” Arts Approach: The International Studies Major and the Next Millennium. In *International Studies in the Next Millennium: Meeting the Challenge of Globalization*, edited by Julia S. Kushigian and Penny Parsekian. Westport: Praeger.
- LEWIS, TAMMY L., AND RICHARD A. NIESENBAUM. (2005) The Benefits of Short-Term Study Abroad. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 51(39): B20.
- MONROE, KRISTEN RENWICK., ED. (2005) *Perestroika! The Raucous Rebellion in Political Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- O'MARA, JOAN, JANE HORVATH, MARICA SEABURY, HAROLD SANDSTROM, AND SUSAN COLEMAN. (1998) The All-University Curriculum: A Team-Teaching, Interdisciplinary, and Inter-College Approach. In *International Studies in the Next Millennium: Meeting the Challenge of Globalization*, edited by Julia A. Kushigian and Penny Parsekian. Westport: Praeger.
- PROCTOR, ROBERT E. (1998) Synthesis and Tension: Creating an International Studies Program. In *International Studies in the Next Millennium: Meeting the Challenge of Globalization*, edited by Julia S. Kushigian and Penny Parsekian. Westport: Praeger.
- RHODES, TERREL L., AND SUSAN AGRE-KIPPENHAM. (2004) A Multiplicity of Learning: Capstones at Portland State University. *Assessment Update* 16:4–5, 12.
- ROSOW, STEPHEN J. (2003) Toward an Anti-Disciplinary Global Studies. *International Studies Perspectives* 4:1–14.
- ROWELS, CONNIE J., DAPHENE CYR KOCH, STEPHEN P. HUNDLEY, AND SHARON J. HAMILTON. (2004) Toward a Model for Capstone Experiences: Mountaintops, Magnets, and Mandates. *Assessment Update* 16:13–15.
- SCHWARTZ-SHEA, PEREGRIN, AND ANDREA BENNETT. (2003) Symposium: Introduction—Methodological Pluralism in Journals and Graduate Education? Commentaries on New Evidence. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 36:371–399.
- SELINGO, JEFFREY. (2003) What Americans Think About Higher Education. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 49(34): A10–A16.
- SPRINZ, DETLEF F., AND Yael WOLINSKY-NAHMIA. (2004) Introduction: Methodology in International Relations Research. In *Models, Numbers and Cases: Methods for Studying International Relations*, edited by Detlef F. Sprinz and Yael Wolinsky-Nahmias. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- STRATEGIC TASK FORCE ON EDUCATION ABROAD. (2003) *Securing America's Future: Global Education for a Global Age*. Washington: NAFSA: Association of International Educators.

- TESSLER, MARK, JODI NACHTWEY, AND ANNE BANDA. (2001) Introduction: The Area Studies Controversy. In *Changing Perspectives on International Education*, edited by Patrick O'Meara, Howard D. Mehlinger and Roxana Ma Newman. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- THIES, CAMERON G., AND ROBERT E. HOGAN. (2005) The State of Undergraduate Research Methods Training in Political Science. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38:1–5.
- WAHLKE, JOHN C. (1991) Liberal Learning and the Political Science Major: A Report to the Profession. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 24:48–60.
- WATERS, NEIL, AND DAVID A. J. MACEY. (1998) Beyond the Area Studies Wars. In *International Studies in the Next Millennium: Meeting the Challenge of Globalization*, edited by Julia S. Kushigian and Penny Parsekian. Westport: Praeger.