

Area Studies Course Coverage: Then and Now

In the early 1980s, as a program officer at the Department of Education, I found little clear guidance for evaluating the course offerings a Title VI National Resource Center (NRC) should have. The 1983 situation was clearly different from 1965, when the announced eligibility standard for a Center application was one area course and perhaps two years of a relevant language. But how different? I was eager to learn what the data would show about the actual composition of an area studies instructional program, so my special 1983 projects were to count the courses promised in that year's applications, then write up the findings to share with the NRC community. It turned out that indeed the quantity of courses was much more than 20 years before that – and that, as expected, the profiles for each area were significantly different and furthermore that each needed to focus on distinct needs, building on existing strengths and developing new resources.

Now, another 20 some years later, have the NRC profiles changed again? Have they added strength? Become more varied? Has the “internationalization” movement included improved resources for language and area studies? Or are the NRCs just maintaining their instructional programs at the 1983 level? Or might they even have lost some of their earlier strengths? My recent consultations have indicated some of each, and I wondered about the larger picture. In other words, is Title VI effectively 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?

My 2009 updating efforts have yielded mixed answers to these questions. Among the positives are the increases in apparent curricular linkages between NRCs and a widened circle of professional schools. Coverage of a few disciplines for some world areas seems a bit stronger. However, many gaps and challenges remain. For example, looking at a major world “hot spot,” the Middle East, in Table 2 we can see indications of reduced coverage in anthropology, economics, and geography, compared with 1983, and if we limit our comparison to full content courses, coverage is also less in history and even political science. The picture is not much better in the humanities and professional fields.

Methodology

Let me describe how I have come to these conclusions. I wrote to about 40 NRCs, and 35 very kindly responded by sending copies of the course lists submitted with their most recent applications, to supplement the information I already had and what I found on the Department of Education's website. The sample of 42 covers all world areas, and has a mix of public and private institutions as well as nationwide geographical distribution. Just as in 1983, consortium partners are counted as separate programs, since the reality is that they facilitate very little cross-registration. In addition, I tended to choose centers that have been funded for several cycles, even though doing so could bias 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 – hopefully – to keep raising the standards and benchmarks.

The process of measuring these instructional resources and categorizing the actual courses also required a number of choices. In order to truly compare the data with the 1983 information the discipline breakdowns have to be the same, as they are in Table 1, rather than how grantees may now be organizing their lists. Thus the first column of that table may seem to offer some anomalies. International Relations and Political Science are juxtaposed in this year's tables because they were counted together in 1983. 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.¹ Most professional program courses were not counted separately in the 1983 reports, but it seemed potentially useful to see disaggregated data this time, even when, as in the addition of a "Performing Arts" category, it may have slightly reduced counts in a few disciplines, such as music.

Examining the course lists themselves involved a modicum of guesswork when the only information on the list was a much abbreviated title (for example, "Const.Comm.Creat & Culture" [*sic*]). 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 the suggested format). Several lists indicated both the primary and secondary departments for cross-listed courses – a very helpful set of clues for the time-pressed reader. Many programs draw on a much greater variety of departments than the 1983 disciplinary breakouts, so combining – or separating – involved more guesswork, but I'd like to think that any agreements or disagreements about these aggregations/disaggregations will balance each other out. Because most departments have "individual studies," "directed readings," "dissertation research," and similar headings, just as in 1983, I refrained from counting them too (although yes – enrollments in such offerings, when they are on the Center's topic, should eventually be reported by grantees to the Department of Education). Probably not exaggerations, and therefore counted as separate courses, were most multiple topics with the same number (likely a general purpose or temporary departmental number hopefully, in such cases, preliminary to formal addition to the curriculum). 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 this paper; one hopes that the actual instruction is also available to students unable to go abroad, in other words, that such courses are duplicates.

Another definitional challenge was much more evident in this go-around than in 1983: 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 could be included in an area or 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. In the intervening years making such distinctions has become more difficult, and my solution to this dilemma has been to count the "100%" courses and the "25%-99%" courses separately. Only infrequently did I ignore a grantee's claim that a partial content course is an integral part of the program. The relevant data for us to examine have thereby more than doubled, and inclusion of the 1983 data for comparison purposes has in fact tripled the numbers to be analyzed. Therefore, for

¹ Interestingly, the American Council on Education, in preparing its report on *Where Faculty Live: Internationalizing the Disciplines* (April 2006), included the field and the report stated that the American Psychological Association planned to endorse an action plan for internationalization.

readability's sake, I have prepared three tables, one for social science offerings (Table 2), one for humanities offerings (Table 3), and a third for professional school courses (Table 4), although the reader will note that two subject categories, history and the interdisciplinary, are included in more than one table. The result is well more than 150 comparisons from which to attempt some generalizations.

Accomplishments

Happily, the resulting data do yield some good news. My first overall impression is one of many courses that I wish I could take! More seriously, comparison of only the 100% courses for 2005 with the 1983 data show increased offerings for 26% of the social science situations, 37% for the humanities, and 30% for the professional program offerings. Examples of these would be

- the average 5.2 courses in anthropology for East Asian NRCs in 2005, compared with 3.9 in 1983 (see Table 2),
- the 6.6 course average in art and architecture for the Middle East Centers (see Table 3) in 2005, compared with 3.5 in 1983, and
- the 3.0 courses in law for Western Europe in 2005 compared with only 1.8 in 1983 (see Table 4).

The percentages of increased offerings shoot up dramatically when the partial content courses are included, so that the 2005 data are higher than in 1983 for as much as 84% of the comparisons in both the social sciences and the humanities, and even 90% for professional program courses. As noted earlier, another important positive is the much increased NRC attention to professional programs, which the Department of Education has long been encouraging. And the totaled numbers in some disciplines seem to be larger.

A prime example of an overall increase in numbers is actually in the category labeled “interdisciplinary.” Title VI has long encouraged interdisciplinarity, but for years it took the form, in fact, of the multidisciplinary, in which students were expected to take courses about the area in a variety of disciplines, but little was done to pull the disciplinary strands together in the curriculum itself, so that the interdisciplinary, if any, tended to be fostered in the extracurricular activities organized by the Center, such as coffee hour and brown bag presentations. By the early 1980s NRCs were beginning to offer interdisciplinary introductory courses that could fulfill general education requirements and could at the same time serve a recruitment function for the area studies degree programs. Then more and more senior year capstone courses and seminars were offered for majors and introductory interdisciplinary seminars were developed for graduate programs, thereby encouraging students to become familiar with a variety of disciplinary approaches to their subjects. And now (i.e., for 2005) Tables 2 and 3 indicate that the average area studies center is offering at least three more interdisciplinary courses than it was 20 years ago, and more like eight more when partial content courses are included.

Before we indulge in much self-congratulation, however, some additional qualifiers from the counting procedure should be noted. Many of the courses counted as interdisciplinary are offered in history or literature departments – examples being “Key Ideas and Issues in Latin America” or “Buddhism and the Literary Arts in Japan” – which might lead some to question their true interdisciplinarity. Others are offered through the Center or its surrogate department, and may or may not be cross-listed. Cross-listed courses might involve a variety of both areas and disciplines. One example of a partial content interdisciplinary course – and I found many – is “Introduction to the World of Islam,” which would seem relevant to several world areas as well as likely containing elements of anthropology, history, and political science, as well as religion. And there are others, I must admit, whose disciplinary base(s) seemed unclear to me, although the area focus (100%) or partial content qualities were obvious. Nonetheless, even given these qualifications, it still seems that the program has succeeded in strengthening its interdisciplinary

character, with the range of average interdisciplinary offerings (including both 100% and partial content courses) now seeming to be from about 5 (Canada) to 14 (Africa) to over 22 (Western Europe).

Issues of Concern

However, is a large accretion of interdisciplinary area studies courses an indication of strengthened training of experts? Maybe not. Many of the interdisciplinary courses are likely designed to meet general education requirements, although they may also serve an effective recruitment function for students who might do a major or minor on the area, and in turn may be prerequisites for the more advanced and discipline-based courses. Two recent pieces in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* point to hazards in interdisciplinarity. The first article discusses pros and cons of interdisciplinary approaches (fudging?), challenging the reader with descriptors such as “evasion” and “coverup” as authors (with interdisciplinary orientations) jump to conclusions even within their disciplines;² it thus seems possible that too much NRC reliance on the inter-disciplinary may compound “evasions” of complexity in understanding the languages and cultures studied by the area center. A second piece notes other consequences, describing a scenario in which, particularly under tight budget constraints, discipline-based department chairs may find insufficient justification to replace or retain experts whose teaching serves mostly students in other fields.³

The 2005 data 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 the great majority of the 1983 courses were 100% content, well more than half of the area/discipline breakout data show declines in course coverage – with relevant percentages being 66% in the social sciences, 56% in the humanities, and 70% for professional programs. Among the many examples would be
 - in the social sciences (Table 2), for Russia and Eastern Europe, 12.8 courses in political science in 1983 compared with 5.6 (including international relations) in 2005;
 - in the humanities (Table 3), for East Asia, 7.8 courses in philosophy and religion in 1983 compared with 3.8 in 2005; and
 - from professional fields (where the overall numbers were much smaller in 1983) (Table 4), 1.6 courses in education for the Latin American NRCs in 1983 compared with an average of but .2 in 2005.
- Even when the partial content courses are included (more about that later), 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. In the social sciences, geography seems to be losing ground particularly for the Asian categories, while in the humanities an example would be African literature (from 10 courses in 1983 to 8.6 in 2005), and for professional fields (again, where the numbers are small) an example could be Canadian education, falling from an average of 1.8 in 1983 to 1.0 in 2005.
- And because I surely did not catch all the duplicate course listings, the 2005 numbers could very likely be less.
- Another way of looking at the data is by area. Returning to consideration of other current hot spots (I mentioned the Middle East earlier), how are we doing –
 - in East Asian studies?

² Cathy N. Davidson, “The Art of Fudging,” *The Chronicle Review*, December 19, 2008, page B5.

³ Mark Bauerlein, “The Consequences of Interdisciplinarity,” *The Chronicle Review*, January 13, 2009, page B2.

Only if we include the partial content courses do we find increases in economics, history, political science, music, and the law. And still, even including partial content courses covering more than East Asia strength (i.e., partial content), offerings seem to have declined in geography and philosophy and religion. Closer analysis might also reveal continuing sparse attention to Korea, compared to China or Japan.

- in South Asian studies?

However one counts, history, anthropology, linguistics, and philosophy and religion are down, and professional program coverage remains scant. Political science is up only because a comparatively large number of more general, partial content courses (such as “Nationalism in the Age of Globalization,” with a claim of 25% South Asia content and “International Relations of the United States and Asia,” with 50%) were included in the grantees’ course lists.

- in African studies?

Comparing the 100% courses for 2005 with the 1983 data, there appears to be less strength for anthropology, economics, geography, history, political science, sociology, all of the humanities – and all professional fields. In addition, the contrasts between numbers of full and partial content courses are particularly striking in anthropology, economics, linguistics, literature, and sociology. No full coverage (in the sample, at least) in education, business, and health was also surprising.

And so on. Check your own areas in the accompanying tables for further inspiration.

In the final paper of the 1983-84 series I reviewed general tendencies by discipline and here again some comparisons may be useful. It was noted 20 years ago that anthropology (which, in these exercises, includes archeology) was notably weaker for Western Europe than for several other areas; now it seems that the coverage may be even less (looking at the 100% figure). Only for East Asia and Latin America do anthropology’s 100% coverage courses seem to be stronger. With few exceptions (in history and political science) the same is true for the other social sciences, with little evidence of the strengthening that was urged twenty years ago. The humanities have done a little better, but not by much, with declines in 100% courses in all disciplines and for most areas. Professional field coverage was noted as low in 1983 and, although stronger, it continues to be spotty, and very dependent on partial coverage courses.

Still another way to look at the 2005 course coverage data is presented in Table 1, a composite of all the area studies course information in comparison with the course coverage distribution for the international category. Averages can be misleading, but they may also offer some areas encouragement to boost their coverage, to reach toward the benchmarks set by others; these data should not, however, provide umbrage to those on the higher end of the scale if pressed to reduce their offerings. For most, the better comparisons are within each world area.

The information in Table 1 about the (numerical) range of offerings in each discipline gives us further pause, as the extent to which the NRCs represent a variety of strengths – and deficits – becomes clearer. It is disturbing to find any area-oriented NRC seemingly with no 100% coverage courses in political science – such a basic area studies discipline – and a few others with only two 100% offerings in history; one hopes that each of these centers, however, is on the higher end of the range in other disciplines, or with interdisciplinary options including some history and political science. This may suffice for the undergraduate, but what does this offer the graduate students enrolled in most NRC programs and expecting to become experts – experts who are badly needed in both public and private sectors?

Explanations?

What could be the explanation for such key omissions? Perhaps the needed courses were added during the grant, or a key faculty member was on leave so that the list sent with the application was incomplete, or curriculum planners expect that sufficient political science, or history, would be taught in an interdisciplinary mode. It seems more likely that area specialist faculty have retired and departments have given priority to replacement faculty with different interests. On one campus I heard of faculty moving from their initial 100% area course offerings to more generalized, theoretical, or comparative approaches, possibly reflecting shifting research interests. The data on current course offerings could indicate that this is not an isolated phenomenon, and that questions should be raised about programs with seemingly heavy reliance now on courses with less than 50% content on the area. How do students at NRCs with little or no area coverage in basic disciplines get adequate instruction, as experts-to-be, for 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 an area-focused paper) really provide adequate grounding for a would-be “expert” on the area? To measure its impact, does the NRC include enrollments in such partial content courses 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? And does the university count such courses toward a major or minor in area studies?

I have also looked at the data in a way that might show differences, if any, between the curricula for area studies and the international category; Table 1 shows the averages separately for each. Overall, the table indicates that the international category, for NRCs, has more emphasis on the social sciences and professional fields. Indeed, distinctions between area and international studies were the topic of another paper I did while at the Department, in 1991, for distribution to applicants;⁴ the paper concluded that the category was still evolving – and that seems still to be the case.

On reflection, it seems that many courses listed with the claim of partial content on the area may well be more appropriate for the international category. I have also wondered how so many courses in the international category could have “partial content” and in fact those applicants did not usually make the distinction – adding to frustration, at least for this reader. One type of partial content course in the international category would be the general theory courses whose international content is incidental. Examples of these might be “The Human Footprint” or “Fundamentals of Air Pollution” – for which questions might be asked about whether the content relevant to the international center’s focus is really even 25%. Also, any number of courses in the applications in this 2005 sample from the international category have included courses that would more likely fit in an area studies curriculum but could still have elements of wider and international generalization (although such elements were rarely specified in application notes about content); examples might be “Studies of French Cinema,” “Chinese Economy and Society,” “Africa in the 20th Century,” or even “Good Girls, Bad Girls.” The reader’s imagination is stretched further to discover relevant international (distinguished from foreign area) content – at or above the minimum of 25% – in standard courses such as “15th Century Italian Art,” “French Literature of the Middle Ages,” “Applied German Diction for Singers,” or even “Devotional Literature of India” (none of which I included in my counting exercise). Again, just as for area studies, questions might be raised about the number of partial content courses related to the topic focus, or foci, of the international studies

⁴ 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, p. 1.

application and, even more, in relation to the formation of curriculum intended to train the experts specified in the Title VI legislation. “International,” for NRC purposes, has to be much more than “not-the-United-States!”

Further Thoughts about Partial Content

Now to return to discussion of the current state of area studies. Some ten years before the current NRC applications were written, the field seemed to be roiled by efforts to “move beyond” area studies, with suggestions even that area studies might be passé, and that Title VI should be more interested in the international, topic-oriented category. (This was discussed in more detail by other panelists at the March 2009 conference.) Then, in the mid-1990s, came realization that solid research in comparative area, or issue-oriented, fields would require strong grounding in area studies – in fact, a full understanding of the languages, history, and cultures of more than one area. Now, in the light of this data on course coverage, one might wonder whether the research agenda of faculty moving into these comparative fields has replaced the teaching needs of their departments and programs rather than being added on to it; if a faculty member is encouraged to develop and teach a course on comparative politics, has the department taken the necessary steps to be sure that the original area-oriented course(s) will still be offered? By encouraging “new approaches,” which likely take the form of development of the partial content courses now figuring more prominently in the NRC curriculum, has Title VI inadvertently fostered neglect of the basics?

Furthermore, for both area and international studies, one must wonder whether some of the increases in partial content courses can be attributed to current efforts to “internationalize” at postsecondary institutions, even though the assumed definitions of “internationalization” and “international education” are several. Some think internationalization goals should be met primarily through development of study abroad programs while others 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 almost exclusive emphases on study abroad and international students and exchange programs – for example, the lead article of the current 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, in its July/August 2006 issue *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. But 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). I would suggest that the current popularity of internationalizing efforts may be a contributing, though indirect, cause for the apparent declines in NRC course coverage. If this is a frequent scenario, the continuing impact of “internationalization” on NRC resources may be another serious cause for concern.

While a few very ambitious institutions have established the permeation of their entire curricula with international content as a goal, others are taking a more gradual approach. However, either approach – added to funding agencies’ varying priorities – could be setting diversionary traps for efforts to maintain and continue development of strong and focused area and international studies programs that are so basic to

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

the NRC enterprise as envisioned under Title VI. If NRC home campuses are trying to spread international content to an increased number of courses, and particularly if budget constraints preclude adding faculty, exploitation of NRCs' focused resources to achieve broader internationalization goals could be very tempting, and could result in diminished NRC strength. The large number of partial content courses for so many area NRCs might indicate the successful "internationalization" which so many are urging, but the smaller number of full content NRC courses may be a high price in the long run. Universities need to find less detrimental ways to make use of NRC faculty expertise, such as, for example, workshops to help non-NRC faculty add international modules to their courses, rather than moving the NRC faculty away from their training efforts, and research, in areas of their real expertise. Even while NRCs work to extend the breadth of their course offerings (and recognizing that this may incidentally serve a useful recruitment function) they must maintain and improve the depth of their course coverage if they are to fulfill their training-of-experts mandate.

Language Offerings

A final table for this presentation, Table 5, shows some comparative information about language offerings for area-oriented NRCs. Because language offerings were covered in the 1983 papers, I am also reporting on them now, but hesitantly, with less confidence in use of the sample (rather than the entire cohort) for this set of data. I have included languages in the table only when offered by more than one institution in each area cohort (thereby permitting averaging), and even then, for some areas, the list of languages could be longer if space permitted; furthermore, because the language information from 1983 reports is much more limited than what I found in most of the 2005 course lists, less data is available for comparison purposes. The table does not include the international category because the number of the international NRCs' languages is much longer, because they give less emphasis to the less commonly taught languages (LCTLs), and because 1983 data on language offerings for those NRCs are not available at all.

However, even this limited amount of area center language data does provide some good news. For all languages for which 1983 data are available the levels of offerings at NRCs seem to have increased slightly, or stayed the same (with exceptions such as the Arabic offerings in African studies programs, which are notably lower than the Arabic teaching resources at Middle East NRCs). Because most of these languages are LCTLs, this is good news for recent efforts to strengthen LCTL instruction, although some will wish that the amount of increase were more – and perhaps with a larger sample and in even more recent years it will be. Other language information not shown in the table are increases in the number of subject courses offered in a language other than English (responding to demand for Languages-across-the-Curriculum) and language courses designed for special purposes, such as business, as well as introductory courses for heritage speakers. All of these showed up in some course lists, although they were relatively few.

Advising

In addition to direct efforts to strengthen and rationalize NRC curricula, what else might be done to improve NRC impact via the curriculum? The findings of my recent (Title VI-funded) research on internationalization in K-12 teacher preparation⁷ underlined the importance of advising in the undergraduate curriculum; students, faculty, senior administrators – and advisors – felt strongly that better

⁷ 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.

advising could facilitate incorporation of more “international” components in prospective students’ undergraduate experience. For NRC purposes, a strong advising program should go well beyond what center faculty and staff can offer; to be effective (indeed, as part of a wider internationalization process) advising activity should include participation in freshman orientation, workshops and other training for 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 NRC impact – and to the better preparation of future citizens and the experts envisioned by the Title VI legislation, whether or not they eventually become teachers, public servants, or contributors to non-profit or for-profit organizations.

And eventually, if another set of comparisons is undertaken, the results of increased demand (facilitated by effective advising) and improved supply (of courses to meet that demand) might show a stronger set of benchmarks for future programs.

There is much to be accomplished in the next 50 years of Title VI.

Table 1
Composite (Averaged) Data on Course Offerings
 by discipline, from selected 2006 NRC Grantees' Lists

Subject	<u>Area Studies</u>			<u>International</u>	
	<u>100% average</u>	<u>content range</u>	<u>partial content</u>	<u>100% content</u>	<u>partial content</u>
Anthropology	3.8	0 - 16	7.6	4.5	14.5
Art and Architecture	6.0	0 - 49	5.3	1	5.75
Economics	1.2	0 - 14	3.8	7.8	7
Geography	.8	0 - 4	1.9	7.25	4
History	14.9	2 - 42	11.6	10	22
Linguistics	3.4	0 - 23	2.6	.25	3
Literature	21.0	0 - 95	9.7	4.5	14.8
Music	1.5	0 - 7	2.3	.5	3.25
Philosophy & Religion	3.5	0 - 15	7.0	3.25	10
International Relations	1.0	0 - 4	6.3	15	9.25
Political Science	4.3	0 - 15	7.8	14.75	16.5
Psychology	.05	0 - 1	.08		.5
Sociology	1.2	0 - 9	4.4	7.5	11.8
Interdisciplinary	8.0	1 - 22	4.9	3.5	12.8
Business	.4	0 - 8	4.1	6.5	4.5
Communication, Media	1.4	0 - 5	2.7	4.25	6.8
Education	.2	0 - 4	1.4	1.25	1.75
Environment, Natural Sci. and Resources	.3	0 - 4	3.2	7.8	11
Health Sciences	.3	0 - 5	2.0	2.8	2.5
Law	.8	0 - 4	3.4	11	10
Performing Arts	1.2	0 - 5	1.1	.25	.75
Public Policy, Admin.	.2	0 - 6	1.4	4.8	6.25

Table 2
Selected NRC Social Science Average Course Offerings
from 2005 applications, compared with 1983 course list data

Area		Anthro.	Econ..	Geog.	History	IR/Pol.Sci	Sociol.	Interdisc
East Asia	100% content	5.2	1.2	.5	20.8	8.5	1.5	11.0
	<100%	4.3	2.7	.5	5.3	9.1	2.7	3.0
	1983 data	3.9	2.5	1.6	20.8	8.9	2.4	5.5
Southeast Asia	100% content	4.0	.3	.7	9.3	3.3	1.0	4.0
	<100%	9.0	3.3	2.0	5.0	3.0	2.3	5.3
	1983 data	4.0	1.3	3.0	5.3	3.3	1.0	3.7
South Asia	100% content	2.2	.8	0	4.5	2.0	0	4.5
	<100%	4.2	2.8	0	5.8	8.2	2.0	4.2
	1983 data	8.4	2.0	.8	14.0	6.0	1.6	2.9
Middle East	100% content	2.2	.2	.4	17.4	5.0	1.8	6.8
	<100%	6	.6	.6	17.6	9.8	2.6	5.2
	1983 data	9.5	2.8	2.1	27.3	7.6	1.8	3.0
Eastern Europe & Russia	100% content	1.4	.2	1.2	13.4	5.6	.8	12.0
	<100%	6.4	6.2	1.2	20.4	31.4	5.2	3.0
	1983 data	2.8	4.1	2.5	22.6	12.8	2.2	5.5
Western Europe	100% content	0	1.3	.3	30.7	5.6	.3	14.0
	<100%	5.0	4.3	3.7	35.3	35.4	7.3	8.3
	1983 data	1.2	4.0	2.0	23.6	11.0	.6	10.8
Africa	100% content	4.2	.5	1.8	10.2	3.2	.8	4.5
	<100%	12.8	4.5	2.0	6.8	7.0	4.2	4.0
	1983 data	8.9	3.9	2.9	12.5	7.3	2.7	3.0
Latin America	100% content	9.3	3.8	1.2	16.0	7.6	2.8	7.8
	<100%	12.5	6.5	4.8	7.2	15.8	9.8	8.0
	1983 data	8.7	4.4	3.3	14.3	6.5	2.8	4.4
Canada	100% content	0	.5	1	5.5	2.5	0	4.0
	<100%	7.5	1.0	3.5	2.5	2.0	.5	3.0
	1983 data	5.2	2.2	2.8	9.0	3.2	3.2	4.0
International	100% content	4.5	7.8	7.2	10	29.8	7.5	3.5
	<100%	14.5	7.0	4.0	2.2	25.7	11.8	12.8
	1983 data	4.7	12.5	2.3	9.7	41.6	3.9	4.1

Table 3
Selected NRC Humanities Average Course Offerings
from 2005 applications, compared with 1983 course list data

Area		Art & Arch	History	Ling.	Lit.	Music	Phil./Rel.	Interdisc
East Asia	100% content	11.2	20.8	9.2	23.8	.5	3.8	11.0
	<100%	2.3	5.3	1.2	3.3	1.5	2.0	3.0
	1983 data	10.6	20.8	4.1	19.4	1.8	7.8	5.5
Southeast Asia	100% content	2.7	9.3	3.0	6.0	.7	1.7	4.0
	<100%	2.3	5.0	.3	3.3	1.67	2.0	5.3
	1983 data	3.0	5.3	3.0	3.7	5.3	3.0	3.7
South Asia	100% content	3.0	4.5	.5	9.8	1.2	9.5	4.5
	<100%	5.0	5.2	.2	9.	1.5	7.8	4.2
	1983 data	5.6	14.0	5.7	14.8	2.1	21.1	2.9
Middle East	100% content	6.6	17.4	1.4	17.4	.8	3.8	6.8
	<100%	6.0	17.6	.2	6.2	2.8	17.2	5.2
	1983 data	3.5	27.3	3.6	21.7	1.1	8.6	3.0
Russia & Eastern Europe	100% content	1.4	13.4	5.0	32.6	2.2	1.0	12.0
	<100%	4.8	20.4	.4	8.4	1.6	3.4	3.0
	1983 data	2.1	22.6	7.1	34.0	1.2	.7	5.5
Western Europe	100% content	22.0	30.7	6.7	71.3	4.3	10.0	14.0
	<100%	22.7	35.3	9.0	46.3	9.0	22.3	8.3
	1983 data	15.2	23.6	14.4	85.6	3.8	6.4	10.8
Africa	100% content	2.0	10.2	.5	1.8	1.0	1.2	4.5
	<100%	1.2	6.8	4.0	5.8	2.8	3	4.0
	1983 data	2.7	12.5	3.1	10.0	1.5	1.0	3.0
Latin America	100% content	5.5	16.0	1.3	20.0	2.5	1.2	7.8
	<100%	5.0	7.2	6.8	8.3	1.3	2.3	8.0
	1983 data	2.8	14.3	5.5	18.7	1.0	.8	4.4
Canada	100% content	0	5.5	0	4	0	0	2.3
	<100%	1.0	2.5	1.5	9.5	0	0	3.0
	1983 data	.5	9.0	-	5.8	.2	-	4.0
International	100% content	1	10	.2	4.5	.5	3.2	3.5
	<100%	5.8	22	3.	14.8	3.2	10	12.8
	1983 data	.2	9.7	-	-	.5	3.8	4.1

Table 4
Selected NRC Professional Programs Average Course Offerings
from 2005 applications, compared with 1983 course list data

Area		Educ.	Law	Business	Com., Media	Env., NatSci	Health	PerfArt s	Pub.Pol.
East Asia	100% content	.2	1.2	1.3	2.3	0.2	0	1.0	.3
	<100%	.3	1.5	4.7	2.3	1.0	.5	0	1.0
	1983 data	1.2	1.6		Other Professions: 3.3				
Southeast Asia	100% content	.3	0	0	.7	0	0	3.0	0
	<100%	0	.7	3.3	1.0	1.7	1.7	3.0	1.7
	1983 data	.7	.3		Other Professions: 8.7				
South Asia	100% content	.2	0	0	1.0	0	1.2	2.2	0
	<100%	2.2	2.5	2.5	.8	.8	1.0	.5	.1
	1983 data	1.3	.6		Other Professions: 1.7				
Middle East	100% content	.4	.6	.2	.6	0	.4	.2	0
	<100%	.4	3.8	.6	3.8	.8	.8	.2	.2
	1983 data	.5	1.0		Other Professions: .5				
Russia & Eastern Europe	100% content	.2	.2	0	1.0	0	0	.4	0
	<100%	1.4	3.8	5.4	2.2	1.0	0	1.0	.6
	1983 data	1.2	1.2		Other Professions: 4.5				
Western Europe	100% content	0	3.0	0	4.0	0	0	2.3	.3
	<100%	4.3	9.0	6.7	8.0	3.7	.7	4.7	4.7
	1983 data	1.8	1.8		Other Professions: 9.8				
Africa	100% content	0	.2	0	.5	.5	0	.2	0
	<100%	1.5	2.2	.5	1.8	9.2	7.0	1.5	1.2
	1983 data	1.0	.7		Other Professions: 4.0				
Latin America	100% content	.2	.8	1.0	1.8	1.2	.5	1.5	1.0
	<100%	2.7	5.3	9.2	3.5	7.3	5.0	1.5	2.8
	1983 data	1.6	.5		Other Professions: 4.3				
Canada	100% content	1.0	.5	.5	0	1.0	0	0	0
	<100%	0	2.0	1.0	.5	3.5	0	0	0
	1983 data	1.8			Other Professions: 6.2				
International	100% content	1.2	11.	6.5	4.25	7.8	2.8	.2	4.8
	<100%	1.8	10.	4.5	6.8	11.0	2.5	.8	6.2
	1983 data	2.3	3.5		Other Professions: 9.7				

Table 5

Selected NRC Language Offerings
from 2005 applications, compared with 1983 data

Area	Languages (years offered, averaged for NRCs that offer)							
	Chinese	Japanese	Korean					
East Asia	4.4	4.2	3.2					
<i>1983 data</i>	4.4	4.0						
	Indonesian	Thai	Vietnamese	Khmer	Tagalog			
Southeast Asia	3.3	3.5	3.3	3.2	3.3			
<i>1983 data</i>	3.3	3.3						
	Hindi	Urdu	Tamil	Panjabi	Bengali	Telugu	Tibetan	
South Asia	3.2	3.1	2.8	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.7	
<i>1983 data</i>	2.9							
	Arabic	Hebrew	Persian	Turkish	Armenian			
Middle East	3.9	3.4	3.1	2.6	2.5			
<i>1983 data</i>	3.8	2.8	2.5	2.3				
	Russian	Czech	Polish	Serb-Croatian	Ukrainian	Yiddish	Armenian	
Russia & Eastern Europe	4.9	2.2	3.3	2.6	2.0	2.7	2.5	
<i>1983 data</i>	4.8							
	Spanish	French	German	Italian	Portuguese	Swedish	Greek	
Western Europe	3.7	3.8	3.8	2.8	2.2	2.7	2.3	
<i>1983 data</i>								
	Swahili	Arabic	Hausa	Wolof	Zulu	Akan/Twi		
Africa	2.7	2.5	2.3	2	1.8	1.7		
<i>1983 data</i>	2.7							
	Portuguese	Spanish	Quechua	Mayan	Nahuatl	Aymara	Haitian	
Latin America	2.8	3.8	1.8	.8	.5	1.0	1.8	
<i>1983 data</i>	2.4	3.9						
	French							
Canada	3.5							
<i>1983 data</i>	3.5							