

Internationalization vs. Area Studies?

Last year's conference in celebration of the 50th anniversary of Title VI was an appropriate time for me to update the survey I did 25 years earlier as a program officer for the National Resource Centers (NRCs), examining the actual composition of Title VI-funded area studies course offerings. The results, comparing 1983 and 2005 data, were encouraging in some respects, but also had more sobering elements.¹ In this presentation I focus a bit more on the sobering aspects of my current course-offerings review – namely, a finding that National Resource Centers (NRCs) seem to be relying substantially on courses with only partial content on their area of presumed specialization. It would have been quite satisfying to find that the “internationalization” movement has included improved resources for language and area studies, that Title VI is clearly now, more effectively than ever, fulfilling its mandate of developing “a pool of international experts to meet national needs,” as specified in the original legislation, section 601(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and subsequent reauthorizations. Unfortunately, however, I found that, overall, more than half of the courses listed by the area-oriented NRCs in my sample have less than full content on the area of the program – and wondered whether and how this might be another viable route for specialist training.

When doing the 2009 count I hoped to find that NRCs had added to the depth of their disciplinary coverage over the previous 20 years while broadening their impact on their universities' teaching resources. Among the positive findings were indications of increased curricular linkages between NRCs and a widened circle of professional schools. Discipline coverage for some world areas may be stronger, but changes in area profiles (i.e., general differences between, for example, East Asia and Southeast Asia programs) are minimal. And some gaps in discipline coverage seem to be increased. For example, looking at a major world “hot spot,” the Middle East, I found fewer courses in anthropology, economics, and geography, compared with 1983; the picture was no better in the humanities and professional fields for the area. Might academic interest be shifting away from area specialization to more generalized internationalization of the curriculum?

Thinking that one characteristic of an internationalized curriculum could be an increased number of general courses with added area studies modules, for this presentation I have looked at the NRC partial content courses by discipline (Table 1) and by world area (Table 2). For some areas and disciplines the relationship of partial- to full-content courses is probably not a problem, but unfortunately the average of 52% that are partial includes a range, by world area, from 30% (East Asia) to 69% (Canada), and by discipline the partial content course offerings range from 33% in literature to 76% in economics. For four world areas and at least seven disciplines more than half of the course offerings are partial content and indeed even less than 50% content on the NRC's area. Looking at averages within areas, and within disciplines, it is not unusual to find that the only courses available are those having less than half their content on the NRC's area – if the discipline is covered at all. Has the continuing infusion of Title VI funding for NRCs been but a holding operation vis-à-vis area studies, or is it now serving other and more specialized purposes such as increased emphasis on language instruction, and even outreach?

¹ Ann Imlah Schneider, “Area Studies Course Coverage: Then and Now” presented on March 19, 2009 and available at www.internationaledadvice.org.

Methodology

Let me describe how I came to be asking these questions. Supplementing the information I already had and what I found on the Department of Education's website in 2009, 35 NRCs very kindly sent me copies of the course lists submitted with their most recent applications (for grants beginning in 2006). The sample of 38 area centers, plus four in the international studies category, has a mix of public and private institutions as well as nationwide geographical distribution. Just as in 1983, consortium partners were counted as separate programs, since the reality is that they facilitate very little cross-registration. In addition, when possible I chose centers that have been funded for several cycles, even though doing so probably biases the sample in the direction of "stronger" than in 1983. My rationale was/is that the long-time NRCs have had more opportunity, with their Federal funding, to develop the varied resources expected of them and to keep raising their standards and benchmarks.

Measuring and categorizing the actual courses required a number of additional choices. To realistically compare the 2006 data with 1983 information the discipline breakdowns have to be the same, as they are in Table 2, rather than how grantees may now be organizing their lists; for the same reason (comparability) centers with different geographical designations were simply not included. Thus Tables 1 and 2 in this paper may seem not to reflect a full range of current practices – international relations and political science are juxtaposed in this year's table because they were counted together in 1983, and neither general Asian or general European categories are shown. Psychology was included in 1983 because a significant number of psychology majors were reported by NRCs as taking a substantial number of area studies courses, yet – and still – few area or international courses are offered in that field.² In the 2009 paper several professional fields were included, but for this year's re-count, only two categories (business and natural and environmental sciences) were included as examples because the 2009 evidence of reliance on partial content courses was so strong in all professional fields.

Examining the course lists themselves has involved guesswork about content when the only information on the list was a much abbreviated title (for example, "Const.Comm.Creat & Culture" [*sic*]) with no annotation about content; the lists presented in the Department of Education's suggested format were generally much easier to work with. Analysis of those that submitted separate lists for each year was very time-consuming as I tried to eliminate duplicate entries (and there were many, even in the lists using elements of the suggested format); lists that indicated both the primary and secondary departments for cross-listed courses provided helpful clues for a time-pressed reader. Hopefully, any agreements or disagreements about aggregations/disaggregations would balance each other out. As in 1983, "courses" such as "individual studies," "directed readings," "dissertation research," and suchlike were not counted (although yes – enrollments in such offerings, when they are on the NRC's topic, should eventually be reported by grantees to the Department of Education). On the other hand, most multiple topics with the same number (likely a general purpose or temporary departmental number often intended, in such cases, to be preliminary to formal addition to the curriculum) were counted as separate courses. Notwithstanding many universities' efforts to increase participation in study abroad programs, and to connect them to the on-campus curriculum, courses listed as offered overseas are not included in the counts for these papers; one hopes that the actual instruction is also available to students unable to go abroad – in other words, that such courses are duplicates.

² Interestingly, the American Council on Education, in preparing its report on *Where Faculty Live: Internationalizing the Disciplines* (April 2006), included the field and stated that the American Psychological Association planned to endorse an action plan for internationalization.

Relevant for this paper is what now seems like the major defining challenge: When should courses with less than 100% content on the area or topic of the center be counted? In 1983 I rarely counted a course without clear and substantial content on the center's topic; thus a course on comparative economic systems might be included in an area studies program (if an annotation showed substantial coverage of the area) and should certainly be included in an international studies program, while a course on international economics (which, in my student experience, was a highly theoretical course with little if any actual country or regional content) was eliminated for all area studies programs but included for the international studies category. For the 2009 paper my solution to this dilemma was to count the "100%" courses and the "25%-99%" courses separately. Only infrequently (in contrast to 1983) did I ignore a grantee's claim that a partial content course was an integral part of the program.

For this paper I have again reviewed the partial content courses, separating the courses whose content seems to be 50% or less (indeed, thinking that those labeled 50% might well be a bit less). Again guesswork was required since very few lists were annotated about content and many did not even include percentage estimates of content. Examples of courses – all taken from area studies NRC lists – counted as "<50%" would be a political science course labeled "Social Identities," an anthropology course entitled "Body, Personhood, and Culture," a course on "History of the Second World War," and "Women in Art."

2009 Findings

The resulting data yielded some good news for the 2009 paper comparing 2005 and 1983 data, as mentioned above. The 100% content course data for 2005 show increased offerings for 26% of the social science situations (i.e., area/discipline), 37% for the humanities, and 30% for the professional program offerings. Many more specific examples of discipline coverage, for each world area can be found in the paper's tables. When the partial content courses were added, the 2005 data were higher than in 1983 for about 84% of the comparisons in both the social sciences and the humanities, and even 90% for professional program courses. Indeed, another important positive is the much increased NRC attention to professional programs, which the Department of Education has long been encouraging. Still another increase is the "interdisciplinary" category, which the Department has been encouraging for even longer and which now averages three more (100%) courses than in 1983 – even eight more when partial content courses are included.

However, the 2009 findings may also offer causes for concern, particularly since the sample is biased toward the more established and presumably stronger programs. Looking only at the full content courses, and assuming that most of the 1983 courses were 100% content, well more than half of the area/discipline breakouts show declines in course coverage – with relevant percentages being 66% in the social sciences, 56% in the humanities, and 70% for professional programs. Again, even when the partial content courses are included, there still seem to be situations indicating decline, overall, for 11% in the social sciences, for 14% in the humanities, and for 10% in the professional programs. Looking at the data by world area, we have already noted decreased offerings on the Middle East. For South Asia the counts are down in several fields, even when partial content courses are included; and even for well-established East Asian studies key disciplines such as political science and history depend on inclusion of partial content courses to register increases. And finally, the first table in the 2009 paper reveals that in nearly all disciplines significant numbers of NRCs offer no full content courses at all, the only exceptions being history, for which the lowest number of full-content course offerings at an NRC is two – and the interdisciplinary. Can NRCs with gaps in their curricula in such disciplines as political science, economics,

anthropology, art history – and/or even literature – truly be preparing the experts who are still so badly needed in both the public and private sectors?

2010 Findings

This year I wondered if distinguishing levels of partial content courses might help in understanding the ingredients of this trend. Might a significant number of the courses in the “partial” category really provide substantial content for the area being studied? Perhaps, but unfortunately the new counts show that an overall average of about 10% – only – seem to be providing between 50% and 99% of their content on the area of the NRC’s focus. Again the averages mask a lot of variation. On the high end of the scale (i.e., with a larger proportion of courses that seem to offer substantial content on the area) are the Middle East (20%) and Western Europe (16%). At the low end are NRCs for Africa, Southeast Asia, East Asia, and Latin America with 6% or less. Unfortunately those on the high side are not very high and in addition, the first two on the low side (Africa and Southeast Asia) also rely heavily on courses with less than 50% content – for Africa the percentage of courses with less than half their content on the area is 60%. For Canada, which is a bit above average for courses with between 50% and 99% content on the area, the percentage of courses below 50% is 57%. Furthermore, the total numbers of course offerings for Africa and for Canada are low, as are the totals for South Asia (whose proportion of under-half content courses is 52%) and Southeast Asia (48%). Most of these comparative data and juxtapositions are shown in Table 1.

Table 2 shows the summary data on NRC course offerings from a disciplinary perspective. The most substantive content, of course, is found in literature and history offerings, which are well above the averages of 48% for full-content courses and 52% for all those above 50%. Only one other discipline category, art and architecture, is much below the average of 41% for all NRC liberal arts courses with less than 50% content on the area. At the other end of the scale we find a few surprises, along with confirming data on disciplines known to be reticent vis-à-vis area studies. For seven of the 13 disciplines listed in Table 2, more than half of the courses offered in area-focused NRCs have less than 50% of their content on the area. Among them are anthropology (61%) and geography (70%), which in another time were much more area-based. Others that are seriously dependent on low content courses are less surprising, including economics, political science, and sociology.

More specific liberal arts examples combining area and discipline breakouts make the point more emphatically. (The reader will recall, while pondering these data, that the programs providing these courses are competitively selected for their strong training programs for the specialists needed “to meet national needs.”) Table 3 shows selected disciplines that seem problematic, as well as two for contrast – history and literature. In bold type are combinations that seem especially worrisome, where the NRCs’ discipline coverage seems to depend to a surprising extent on partial coverage courses to instill a modicum of understanding of the areas’ people and activities. For example:

- Given continuing economic rivalries with Russia and East European countries, are students able to find sufficient instruction on the area when more than 90% of the offerings listed by the NRC in economics have minimal content on the area?
- Although it certainly can be argued that a course on “Nonviolence” is relevant for South Asia, does such a course, as one of the many partial content courses (some 80% of political science offered by the NRCs in the sample), convey substantial understanding of politics in South Asia?

While the percentages in Table 3 show the relative reliance on courses with less than 50% content

Table 3
Proportion of Course Offerings with Less Than 50% Area Content
 by world area, for selected disciplines

<u>Area</u>	<u>Anthrplogy</u>	<u>Economics</u>	<u>Geogrphy</u>	<u>History</u>	<u>Literature</u>	<u>IR/Pol.Science</u>	<u>Sociology</u>
East Asia	39%	60%	33%	26%	8%	46%	60%
Southeast Asia	69%	91%	-	30%	32%	47%	67%
South Asia	65%	79%	-	50%	47%	76%	100%
Middle East	54%	75%	60%	35%	13%	57%	59%
Russia & East. Europe	77%	94%	50%	47%	17%	69%	73%
Western Europe	93%	72%	91%	37%	87%	71%	83%
Africa	73%	68%	53%	35%	67%	67%	79%
Latin America	52%	67%	81%	28%	25%	58%	73%
Canada	87%	29%	78%	18%	60%	44%	100%
Total (average)	61%	71%	70%	34%	23%	61%	73%
Total no. of courses	430	193	103	1,004	1,185	722	220
Average courses/NRC	11.3	5.1	2.7	26.4	31.2	19.	5.8

on the area, the hard numbers on which they are based show a further dimension to the problem. For example,

- only two of the five Middle East studies centers in the sample offer any economics at all;
- for South Asia, full content sociology courses are not available at any of the NRCs (in the sample), and the partial content sociology courses are offered at only half of the centers; and
- the range in these relationships within areas can be considerable, one example being political science resources for Western Europe, where one center offered less-than-50% coverage on the area in 88% of its 32 courses, compared with another with half as many total courses, for which closer to half had less than 50% coverage.

The reader will also note, in Table 1, the great variety in total area course offerings. Not surprisingly, Western Europe has reported the most, while Canadian, Southeast Asian, South Asian, and African Studies centers average only between a quarter and a seventh as many. For most areas, history and literature are the basic disciplines. The overall discipline averages are a bit misleading, first because some areas have very different profiles, and secondly because, as Table 3 demonstrates, so many are heavily dependent on partial content courses. The reader should also keep in mind that the body of Table 3 does not include the partial content courses with between 50% and 99% content.

Many courses listed with the claim of partial content on an area may well be more appropriate for the international category of NRCs, a category which has always been difficult to define. Looking for commonalities between this group of NRCs and the area studies centers, what would be a “partial content” course here? Any number of courses in the applications in this 2005 sample from the international category would more likely fit in an area studies curriculum but could still have elements of wider – international – generalization, although such elements were rarely specified in application notes about content. Examples might be “Studies of French Cinema” or “Africa in the 20th Century.” The reader’s imagination is stretched further to discover relevant international (distinguished from country or area) content – at or above the minimum of 25% – in courses such as “15th Century Italian Art,” or “Devotional Literature of India”

(neither of which I included in this counting exercise). Comparative area studies offerings can fit the international studies category as full content courses, but courses on the history or politics – or literature – of a single country or region do not fit the international studies category, unless their annotations demonstrate explicit international relations content relevant to the discipline. Indeed, distinctions between area and international studies were my topic in a paper from my days at the Department, prepared for distribution to applicants;³ the paper concluded that the category was evolving – and that still seems to be the case. However it evolves, “international,” for NRC purposes, has to be much more than “not-the-United-States,” yet applicants continue to be tempted to include non-U.S. courses, seemingly irrespective of whether the content includes international relations issues. So it is not surprising that more than 60% of the international studies category courses seem to be “partial content.” I have not attempted a count of international studies category courses that may offer less than 50%, so the 2009 partial content data are included in Table 2 for this paper simply for comparison purposes.

Since the 1970s Title VI NRCs have been encouraged to include professional school programs and students in their activities. For the 2009 paper I counted NRCs’ professional program course offerings and – again, probably not surprisingly – found that, with the exception of the performing arts, such courses overwhelmingly offer only partial content, with few seeming to provide much instruction on the area of the center; indeed, one might suspect that many courses are included not because they deal with the area in question but because the material is deemed “related to” it. Nonetheless, in case anything might be a little different in two fields of particularly keen current interest, for this 2010 exercise I reviewed the partial-content course offerings in business and in the environmental and natural sciences and ecology-related fields. As Table 2 shows, very few of the courses are full content on any area and only 5-6% of the partial content courses seem to have more than 50% content on their areas. Might the challenge of improving linkages between NRCs and professional schools suggest more courses with substantial content on the area of focus of the NRC that claims them as part of their program?

So why is this important at a time when we are ever more aware of the need for better “global” understanding? Yes, area studies curriculum planners and administrators should keep the international context alive in their programs, possibly through prerequisites and through their approaches to their subjects. A recent article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* makes this point very well, also positing that global studies programs should require their students to “gain an intimate familiarity with at least one region of the world.”⁴ This would seem to be an argument favoring more full content area studies course offerings, but in combination with a modest number of 50% - 99% partial content courses.

Thus it seems clear that questions can be raised about NRCs relying significantly now on courses with less than 50% content on the area. Program planners and administrators need to be satisfied with answers to a number of related questions. Do students at NRCs with relatively little area coverage in basic disciplines find adequate instruction, as experts-to-be, about the areas on which they wish to focus? Will courses on “The Challenge of Democratization” (whose content may be 40% on the NRC’s area) or the impact of domestic politics on foreign policy (in which a student might write a foreign area-focused paper) provide adequate grounding for a would-be area “expert”? Inclusion of such courses in an area studies application course list would imply that they are part of the program, but does the university actually count

³ It was later revised and published: Ann I. Schneider and Llewellyn D. Howell, “The Discipline of International Studies” in *International Studies Notes*, Vols 16, No. 3, and 17, No. 1 (Fall 1991/Winter 1992), p. 1.

⁴ William G. Moseley, “Area Studies in a Global Context” in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, December 4, 2009, p. B4.

such courses toward a major, minor, or concentration in area studies? To measure its impact, when it prepares reports on degrees awarded (to undergraduates with 15-18 semester credit hours on the Center's area or topic) to the Department of Education, does the NRC include students who take such partial content courses? Perhaps even more importantly, do these findings demonstrate a relaxation of the Title VI area studies effort?

Explanations and Recommendations

Explanations for this movement toward reliance on partial, even minimal, content courses may be several. As the title of this paper indicates, it has been suggested that campus "internationalization" efforts could be a contributing cause for these apparent declines in NRC course coverage. For many this has meant development of study abroad programs, while many also look to increasing numbers of international students and/or faculty. Indeed, although NAFSA has recently added "Association of International Educators" to its name, its publication, *International Educator*, still puts heavy emphases on study abroad, international students, faculty travel, exchange programs, and international development projects; for example, the lead article of a 2009 issue, touted on the cover as "Seeds of Change: Internationalizing Agriculture Programs," focuses entirely on study abroad programs as the route to understanding not only varieties of agricultural practice but also their cultural and political contexts.⁵ Pointing to another "international education" issue, the July/August 2006 issue of *Change* magazine highlights "Global Higher Education – Today and Tomorrow,"⁶ discussing "tectonic" shifts in other countries' education and exchange programs, compared with lagging American accomplishments. However, the "international education" effort with most far-reaching and widest impact in the American education context is on-campus curricular change – as emphasized in the numerous publications of the American Council on Education (ACE) and the AAC&U (Association of American Colleges and Universities). Indeed, the many curriculum-internationalizing efforts have seemingly achieved considerable current popularity.

A major type of effort to internationalize undergraduate curricula – to get significant student impact – is at the general education level. Among the strategies suggested by the ACE and AAC&U (and frequently funded through the Title VI Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Program) are incorporation of international learning in the general education curriculum and infusion of the disciplines with international content, often via faculty development activity.⁷ To check a possibility that these approaches may be diverting resources from area studies programs, when doing this year's review, I also counted the courses showing only undergraduate enrollments, finding that more than 30% of the courses listed by the NRCs in my sample seemed to be only for undergraduates.⁸ But are these undergraduate courses the ones more likely to have less than 50% content on their area, possibly indicating their general education function? General impressions from the review suggested little if any relationship between undergraduate-only courses and those with less than 50% content, but to check my impressions I looked in detail at three disciplinary categories, for all world areas, where "undergraduate enrollment only" courses are a high proportion of the totals, and found that the actual figures do not make an overwhelming

⁵ Nicole Branan, "Planting the Seeds of Change," *International Educator* (NAFSA: Association of International Educators), Mar+Apr 2009, Vol. 18, No. 2.

⁶ *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* (Heldref Publications) July/August 2006, Vol. 38, No. 4

⁷ Madeleine F. Green and Christa Olson, *Internationalizing the Campus: A User's Guide* (American Council on Education, Center for Institutional and International Initiatives, Washington, DC, 2003), p. 63, and Association of American Colleges and Universities, *Diversity Digest*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 2005.

⁸ Unfortunately, some lists did not provide enrollments, or did not separate graduate and undergraduate enrollments; also most lists include courses that are yet to be offered and are therefore without enrollments, so the counts are surely on the low side.

case either; in other words, the undergraduate courses do not seem to be significantly more diluted than graduate-only, or mixed enrollment, classes. Furthermore, at the other end of the scale, for both history and what is described as the interdisciplinary category of courses, for example, about half of the full content courses seem to be only for undergraduates. Indeed, the ACE recommendations, like the recent Moseley article in the *Chronicle*, also include encouragement of student enrollments in area studies courses and interdisciplinary approaches. Internationalization seems not to be the enemy of area studies!

Fostering the interdisciplinary has long been a goal of the Title VI NRCs, but could this become a distraction from an area focus? The higher education press has recently offered several articles on the pros and cons of the interdisciplinary, with one giving area studies as an example, noting that over 70% of area studies social science research citations are from “other fields” (in a sense confirming success for one of the Title VI goals) – yet this article comments as well that interdisciplinarity – presumably for both research and teaching – must depend on strong disciplines.⁹ My research on area studies course lists has shown an increase in interdisciplinary courses in the last 25 years – but it does not reveal any less focus on area studies in those courses. Table 2 shows the proportion of partial content interdisciplinary courses to be about average for all area studies centers; furthermore, the proportion of interdisciplinary courses for undergraduates is above the area studies average, probably indicating their use to attract potential “specialists.”

One is reluctant to attribute the increased number of partial courses to NRC applicants’ giving in to temptations to think that “more is better” in their applications, that an extended course list might be found more competitive, however irrelevant parts of it may be to study of the region or topic. When this is the case (as it may have been for several of the lists in my sample), then reviewers – and staff – should not hesitate to react appropriately, emphasizing that courses “related to” the area or topic are not the same as courses “on” it. It is also possible that some courses are included on the lists simply because disciplinary coverage is otherwise so sparse. Applicants should not be advantaged by padded course lists! The theoretical framework is important, but students are not well served by any suggestion that minimum content courses will offer the real area expertise that may (or may not) fit with the theory.

Another explanation for the large percentage of partial content courses may be an element of diminishing institutional commitment to area studies. Sometimes when area specialists have retired or moved to other positions, departments have replaced faculty with different interests. In other words even in the face of stiff competition for the prestigious Title VI funding, area centers have lost to other disciplinary pressures, an indication of softening institutional commitment to area studies programs. On one campus I heard of faculty abandoning their area course offerings to teach courses with more generalized, theoretical, or topic-oriented approaches, possibly reflecting shifting research interests; these faculty members are probably included in the NRC’s faculty list, and they may be advising doctoral candidates’ work on an area specialty, but their expertise on the area can hardly, in itself, define their topic-oriented courses as area-oriented. Such shifts in faculty interest may have happened at a time when the field was urging more comparative studies and when the Department of Education and other funding agencies were suggesting a need for more “problem-oriented” courses, possibly involving cooperation between two or more area centers or even moving away from area studies to the more generalized and theoretically-oriented international studies. It should have been recognized that these suggestions were intended as add-ons, not replacements for existing courses. Indeed, it was noted at the time that strong (single) area and disciplinary bases are needed to do (teach or research) comparative studies effectively, that the preparation for any

⁹ Jeremy Jacobs, “Interdisciplinary Hype” in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 27, 2009, p. B4.

comparative area study requires strong grounding in area expertise. Is it possible that encouragement of “new approaches” has confused research and teaching agendas and come to take the form of the partial content courses that now figure so prominently in the NRC curriculum? Has Title VI inadvertently fostered diminished attention to the basics?

Of course tightened budgets contribute, as do the politics of several disciplines, particularly in the social sciences, and programs and departments must experiment with alternative approaches to make the best use of available resources. Surely related also are the NRCs’ efforts to attract potentially interested faculty in several social sciences, possibly in the hope that they may eventually offer more substantial courses or provide independent study options. Data on job seekers – and, one hopes, on NRCs’ Ph.D. productivity – would indicate that qualified people are probably available for strengthened course offerings, at NRCs and in other area studies programs.¹⁰ Perhaps they are being hired, but, as part of a push to increase international content in more general courses, to teach the partial content courses; if such is the case, then why are they not also teaching the courses that would train experts more intensively? Might grant funds – or other sources – be used to help such faculty members develop more courses with substantial content on the NRC’s focus, to increase the area content in the partial content courses?

If area studies program directors (and the department chairs with whom they collaborate) are worried about low enrollments for area studies courses, they should improve their efforts to attract students. Yes, partial content introductory courses may be one way to evoke interest. Another way is indicated by the findings of my recent (Title VI-funded) research on internationalization in K-12 teacher preparation¹¹ which underlined the importance of advising in the undergraduate curriculum. Most NRCs (and other international programs) could probably do a great deal more to assure that all involved in undergraduate advising are fully informed about their teaching resources. To be effective (indeed, also as part of a wider internationalization process) advising activity by program administrators should include participation in freshman orientation, workshops and other systematic training for all advisors of first-year students, and even involvement in recruitment and admissions processes. Making sure that all students, and prospective students, are aware of the benefits, and challenges, of language and area studies specialization, and any other resources offered by the NRC, can surely add to area studies program impact, to demand for more substantial courses on the area (and for foreign language instruction) – and to the better preparation not only for the experts envisioned by the Title VI legislation but also for future citizens, whether or not they eventually become teachers, public servants, or contributors to non-profit or for-profit organizations.

In conclusion, I would urge any reader who is involved in the organization of an area studies program to pay serious attention to the nature and strength of the program’s actual course coverage. Over-reliance on partial content courses should be a cause for concern and vigilance. The program’s existence is an important part of an “internationalized” campus, and its teaching resources should be carefully preserved, nurtured, and strengthened – whether or not NRC status is in question. The “national needs” cited by the Title VI legislation can – and must – be met in a variety of university settings. NRCs should be shining examples, but not the only ones.

¹⁰ The January 2010 *Perspectives on History* (American Historical Association, Washington, DC), for example, has two articles indicating more Ph.D.s conferred than job announcements, for most world areas.

¹¹ Ann Imlah Schneider, *To Leave No Teacher Behind: Building International Competence into the Training of K-12 Teachers* (Washington, DC, 2007) available at www.internationaledadvice.org.

Table 1
Composite (Averaged) Data on Area Center Course Offerings
 by world area, from selected 2006 NRC Grantees' Lists

Area	Total (average/NRC)	Course Offerings		Less than 50% content
		100% content (average/NRC)	%	
East Asia	140	98	70%	24%
Southeast Asia	76	36	48%	48%
South Asia	89	38	38%	52%
Middle East	140	64	46%	34%
Russia & Eastern Europe	167	76	46%	45%
Western Europe	378	169	45%	39%
Africa	90	32	35%	60%
Latin America	168	79	47%	47%
Canada	53	16	31%	57%
All Area Centers (not including professional school courses)	146.4	71	48%	41%

Table 2**Composite (Averaged) Data on Course Offerings**
by discipline, from selected 2006 NRC Grantees' Lists

Subject	Total no. courses (average/NRC)	<u>Area Studies</u>		<u>International</u>	
		<u>100% content</u>	<u>Less than 50% content</u>	<u>100% content</u>	<u>partial content</u>
Anthropology	11.3	33%	61%	4.5	14.5
Art and Architecture	11.7	54%	36%	1	5.8
Economics	5.1	24%	71%	7.8	7
Geography	2.7	29%	70%	7.2	4
History	26.4	56%	34%	10	22
Linguistics	6.1	55%	40%	.25	3
Literature	31.2	67%	23%	4.5	14.8
Music	3.8	40%	49%	.5	3.2
Philosophy & Religion	10.3	34%	42%	3.2	10
International Relations	7.3	13%	71%	15	9.25
Political Science	11.7	37%	55%	14.8	16.5
Psychology	.2	29%	57%		.5
Sociology	5.8	20%	73%	7.5	11.8
Interdisciplinary	12.9	61%	42%	3.5	12.8
Total (average)	146.4	70.8 (48%)	41%	79.8 (37%)	135 (63%)
<u>Selected Professional Fields</u>					
Business	4.5	.4	85%	6.5	4.5
Environment, Natural Sci. and Resources	3.8	.3	80%	7.8	11