DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 091 48 SO 007 861

AUTHOR Paine, Whiton S.; And Others
TITLE An Evaluation of Undergraduate, Problem-Oriented Interdisciplinary Courses in International Studies. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y. Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education.
SPONS AGENCY Institute of International Studies (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO BR-2-2104-FR
PUB DATE Aug 74
CONTRACT OE-0-73-0092
NOTE 244p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$11.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Concept Teaching; Developing Nations; European History; Group Unity; *Higher Education; *Instructional Innovation; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Peace; Political Power; *Political Science; Problem Solving; Program Evaluation; Rural Development; Team Teaching; Thematic Approach; War; *World Affairs
IDENTIFIERS Center for International Studies; *International Studies

ABSTRACT

A program developed by the Center for International Studies (CIS) at Cornell, focusing on world-based, political problems was evaluated for the ongoing improvement of the program. Of particular interest was whether the program was meeting its characterized goals of interdisciplinary content, problem orientation, and team teaching at the introductory level for undergraduates. The "Context-Input-Process-Product" evaluation model chosen to assess the program relied on data collected from student questionnaires and ratings, course and program documents, grading data, interviews with faculty, and observations of course activities. The results of the evaluation presented descriptively, begin with a history of CIS and the development of the program. A description of the character of the courses, then, indicates a change in the focus of the program as it progressed. The six courses are now more aptly characterized as being specialized, advanced, international studies courses. Suggestions for continuation of the program take these changes into consideration. A bibliography and appendixes containing data collected and important aspects of each course complete the report. (JH)

Abstract

Like many institutions of higher education, Cornell University was in a state of change as the decade of the sixties ended. One of the results of that period of ferment was the establishment, in the Center for International Studies, of an experimental teaching program for undergraduates. This Undergraduate Program was a sequence of six introductory courses focusing on different problems within the general area of International Studies. They were taught by teams of faculty who brought their disciplinary expertise to an interdisciplinary consideration of the following topics:

Centralization and Decentralization in Europe
Domination and Subordination
Peace and War
Rural Development in the Third World
Ethnicity, Race, and Communalism
The Concept of Europe.

These courses were taught largely as separate attempts to utilize the conventional instructional techniques developed for introductory courses in an interdisciplinary, problem-oriented, team-teaching environment.

In order to assist program planning by the Cornell Center for International Studies and to contribute generally to an understanding of interdisciplinary, problem-oriented teaching, a Context, Input, Process, Product evaluation model was employed to describe and assess the courses as discrete entities and the program as a whole.

Final Report

Contract No. OE-0-73-0092

AN EVALUATION OF UNDERGRADUATE, PROBLEM-ORIENTED INTERDISCIPLINARY COURSES IN INTERNATIONAL STUDIES.

Whiton S. Paine
Stephen C. Brock
David B. Macklin
Alison P. Brown
with the assistance
of Caroline Bunton

Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14850

August 1974

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Institute for International Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The Center for International Studies is an autonomous center at Cornell University, which was founded in 1961. In its 1970-1971 Annual Report on "International Studies at Cornell University" its function was described:

> The major role of CIS has been to support and coordinate the University's programs of international and comparative studies. The Center functions through a network of faculty committees which are organized on a multidisciplinary basis and are essentially self-governed. These include Cornell's established area studies programs and the International Agricultural Development Program, International and Comparative Labor Relations, and the International Legal Studies Program.
>
> In the past few years another of the Center's roles has been to strengthen inquiry into substantive policy issues which cut across professional and area concerns. Although Cornell has been rich in faculty and student resources and concerned with such critical problems as war and peace, international development, and the environment, these interests have not previously been structured and supported intellectually and financially.
>
> Increasingly, the Center has been concerned with making its resources and those of its affiliated programs more relevant to the needs of undergraduates. During the past year, several of these innovative activities have reached fruition. The Center has developed an experimental, interdisciplinary teaching program in international studies at the undergraduate level.[1]

The history and analysis of internal and external influences which affected the genesis of the CIS Undergraduate Program can be found in Chapter III. Originally, the program was conceived as an "interdisciplinary, problem-oriented, team-taught" series of courses which, taken successively, would develop an integrated body of knowledge pertaining to international studies.

Ideally, a "program" is a coherent structure with specific goals to guide decisions and utilization of resources. The Undergraduate Program of the Center for International Studies began in this way but soon metamorphosed so that now it is best understood as a series of six discrete courses each with its distinctive features and separate faculty but subsidized by the Center for International Studies.

The need for major changes in the original concept of the Undergraduate Program emerged as the first course progressed and in the planning of the second course. Recognizing the benefits that might accrue from outside appraisal of the Program, CIS called upon the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education (CIUE) to study the second and third courses. CIUE is an agency organized by the University to support instructional development, including the development of methods for evaluating teaching and courses. The second course, however, stirred up so much controversy within CIS and the University community at large that it led to a direct faculty challenge of CIS' right and competence to offer undergraduate courses. Under these circumstances a comprehensive assessment of the program seemed urgent.

Stephen C. Brock, then Associate Director of CIUE, negotiated support from the Institute for International Studies in the United States Office of Education for a detailed evaluation of the CIS Undergraduate Program and hired Whiton S. Paine as an evaluation specialist.

The team which was formed at CIUE to conduct the evaluation of the CIS courses brought the perspectives of several different disciplines to bear on the problem. Whiton Paine was trained in Experimental Psychology and had previous experience with program evaluation and research on instructional variables in introductory courses. Stephen Brock, Associate Director of CIUE was an Educational Philosopher and coordinated the work. David Macklin, a Social Psychologist, served in many consulting roles. Alison Brown, an Intellectual Historian, investigated the history and political environment that influenced the evolution of the CIS Program.

Orientation to evaluation research. "Course evaluation" is not educational or instructional research. It may draw upon eight of the nine separate types of research (historical, descriptive, developmental, case/field study, correlational, causal-comparative, quasi-experimental, action) listed by Isaac and Michael (1971) but clearly is not limited to any one of them. The Phi Delta Kappa National Study Committee on Evaluation (1971) relates evaluation to 1) measurement, 2) determining congruence between performance and objectives, and 3) progressional judgment. Richard Miller's (1972, 1974) review of faculty evaluation shows that course evaluations can and do imply all three definitions. In the case of the CIS Program evaluation, however, "congruence" considerations were fruitless since there were no overall program goals and few attempts to define objectives.

In general, the major emphasis in course evaluation has been on the opinion of the consumer of instruction, i.e., the student. This emphasis may be shifting (Miller, 1973, 1974), but Costin, Greenough and Menges (1971) concluded that students' ratings can provide information which is both reliable and valid. In the present study it was decided that student ratings should be a major component.

A Search for Criteria. From the inception of the Undergraduate Program, the CIS courses were described as "interdisciplinary, problem-oriented, team-taught" courses. The descriptive phrase refers to a number of instructional innovations in higher education which were relatively unfamiliar. The evaluation team undertook a review of the literature to discover if criteria existed for judging these aspects of the CIS courses.

Interdisciplinarity is a particularly fluid concept. Sherif and Sherif (1969) pointed out in Interdisciplinarity: Problems of Teaching and Research in Universities, this is a fashionable term suitable for "academic chitchat", but it also refers to a serious concern on the part of scholars who are dissatisfied with the narrow disciplinary approach to general knowledge.

There appears to be a range of possible alternative approaches, ranging from intradisciplinary, cross- or multi-disciplinary, to synthetic interdisciplinary. At one extreme the emphasis is on the procedures and concepts developed in one discipline. At the other is a broad, eclectic approach involving many disciplinary perspectives.

Briggs and Michaud (1972), representing a European point of view, asserted the need to reorganize universities to accomodate interdisciplinary teaching. Levine and Weingart (Reform of Undergraduate Education, 1974) suggest different organizational and programmatic structures which might augment or serve as alternatives to traditional disciplinary departments:

> "At most traditional universities with strong graduate and departmental orientations such structures may be the only way to introduce a significant measure of flexibility within the curriculum."[2]

A logical way to organize such extra-departmental efforts is by focusing on problems which involve the expertise of individuals from different disciplines (i.e. problem-oriented studies, team-taught). This was the direction in which the CIS Undergraduate Program started.

At a national conference on higher education in 1972, Kolka and Swinerton (1972) concluded that interdisciplinary programs in general, have not fared well at American and Canadian universities, mainly due to their inability to compete with the traditional departments for the shrinking pool of resources.

The financial difficulty confronting interdisciplinary efforts is compounded by the problem of developing effective teaching teams at both the course and departmental (or quasi-departmental) level. A recent book by LaFauci and Richter (1970) provides a brief overview of different ways of organizing team-teaching and a detailed analysis of one attempt at Boston University's College of Basic Studies. Particularly interesting is their analysis of the use of teams in the development of interdisciplinary projects. Among the advantages in this form

of teaching they cite increased program flexibility, stimulation of creative thinking in students and faculty and intellectual challenge and practical utility in the study of contemporary problems. On the negative side they note that team-teaching is plagued by interpersonal problems stemming not only from personality differences but from the rigidities of graduate training programs in traditional universities. International Studies is a field that offers many illustrations of both facets.

Since World War II, non-American content in college and university curricula has been steadily increasing -- a change heavily subsidized by government and foundation resources. In 1962, Percy Bidwell completed a national assessment of Undergraduate Education in Foreign Affairs. His review is notable for its emphasis on the importance of international subject matter in an undergraduate liberal arts education.

In 1967, Education and World Affairs selected six universities for a detailed study of the approach to teaching, research, and service in the area of world affairs. This report included a history of international activities at Cornell, focusing on the work at the Center for International Studies. One important conclusion of this study was that while curricula had been internationalized to some extent, the impact on students was discouragingly weak. The suggestion was made that introductory courses in social and behavioral sciences should be modified to accommodate international material.

Similar conclusions appeared in a report issued as one of a series of studies commissioned by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (Sanders and Ward, 1970). This report summarized information obtained from 612 institutions on 2,185 programs. Sanders and Ward, however, emphasized that

> "International Studies are only a small part of the overall academic activities in any four year institution and involve only a fraction of the more than six million college students in the United States."[3]

They also described the beginning of the decline in International Studies which took place when Congress and the foundations began to withdraw their financial support.

One of the most important aspects of the Sanders and Ward study is that it documents the diversity of International Studies. This field is so complex that it is difficult to formulate generalizations. There is a general breakdown between programs stressing area or language studies and those which focus on comparative and topical studies. James Rosenau (1973) has prepared a quantitatively oriented survey of International Studies with emphasis on the role of what he calls "Discipline Generalists" in the social sciences. His analysis is important because it illuminates the approach taken in the CIS Undergraduate Program.

Rosenau defines a "Discipline Generalist" as an individual who

"...employs the discipline of one or more -- or some combination -- of the social sciences for the purpose of developing knowledge about human affairs that is generalized beyond a specific case, situation, or country."4

The emphasis is on the study of a range of phenomena in order to define patterns rather than on interdisciplinary analysis per se. Implied here is a commitment to multi-methodology and emphasis on quantitative analysis.

Rosenau opines that collaboration across disciplines is a valid ideal but one which is seldom met in International Studies. In support of this contention he cites the responses to a survey of an "elite sample" of disciplinary generalists who found only 46-47% examples of cross-disciplinary collaboration in the literature. His data also indicate that 55% of his Discipline Generalists were Political Scientists and fully 84% of the membership of the International Studies Association represented this discipline. Rosenau endorsed problem-oriented studies as a way of bringing together Disciplinary Generalists in collaboration with area specialists. This, he felt, would lead to some degree of interdisciplinary cooperation and synthesis.

The following paragraphs offer a brief description of the Center for International Studies (CIS) courses which were the subject for evaluation by the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education (CIUE).

CIS 110, entitled "Integration and Decentralization: Competing forms in International Society" (referred to in this report as "Integration"), was the first course in the Undergraduate Program. Offered in Spring 1971, it brought faculty from Economics, Political Science, Anthopology, and History together with 68 students, primarily freshmen. They examined centralizing and decentralizing forces at both the local/personal levels and the national/international levels by working through four case studies: the Hapsburg dynasty, Modern France, Modern Western Europe, and Modern Yugoslavia. The course was divided into weekly "disciplinary" seminars and "interdisciplinary" lecture sessions, with a reading list for each of these. Students were graded on their performance in discussion sections and on the several essays which were required.

CIS 209, offered in the Fall of 1971, entitled "Domination and Subordination: Origins, Strategies, and Justification" (here, "Domination"), approached its subject on three levels: domination/subordination 1) between individuals and groups within society (Male-Female and Worker-Manager-Owner), 2) as ways of organizing societies (U.S. Liberalism/German National Socialism), and 3) between countries (War, Imperialism, Colonialism, and Nationalism). There also were presentations centered on neo-Freudian, Marxian, and Weberian models as broad, internally consistent approaches to domination and subordination.

The faculty, representing the disciplines in Economics, Political Science, Psychology, and History, divided themselves into teams of two in order to prepare lectures and readings on each of the course's sub-topics. Once a week a lecture session was offered in which members of a faculty team presented a short lecture. These were followed immediately by questions and discussion by the two other faculty participants. This session was then followed by small group discussion sections led by the faculty and finally the total class of 76 students would reconvene for a general session. In addition to this weekly "marathon" session there was one weekly seminar for small group discussion of the readings. Faculty were assigned as discussion group leaders so that over the total semester students had two leaders for their group; one for the first half of the term and a different one for the second. Students were graded on their performance on essays and a term paper.

CIS 210, "Peace and War" ("Peace"), enrolled 148 undergraduate students, mostly freshmen and sophomores, to consider the causes of war and the prerequisites for peace from the points of view of seven disciplines. After studying the anthropological, psychological, and historical roots of war, particular techniques and proposals for prevention were examined. Here Political Science, Chemistry, Physics, and Economics were represented. Eleven lecturers participated, while five persons were discussion section leaders. In addition to one two-hour lecture session per week, each student was assigned to a discussion section, with section leaders rotating every three weeks. Also, the game "Diplomacy" was played by some students. A final examination and four five-page papers were used to assess student performance.

CIS 211, the fourth in the series of courses, attracted 77 students from across many colleges and classes, including some graduate students. "Peasants, Power, and Productivity: Rural Development in the Third World" ("Peasants"), had a core faculty representing the disciplines of Political Science-Economics, Anthropology, and Agricultural Economics. In addition, five guest lecturers representing Agricultural Economics, Anthropology, Political Economics, and Political Science, participated in the second half of the semester. In the first part of the course an analytic framework was presented which analyzed rural development phenomena from three views: the MACRO: political processes, the MICRO: the peasant community, and the TECHNICAL: production process, with India as the referent country. In the second part of the course there were guest lecturers on: The Philippines and Taiwan, Kenya and Tanzania, China and Mexico. For the first time, two graduate assistants were added to the staff and they, along with one of the core faculty, led the sections. The students attended one discussion section per week and the lecture session. Students were graded on their performance in sections and on a midterm and final examination.

CIS 212, "Ethnicity, Race, and Communalism: their significance for nation building and international relations" ("Ethnicity"), offered

in the Spring of 1973 brought together three political scientists -- each with a different emphasis: one in population, one in public administration, and the third in international racism, to treat the written materials touching on this subject found in a variety of disciplines. Guest lecturers from Anthropology, Rural Sociology, and Psychology were invited to round out the interdisciplinary treatment. Three case countries were treated in the first half of the course, levels of analysis from "above" (political/economic) and "below" (psychological/anthropological) were posited. As in "Peasants", graduate assistants served as additional discussion leaders. The course met twice each week, once in a lecture session and once in discussion sections. The 26 students enrolled in the course were graded on their performance on midterm and final examinations, on the term paper, and in discussion sections.

CIS 135 was the last of the CIS courses considered in the evaluation. Its title was "The Concept of Europe: Crisis and Continuity in the evolution of an idea" ("Europe" throughout this report). Here a political scientist and an historian, together with a graduate assistant in political science, taught the course which consisted of one lecture combined with discussion each week, with additional discussion meetings which convened on an ad hoc basis. Three guest lecturers, two in political science and one in history, supplemented the core faculty's presentations. In examining the evolution of the concept of Europe, particular emphasis was given to post-1945 European developments.

What this brief review intimates is that the special characteristics of the Undergraduate Program cannot be evaluated according to criteria developed in other environments. The terms "interdisciplinary," "team-teaching," "problem-oriented," and even "International Studies," involve a heterogeneous and changing body of instructional and research activities. Within wide boundaries, whatever the Undergraduate Program did could be seen as reflecting these attributes. When attempting to answer the question "What is an Interdisciplinary, Problem-oriented, Team-taught course in International Studies at Cornell," the emphasis must be on description rather than evaluation against fixed criteria. Detailed descriptions of the individual courses can be found in Appendix B.

Aside from its special characteristics, the CIS Undergraduate Program stressed the importance of these courses as introductions to the social and behavioral sciences. Since World War II there has been a continuously increasing literature on appropriate instructional technologies for introductory courses in these fields. Probably the best review is provided by McKeachie (1963), in Teaching Tips, a Guidebook for the Beginning College Teacher. More specialized treatments are to be found in such collections as the one edited by Lee (1967), Runkel, Harrison, and Runkel (1969), and Levien (1972), Bjerstedt's volume on Educational

Technology (1972) and innumerable journals. This prior research, combined with information on how social science courses are typically taught at Cornell, made it possible to evaluate this aspect of the CIS courses against established criteria. Details of this part of the evaluation are presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER I

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents an overview of the methodological approaches used in evaluating the CIS Undergraduate Program. It is divided into three parts. First is a section on the basic strategy which guided the overall evaluation design. This discussion includes an analysis of some fundamental assumptions, the constraints and opportunities which affected the design, the evaluation goals, and the general Context-Input-Process-Product model used to structure data collection.

Data collection methods are the focus of the second section. Following the concept of multiple operationalism, a range of assessment procedures were used to obtain data on the various courses. These included course questionnaires soliciting the students' perceptions, non-participant and participant observation of course activities, analysis of course and program documents, follow-up questionnaires to students, and faculty interviews.

This approach generated considerable data which were then analyzed and interpreted. The basic problem was to utilize effectively the talents of a multi-disciplinary evaluation team in the interpretation of the results. How this was done is the concern of the final section of this Methodology Chapter.

This chapter is supplemented by materials in the Appendices which describe the student and faculty populations in detail and present a structural analysis of the six courses. Additionally, the Follow-up form and the questionnaires for each of the six courses are reproduced, along with the item means.

Evaluation Strategy. The CIS Undergraduate Program was a complex, heterogeneous entity and the first evaluation question to be answered was "How can this complexity be separated into discrete, measurable components without losing the overall richness of the situation to be assessed?" The strategy chosen was one which concentrated on the individual courses and developed a basic set of program generalizations by comparing one course with another. Similarly, single course elements were compared with their counterparts in other courses.

What is the justification for this strategy, as opposed to viewing and assessing the nature of the total Program? Fundamentally, the terms of CIS's definition of the Program itself are accepted because they convey the differentiated reality that finally ensued.

As originally conceived, the Program was intended to provide a series of cumulating experiences for a group of students who would enroll in one course after another. Integration and Decentralization,

the first Program course, was planned as the initial offering in a four-course sequence. One major facet of the course design was a set of disciplinary discussion sections, introduced in this course, which were to be utilized in the subsequent courses. The intent of this approach was to engage the student in four different disciplinary areas, over the four courses, and -- by cumulation -- provide an intellectual base of different interdisciplinary social science experiences. The abandonment of this plan during the first term and the redefinition of the Undergraduate Program created a series of discrete courses, whose linking characteristics would include problems of international scope and teams of disciplinary specialists to conduct the courses. This redefinition was adhered to and most students did not pursue a series of CIS course experiences. Consequently, any view of the Undergraduate Program realistically means "What can be learned from the courses as multifaceted events?" not, alternatively, "Has 'The Program' as a totality succeeded?"

The independence of the various CIS courses can be summarized in categories also. Each course was established de novo in many essential respects:

a) Faculty were recruited for the courses in several different ways (as will be seen in the History of the CIS Undergraduate Program).

b) Responsibility for the Program in the administrative sense was rapidly decentralized, moving from a central CIS committee to individual faculty on the ad hoc course faculty teams.

c) A substantive continuity or progression across the various problems treated by the courses was not contemplated. ("Majoring" in international studies, under the Center's aegis, was rejected as an available option or goal.)

d) According to the Director of CIS, there was a conscious effort to design each course so that it differed from the previous courses in order to test varying ways of organizing this type of effort.

e) Feedback between courses, while present, was minimal.

Given these factors, the original expectation was that the evaluation would focus on individual courses, in particular the fifth and sixth courses in the Program; Peasants, Power, and Productivity and Ethnicity, Race, and Communalism. These were the two CIS efforts given during the time period covered by the grant from the Institute for International Studies.

Once the decision had been made to concentrate on the individual courses, the next step involved the definition of the evaluation goals. The obvious strategy of selecting program or course goals and measuring the attainment of either or both sets was not feasible in this instance. By the time Peasants was being planned, the program goals had been discarded because of problems that arose in the first two courses. Also, goal setting (specifying in advance the expected impacts of the course on students), while present to some degree was not a primary activity of the faculty groups involved in the design of Peasants and Ethnicity.

CIS, as an organization, essentially asked three questions:

a) Were these good courses?

b) What instructional procedures were or were not effective?

c) How could the courses be made better in the future?

A problem here was that "good", "effective", and "better" were never satisfactorily defined. For example, a "good" course incorporated complex criteria such as academic respectability and long-term cognitive and affective impacts on both faculty and students, as well as short-term cognitive and affective consequences for these groups.

CIS in collaboration with the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education, defined six major problem areas of mutual interest for evaluation. These were discussed in the project proposal "An Evaluation of Undergraduate, Problem-Oriented Interdisciplinary Courses in International Studies". Briefly, these were:

I. Course Description. What is occurring within each course?

II. Course Impacts. What impacts do these types of courses have on faculty and students?

III. Unanticipated Outcomes. What unanticipated outcomes occur?

IV. Shared Objectives. To what extent are there common objectives between the various courses?

V. Interdisciplinary Models. What models of interdisciplinarity are being used?

VI. Evaluation Guidelines. What guidelines for evaluation can be suggested, both for interdisciplinary courses in general and for CIS's future use at Cornell?

The exploratory nature of some of these areas, as revealed in the literature, plus their range and complexity strongly suggested that the evaluation should be descriptive, outcome-oriented, paying particular attention to the interdisciplinary aspects of the Program and oriented

toward the generation of guidelines for the evaluation of similar courses either at other universities or at Cornell in the future. Area IV was modified because of the limited evidence that there were shared objectives between courses. Instead, there was an emphasis on shared characteristics, structural features common to the courses, to provide the data for comparative analysis.

Two further decisions were made to aid in the definition of an evaluation strategy. First, a general evaluation model was selected and then the major aspects of the CIS courses were delineated.

There is a wide variety of evaluation approaches available (Steele, 1973) but many of these are program-goal oriented and thus were judged inappropriate. Of the remainder, the CIPP (Context-Input-Process-Product) approach developed by the Phi Delta Kappa National Study Committee on Evaluation (1971) was chosen because CIS had indicated that the various courses were envisaged primarily as opportunities to learn about different approaches to the teaching of problem-oriented, interdisciplinary courses in International Studies. Since one function of the courses was to generate guidelines for the design of future offerings, the emphasis of the CIPP model on information for decision making was seen as directly relevant to this basic program goal. Additionally, this model is probably the most completely developed evaluation approach available for an in-depth assessment of a curriculum.

Basically, the CIPP model suggests that four major classes of information are needed for decision making. Context information defines the relevant environment with a particular emphasis on intellectual assumptions and values, institutional factors, and premises about students and teaching techniques. The Input to a course covers the particular course design arrived at during the planning period. Process assessment investigates the ways in which that initial design was actually implemented. The course Products, both expected and unexpected, are the impacts of the total course experience on students and faculty. In this CIS evaluation project, data were collected in each of these areas.

Within the evaluation, the most important use of the CIPP model was that it sensitized the evaluation team to the importance of all four classes of information and related sets of decisions whenever they considered different aspects of the courses. Additionally, this model was an aid in relating aspects and considering course phenomena over time. The only major problem encountered with CIPP was in the final, interpretation stages of the evaluation. Structuring the evaluation findings according to the Context-Input-Process-Product categories was not effective in communicating with the different audiences interested in this evaluation. In a sense, it is an excellent data-retrieval or file model, but the results do not readily provide an integrated, overall picture or viewpoint.

The collection of data was further structured by differentiating three major aspects of the CIS courses. On one hand there is a set

of special characteristics. These courses were organized as problem-oriented, team-taught, interdisciplinary offerings. Naturally these three characteristics are interrelated but, for the purposes of the evaluation, salient course activities were categorized as related to either the organization of course content, to the interpersonal structure for team-teaching, or to the approach to interdisciplinary inquiry. These categories were particularly useful when faculty actions and the impacts of the courses on the faculty were considered.

CIS courses are also in part adaptations of conventional, introductory courses in the social sciences. Again, for the purposes of analysis, instructional activities were grouped as lecture, reading, discussion section, or grading system procedures. The use of films or other additional techniques was placed in a separate, miscellaneous category.

Finally, an important component of almost any course evaluation concerns the generalized outcomes of a course, outcomes which tend to reflect the students' and faculties' entire experience rather than one component of that experience. This was treated as a separate category of evaluation information. These are programmatic issues that are dealt with in the last chapter of this report.

Before the evaluation strategy could be implemented, before it could be used to define data collection procedures, the particular opportunities and constraints present at the beginning of the evaluation had to be considered.

First of all, in the Summer of 1972, an evaluation specialist was hired to formulate the evaluation design and coordinate the project as the Principal Investigator. The timing of the grant approval and the subsequent hiring of this individual made it impossible for him to be present during the planning of the Fall 1972 CIS course. His contract began August 15; prior to that date, he was able to consult with CIUE and CIS personnel only once. Thus many crucial evaluation design decisions were made in the two week period prior to the start of "Peasants, Power, and Productivity - Rural Development in the Third World". These decisions reflected the particular pattern of opportunities and constraints that were operative at that time. Briefly these were:

Opportunities

1. Adequate resources for a range of evaluation procedures;
2. Considerable flexibility in the project proposal;
3. Excellent relationships between administrative personnel in CIS and CIUE;
4. A strong commitment to evaluation by CIS as an organization;
5. The availability of some data on earlier CIS courses;
6. The agreement with the Peasants course faculty that the evaluator could be present at staff and course meetings as a non-participant observer;

7. The agreement with the Peasants course faculty that provision would be made for evaluation questionnaires at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the semester;
8. A sufficiently large enrollment in the Peasants course to allow a range of measures and analyses.

Constraints

1. The limited amount of planning time;
2. The perception of the Peasants course faculty that they had been inadequately consulted about the evaluation of their work;
3. The limited commitment of the Peasants faculty to evaluation;
4. The requirement that the evaluation be minimally obtrusive with regard to ongoing course activities;
5. Absence of evaluation personnel when many crucial course design decisions were made in the Summer and Fall.

Because of the limited design time and the constraints surrounding the Peasants course, it was decided that this course would be used to develop a model evaluation approach which would then be applied to the next course. Part of the reason for this strategy was that the evaluators were more intimately involved in the planning processes for the later course, and the Ethnicity course faculty were more receptive to evaluation procedures and feedback from the evaluators.

Unfortunately, there was a marked drop in enrollment in the two courses, from 76 to 26. With that small an enrollment, the evaluation design was inappropriate, too complex for the job at hand. Under these new conditions, the Center for International Studies made some additional resources available to the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education, and the overall evaluation design was modified to include all six courses in the Undergraduate Program.

The revised plan was to use the basic approach to data collection developed in the Rural Development course in the last two courses, Ethnicity, Race, and Communalism and The Concept of Europe. In addition, faculty and students from the earlier courses were to be contacted on a follow-up basis, and similar follow-up information on the Peasants and Ethnicity students would be collected. This change added one year to the length of the project but it had the advantage of providing an overview of the entire Undergraduate Program rather than the originally intended, more comprehensive analysis of two courses.

Data Collection Procedure. The concept of "multiple operationalism", central to the work of Webb and his colleagues (1966) guided the data collection procedures. Such procedures were designed to provide independent views of the same set of events, the six courses. Each procedure is less than ideal in that it is subject to factors which threaten reliability and validity. By providing a range of independent and different measures, however, these limitations tend to cancel each other and the emphasis of data interpretation shifts to delineating similar patterns demonstrated by different types of measures. It is assumed that

to measure complex situations there is a need for "... multiple measures which are hypothesized to share in the theoretically relevant components but have different patterns of irrelevant components."1

Standardized evaluation procedures for this type of interdisciplinary curriculum were not available and the research was designed to yield first answers to the Center for International Studies. A wholly different research program would have been involved, if the primary purpose had been the development of measurement instruments for general use.

In this study six different data collection procedures were used:

1) Course questionnaires for student ratings of the courses;
2) Course and program documents;
3) Grading data;
4) Post- and Follow-up interviews with faculty;
5) Observation of course activities;
6) Student Follow-up questionnaires.

These represent quite different procedures. Even in the case of the course and follow-up questionnaires, the way in which these forms were administered diverged. Each procedure is discussed in some detail below, along with an indication of its particular limitations and benefits.

Course and Program Documents. The Center for International Studies and each of the courses have generated different types of public and private documents. These were a rich source of data, particularly with respect to program and course decisions. They also illuminated the context(s) for each course as well as for the total Program.

Course documents on the last three courses were obtained as they were generated during the semester each course was offered. These were supplemented by related documents in the CIS files.

Two different sets of Program documents were collected because of the change in the evaluation design. At the beginning of the evaluation, the Principal Investigator reviewed the major Program documents as part of his orientation to the task of evaluating Peasants and Ethnicity.

When the overall design was changed to include the six courses, it became important to analyze in greater depth the earlier documents in order to understand fully the context of the total program. Allison Brown, an Intellectual Historian, was engaged to undertake this appraisal. Her task was to produce an institutional history of Cornell's Center for International Studies Undergraduate Program from its foundation through the present, together with collated documentation. Rather than simply establishing an accurate chronology of events, the aim of this history was to establish the life history of CIS, a significant administrative, research, and teaching institution at Cornell.

The term "life" history was chosen because institutions, like human beings, develop their own peculiar structure and personality in the process of interacting with a host of particular realities -- people, existing social, economic, and political conditions, and in the very presence of other institutions. One of the major requirements for achieving the objective of a general history of CIS is that of arriving at an adequate understanding of the institutional milieu into which it was born, and in the midst of which it has grown and developed.

A prerequisite for such an understanding is the development of an awareness of and sensitivity for the institutional structure of Cornell on the departmental and university-wide administrative levels as well as an awareness of the way in which centers like CIS have come to fit into this structural framework. But behind and within institutions, as this history attempts to show, are people. This institutional history tries to unravel the intentions, primary motivations, and major considerations of those people who were active in creating and shaping CIS from its birth through the present day.

In seeking to answer the question of why there has been a redefinition of the fundamental philosophical assumptions and goals of CIS, of its very roles and functions over a period of thirteen years, a body of documents relating to the Center was collected and collated. These include CIS Executive Committee meeting minutes, correspondence, proposals to and from the Ford Foundation for supporting grants, internal memoranda and correspondence of CIS, and correspondence between CIS and the Cornell University Administration. Where appropriate, interviews with those persons who either generated these documents or who were active in the discussions that shaped the ideas these papers reflect were used to clarify and supplement documentary materials. These included interviews with former and present CIS Directors, former and present Cornell University Presidents, and those faculty central to the foundation and development of the Center.

Two products were expected to accrue from this project: 1) an historical-contextual account of the institutional and intellectual environment in which CIS's Undergraduate Interdisciplinary Program originated and developed; 2) the documentation collected and collated in the writing of these histories. These documents provided understanding of why particular events occurred and how CIS developed its current form.

Ms. Brown's report became a primary source document for the other members of the evaluation team as they interpreted the results. It was supplemented by a compilation of program goal statements compiled from the CIS documents by Caroline Bunton of CIUE. Chapter II on the Background of the Program condenses the history and goal considerations.

Observation. To assess the courses as complex entities occurring over time, observational techniques were used. The Principal Investigator

played a range of observer/participant roles with respect to certain course activities during each semester for the last three courses in the series. No one played a similar role in the first three courses, which preceded the evaluation effort. For the Peasants course he was a non-participant observer in lectures and in a sample of the discussion sections; in the weekly staff meetings he observed and participated. In Ethnicity, the Principal Investigator's participation in staff meetings was somewhat enlarged; he had an active role in the planning meetings for the course. In lectures he again was a non-participant observer. The discussion sections were video-taped and also observed through a one way mirror, with prior faculty and student permission. For the Europe course, the Principal Investigator was largely a non-participant observer for all course activities. These roles are described in somewhat more detail below.

Lectures. The Principal Investigator attempted to attend all lecture sessions. During the lectures he noted the following:

On-time student attendence;
Attendence at 20 minutes past the hour;
Content and number of student questions;
Content and number of faculty comments;
Major topics covered by the lecture, and digressions;
Films and other techniques used;
When students began leaving the lecture;
When the lecture ended.

This information was supplemented by notes on the lecturer's style, apparent student interest in what was said, and any unusual events that occurred. For Ethnicity and Peasants, the degree of correspondence between decisions made during weekly staff meetings and the lecture content was also noted.

Discussion Sections. In the Peasants course, the Principal Investigator attempted to attend a randomly selected sample of sessions each week. Here also he was a non-participant observer and made notes on:

On-time student attendence;
Attendence at 20 minutes past the hour;
Content and number of student-faculty and student-student interactions;
Content and number of section leader responses to questions and mini-lectures on specific topics;
Films and other techniques used;
Attendence at end of session.

The basic question of interest here was who talked to whom about what. For this information a simple rating scale which treated each contribution as a unit was used to rate student and faculty participation.

A more sophisticated system was used for the Ethnicity course. All sections met in a room with a one way mirror and a randomly selected set of 30 minute time samples were observed and (for all but one sectoon) videotaped. These tapes were rated by students from outside the class who were trained to use a discussion section interaction assessment system developed at CIUE, (a variant of the Flanders interaction scheme). Both quantitative and qualitative aspects of student and faculty interactions were assessed and the same data as in Peasants was collected. Actually, given the low enrollment in the course, this was an overuse of available technology. The system, however, had been developed before the enrollment figures were available.

The Concept of Europe had infrequent, ad hoc discussion sections and these were attended periodically by the principal investigator. The same kind of information was collected in these sessions as was collected in the Peasants discussion sections.

Staff Meetings. The principal investigator attempted to attend all staff meetings in the Peasants and Ethnicity courses. For Europe, meetings were called only occasionally and were not announced in advance so that attendance was impossible. In the sessions attended, he acted as an observer and partial participant. As an observer, he collected much the same data that was collected from the discussion sections. The emphasis, however, was on the observation of faculty participation in course decision-making and in the discussion of forthcoming lecturss.

The investigator attempted to restrict his participation to the answering of direct questions and rarely volunteered information on topics related to Educational Psychology. In particular, he provided input to the design of the grading systems in both Peasants and Ethnicity. The evaluator's notes indicate that at various sessions, usually attended by five or six faculty members, his participation ranged from 0% to 5% of the contributions.

Planning Meetings. The planning for Peasants took place before the evaluation began. In the Ethnicity course, the principal investigator did attend all planning sessions. Again, he acted as an observer and partial participant. As a participant, he served the same role as was noted in the discussion of the staff meetings but in addition he provided evaluation information from the Peasants course which was appropriate to the planning for Ethnicity. This feedback role continued into the staff meetings for this course. Like the pattern of infrequent staff meetings for the Europe course, the planning sessions were infrequent and unannounced. The principal investigator, therefore, played no role.

The major advantage of these observation activities was that they provided week-by-week information about the last three courses in the

Undergraduate Program. This information then was quite useful in highlighting the data gathered from the course and follow-up student questionnaires and from the faculty interviews.

Student Questionnaires. The most detailed information on the impacts or perceptions of components of a course came from ratings on specifically designed student questionnaires. These were designed to assess both specific and general aspects of the courses during the semester that these courses were offered. For the last three courses, questionnaires were administered at the beginning (pre-), middle (mid-), and end (post-), of each semester.

Design. It is necessary to consider the first three and the last three courses separately. For the first three courses (Integration, Domination, and Peace), the post-forms were designed without consideration for the evaluation, but in each case the items were selected after consultation with personnel from the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education. The post-form for Integration was a ten question course rating-form developed by students to rate Cornell courses and provide information to aid other students in selecting courses. These are course-as-a-whole items, and they are reproduced in Appendix A, 1.

For Domination, the faculty modified an earlier version of the Cornell Inventory for Student Appraisal of Teaching and Courses -- a general course-rating form developed at CIUE. The major modifications were that the sections on teaching and discussion sections were filled out separately for each lecturer and section leader. A much shorter form, consisting of six course-as-a-whole items and one item on the assigned papers, was used in the Peace course and again these items were drawn from the Cornell Inventory. (Appendix A, 5.)

Thus there are wide differences in the amounts and types of information available on the initial three courses. Appendix A, 1, Table 10 shows there are also some questions about how representative the results are since only part of the course was sampled in Integration and sample sizes are not available for Domination, and Peace. On the other hand, the items were standardized and do allow some comparison with Cornell norms.

After the formal evaluation began, a more thorough design process was initiated. First, the function of each form was delineated. Then items were selected and a rough questionnaire developed. Course faculty input on each questionnaire was solicited and incorporated in the final form.

Each of these questionnaires designed for the courses was seen as having somewhat different functions within the evaluation. The pre-form, given at the beginning of the semester, was to:

1) Introduce students to the fact that the course would be evaluated and that they would be asked to fill out a number of forms;

2) Obtain initial information on the student's

General academic background;
Background related to the course content;
Expectations about
    Specific aspects of the course;
    The course as a whole;
Suggestions about organization of course activities;
Attitudes related to the course content.

The last, attitude function, was used for Ethnicity and Europe only.

Feedback to the faculty was the major function of the mid-form which was administered around the time of the midterm examination. In particular, this questionnaire was to:

Obtain student ratings of
    Specific course components;
    The total course;
    Readings completed and lectures and sections attended;
Obtain information on how students thought the course objectives were being met for them;
Solicit suggestions on how the course could be modified to make it more useful to the students.

This was a brief, one page form which was designed to be filled out quickly. On the forms for the last two courses, students were asked to list by title the most and least useful books and lectures as well as to rate the readings and lectures as a whole. This was an attempt to obtain more detailed information for feedback purposes.

Finally, the post-form was designed to obtain a wide range of summary information on the course. Its function was to:

Obtain student ratings of selected aspects of
    the readings;
    the lectures;
    the discussion sections;
    the examination procedures;
    the course as a whole;
Obtain information on how students thought the course goals had been met for them;
Solicit suggestions on how the course could be modified to make it more useful to students.

Basically the post-form was an expanded version of the midsemester form.

Administration of Questionnaires. The forms developed for the Peasants course were the models used for later courses, but as Appendix B shows, there were differences in the pre-, mid-, and post-forms for the three courses, differences resulting from problems identified with specific items and from comments of the course faculties.

In each course, the faculty were asked about the information that would be most useful to them and they were also given an opportunity to comment on the drafts of the forms. Most of their comments concerned ambiguities they perceived in certain items and, on occasion, they requested that items be added or deleted. Whenever possible, these requests were heeded. Faculty input was particularly useful when it concerned the content related areas of the pre-form and the course related attitude items on the mid- and post-form.

After the final forms were designed, they were administered to the students. On occasion, administration was a problem because the course faculty were reluctant to release course time for this purpose. One result, particularly in the Peasants course, was that some students did not fill out some of the forms (See Table 1). A second consequence was that the forms were filled out under different circumstances in the different courses. Some were filled out in the discussion sections, some away from class -- some to be handed in during class and some to be mailed to CIUE. These difficulties were unavoidable, given the faculty desire to reserve class time for instructional use, but they greatly complicated the interpretation of the results when these are compared across courses.

The administration experiences within this evaluation suggest that the optimal procedure is that all forms be filled out in class. If this is not possible, the pre-form may be administered during the first discussion section and can then be used to structure discussion about the course. Similarly, the mid-form should be completed in the discussion sections. The post-form can be given to students at the last lecture session and returned either at the last section meeting or when the final examination is administered. A contingency such as no final grade unless the post-form is returned may be necessary, but, if used, the students must be informed that completing the questionnaires is a course requirement. Mail returns, even if coupled with telephone inquiries to those not responding within a specified time period, were not effective.

For Peasants and Ethnicity, one additional use was made of the post-form. The faculty were asked to answer these items in terms of what an acceptable student response would be. This is not simply a prediction of student ratings; rather it asks the faculty to define what level of outcome is acceptable in terms of the time and effort expended during the semester. These results provide an additional index of faculty expectations despite the fact that some individuals had difficulty in following the directions and either attempted to predict student ratings or to outline optimal outcomes.

Table 1. Samples on Course Forms

Student Form	110	209	210	211	212	135
Pre-	--	--	--	62	25	22
Mid-	--	--	--	38	25	17
Post-	21	?	?	69	23	5
	14	18	17	15	8	--
Number receiving Grades	68	76	148	77	26	17

Grading Data. All six courses generated a summary letter grade for students but the procedures for obtaining that grade varied greatly. For the first three courses this information was of little use to the evaluators, but for Peasants and Ethnicity, examination performance was the main measure of academic performance. In these two courses particular attention was paid to the design and grading of the examinations so as to increase the reliability and validity of these indices.

Faculty Interviews. Interviews with the faculty were intended to serve two purposes: 1) to make possible the comparison of faculty impressions of the courses with student views and the perceptions of the evaluation team; 2) to determine the impact of team-teaching on the faculty. These interviews were conducted after each of the last three courses. In addition, all the available faculty associated with the earlier CIS courses or connected with the genesis of the Undergraduate Program were interviewed.

The list of "possible" topics to be covered in the interviews in Appendix A, 6, shows how the Context-Input-Process-Product model was adapted to serve the evaluation. In some cases the interviews were taped.

Table 2 shows the number of faculty interviewed as well as the total number who taught in each course.

Table 2. Faculty Interviews

	110	209	210	211	212	135
Total	4	5	5	5	5	3
Number Interviewed	1	4	4	5	5	0

During the interview process it became clear that this procedure had a number of limitations. While it was quite effective in soliciting descriptions of the conventional instructional techniques and attitudes toward these, when the interviewer tried to get information on the interdisciplinary, team-teaching and content related impacts of the course, difficulty arose. Some of those interviewed were defensive and reluctant to talk about such things as interpersonal relationships among the faculty. Perhaps also faculty are not used to thinking in terms of

how a course may affect not only students but themselves and thus they were poor informants about how their teaching styles might have changed as a result of their experiences in a CIS course or how they had incorporated new, interdisciplinary learning into their professional work. These effects may take some time to come about but the interviews with the faculty from Peasants and Ethnicity took place soon after the courses ended.

Follow-up Questionnaire. The specific items for the Follow-up Questionnaire were chosen by the evaluation team. Some were drawn directly from the Cornell Inventory for Student Appraisal of Teaching and Courses. On both forms the definitions of the end points are identical but the questionnaires were assigned a seven point scale rather than a five point one. There are some methodological advantages to a seven point scale, particularly when analysis of variance procedures are contemplated.

The majority of items were designed to reflect specific aspects the courses, such as how (in the student's view) certain activities were integrated in the course, how course content was organized, what disciplines were stressed, whether the course resembled other courses at Cornell, and whether it had succeeded in aiding the student to learn about the "problem". Efforts to frame items dealing with team teaching and interdisciplinary synthesis were unsuccessful, so these areas were tapped by using open-ended questions.

At the end of the Follow-up Questionnaire, a section was added to give students an opportunity to suggest how content organization, lectures, discussion sections, readings and grading aspects of the course might be redesigned if the same course were offered again.

The questionnaire underwent a number of revisions and reflects the combined efforts of the three members of the evaluation team. The final version is reproduced in Appendix A, 2, showing the item means for each course.

Students who had taken a course in interviewing were hired to contact ten CIS students each and personally give them the follow-up questionnaire and go over it with them. The purpose of the student interviewers was not only to obtain interview data but also to assure that the forms would be completed. There were two major problems with this system. First, the length of time between the time when students had finished the courses and the time when they filled out the forms. For students in Integration, this was a matter of two years; for those in Peasants and Ethnicity it was only one semester. Second, the sample does not represent the total population of the courses. Students who had left Cornell or could not be located did not fill out the form.

There are two distinct groups of students in the sample -- those who took only one CIS course and those who enrolled in more than one. The latter group was considered especially valuable since they had a different basis for assessing CIS courses. All the repeaters who could be located filled out separate Follow-up Questionnaires for each course they had taken. Then the proportion of repeaters in the original

population was computed and a commensurate number of repeater questionnaires for each course was randomly selected and merged with the questionnaires of non-repeaters. No repeater contributed more than one form to the combined sample which was used to generate item means on the Follow-up Questionnaire and for the course-by-group means (repeater/non-repeater) analysis of variance of clusters of items on the Follow-up form.

No claim is made that the ratings of the combined sample are an exact reflection of the ratings of the original course population. Table 3 shows some of the similarities and differences. The sample is equivalent, in terms of final grades, but represents a smaller proportion of Arts and Sciences students and a larger ratio of females.

Table 3. Comparison between the Original Course Population and the Follow-up Sample

	110	209	210	211	212	135
			Grade Averages			
Original Population	10.0	9.6	8.8	8.9	9.6	-
Proportional Sample	9.2	9.5	9.2	9.1	9.3	-
			Percentage Arts & Sciences Students			
Original Population	65	54	56	71	54	-
Proportional Sample	75	43	45	64	62	-
			Size			
Original Population	68	76	148	77	26	-
Proportional Sample	12	21	19	13	8	-

Summary. The choice of data collection methods was influenced by constraints and opportunities existing at the beginning of the evaluation and they continued to be flexible, depending on the peculiarities of each course. Time pressures, the necessity for a descriptive evaluation, the absence of precise, predetermined goals, and the complexity and fluidity of this particular evaluation situation all suggested that data collection procedures should obtain contrasting or complementary pictures of the CIS Undergraduate Program. Under these conditions, no single source of data could withstand a challenge to its exactness but common features appearing in different types of data suggest the crucial, most-likely-to-be-valid information.

It is impossible to estimate how precisely the reality of the CIS Undergraduate Program is reflected in the data, but the frequency with which different viewpoints coincided is impressive. The students, faculty, and evaluator often saw events in the same way and when one set of viewpoints differed from the others, the difference was frequently explainable in terms of a particular viewer's needs. For example, the views of the students and the principal investigator con-

flicts during lecture sessions diverged markedly from the faculty opinion on that subject.

Thus the data reveal six courses and their components, viewed from a variety of perspectives. Included are observations of a trained evaluator and video-taped records, student ratings of the courses, reports of faculty interviews, and the public and private documents generated by each course and by the program. Grouped together, these disparate voices were heard and interpreted in such a way as to bring forth meaningful generalizations and suggestions for future courses.

Analysis and Interpretation. After the evaluation design was changed to include all six courses, the volume and complexity of the data became awesome. The situation was further complicated by the fact that the members of the evaluation team brought very different perspectives to the work. Eventually a systematic procedure was developed whereby data analysis and interpretation were separated. Analysis, the grouping and preliminary identification of results in each course were the task of the principal investigator. The two other members of the team then examined the materials to formulate generalizations. These formulae were then tested against the original data and corroborated by additional data elements inferred (by way of the generalizations) to be related.

Psychometric problems with data sources and limited sample size severely limited the potential utility of statistical analytic tools. It was decided to treat the different sources of data as differing pictures of the same set of events. Thus the primary analytic procedure was to group all data about one aspect of a given course and then summarize the major patterns appearing in this subset of data.

For each course, all the data were combined into a set of course aspect files, each of which became the basis for a brief report linking context, input, process, and product data into a set of patterns which appeared across different types of data. For example, the rating of an aspect would be linked to the apparent faculty goal for that aspect to earlier ratings, and to the in-class observations of how that course component was implemented and finally to the follow-up ratings. These aspect reports were then combined in a summary report on each of the six courses.

Meanwhile, two members of the evaluation team were developing a general model for the design and operation of interdisciplinary, problem-oriented, team-taught courses in International Studies, based upon their knowledge of instructional techniques and on the analysis of the CIS Undergraduate Program's history and goals. The intent was to build a combined inductive/deductive pyramid: while Stephen Brock and David Macklin were elaborating sets of basic principles into a structure, Whiton Paine was assembling and analyzing raw data accruing from the CIS courses. When both tasks were completed, the two parts of the pyramid were joined -- the data reanalyzed in terms of the model, the model modified in terms of the data. In this way, the different analytic and synthetic skills of the members of the evaluation team were put to use.

Background

Part I. A History of the CIS Undergraduate Interdisciplinary Program

The CIS Undergraduate Program was very much a creature of its environment -- that many-layered context in which all levels are not equally salient; nevertheless, each level has played a role in the formation and evolution of the program. There are three major environmental spheres: 1) the Center for International Studies; 2) Cornell University; 3) the world outside Cornell. Each of these spheres includes a number of layers or levels. A host of interactions exist between the component elements of these spheres, creating a maze of linkages and interactions. A brief listing of these levels and their lines of interaction will highlight the complexity of the Undergraduate Program's context:

1) the structure of internal CIS relations: between the Center's administration, committees, and programs, and the area programs.

2) relations and interactions between CIS as a total organization and other components of Cornell's institutional structure. Within this category are the subcategories:

a) interactions between CIS's administration and the University-wide administration;

b) interactions between the CIS administration and the departments in all colleges and divisions at Cornell;

c) interactions between individual CIS elements and component elements in Cornell's institutional structure. For example, between a CIS program and the University-wide administration; between a CIS program and a department;

d) relations with individual faculty and students within the institutional structure of the University; interactions between departments and University-wide administration.

3) how CIS relates to a changing national and international sphere. For example, interactions between CIS and foundations, the state government, the federal government, other centers or institutes of international studies, and private individuals.

4) interactions between the CIS administration, Cornell's administration, and fund-granting institutions like the Ford Foundation.

It is in this highly complex context of spheres and levels of interacting environments that the CIS Undergraduate Program was developed and situated. It shall fall to the remainder of this history to illustrate the fundamental methodological assumption which has thus far informed this program: this context has shaped the inputs -- the basic assumptions, goals, and objectives -- of the Undergraduate Program. That is, the goals grew out of the context; and changing inputs can only be comprehended within the framework of an understanding of a changing context.

Some External Factors

The Center for International Studies (CIS) was created by Faculty Council resolution in May 1961 primarily in response to two concerns: a strong faculty interest in promoting and better coordinating international studies at Cornell[1], and a realization on the part of these individuals that in order to take advantage of the growing interest by foundations in furthering the growth of international studies at American universities, Cornell would have to establish a strong administrative apparatus to assure these fund-granting institutions of the University's ability to use financial support effectively and efficiently[2].

The above concerns developed, in large measure, in response to a particular national milieu -- an environment to which Cornell faculty and administrators, and foundation people, were responding in common. It was an environment in which the United States -- in a variety of sectors including the federal government, institutions of higher learning, private foundations, and private enterprise -- was turning in the early sixties, with greater interest and deepened understanding toward the world beyond U.S. borders.[3]

In its early years, 1961-64, CIS initially functioned as a conduit for available external resources into international studies activities at Cornell. Its function during this period remained largely one of a holding company for funds allocated to existing, well-developed area programs[4] such as the Southeast Asia Program. These programs had been created in the late fifties and early sixties in response to specific government interests regarding various regions of the world and had attracted substantial external funding. In the middle sixties, however, the Center for International Studies began to develop an academic program of its own through a limited set of graduate course offerings and faculty seminars, and a program of visiting professorships. Serious interest in, and decisive steps toward, establishing an undergraduate program of course offerings in international studies as a necessary and proper part of the effort did not occur until the late sixties.

After World War II, a consequence of the changing perceptions of the United States' role in the world[5] was the generation of a

strong interest in developing international studies at American institutions of higher education. International studies thus assumed a new place in the curricula of American colleges and universities; but it remained, until the late sixties, almost exclusively restricted to the faculty and graduate levels. As a response to their gradually changing perceptions of what the well-educated undergraduate would need to know to both understand and deal intelligently with the world he lived in, both university educators and foundations supporting international studies programs began to feel the need for strengthening undergraduate education as well. International studies thus came to be viewed as an integral component of an undergraduate curriculum by both the Carnegie and Ford Foundations[6]. These factors were among the primary stimulants for the view at Cornell that the development of a strong program in international studies was desirable and necessary. The development of such a program occurred in the early sixties.

In its 1965-67 negotiations for renewal of Ford Foundation general support for international studies at Cornell, Ford stressed its interest in the development of comparative, problem-oriented programs in international studies as well as its desire to see courses in this area incorporated into the undergraduate curriculum of American universities[7]. Cornell responded to these stimuli in its 1968 proposal to Ford for a second five-year grant with a commitment to embark on innovative directions in both research and teaching in international studies including the establishment of a program of undergraduate courses.

But motivation for the development of undergraduate courses in international studies was not derived solely, nor primarily, from concern for the acquisition of funding support. At CIS and throughout Cornell there existed a genuine commitment to the belief that international studies was an integral and important component of a well-rounded liberal arts undergraduate education.

The preceding analysis helps to account for the way in which CIS came to view the establishment of an undergraduate program in international studies as a <u>necessary</u> role for the Center to play. As memoranda from CIS faculty in the period 1965-1969 indicate, this action was also viewed as a <u>proper</u> role for the Center to exercise[8]. At Cornell, prior to the late '60s, Centers had been enjoined from offering courses. This activity was strictly within the province of departmental prerogatives. A basic change in the possibilities of center sponsorship of courses occurred, and -- as shown above -- CIS was interested in capitalizing on the opportunity. However, this view was not accepted by certain components of Cornell in the late sixties*. There were those at Cornell who questioned the general

* Reference is made here to those representing the departmental, discipline orientation, as well as those with vested interests in already existing international studies programs, e.g. the area studies people.

right of a center to offer undergraduate courses, and even questioned the legitimacy of centers to exist at all. These sentiments continue to be expressed at the present time.9

Background of the Program within the Center. The original Undergraduate Program was conceived by the CIS Undergraduate Program Planning Committee as an experimental four-semester sequence of interdisciplinary, problem-focused courses in international studies which would serve as an integrated, interdisciplinary introduction to both topical issues in international studies and to the specific social sciences as well[10]. In order to understand why the initial conception and structure of the program took this particular form, it is necessary to dwell for a moment upon the circumstances surrounding its creation.

The Ashford Evaluation of CIS. In July 1968, the Executive Committee of CIS authorized the creation of a committee to evaluate CIS' activities and make recommendations for the Center's future. This decision was undertaken with the realization that CIS itself was now in a transitional phase. In its first seven years of existence, CIS had become established as both an administrator for and coordinator of international studies activities at Cornell. The termination of the 1968 five-year grant from Ford would mean the end of unrestricted support for the Center. Hence, a clear delineation of directions for future development was required.

A number of recommendations grew out of the Ashford Evaluation, as it came to be called (after Douglas Ashford, then Director of CIS). One of the report's recommendations was the creation of an undergraduate interdisciplinary program in international studies.

In the fall of 1969, Professor Milton Esman, Ashford's successor as Director, came to CIS after having carefully reviewed the Ashford Evaluation. In strong agreement with the substance of this report[11], he also believed CIS should develop a more substantive academic role and could do so through the creation of comparative, multidisciplinary programs and course offerings.[12] He initiated developments in these directions with the creation of problem-focused, multi- and inter-disciplinary research programs and faculty (e.g. Peace Studies, Rural Development), and with the establishment of a committee in September 1969 to plan an undergraduate program.[13]

In 1968, then, CIS sought to emerge on the Cornell campus as a research, teaching, and training facility in international studies which would have significant intellectual resources of its own. This goal was met in part in 1968 when the CIS Executive Committee approved a new set of guidelines for the Center. Included in these guidelines under "academic functions", was the right of the Center "to make joint appointments with academic departments and... offer courses of instruction jointly with them". In addition, the Executive Committee recommended that CIS "offer courses under its direct sponsorship for whatever portion of a jointly appointed faculty member's time may be

acceptable to the department chairman and the Center. Such courses will be approved by the Center and the appropriate school or college."[14] Through these new roles, CIS sought to meet faculty, graduate, and undergraduate needs and interests which were not fulfilled by the existing disciplinary-focused departments.

The Role of the Departments. In the initial planning stages of the Program, CIS' Planning Committee sought to involve department chairmen[15]. Throughout this period, CIS staff met regularly with the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (this college in particular because the majority of anticipated joint appointments would be between CIS and Arts departments) and his representative in an effort to keep the Dean abreast of the Program's development as well as to coordinate with his office's efforts in securing departmental approval for the undergraduate teaching venture. At Cornell, undergraduate teaching traditionally has been the sole province of the departments.

An August 1970 letter written by a member of the Planning Committee who had worked vigorously to create a dialogue between this Committee and departmental chairmen points to a fundamental skepticism on the part of the departments toward the program and their vacillation when it came to supporting steps that would get it under way[16]. Departments were unwilling to have their exclusive prerogatives infringed upon; the very concept of a "discipline" and the sanctity of education along disciplinary lines was at stake. The letter concludes that after many long months of meetings with department chairmen or departmental representatives, "we were back where we had started. The problem: how to create a more flexible structure within the university for experimenting with educational innovations" -- specifically, courses with interdisciplinary content, which are not departmentally based.

In addition to departmental opposition to the Program on intellectual grounds -- the feeling that these courses would lack a firm disciplinary base and therefore not be academically rigorous (a major issue in the debate over disciplinary versus interdisciplinary education) -- departmental apprehension over, and hostility toward, this educational innovation was fueled by funding considerations. From the late sixties on, institutions of higher education were plagued by the erosion of funding. It is in the context of this funding crisis that CIS' Undergraduate Program must be understood. Departments felt threatened financially by CIS' venturing into the course-offering business. This made for increased competition for students; and, as departments viewed it, the more students the Center attracted to its courses, the smaller would be the funds that would be allotted to the departmental budgets.[17]

The tailoring of a system of academic rewards along departmental lines -- for example, the system of tenure, centered as it is/was around affiliation with a disciplinary-organized department -- has also made it difficult for interdisciplinary courses to be staffed.

Faculty are rewarded when they produce in their capacities as disciplinarians: research and teaching as economists, historians, or anthropologists[18].

Faculty and Student Inputs. This discussion of the circumstances that led to the development of CIS Undergraduate Program would not be complete without mentioning one additional, yet crucial factor: the presence of a group of faculty and graduate students who had definite ideas about innovative directions in which undergraduate education should move to ignite student interest in international studies in particular and learning in general. This group of very highly motivated young professors and advanced graduate students was active in planning the Undergraduate Program, and they were largely responsible for the program's initial conception and structure.

In large measure, this group viewed the creation of the program in international studies as an experiment in a new form of undergraduate education -- one where a student's genuine interest in a "topic" would motivate learning; and one where an interdisciplinary, problem-focused method of inquiry would introduce the undergraduate to the social sciences. A few excerpts from the program's early proposals will serve to illustrate the thinking of the Planning Committee:

> "...one of the assumptions upon which this proposal is based is that there is a direct relationship between a student's underlying interest in an issue or idea and the amount of value he derives from a course"[19]

The proposal then goes on to discuss how each traditional discipline constructs a rigid conceptual framework to define problems and creates a particular methodology to apply in solving these problems. The student becomes "confused" by being exposed to a large number of introductory courses with different methodologies in the various disciplines. But a program which "captures and sustains" a student's interest, the proposal continues

> "... in a topic both challenging and relevant while at the same time offering the student a realistic and working knowledge of the ways in which various disciplines should or could approach the topic, offers numerous advantages both to students and faculty"[20]

A final drafting of the program proposal further reveals the fundamental commitment of the Planning Committee itself to interdisciplinarity:

> "...By approaching these topics simultaneously through several disciplines, students could achieve a genuine appreciation for the optimal way of attacking various issues and a feeling for the limitations of each approach".

Design and Evolution of the Undergraduate Program

As originally conceived, the Undergraduate Program was a four semester integrated curriculum for freshmen and a few sophomores. Each course would have an interdisciplinary and disciplinary component (a seminar) and the students would experience both the interdisciplinary aspect and a different disciplinary emphasis each semester. It was hoped that the curriculum would be both the equivalent of four standard introductory offerings in different social science disciplines and an introduction to how these disciplines were interrelated in the consideration of four different problems in international studies.

One of the underlying assumptions guiding this four-semester design was the belief that the existing departmentalized, discipline-oriented mode of undergraduate education was not fully adequate.[21] In being introduced to the social sciences through a program of courses which coordinated the disciplines, the student, it was hoped, would

> "...become familiar with the concepts and methodologies of a number of disciplines, and acquire a broad perspective on their roles and interactions in approaching a variety of problems, before he has to devote most of his time to a single major area of concentration... it is hoped that the Program will help students avoid the preconceived notions and disciplinary blinders so often seen in the present system."[22]

The orientation of the Undergraduate Program toward underclassmen was a highly conscious one; it was a necessary correlate to the goal of giving students an interdisciplinary experience before they were trained to see knowledge and techniques of intellectual inquiry as compartmentalized into discrete disciplines.[23]

A second fundamental assumption underpinning the Undergraduate Program was the conviction that an understanding of international problems was a necessary component of a successful education in today's world.[24] Coupled with this belief was a firmly held conviction that the way to an understanding and solution of international problems was through an interdisciplinary approach, given"the fact that social, political, economic, and cultural components of real-world problems are highly interrelated and must be combined in analysis..."[25] A key goal of the program was to inculcate a sense of "the disciplines' dependence on each other in the face of complex issues or problems."[26] In each of the program's four semesters, the larger, once-weekly interdisciplinary session of the courses would enable "disciplinary integration"[27].

Before leaving this brief history of the context of the CIS Undergraduate Program, it is important to summarize the most important design decisions that were made by the committee that established this innovation. First, the courses were to be taught by teams of faculty

whose primary allegiances were to specific disciplines. Secondly, each course was to concentrate on an introduction to a specific problem in International Studies. Third, there was to be separate disciplinary and interdisciplinary components. Fourth, implicit in these three decisions was another -- that the normal teaching technologies of introductory courses in the social sciences would be stressed in the CIS offerings. This included lectures, reading lists, discussion sections, and exams, and excluded the development of such innovations as modules, games and simulations, or computer assisted instruction. One basic intent of the Undergraduate Program was to test the limitations of conventional introductory course teaching techniques in an unconventional, team-taught, problem-oriented, interdisciplinary teaching environment.

Part II. Goals of the Undergraduate Program

The basic goals of the Undergraduate Program changed over time as the program itself evolved in response to external factors and student reactions to the initial course. The section of this report on Methodology describes the impact of the modified goals on the evaluation conducted by the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education. By extracting goal statements from various CIS documents and from interviews with CIS principals it is possible to identify some consistencies in program goals and trace major reasons for changes.

On June 8, 1973, the then Director of CIS said[28] "I picked up the recommendations for the creation of an undergraduate program from the Center Evaluation Report [Ashford Report, 1968] The idea for the particular type of undergraduate program that the Center would have was not mine; however, it was my idea that CIS should have such a program, and I pushed it."

It is reasonable to suppose, therefore, that the goals set down by Douglas Ashford in a memo[29] concerning a "proposed undergraduate international relations major" underlay the thinking of the people who gathered at a luncheon[30] on September 10, 1969, "to initiate a planning committee" for the undergraduate program.

In the words of that memo, the undergraduate program "should ... communicate to the student at least a rudimentary understanding of how the behavioral sciences relate to perception and communication across national boundaries. The program should convey in dramatic and clear terms to the undergraduate the full dimensions of the catastrophe that irresponsibility and impulsiveness might cause in the world... communicating to undergraduates the radical transformation to be anticipated in the coming generation... study in depth a major international crisis... conveying the time pressure and the uncertainties of foreign policy decision making... The last major Ford grant to Cornell contained the promise that we would, in the coming four years, make a serious effort to improve undergraduate education in International Studies...."

While these thoughts may have formed the background for those who undertook to initiate the undergraduate courses, specific goals were not clearly defined. It is noted in a memo that "An important topic that was not broached at the luncheon and that probably ought to be brought up at future committee meetings is what the goal of such a program is."[31] At the first meeting of the Planning Committee on October 6, 1969, it was decided that: "The committee ought to develop major ordering concepts and guidelines for establishing boundaries in order to arrive at a discrete working definition of "International Studies".[32]

On January 6, 1970, the Committee organizer wrote in a letter to members of the Planning Committee: "The reaction of those present was favorable to the most recent edition of the proposed program on all points except one. Their objection was that it is unrealistic to expect a student to effectively engage in an interdisciplinary program until he has mastered the rudiments of the disciplines involved."[33] This has been a continuing, but covert, assumption in the program.

In a memo reporting a meeting of the Planning Committee on January 16, 1970, it was stated "One of the essential goals of the program -- creating a social science perspective before a student becomes immersed in a single discipline -- would be compromised were the program to begin later than the freshman year."[34]

A report, "Undergraduate Program in International Studies"[35] dated June 17, 1970, states:

> "The program aims at, first, introducing students to the social sciences in an integrated fashion, and second, introducing them to subjects of present and future importance in international relations. To accomplish this twofold purpose each course will be structured in such a way that the various disciplines can be brought to bear on the factors of, and possible solutions to, a well-defined international problem. By beginning the program in the freshman year, the student can become familiar with the concepts and methodologies of a number of disciplines and acquire a broad perspective on their roles and interactions in approaching a variety of problems before having to select and concentrate on one of them as a major. In the fall semester the participating faculty will conduct their own regular seminar. Its purpose will be twofold: to structure the course and select reading materials for it and to provide an open forum for discussion of succeeding topics...."

In an undated proposal[36] (apparently to the Educational Policy Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences), the expectation is that

> "After two years of interdisciplinary work... they [the students] would bring to course work in their major field an ability to conceptualize the broad areas within their discipline and a familiarity with its methodology that traditionally is not acquired until the senior year. An integral objective would be to introduce the main disciplinary tools (concepts and techniques) and their advantages (and limitations....)"

Additionally, a suggestion was made for a summer workshop and "continuous and systematic coordination... through regular faculty discussion sessions".

Thus, at the beginning of the Undergraduate Program, the Center for International Studies was committed to a number of rather

idealistic and interrelated curricular goals. However, the first course was less successful than expected, both as an interdisciplinary effort and as the basis for a curriculum. The second course generated considerable controversy within CIS and between CIS and external faculty and administrative agencies. This led to the changes summarized an an outline of the Program which accompanied the first application for U.S. Office of Education funding, April 28, 1971.[37] Six separate goals were spelled out:

> 1) to provide a means by which the undergraduate curriculum can become more internationalized;
>
> 2) to provide undergraduates with a better understanding of how knowledge is organized and... can be used more effectively;
>
> 3) to provide... greater awareness of structure and the sheer complexity of a few typical international problem areas;
>
> 4) to provide familiarity with the concepts and methodologies of a number of disciplines;
>
> 5) to help students avoid preconceived notions and disciplinary blinders;
>
> 6) to help professors feel less inhibited in ranging over the various disciplines in attempting to criticize and complement one another.

By July 1, 1971, the concept of the Undergraduate Program in International Studies had evolved so that a member of the faculty wrote the associate director that

> "The primary objective of the program appears to be to demonstrate the interrelated applicability of various social science disciplines to the study of relatively broad basic questions. The international aspect seems to be secondary and to some extent used as a vehicle for capturing student interest".[38]

Assuming that most students would not follow the original program through its entirety, he concludes:

> "This would mean... the courses would not build on one another and would not reflect an increasing depth of approach or understanding. Thus the objective would be shifted somewhat to emphasize the introduction to major international questions with scholarly consideration from as broad a discipline base as possible."

Reporting on the first course (Integration), the Program Coordinator wrote[39]

> "The teachers attempted to fulfill three goals that had been defined during the original planning of the program: a) focusing on a significant international problem; b) providing an interdisciplinary approach to that problem, and c) at the same time, in seminar-type sections, introducing students to particular disciplines. The course was a highly ambitious experiment, and it is doubtful that we managed to do justice to all three goals..."

In October 1971, the Director of the Undergraduate Program wrote that the program goal is "to offer carefully selected series of problem-oriented, interdisciplinary studies to stimulate interest in international studies..." and states further that "Faculty members of different departments [will] construct courses dealing with specific and manageable international problems suitable for interdisciplinary approach". The memorandum ends with the observation "One goal of a program such as this should be to determine significant areas of agreement or differences between the disciplines".40

Basically, CIS discovered that it is difficult or perhaps impossible to establish an integrated, interdisciplinary curriculum in International Studies at Cornell. This goal, along with the possibility of quasi-departmental status and the establishment of International Studies majors, was shelved. At the present time, the main function of the program is to provide undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty with an opportunity to participate in an educational experience that is somewhat different from a conventional, disciplinary course taught by one individual. Thus a CIS course now (if successful), is expected to increase student knowledge of 1) some International Studies problems not systematically covered in the conventional departmental offerings; 2) the ways in which different disciplines approach this problem; 3) the roles of an interdisciplinary approach in the analysis of this problem. Affective goals might include 1) increased student awareness of the complexity and importance of the problems under consideration; 2) increased student interest in these problems and in International Studies. The faculty and graduate teaching assistants will gain in the skills needed for interdisciplinary team-teaching and in assimilating the insights of other disciplines. Together with other CIS programs it is hoped that the courses will prompt an increase in the international content of other course offerings and encourage more cross departmental or interdisciplinary efforts.

While it is clear that the Undergraduate Program has not successfully achieved the initial goals articulated in the early 1970's, this report will illuminate the extent to which it has moved successfully toward fulfillment of newly emerging goals.

CHAPTER III

SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS

In the analysis of the CIS Undergraduate Program, it was useful to differentiate three sets of outcomes. The first involves the special characteristics of the program, i.e., its emphasis on interdisciplinary, problem-oriented, team-taught courses. This is the concern of this chapter. The instructional characteristics related to introductory courses in the social and behavioral sciences, and some programmatic considerations are discussed in Chapters V and VI.

There are no set standards for assessing the value of course activities which can be grouped under the rubrics of "interdisciplinary", "team-teaching", or "problems in International Studies". Each of these areas is too new and too exploratory to have developed standards. Hence, the evaluation team concentrated on describing the meaning of these terms within the context of the CIS Undergraduate Program and delineating a unique reality which cannot readily be compared to other examples that superficially may seem similar.

This strategy was rendered more difficult by the fact that each course was different, not simply a variation on a theme. Each course spoke in a different voice and drew attention to a different range of phenomena. There is no evidence that CIS, as an organization, or the teams of faculty responsible for the different courses, gave great thought to the implications of problem-oriented, interdisciplinary, team-teaching. Their intent was not to predict the limits of this type of innovation but to discover them by testing different topics, types of teams and disciplinary combinations.

The purpose of this chapter is to develop some generalizations about the organizing principles which were tried in various combinations in the different courses. The "data base" for these generalizations is not as strong as that used to define the general instructional characteristics. It draws heavily on the analytic skills of the evaluation team and is to a lesser extent based on data provided by faculty and students, for the reason that neither group had a perspective that extended across all six courses and included awareness of the relevant literature. While both students and faculty made important contributions to the analysis, they were so personally involved in the actual courses that their perceptions were often partial. We caution the reader to consider the generalizations presented here as somewhat idealized, because we probably have molded the aspects which are of interest into a kind of archetypical reality. In actuality, each instance may be vulnerable in its particulars.

What value can such generalizations have, then? Principally, the purpose is to emphasize the probable -- and often explicit --

existence or intended existence of the selected characteristics because they provide categories or dimensions about which decisions can and perhaps must be made. In the future, CIS may wish to offer course guidelines which take these proposed dimensions into account.

Two sets of characteristics will be discussed. The first is highly explicit in the objectives of the CIS courses. This includes 1) problem-orientation, 2) interdisciplinarity, and 3) team-teaching. The second set of dimensions is less explicit and we have labelled them "induced" characteristics.

Explicit Characteristics. While it is possible to be problem-oriented without being interdisciplinary, and probably it is possible to be interdisciplinary without being problem-oriented, the most natural and most productive arenas of problem-orientation in the social sciences today are those which also are interdisciplinary. The problems selected for the CIS courses were intentionally designed to be interdisciplinary, so we have not tried to analyze the interdisciplinary aspect independently from the problem-orientation or team-teaching characteristic of the courses.

Because CIS had a particular concern for the acceptability of their undergraduate effort, they attempted to staff the courses with teams of individuals from different disciplines rather than obtaining the services of people whose training and background were "interdisciplinary". This decision reflects the academic reality at Cornell -- a milieu that emphasizes specialized, disciplinary competence in its faculty. At least initially, the composition of the teams was, by definition, interdisciplinary, but there was continuing strain between the interdisciplinary requirements of certain problems and the disciplinary requirements imposed by faculty. For example, in Ethnicity, all the faculty members were political scientists -- which resulted in an analysis of Ethnicity, Race, and Communalism without the sustained, pertinent viewpoint of a psychologist or sociologist.

Problem-Orientation. Minimally, it is possible to define different types of problems included in the CIS courses. (This is not a question of different substantive or content areas.) We would argue that the "problem" of Domination is clearly distinguishable as a problem-type from the "problem" of Peasants. Peasants had an explicit "analytic framework", whereas Domination had a rationale for selecting and organizing content but did not incorporate anything that might be so elaborately labelled as "an analytic framework".

The distinction concerning problem-type centers on the dual aspects of "the problem":

1) How diverse is the set of viewpoints or analytic considerations which are selected as appropriate to the problem?

2) Given a spectrum of relevant viewpoints/analyses, to what extent are these incorporated into a (relatively) unified, integrated conceptual network? Stated otherwise, how sophisticated is the conceptual scheme that is used to link the viewpoints in the analyses of the problem?

The facet labelled "diversity" refers to the variety of viewpoints brought to bear on the subject of interest ("the problem"). "Viewpoints" does not have a precise definition in this usage but relates to orientations that are thought of as essentials or basic positions in a discipline. For instance, in psychology -- quite aside from the areas of application -- a brief list of "basic orientations" would include depth-analytic, behavioral, perception-and-cognition, and biological. Each of these contains its basic observations or experiments, conflicting interpretations, bodies of supporting work, etc. Nonetheless, each is regarded as "psychological", rather than, say, economic or chemical. Further, no one of these orientations is deemed sufficient -- in current explanatory power -- to supplant the others.

Diversity among disciplines, is an extension of the notion of diversity of viewpoints within a discipline. In the following discussions, a "discipline" will be used as a shorthand way of referring to a set of viewpoints. Presumably the viewpoints within a discipline are more coherent (conceptually related or relatable) among themselves than a set taken from two or more different disciplines would be. It can also be assumed that, on the average, there is a greater degree of diversity between certain disciplines than between others. For instance, there is more diversity between psychology and political science, on the whole, than there is between sociology and anthropology, or between economics and political science.

The second aspect of the conceptualization about "the problem" is the degree of unity established in the course among the viewpoints that are brought to bear on the course problem. Unity or high coherence is thought of in terms of an integrated conceptual framework. A high degree of unity means there is a network of concepts and relationships which relate to the phenomenon of interest, "the problem", across disciplines.

Again the question arises as to how "high" diversity can be combined with "high" conceptual unity? The easier approach would be selection of compatible viewpoints to be included in a given course. The more difficult answer would be creative -- moving from apparent or conventional conceptual incompatibility toward an integrated, synthetic framework. There are various possibilities:

1) the notion of "levels" used either to refer to levels of abstraction or to the levels at which phenomena are analyzed (e.g., individual or societal);

2) through an "enrichment" of one or more conceptual frameworks such that what ordinarily are thought of as diverse/disparate viewpoints are embryonically related to an available (more) unitary conceptual framework;

3) through "adding together" abstracted qualities from diverse viewpoints which are at approximately the same level of abstraction or analysis, e.g., where some sociological variables influence some economic ones, and vice versa.

In the following discussions, since such "viewpoints" cannot be adequately operationalized, the shorthand of disciplines will be used and the conventional notion of average degree of diversity among disciplines (within the social/behavioral sciences) is assumed.

"Unity of conceptual framework" also cannot be adequately operationalized but instances in the CIS courses that exhibit more or less of this aspect can be shown by referring to the prevailing historical relationships among the disciplines involved. Lack of such history implies scant degrees of "unity", whereas well established historical interconnections implies much more "unity". This history relates to time depth, amount of [joint] effort at developing/testing/revising/interconnections, consideration of the range of phenomena upon which the disciplines are mutually brought to bear, etc.

The terminology used for the overall distinction, then is: problem <u>topic</u> for the problem which exists as a "natural" or "organic" entity -- greater conceptual or practical unity but diversity unspecified; problem <u>theme</u> for the problem which is constructed or synthesized which identifies a salient aspect in a variety of different settings, etc. -- less conceptual unity and usually greater diversity of disciplines. A continuum might be hypothesized to exist between "natural" and "synthetic" problems. Given such a proposition, where do the various CIS courses stand along this continuum?

In Domination, the degree of previous attention paid to these problems (as would be represented in scholarly writings, primarily), by the disciplines represented through the faculties involved, was fairly small and there is little cross disciplinary work available. (Appendix A,1, especially faculty specialties.) The phenomenon of

domination was viewed, in the course, at various social levels, from individual (i.e., as member in a two-power relationship, e.g., family), to the international level (i.e., nation states). To state the low extremes regarding this "problem" and the represented disciplines: there is relatively little background for psychological understanding of relationships among nation states; correspondingly, there is relatively little background of political science understanding for the family. There is justifiable reason for saying that the problem of Domination-Subordination was a synthetic one, which, in many respects, lacked unity.

The sixth course, the Concept of Europe, also represented a "theme" course. Like Domination, it attempted to use the insights of different disciplines to understand a universal process or concept. It focused on the evolution (intellectual and empirical) of the concept of "an Europe". Integration and Decentralization, on the other hand, was more of a "topic" course which attempted to investigate what balance had been struck, in each of a number of cases, between political/cultural/control-of-life ("Integration"), and differentiation or individuation ("Decentralization").

It should be evident that the disciplines relevant to these problems, i.e., what disciplines have a history of cooperative attention to such problems, include political science, history, and sociology, but an integrated theory which relates each of these to the other does not exist. On the other hand, the likelihood that any social science discipline would have something to contribute to the analysis of these problems is obvious.

In contrast to Domination and Europe, which drew on only two or three disciplines, Peasants, Power, and Productivity called on anthropology, political science, economics (or political economics), and agricultural technology, to delineate the problems of rural development. Alternative elements immediately spring to mind, such as sociology, psychology, communications, etc., which might also be involved. This points to the fact that there is great intellectual (and empirical) conjoined attention and analysis that have been directed to the problem of agricultural development in Third World countries. Even if one focuses on problems (plural) of rural development, one does not arrive at a meta-problem that would be labelled "synthetic". Rather one would see a number of genuinely/empirically interlocking problems.

A different way of pointing out the distinction is: whereas any discipline can be thought of as having made or being capable of making a contribution to the analysis or understanding of the problem of Domination-Subordination (even though some may be more "natural" than others), the number of disciplines that would be expected to make significant contribution to the understanding and analysis of rural development is much more determined by the actual history of which disciplines have in fact contributed.

A similar but weaker argument can be made concerning the problems treated in Peace and War, and Ethnicity, Race and Communalism. Considerable practical attention has been paid to these topics but the avail-

able literature is uneven in quality, and unlike the team approach common to rural development efforts, does not offer any adaptive conceptual models for teaching purposes. These courses thus were hybrids containing both thematic and topical aspects.

Despite the fact that all the experts who taught Ethnicity, Race, and Communalism were all political scientists, the potential contributory disciplines to this arena are many, e.g., political science, sociology, psychology, biology (genetics), anthropology, history, literature. The label given the course reveals the synthetic nature of the problem by the use of a three-word rubric. By the terminology proposed earlier, Centralization, Europe, and Ethnicity are all more "theme-" like than "topic-" like, but Ethnicity less so than the other two. As with Domination (the exemplar of "theme" course in the CIS Undergraduate Program), there was no body of extensively developed, interrelated, detailed knowledge that currently could be brought to bear but only scattered, largely disciplinarily confined pieces of knowledge to point toward ways of developing solutions to the problems under study.

Several considerations relate to the distinction developed between topic and theme, as these bear on possible introductory, interdisciplinary courses. First, there is the interest-value or attractiveness of a course to freshmen and sophomores who would consider taking it. Such students usually do not have clearly defined, disciplinary interests, and the potential breadth of a course is, we propose, a significant factor in their deciding to enroll or not. This breadth is generally greater when the "problem" of the course is a thematic or synthesized one. Indeed, a topical course, as exemplified by Peasants, for instance, can be conceived of as quasi-disciplinary, in that it embodies its own theoretical coherence.

But a tension is created, between the desirability of treating a problem that penetrates many intellectual domains and yet maintaining a relatively integrated, coherent analysis. It is our presumption that Cornell underclassmen are not satisfied with a variety of unrelated treatments. We know, also, that the stronger the theoretical underpinnings a discipline has, the greater the prestige it carries with other faculty.

Substantial numbers of students may enroll in either a thematic or a topical interdisciplinary course, but the tendency exists for the latter to be oriented to upperclassmen, with even some graduate students being enticed. This is due, in large part, to the relatively great disciplinary bases drawn upon, and integrated to a large extent. In a word, it is a course for specialists which -- in the academic world -- is regarded interdisciplinary. As such, it is not appropriate as an introductory course.

The dilemma this analysis leaves, then, is how to strike the appropriate balance between thematicness and degree of integration of

the course content. In Chapter V are developed some alternatives among the various possibilities which exist; these, in turn, are tied to different student clienteles.

Interdisciplinary courses have the advantage of being less likely to infringe upon the areas normally covered in departmental curricula. This difference, however, leaves them open to the charge that they are not academically sound. In fact, this charge was brought against Domination, with the result that an academic controversy arose involving several units of the University (see Chapter II, and Appendix B, 2).

Topic courses can usually draw upon fairly well developed interdisciplinary literature but the teaching of theme courses in particularly difficult because there is little available literature which is applicable. Nevertheless, theme courses like Domination could be more exciting to students and faculty simply because they require the breaking of new ground and the exercise of professional and intellectual skills in new ways. It does not seem surprising that Domination had the greatest impact on the faculty of any of the CIS courses.

On the other hand, a topic course like Peasants may draw a variety of students because it touches on the practical concerns of different majors such as agriculture, anthropology, and political science. Ethnicity, a more "theme-" like course, was successful in attracting students partly because some of those interested in the subject matter had strong preconceptions about the approach that should be taken. Peace and War had the highest enrollment (148) of all the CIS courses even though it was more a topic course than a theme course. Perhaps a theme-topic amalgum has some utility since it can deal with general themes of personal interest to students at a given time.

Recommendations. Courses that interest the faculty may not be interesting to the students. This suggests that CIS should concentrate on problems (be they themes or topics) which are of immediate interest to both students and faculty. Peace and War was an important topic while the Viet Nam war continued; at present it is probably less stimulating. CIS is in a unique position to hone in on problems which will increase student awareness of contemporary events which are only dimly perceived. The impact of the energy crisis, of inflation, or of changing climatic patterns are highly appropriate themes/topics for interdisciplinary analysis in CIS courses.

It is also recommended that, with both theme and/or topic courses, CIS reconsider its prohibition on the use of American materials. Pedagogically it makes good sense to link the course content with the society most familiar to the students. With few exceptions, America is directly involved in most areas of concern for International Studies and is frequently the major or most influential actor.

General recommendations are difficult to make because of the singular nature of each course. Peasants and Ethnicity were conscious attempts to deal with conceptual tools and case studies in separate sections of the semester. It did not seem to matter which came first; students had difficulty in transferring conceptual knowledge to the analysis of cases or the knowledge of cases to the study of concepts. This suggests that the two aspects of the course should be intertwined -- a policy that proved successful in a revision of Peasants recently offered.

Students, however, recommend that each course begin with some sort of conceptual or analytic framework to guide them through the mass of material that tends to accumulate in this kind of course. In Peasants it became clear that a theoretical presentation must be closely tied to "real" referents -- to events in the world familiar to students, to student concerns and past knowledge, or to similar information presented concurrently with the analytic framework. If this is not done, the students tend to loose interest and, at the beginning of a course, this may affect enrollment. The evaluators feel that, with the above caveats, courses should begin by presenting some kind of simple analytic framework.

Regarding levels of analysis, the evaluation recommendation is also necessarily complex. Students seem to respond best to lower levels -- on the plane of the individual in the village, for example. Faculty, however, (particularly economists, sociologists, and political scientists), are most at ease when dealing with national institutions, policies and governments. This may be an enduring and insoluble conflict unless the peculiar nature of introductory courses is taken into account. In these courses there is no requirement that all phenomena be investigated in depth. Perhaps it would be more useful to begin at the individual level and trace the ramifications of a limited set of themes or topics across all levels, ending with the International one. To maintain validity, the CIS courses must deal in some way with the international aspects of the problems addressed, although this aspect has been somewhat neglected in some of the offerings. Dealing with the international implications of any problem, however, is virtually impossible if American materials are prohibited, but the impacts of American actions and policies on international situations is of real interest to students.

Given a CIS commitment to introductory courses, the evaluation team recommends that CIS courses attempt to include the full range of individual, local, regional, institutional, national, and international levels in their courses. There appears to be some advantage to following roughly this sequence and the faculty in each course should attempt to develop an analytic framework which can be used at each level and in the discussion of each case study.

The final issue concerns analysis and prescription. For a number of reasons, prescription should not be stressed in CIS courses. Suggesting policy in the areas of International Studies is a particularly complex undertaking. It is unlikely that students in a one-semester, introductory course would master the requisite skills for the task. In fact, it is so complex that most of the faculty would hesitate to be

prescriptive and thus they cannot provide appropriate models for the students. Finally, the students themselves have indicated reservations about prescription and have tended to perform inadequately on final examinations when asked to attempt this type of assignment. Some additional recommendations in this area are presented in Chapter V as part of the discussion on grading systems.

Summary. To return to the basic question: what is a "Problem-oriented, Interdisciplinary, Team-taught Course in International Studies" at Cornell? Operationally, it is a group of faculty from different disciplines who collaborate in teaching a topic or theme of common interest or concern in the area of International Studies. These courses are interdisciplinary not in a synthetic sense but because they use teams of faculty from different disciplines. Over the period of time that the program was in operation, interdisciplinarity has decreased and the courses have become more conventional.

The courses are "team-taught" because groups of faculty were involved in the design and implementation of each course. The teams were ad hoc groupings of faculty who came together to offer one course and then go their separate ways. On-going, stable teams have not been created in the program.

They are in the area of International Studies to the extent that the content (with the exception of Domination) stresses situations and conditions in countries outside the United States. By the end of the program there was a sort of prohibition on using American materials in the lectures, although American analogies could be discussed in the section meetings.

In terms of content organization, each course was unique and a range of different structures was tried, involving different levels of analysis, conceptual tools, case studies, and -- even beyond analysis -- prescription.

What was missing from the special characteristics of the Undergraduate Program was a sense of planned coherence and continuity. It appears that CIS, like other programs, assumed that bringing together faculty from different disciplines but with a common interest, would automatically insure an effective, interdisciplinary, team-taught course. This policy does lead to a certain content selection, but it seriously underestimates the special requirements of this type of innovative teaching.

In particular, the interpersonal and intellectual differences were seriously misjudged. Faculty trained in graduate programs which stress the individual search for excellence and the critical attitude and members of departments which are dominated by lone professors teaching advanced courses, do not acquire the skills needed for interdisciplinary team-teaching.

Ideally, a team-taught, interdisciplinary course would involve a cohesive, committed team of individuals who have respect for one another and are at ease crossing disciplinary boundaries and working together. Potentially, they would be able to create a synthetic and interdisciplinary approach to problems in International Studies. No CIS course has approximated this idea and, in the future, some consideration might be given to substituting a more realizable objective for this possibly unattainable goal.

CHAPTER IV

GENERAL INTRODUCTORY COURSE INSTRUCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

In many ways the CIS courses resembled standard introductory courses in the social sciences, with lecture and discussion sections, reading assignments and grading procedures. Apart from the interdisciplinary, problem-oriented, team-teaching aspects, these teaching technologies can be evaluated against recognized standards since there is extensive literature on the teaching of introductory courses.

Readings. In all CIS courses, readings were used in much the same way as in standard undergraduate courses where there is no main textbook. The effectiveness of the readings can be judged from the students' ratings on the questionnaires when they were asked to name "the best" and "the worst" assignments and explain. Table 4 (following) shows the books selected by the students.

The disliked readings were those which the students considered too technical, pedantic, or historical. It appears that if the amount of reading assigned in a particular book was large, the students assumed that meant it was important, but, from their understanding of the course, they could not see that these readings were anything more than "general background". This ambiguity affected the students' opinion as to the degree of integration between the readings and the course as a whole.

Technical or historical works may be well accepted if they are used in their proper place. One of the most successful lectures in Europe was an analysis of the methodology, findings, and implications for European integration found in Ronald Inglehart's "The Silent Revolution in Europe: intergenerational change in post-industrial societies". Another example of the successful use of an assigned reading was in Peasants. Here Epstein's economic and political analysis of two Indian villages (Economic Development and Social Change in South India) served to tie together the elements of the first half of the course by showing the applicability of the course's model of rural development in a comparative analysis of two villages in a specific cultural-environmental setting. Favorable student comments and understanding of the model (as shown by the midterm examination results) indicate that this technical reading was used successfully.

Student ratings show a wide gap between faculty preference for technical and specialized selections and student choice of more general and, for the most part, better written books (in a more literary style). The general method for creating a reading list in CIS courses has been to have each faculty member designate the readings appropriate to his/her contribution. The suggestions were discussed but usually additions rather than substitutions were made.

Table 4. Student Assessment of Readings

Course	Favorable	Unfavorable
Integration	Wylie, L., Village in the Vaucluse	No specific title cited by a group of students
Domination	Fromm, E., Escape from Freedom	Bachrach & Buratz, Peace and Poverty
	Fromm, E., Marx's Concept of Man	Laing, R.D., The Politics of Experience
	Hinton, W., Fanshen	
Peace	Julitte, P., Block 26: Sabotage at Buchenwald	No clear pattern
Peasants	Epstein, C., Economic Development and Social Change in South India	Bendix, R., Nation Building and Citizenship
	Nair, K., Blossoms in the Dust	Wolf, E., Peasants
	Hunter, G., Modernizing Peasant Societies	Weaver, T., The Farmers of Raipur
		Nicholson, N., Political Aspects of Indian Food Policy
Ethnicity	van den Burghe, P., Race and Racism	Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Government of Malaysia, Second Malaysia Plan
	Adam H., Modernizing Racial Domination	
	Porter, J.A., The Vertical Mosaic	
Europe	Servan-Schreiber, J.J., The American Challenge	Parry, J.H., The Establishment of European Hegemony
	Calleo, D., Europe's Future	Butterfield, H., Christianity in European History

Table 4. Student Assessment of Readings (continued)

Course	Favorable	Unfavorable
Europe	Freymond, J., Western Europe Since the War	
	Inglehart, R., The Silent Revolution in Europe	

It is strongly recommended that CIS reevaluate the role of readings in an interdisciplinary, problem-oriented course where students will encounter a multiplicity of terminologies. If the faculty were to decide how each contribution fits/interconnects with the others, the readings could be more integrated into the course.

Student ratings in answer to the question "How well integrated were the readings with the rest of the course?" were as follows: (1= not at all integrated... to 5= very well integrated)

Integration	Domination	Peace	Peasants	Ethnicity
3.0	2.8	2.6	3.4	3.3

The average (3.0) rating for these courses seems to stem from the fact that students responded primarily in terms of their experience in the discussion sections, which were discipline-oriented.

The importance of integration between readings and the rest of the course is emphasized when the responses of students who took more than one CIS course are compared with the reactions of those who took only one. It is assumed that those who went on to a second CIS course must have been satisfied and their responses yield insight into the probable reasons for satisfaction. With regard to readings, "repeaters" rated the level of integration of readings with the whole course point higher (significant on the 5 point scale) than "non-repeaters". Furthermore, they revealed a set of relationships between this response regarding the integration of the readings and other responses, i.e., positive correlations with the amount of reading done (.4), the extent to which their expectations of learning were met by the course (.5), and their overall opinion of the course (.4). The "non-repeaters" showed only insignificant correlations (.2 or less) on these questions.

It appears, therefore, that the students who enrolled in more than one CIS course were those who discovered more integration between the readings and the other aspects of the course and that in planning future courses major attention should be given to selection of appropriate readings and clarifying their significance in the course. This may increase satisfaction and lead to a larger, more enduring student constituency in later courses. Appendix A, 4 gives the repeater's comments on the special characteristics, interdisciplinarity, problem-orientation, team-teaching.

A separate problem is the amount of reading students actually do. All the CIS courses were rated higher than average on the amount of reading required, compared with Arts and Sciences courses. The average weekly amount assigned was about 150 pages (except for Domination, which was 200). Students recommended 130 pages a week as the optimal amount. All the indications are that most students do not keep up with the readings on a weekly basis but do read more than 3/4 of the assignments before examinations. If "keeping up" is important, then there might be rewards for weekly reading, or the reading list might be divided

to show what must be done by a certain deadline and what may be done at some later time because they will be covered in papers and examinations.

Faculty are often disturbed because students attend lectures without having done the reading and thus are unprepared to assimilate or contribute. A minor but important problem in the CIS courses was that much of the assigned reading was on two-hour reserve in the library and/or not accessible to students for a sufficient length of time.

Finally, the data from the follow-up questionnaires show that students rated all the CIS courses midway in the balance between disciplinary and interdisciplinary reading materials and neutral as to whether the readings stimulated interest.

In summary, a carefully selected, well analyzed set of readings may be far more effective than a larger, more comprehensive and varied reading list and a balance between general, interdisciplinary, and specialized, disciplinary materials must be maintained whenever possible.

Lectures. McKeachie (1969, 1971) has evaluated much of the research literature on lecturing and concluded that lectures are useful for presenting basic content and highlighting important points. The success with which a lecturer presents material, however, depends on a number of variables, such as the lecturer's style and the students' expectations.

In the CIS courses, lectures once a week were the main channel through which the faculty transmitted to the students their conceptions of the special characteristics of the course. The ways in which the weekly lectures were organized were the best examples of the faculties' instructional ingenuity. They varied from straight lectures two or more hours long, to lectures followed by peer commentary and/or student discussion; from presentations by pairs of individuals to marathon sessions which included pairs of lecturers combined with group discussions. These elaborations on the standard lecture format, however, did not seem to add greatly to the educational value of the courses. Only when the lecturing teams worked together and coordinated their presentations were the results good. Discussions by faculty immediately after lectures had generally negative results since frequently they lead to intellectual confrontations and conflict between faculty members. Student discussions following the lectures were profitable only when limited to the students and when the students were not too fatigued. Sometimes, the more knowledgeable students and the grade-hunters dominated the discussion.

In general, it appears that it would be preferable to restrict lecture sessions to content presentation in CIS courses rather than developing hybrid models. It is more important to develop basic lecturing techniques than to experiment with alternatives.

Student opinions concerning the lectures can be seen in the following tables.

Table 5

Overall Rating

"In general, what effect did the lectures have on your interest in this area?"

	Integration	Domination	Peace	Peasants	Ethnicity
Repeaters	3.0	4.1	3.2	2.2	---
Non-Repeaters	2.6	2.4	2.9	3.3	---

1=decreased interest, were boring.. 5=stimulated great interest

"Repeater" students found the lectures more stimulating than did the "non-Repeaters". Furthermore, the "Repeater" group felt that the guest lectures helped more in understanding the course material than did the "Non-Repeaters".

Table 6

Overall Rating

"Did including... guest lecturers aid you in understanding the course content?"

	Integration	Domination	Peace	Peasants	Ethnicity
Repeaters	3.3	4.0	3.4	2.7	---
Non-Repeaters	3.1	3.3	3.0	4.1	---

1=increased confusion... 5=aided understanding

These results support the contention that those who took more than one CIS course probably "brought" more to the course and also "took away" more -- i.e. learned more. In their ratings of the readings as well as the lectures, "Repeaters" were more favorable. They also indicated that they invested more effort in their CIS courses than in non-CIS courses and that their interest level in the CIS courses was higher than in others.

This leads to the conclusion that in its recruitment of faculty, CIS should try to obtain people with well developed skill in lecturing to undergraduates and also try to discover what the students expect to learn from the lectures.

Films, slides, maps, etc. used in lectures were popular with the students except when they caused the class to run over time. Relatively few students attended out-of-class film series.

Lecture outlines were rated favorably because in wide-ranging interdisciplinary lectures they provided a guide and pointed out the important points. Preparing the outlines helped the faculty to organize lectures in advance and facilitated discussion of up-coming lectures with other members of the staff.

Future CIS courses should incorporate appropriate audio-visual material in the lectures, especially when problems in foreign countries are presented. Lecture outlines have proved advantageous but room should be provided for students to make their own, in-class notes.

Student opinion as to how well the lectures were integrated with the rest of the course is shown in the following table.

Table 7

Integration	Domination	Peace	Peasants	Ethnicity
2.4	3.1	3.2	4.1	3.2

1= not at all integrated... to 5= very well integrated

The responses of "repeaters" and "non-repeaters" were comparable on this question.

The degree to which students saw the lectures as being "integrated with the rest of the course" were at, or above, the midpoint on the 1 to 5 scale. This result is not as "automatic" as one might think. Every CIS course was team-taught; each course was a "first try"; guest lectures were frequent. The work of integrating the course was left to the discussion sections. It is not surprising that the Integration course was rated lowest on this item since the discussion sections had separate reading lists representing different disciplines. Peasants, which had the most detailed analytic framework, was rated highest.

The extent to which lectures fitted in with the rest of the course was of primary importance to the students and their opinions of the courses. Student responses as to "how much the lectures were integrated into the course" correlated .4 with "how much new material was first introduced in the lectures?" If there were only a negligible relationship between the two, the question would be "What was the function of the lectures? Were they irrelevant?" On the other hand, a very high relationship between the two ratings (e.g., .7 or more) would indicate that "integration of lectures" and "introduction of new material" were one and the same -- in other words, that "the lectures equalled the course". Thus, +.4 seems high enough to show that the lectures were a major vehicle of information but not so high as to exclude the importance of other aspects of the course.

At the level of generalized outcomes for the students, there are associations between lecture-integration and (a) the amount students felt they learned from the course (.5) and (b) how satisfied they were with their achievement (.5).

In the light of these findings, it is important that the faculty of future CIS courses pay particular attention to the integration of lectures with other facets of the course.

Discussion Sections. Even more than the lectures/lecturers, the discussion sections in CIS courses showed great diversity. Typically, a number of sections were formed in each course to provide for small group discussions. Appendix A, 1 shows the disciplines represented by the staff. All told, 22 different leaders were involved in the first five CIS courses. The number of sections per course and the number of sections leaders is shown below.

Table 8

	Integration	Domination	Peace	Peasants	Ethnicity
Sections	4	5	6	6	5
Leaders	4	5	5	3	5

Peasants and Ethnicity, the two courses most thoroughly evaluated, provided data on discussion sections. These two efforts revealed striking differences in style among discussion leaders as well as varying quantity and quality of student contributions. The most important finding, however, was that there were major differences between graduate student teaching assistants and faculty as discussion leaders. In terms of those characteristics associated with greater student satisfaction and better performance on examinations (analysis of problems, application of concepts), sections led by graduate students were more successful.

Graduate students' sections tended to have greater student participation, a more balanced pattern of exchange than did sections led by faculty, which were characterized by faculty mini-lectures and generally low levels of student participation. Analysis of variance* using the data from Peasants and Ethnicity, showed that students in the graduate teaching assistants' sections rated the course significantly higher and performed appreciably better on examinations than students in the faculty-led sections. This finding regarding patterns of interaction is consistent with the findings of McKeachie (1954, 1963, 1971), Wilder (1959), Lyle (1959), and others.

It is easy to applaud or dismiss data concerning differential learning in relation to faculty or graduate student leadership but a critical factor must not be overlooked. The crux of the matter is not

* Tables for the multivariate NOVA are available from CIUE. The significance level for these analyses was .10.

the intellectual abilities of the leaders but their skill in guiding discussions so that students become actively involved. Either graduate students or faculty can be drafted to lead discussion sections but thought should be given to the particular skills required for the job.

In view of the fact that the first CIS course (Integration) broke down so that the four sections amounted to four distinct courses, the next faculty group experimented with rotating section leaders. Classical group dynamics theory would suggest that any change of leaders would disrupt the progress of discussions since time would be needed to adjust to the new leader and the possible interpersonal benefits growing out of extended contact would be lessened. On the other hand, switching leaders would give students access to different skills and viewpoints and would tend to dilute any negative mixes.

Table 9

	Integration	Domination	Peace	Peasants	Ethnicity
Learning	3.5	2.8	2.3	3.4	3.0
Interest	3.3	3.3	2.5	3.3	2.7

Regarding the topics for discussion in the sections, students recommend that the focus be on the general course subject rather than specific readings or lectures. While it is necessary to eliminate irrelevant digressions it seems generally desirable not to establish prohibitions, as was attempted in the first five courses (e.g., in Peasants, ethical issues were excluded) but to stress the coverage of the basic topics in the syllabus.

In summary, three broad conclusions can be drawn. The discussion sections are an essential component, providing students with the opportunity to test and extend their knowledge and closely tied to their satisfaction with the course. Unfortunately, group leaders are largely unaware of the student needs and the unique role of the sections and for the most part lack the skills needed for guiding discussion. It is strongly urged that CIS make an effort to provide materials and training to upgrade the proficiency of discussion leaders.

Grading. After deciding what they should teach, the faculty belatedly turned their attention to what proofs of learning the students should offer. Analysis of the test questions suggests that four important issues were involved. First, what assumptions could be made about pre-existent intellectual skills of the students? Second, what skills should they be able to demonstrate on the examinations? Third, how could the course be organized to maximize the transition from initial to later skills? Finally, how could appropriate questions be formulated?

Faculty -- especially those who are accustomed to teaching graduate students -- tend to overestimate the students' analytic and writing abilities. As a result, they are frequently dissatisfied with student performance and students are dissatisfied with faculty grading standards. To meet this problem, one might administer preliminary tests of students' grade-related skills.

There is little evidence that the faculty of the CIS courses have systematically used the examination system to weigh the intellectual impacts of the course. Exam questions and term paper topics have tapped a wide range of abilities, including:

Content mastery -- ability to recall, in an organized way, the basic content covered during the semester;
Comprehension -- ability to understand and use, in an organized way, bodies of material;
Analysis -- ability to identify major factors and their relationships;
Application -- ability to transfer principles and concepts from one situation to another and/or to compare and contrast situations;
Synthesis -- ability to put parts together to form a new entity (particularly important in an interdisciplinary course);
Evaluation -- ability to make judgments about the different values of alternatives such as policies or points of view;
Prescription -- ability to make specific recommendations regarding the solution of a problem (with explanation of the implications).

All of the above objectives are legitimate but some -- particularly the last three -- may not be appropriate for a CIS course which has been designed for undergraduates with a limited social science background and as yet undeveloped analytic and synthetic skills. Before undertaking the design of examinations, the faculty should have a clear idea of what the students can reasonably be expected to achieve. Obviously it is inappropriate to expect graduate level analytic skills or to ask students to develop an interdisciplinary synthesis which the faculty themselves were unable to achieve.

Differences between faculty grading philosophies surfaced in the CIS courses because of the team-teaching but this problem was compounded by the fact that many of the faculty members had far more experience in assessing the performance of graduate students than of undergraduates. To a great extent this problem could be reduced by determining in advance what students can reasonably be expected to achieve and formulating appropriate tests.

CHAPTER V

PROGRAMMATIC CONSIDERATIONS

The two "results" chapters answer the basic question of the evaluation: What is an interdisciplinary, team-taught, problem-oriented introductory course in International Studies? Programmatic questions were only briefly treated. The questions: Were these good courses? and What larger impacts have these courses had on students, faculty, CIS and Cornell University? remain to be considered. To the last query: Should these courses be continued? the evaluation team can only respond by providing information which might be useful to an eventual decision.

Were these Good Courses?

In order to answer this question, it was necessary to define the criteria to be used in the assessment of the quality or "goodness" of the course offerings. Two sets of criteria were eventually employed -- one related to the principles of instructional design and educational research, and a second based on both the student ratings when they were asked to compare specific courses with other courses they had taken at Cornell, and faculty analyses of the impacts of the courses on themselves.

Over the past thirty years, educators, instructional designers and educational researchers have begun to develop a consensus on what constitutes an acceptable total course design. Taken alone, this consensus is not an appropriate criterion in this case because it was not the intent of the program to design methodologically elegant courses nor were adequate resources available for this type of instructional demonstration. Basically, the evaluation team combined these absolute design standards with an analysis of the available resources and constraints affecting the Program. Such an analysis is necessarily inexact but it does provide a basis for a summary judgment on the total instructional enterprise. Please note that this strategy begs the question of what could have, or should have, occurred. Instead, it treats most resources and constraints as given and asks whether or not the effort was credible within this particular context.

To begin with, this Program has not involved large outlays of resources by the Center for International Studies. According to CIS figures, the direct and indirect costs of developing the program and offering the first five courses were $44,600, or approximately $100 per student. This low figure reflects the fact that most of the faculty involved taught the courses as an overload and thus the major expenditures were for the salaries of program coordinators,

graduate teaching assistants, and for various forms of administrative support (secretaries, duplication, etc.). Over the last two years of the program there are indications that CIS was continuously reducing its support and coordination of the Program. For example, Domination had a Ph.D. level, full-time coordinator. The coordinator for the next two courses was a graduate student, part-time, and for the last course there was no coordinator.

A second important constraint was that the faculty, while intellectually and professionally well qualified, were primarily graduate level educators, not undergraduate teachers of introductory, interdisciplinary courses. Additionally, like most faculty, their skills as instructional designers and educational innovators were only partially developed. Finally, as has been noted in Chapter II, the Program operated in a general atmosphere of departmental hostility but necessarily utilized teachers who were affiliated with departments.

A different constraint is that interdisciplinary, problem-oriented, team teaching is an inherently difficult instructional format combining as it does the interpersonal difficulties of team teaching and the intellectual problems of bringing together introductory level material from a variety of disciplinary sources. This innovative difficulty was increased by the policy of making each course consciously different from earlier offerings and by the fact that each course was offered only once.

Now, the ideal course is one where objectives are specified in advance, appropriate instructional technologies are chosen to maximize those objectives, the faculty have the skills to implement those technologies effectively, and the student and course evaluation procedures are chosen to assess the attainment of expected objectives and unexpected outcomes. Given the constraints noted above, this ideal was clearly impossible within the CIS courses. However, it is the perception of the evaluation team that for most of the CIS offerings, the course designs come reasonably close to achieving what was possible.

The evaluation team estimates that participation in a CIS course was approximately a quarter time responsibility over two semesters for each faculty member involved in the design and operation of the course. This includes one, three-hour planning session per week in the semester preceding instruction and a similar weekly staff meeting and the lecture sessions during the semester. Additionally, time was required to read 100-200 pages a week of often new material, for the grading of papers and examinations, and for preparing lectures. For most of the courses, faculty committed themselves to leading a one-hour discussion section per week. Interviews with faculty and observations of them at work in the last three courses indicates that almost all those involved took these responsibilities seriously despite occasionally high opportunity costs. This was particularly true for the courses on Integration, Domination, and Peasants.

The outcomes of this expenditure of effort by teams of faculty

were, in the main, reasonably carefully designed courses. For two of those teams which were observed directly, it was noted that most course decisions were made carefully and reflected a reasoned concern for the costs and benefits of different alternatives. In the case of Peasants, this led to a design which was unusually well organized and thought-out. The Domination and Ethnicity courses also appeared to be particularly well designed.

Where problems occurred, they often reflected the faculty's lack of training in the design of this type of course. In the main, they tended to apply what they had learned in other courses without a critical analysis of how the particular requirements of an interdisciplinary, team teaching format might modify the impact of the conventional techniques used. In part, the CIS program was designed to generate information on this question for use in later courses. The evaluation results indicate that the major problems centered around the team teaching, examination system, and student discussion group aspects of the courses. These are all components that the faculty tend to downgrade but which the evaluation indicates are as important and perhaps more important than the content organization, reading list and lecture sessions -- all areas of major faculty concern. "Importance" in this context relates to student satisfaction and learning.

A complex, interrelated process seems to be occurring here: a combination of unresolved conflicts among the faculty, initially high faculty and student expectations about the course which were not confirmed, and time conflicts with other activities because offering the course took up more faculty time than was expected.

Student Ratings of the Total Course. In this era of consumerism, an important index of the success of a service is the consumers' rating of what they have received. On the post- and follow-up questionnaires for each course, there was a collection of summary items related to the students' perceptions of the course-as-a-whole.

Student ratings of these course-as-a-whole items are available for all courses with the exception of Europe, for which only end-of-course data are available. Most of these items asked students to compare the CIS courses with other courses taken at Cornell. Since the norms for the College of Arts and Sciences are not subdivided there are none for introductory social science courses per se. Therefore it was not possible to compare CIS offerings directly with other similar courses but only with the norms for Arts and Sciences courses as a whole.

Course-as-a-whole items fall into four main groupings and concern 1) ratings of the faculty, 2) personal reactions to the course, 3) perceptions of the amount learned, and 4) summary impressions of the course.

Three generalizations can be made about the course-as-a-whole responses. First, for the 33 instances when end-of-course ratings were compared with the overall Arts and Sciences norms, the CIS students rated their courses .13 scale points lower, on the average. Second, the follow-up scores were .24 lower than the scores given at the end of the semester, the drop averaging .44 or almost half a scale point lower in reply to the question "Overall, my opinion of the course is..." This finding may reflect differences between the end-of-course and follow-up samples but it also may be that students used a different basis for comparison after having taken other courses outside the CIS program.

Third, students who took more than one CIS course tended to rate each of the courses more positively than those who took only one. The mean difference (on the 5 point scale) between the ratings given by repeaters and non-repeaters was .6 for interest level in the course, 1.2 for amount learned, and 1.2 for the overall rating.

Students in the first four courses rated the faculty as willing to help students. Only in the fifth course, Ethnicity, did students rate the faculty below the midpoint on the scale. In none of the courses did students indicate that they had much personal contact with faculty outside of class.

Personal reactions of the students were elicited by asking about interest level and amount of effort expended in the course. Peasants, Ethnicity, and Europe students claimed that a greater than usual amount of work was required while students in the other courses indicated on the end of course forms that they had invested less than the usual amount of effort required for Arts and Sciences courses, but on the follow-up form they reported equal or more effort was required. For all courses except Europe, the interest levels equal or exceed the norm of 3.3, while for Domination it was .7 higher.

Four items dealing with learning covered 1) fulfillment of expectations, 2) amount of independent thinking required, 3) difficulty level, and 4) amount learned. Ratings for "difficulty" clustered around the norm (3.4) for Arts and Sciences courses. Student perceptions of the amount of independent thinking required ranged from 3.0 for Europe to 3.8 on the end-of-course ratings for Integration and the follow-up ratings for Peasants. Apparently students felt that a moderate degree of independent thought was required in the CIS courses. In all the follow-up ratings (except for Peasants), students indicated that the courses were less successful than the norm (3.5) for Arts and Sciences courses in satisfying their expectations. For Peace and Ethnicity this difference of more than .9 of a scale point showed up on the follow-up questionnaire and for Europe, in the end-of-course ratings. Generally, this finding suggests that in fact these courses differed in some real way from traditional offerings at the University. Student expectations of course content, based on experience with one-discipline courses, were not met.

Student responses to queries about interest level, the amount learned, and overall opinion of the course were taken as important indicators of the affective, cognitive, and general impacts of the courses. These items correlate between .7 and .8 with each other on the follow-up forms. The size of the follow-up sample does not allow a factor analysis of the data but an examination of the higher correlations between these three general items and other items on the questionnaire may give some idea of the particular course qualities associated with these student reactions to the course-as-a-whole.

Of the set of items assessing student reactions to the reading list, lectures, and discussion sections, the ones that correlate most highly with the three general items are those that tap the students perceptions of 1) the integration of course components, and 2) the effect of these aspects of the course on the students' interest in the course topic.

Students' ratings of the success of the CIS courses in providing useful terminology, concepts, techniques, and a "feel" for how others live and think also correlated (between .5 and .7) with the ratings for the generalcourse-as-a-whole items.

We would summarize these findings as follows. As designs and as expressions of the effort expended by faculty, the CIS undergraduate courses were adequate courses, if the constraints and opportunities are taken into account. Student data clearly indicate that at the end of the semester the courses were rated as equivalent to other introductory courses and to the norms for Arts and Sciences courses as a whole. Given the complexity of the format and the fact that each course was a new and independent effort, offered only once, this is a reasonably positive outcome.

Larger Impacts

Given that these were reasonably "good" courses, the next question is: What was the larger, longer term impact of the program?

While 60% of the follow-up sample report that experiencing a CIS course was useful to them in other courses, the same percentage indicate that it has not influenced their enrollment in other courses and 75% felt it had no effect on their choice of a major. Even when students felt that a CIS course had influenced them it was to specialize in some aspect of their current major rather than to make a new commitment to International Studies.

Since the Peace course there has been a precipitous drop in CIS course enrollments -- from 148 in that course to 18 in Europe. Students who had registered in Ethnicity but dropped out before it began were questioned. A variety of factors were involved in their decisions, including pressure of departmental or college requirements, increasing emphasis on occupationally related courses, and disinterest in the particular CIS topics all played a part. But student comments

also reflect dissatisfaction with their own or a friend's previous experience in CIS courses. It may be that student interest in International Studies is declining nationally but it is clear from the ratings of CIS courses, that students value the development of personal conceptual frameworks for the organization and analysis of material and that they look for links between the problems encountered in International Studies and their knowledge of American society.

Impacts on Faculty. A question seldom asked is "What are the effects on the faculty of participating in a course such as the CIS Program offered?" Three main classes of faculty impacts were identified from interviews and observations: 1) intellectual, 2) interpersonal, and 3) teaching-related.

Many of the faculty found it useful and interesting to be exposed to different viewpoints and materials but could not say specifically how they had used them.

Interpersonal and social impacts on the faculty in CIS courses were sometimes negative, as in Domination where the faculty interacted vigourously over an extended period of time. Most reported, however, that they had maintained social and intellectual ties with the other members of the teaching staff when possible.

The most apparent impacts of the CIS courses on the faculty involved were in the area of teaching because of the continual exchange of views and information on various aspects of instruction, especially those concerned with lecturing and grading. Improvement in discussion leadership skills was particularly noticeable in Ethnicity. Unfortunately no data are available to show whether these new teaching skills were transferred to other situations.

The faculty's initially high expectations were not met in any of the CIS courses. The teaching teams in Peasants and Ethnicity were asked what they would consider an acceptable student rating for the course and were disappointed that the actual ratings proved to be 1/2 point lower than anticipated.

In brief, data which might reveal the impacts of CIS courses on faculty were scant but it appears that negative findings were balanced by the less observable positive intellectual, interpersonal, and teaching-related advances.

Effects on Curriculum. One of the objectives of the CIS program was to increase the International Studies content of the undergraduate curricula at Cornell. Insofar as CIS added six courses, this goal was met. Ultimately, however, curricular changes require that the departments change and this has not occurred. Departments have not taken over the CIS courses nor have CIS courses (except for Europe) been cross-listed with departments. Since the beginning of the program, there has been decreasing departmental cooperation.

Should the Program be Continued?

It would be inappropriate for the evaluation team to attempt to give a final answer to this question. However, some of the evaluation results yield information which might be useful in the decision making processes established by CIS.

First of all, it is clear that the program was not as successful as either CIS, the faculty, or the students expected. This was partly due to the technical difficulty in realizing a complex innovation with the nascent skills of the faculty and students. It may in part reflect the fact that assumptions were made that were inherently unrealistic and that there were institutional and other constraints which could not be modified.

If the decision is made to continue the program, a first important step for CIS would be to define the realizable and significant goals, including acceptable levels of student learning and satisfaction. The potential of the courses should be assessed not only in terms of undergraduate education but as a contributing factor in the development of social, intellectual, and teaching skills in graduate students and faculty.

CIS must analyze its commitment to interdisciplinary, undergraduate education in International Studies. To what extent is an International Studies component a necessary aspect of undergraduate education? To what extent is interdisciplinary inquiry an appropriate intellectual activity for undergraduates? These questions must be answered before a meaningful decision can be made as to the continuation of the program.

Toward the Future

The lessening of "atypicality" of the CIS courses over the period of the Program's existence can be seen in the diminished presence of faculty representing non-political science fields. A further assertion along the lines of diminishing "atypicality" postulates that the Program has moved generally from a curriculum plan of introductory courses in the social sciences which treat in an interdisciplinary, problem-oriented fashion, broad problems of an international nature, to courses on more specialized topics in International Studies. The student population in these courses has shifted from primarily freshmen and sophomores to upper level undergraduates and graduate students. Related to this shift has been the abandonment of "freshman humanities" status for the courses.

During the 1970 planning sessions for the Undergraduate Program the question was debated: Should the courses be designed for advanced undergraduates relying on and taking advantage of their experience with particular disciplines, or should the courses serve as a broad-gauged

is the course "type" which can benefit most from the evaluation. Such a course, with its broad interest base would, hopefully, attract enrollment in sufficient numbers to warrant the following suggested procedure.

The faculty selected for the course would spend a semester planning the course which then would be offered twice. The planning would attend to objective setting (with direct consequences for improving grading procedures), would provide opportunity for faculty to read the suggested texts (so that the process of final selection of a set of readings would likely be integrative rather than additive), and general consideration of the strategic elements designed to move the student from entry skills to the achievement of course objectives (lectures' content, role of discussion sections for integrating readings and lectures, other teaching technologies). In general, this planning stage would design the conceptual framework for the course which in turn would have the advantage of structuring the contributions of each faculty participant. (The evaluation has shown that students have perceived some of the "intellectual dueling" which has characterized some courses as unhelpful.)

The constraints placed on course content by departments which have insisted that topics in CIS courses not overlap departmental offerings have eliminated, in some instances, reference to United States phenomena. Should this pressure persist or increase, the likelihood of selecting "problems" of wide student appeal is diminished and with it the possibilities for courses of Alternative B type.

Alternative C -- support services for faculty-initiated interdisciplinary courses.

Where Alternative B type courses were of broad interest, attracting a heterogeneous student population, type C courses may be conceived of as more specialized in topic, aimed at a homogeneous population of advanced undergraduates and graduate students. Under Alternative C, the Center for International Studies would be receptive to faculty initiatives to explore an international problem with colleagues and graduate students from diverse fields and share that exploration with advanced undergraduates, well grounded in the methodologies and concepts of one of the represented disciplines. Here rather than suppressing "intellectual dueling" disruptive to freshmen and sophomores as they seek an introduction to international problems and disciplines (Alternative B), the clash of disciplines should be encouraged. Such a course experience may be desirable as a culminating experience for undergraduates from many related fields and suggest to them avenues of application of the skills derived from the discipline in which they majored.

The Alternative C type courses should pass most easily through the narrow channel of constraints and their perpetuation under the

auspices of the Center for International Studies will maintain the spirit of innovative teaching which the Program has launched.

These alternatives are offered as discussion points for the Center of International Studies to begin to articulate its future direction in innovative instruction at the undergraduate level.

FOOTNOTES

and

BIBLIOGRAPHY

FOOTNOTES*

Introduction

1. CIS Document 52
2. Levine & Weingart, p. 94
3. Sanders & Ward, p. 6
4. Rosenau, P. 34

Chapter I

1. Webb et al., p. 31

Chapter II

1. CIS Documents 1, 2, 3, 6
2. CIS Documents 2, 3, 4, 5
3. Sanders & Ward
4. CIS Documents 2, 3, 4, 7
5. Bidwell
   Sanders & Ward
6. CIS Documents 8, , 10
7. CIS Document 12
8. CIS Documents 14, 18, 19, 20, 21
9. CIS Documents 22, 23
10. CIS Documents 15, p. 1, 2; Doc. 24, Doc. 25, p. 1-4
11. CIS Documents 7, 21
12. CIS Document 7
13. CIS Document 26
14. CIS Document 27
15. CIS Document 32, 33, 34
16. CIS Document 35
17. CIS Documents 36, 37
18. CIS Document 16
19. CIS Document 29, p. 1
20. CIS Document 29, p. 1
21. CIS Documents 25, 31
22. CIS Document 25, p. 4
23. CIS Document 25, p. 3, 4
24. CIS Document 25
25. CIS Document 25, p. 3
26. CIS Document 25, p. 4
27. CIS Document 25, p. 1
28. CIS Document 25, p. 1
29. CIS Document 14, p. 2
30. CIS Document 32

* See Bibliography

31. CIS Document 32
32. CIS Document 33
33. CIS Document 33
34. CIS Document 34
35. CIS Document 24
36. CIS Document 30, p. 1, 8
37. CIS Document 25
38. CIS Document 38, p. 3
39. CIS Document 39
40. CIS Document 15

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bidwell, P.W. Undergraduate Education in Foreign Affairs. New York: Kings Crown Press, 1962.

Bjerstedt, A. Educational Technology. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1972.

Briggs, A. and G. Michaud. Problems and Solutions. In Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, Interdisciplinarity: Problems of Teaching and Research in Universities. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1972.

Center for International Studies Documents:

1. "International Interests of Cornell University", a statement by Lauriston Sharp, Faculty Committee on International Affairs, March 22, 1961.
2. Notes from interview with Lauriston Sharp re: formation of CIS; June 19, 1973 (Alison Brown).
3. Excerpts from interview with Steven D. Muller, September 1973, re formation of CIS (Alison Brown).
4. Interview with Douglas Asford June 1973 (Alison Brown).
5. Letter from J.L. Zingle (Vice President, Cornell) to John Howard, (Ford Foundation), July 1961.
6. July 1960 "Memorandum for the Record" by C.A. Hanson, Chairman Long Range Planning Committee (Cornell Archive Collection with access restrictions).
7. Summary of the Preliminary Recommendations of the CIS Evaluation Committee (Ashford Evaluation), February 28, 1969.
8. "The Ford Foundation in the 1960s", Statement of the Board of Trustees on Policies, Programs, and Operations, July 1962.
9. "The College and University in International Affairs", a statement of the Board of Trustees, Ford Foundation, November 1959.
10. "The University and World Affairs", report of an ad hoc committee of Ford Foundation, December 1960.
12. Excerpts from and summary of CIS-Cornell Administration-Ford Foundation correspondence for Cornell's 2nd Ford grant.
13. Excerpts from interview of Gil Levine, June 1973.
14. Memorandum to Stuart M. Brown, Vice President for Academic Affairs from Douglas E. Ashford re proposed undergraduate international relations major, September 1968.
15. Memorandum to Committee on Undergraduate Programs in International Studies from Stephen Frick, Director, Undergraduate Program of CIS re Undergraduate Interdisciplinary Program in International Studies, October 1971.

16. Memorandum from Alfred Kahn to President Dale Corson, "Highlights of 1970-71 Annual Report of the Dean of Arts and Sciences.
17. Confidential statement to the Division of International Training and Research, Ford Foundation, re renewal of support for the program of International Studies at Cornell, June 10, 1966.
18. Memorandum to Dale Corson from Steven Muller, December 1965.
19. A letter to Franklin A. Long, Vice President for Research and Advanced Studies (Cornell), from John W. Mellow, Department of Agricultural Economics, November 1968 re CIS.
20. Memorandum from Douglas E. Ashford to James A. Perkins, re proposal o examine the meaning of international relations or the University response to a restructured world environment (for discussion only.)
21. Memorandum to CIS Executive Committee from Douglas Ashford re appointing a committee to study the role of the Center for International Studies.
22. Excerpts from interviews with Milton Esman, Douglas Ashford, Dick Moore, Walter Pintner, Frank Long et al -- all June 1973; re CIS environment, area studies, disciplines, etc.
23. Letter to Dean Norman Penney from Committee on Soviet Studies, October 13, 1971.
24. Statement of Undergraduate Program in International Studies, CIS, June 17, 1970 (Camhi).
25. "The Cornell Interdisciplinary Program in International Studies", part 1 of the proposal to the Office of Education (no date).
26. Excerpts from interviews with Milton J. Esman, June 1973.
27. Statement "Organization and Functions, Center for International Studies", approved by CIS Executive Committee, February 26, 1968.
28. Excerpts from interview with Jane Camhi, March 3, 1973.
29. "Composite Draft of subcommittee proposal for a possible program in international studies for freshmen and sophomores," (no date).
30. "Proposal: Interdisciplinary program in International Studies for Freshmen and Sophomores," (no date)
31. Letter to Ward Morehouse (Education Department, Albany) from Anthony La Vopa (Coordinator, Interdisciplinary Program), January 13, 1973.
32. Notes at luncheon meeting to initiate planning committee for undergraduate teaching program in international relations, September 10, 1969 (Camhi).
33. Letter to members of Planning Committee for Undergraduate Program from Jane Camhi.
34. Memorandum to members of Planning Committee from Jane Camhi re: report of Friday meeting, January 16, 1970.
35. Letter to Prof. Herbert Ginsburg, from Jane Camhi re cooperation between CIS and Center for Research in Education.
36. Notes on luncheon discussion of CIS course teaching problems, June 8, 1971.

37. Notes from interview with Alfred Kahn, June 14, 1973, re: CIS Undergraduate Program and funding (apprehension in the departments).
38. Memorandum to Milton Esman, Gil Levine, Steve Frick from Bryant Robey re: meeting with Levine, La Vopa, and Frick regarding the Undergraduate Program, July 8, 1971.
39. Memorandum from La Vopa re: Undergraduate Interdisciplinary Program, CIS, Sept. 4, 1971.
40. Memorandum from Bryant Robey to Undergraduate Program files re: meeting with Steve Frick and Dean Kahn on Undergraduate Program, July 21, 1971.
41. Excerpt from interview with Gil Levine, June 8, 1973 (Alison Brown).
44. Memorandum from Walter Galenson to Vice Provost Robert Ris ey, September 21, 1971, re complaints about CIS 209 reading list.
45. Excerpt from interview with Lisle Carter, August 27, 1973, re: Sanders Report.
46. Memorandum from Myron Rush (Committee on Soviet Studies) to Lisle Carter re: complaint that CIS gets funds instead of the Committee on Soviet Studies.
47. Report of Executive Committee meeting, October 27, 1971.
48. Excerpts from interviews with Dick Moore, Walter Pintner, Bryant Robey, June and March 1973 (Alison Brown)
49. Note from interview with Richard Rosecrance re: impact of CIS 209 on future courses (Alison Brown).
50. Notes from conversations re: future of CIS Undergraduate Program, October 1972, between Alison Brown and Joel Gregory; these issues were then reconsidered with Bryant Robey participating.
51. Notes of meeting, February 9, 1973, between Milton Esman, Bryant Robey, Whiton Paine (Alison Brown).
52. Annual Report, 1971-72, of the Center for International Studies, Cornell University.
53. Proposals to the Office of Education for CIS Undergraduate Program, revisions, and correspondence, 1971-1972.
54. Proposals to the Office of Education for an evaluation study of the CIS program, revisions and correspondence, 1970-1972.

Costin, F., W.T. Greenough, and R.J. Menges. Student ratings of college teaching: reliability, validity, usefulness. Review of Educational Research, 1971.

Education and World Affairs. The University Looks Abroad: approaches to world affairs at six American universities, a report. New York: Walker & Co., 1965.

Isaac, S. and W.B. Michael. Handbook in Research and Evaluation. San Diego: Robert R. Knapp, 1971.

Kolka, J.W. and E.N. Swinerton. The Dynamics of Interdisciplinary Departments and Problem Solving as a Teaching Technique. In Tubbs (Ed.), Toward a Community of Seekers. University of Nebraska, 1972.

LaFauci, H.M. and P.E. Richter. Team Teaching at the College Level. New York: Pergamon Press, 1970.

Lee, C.B.T. Improving College Teaching. Washington, D.C.: American Counsil on Education, 1967.

Levien, R.E. The Emerging Technology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Levine, A. and J. Weingart. Reform of Undergraduate Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

McKeachie, W.J. Improving Teaching Effectiveness. PREP Report #25. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

_____. Teaching Tips, a Guidebook for the Beginning College Teacher. Lexington, Mass.: Heath & Co., 1969.

_____. Research on teaching at the College and University Level. In Gage, (Ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.

Miller, R.I. Evaluating Faculty Performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

_____. Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation: A Source-book for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Phi Delta Kappa Study Committee on Evaluation. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock, 1971.

Runkel, P., R. Harrison and M. Runkel (Eds.). The Changing College Classroom. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Sanders, I.T. and J.G. Ward. Bridges to Understanding. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Sherif, J. and C.E. Sherif (Eds.). Interdisciplinary Relationships in the Social Sciences, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1969.

Steele, S. Contemporary Approaches to Program Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: Capitol Publications, 1973.

Swift, R.N. World Affairs and the College Curriculum. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1959.

Thorndike, R.L. Educational Measurement, second edition. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Trent, J.W. and A.M. Cohen. Research on Teaching in Higher Education. In Taavers, R.M.W. (Ed.). Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

Webb, E.J., D.T. Campbell, R.D. Schwartz, and L. Sechrest. Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Wilson, H.E. and F.H. Wilson. American Higher Education and World Affairs. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1963.

APPENDICES

APPENDICES

These Appendices are included for readers interested in the specific courses offered in the interdisciplinary, problem-oriented Undergraduate Program of the Center for International Studies. Over a three year span, six courses were presented:

CIS 110: Integration and Decentralization -- Competing Forms in International Society
CIS 209: Domination and Subordination -- Origins, Strategies, and Justification
CIS 210: Peace and War
CIS 211: Peasants, Power, and Productivity -- Rural Development in the Third World
CIS 212: Ethnicity, Race, and Communalism -- their Significance for Nation Building and International Relations
CIS 135: The Concept of Europe -- Crisis and Continuity in the Evolution of an Idea

These Appendices consist of two parts. Appendix A contains:

Section 1: a cross-course survey (Table 10), showing student, faculty, and course characteristics;
Section 2: the follow-up questionnaire, showing the item mean scores obtained in each course;
Section 3: the grade distribution in CIS courses (Table 11);
Section 4: the response of "repeaters" to questions on the special characteristics of the CIS courses;
Section 5: The Cornell Inventory for Student Appraisal of Teaching and Courses;
Section 6: Topics for Faculty Interviews.

Sections 1 and 2 provide an overview of course characteristics and student reactions. In Section 5, the mean scores for CIS courses as found in the follow-up questionnaires, are compared with the mean scores for courses in the College of Arts and Sciences.

In Appendix B, each course is discussed in a separate section. These are not complete evaluation reports but an attempt to highlight the most important aspects of each offering. The summary analyses are supplemented by copies of the student assessment forms used in each course, including the item mean scores.

Appendix A, Section 1

Cross-course Survey

Table 10

Table 10 represents a cross course summary. Six rather different courses were given in the CIS Undergraduate Program. In this table they are presented in terms of their structural features, both as designs and implemented offerings, and also in terms of the impacts they had on those students who completed the follow-up questionnaire. Structural information is in tabular form and summarized briefly in the text. The follow-up data on student reactions to five of the six courses are given, with mean ratings for the various items on the questionnaire. These data are also summarized in the text.

The Table provides an overview of the structural aspects of the six courses so that they can be compared along a number of dimensions. It includes information as to 1) when each course was offered; 2) the basic characteristics of the students and faculty involved; 3) how many of these were represented in the evaluation samples; and 4) how the lectures, sections, and grading systems were organized. The material represented by the major headings in the "Course Aspect" column is explained below.

A. Semester. The basic procedure was to offer one course each semester, starting with the Spring of 1971 and ending in the Fall of 1973.

C. Total Core Faculty. Between three and five core faculty members were involved in each offering with five being the usual complement. Political Science, History, and Economics were the most common departmental affiliations of CIS faculty, but for two of the courses (Peace, and Peasants), faculty was recruited from outside the social and behavioral sciences. Most of the core faculty were Cornell faculty members and shared a common area of interest and expertise although some sub-Ph.D.'s participated in the first two courses and served as graduate teaching assistants in the last three. All of the courses supplemented the expertise of the core faculty with 3-7 visiting lecturers. Again, most of these were social and behavioral scientists drawn from the Cornell faculty.

D. Student Population Enrollment. This item shows the steady decline in enrollment that occurred during the last four courses. For all courses the majority of students came from the College of Arts and Sciences. As the Program progressed, the percentage of upperclassmen increased so that in the last course, half were Juniors or Seniors. Each course had some students who either went on to later CIS courses or had taken an earlier one. This is the group labelled "repeaters". Finally, the average grade in CIS courses was B to B+ -- somewhat lower than the norm for the College of Arts and Sciences.

E. Integration. The next aspect shown in the Table is the summary perceptions of the evaluation team as to how well each course was integrated on a conceptual, organization, and disciplinary level. Conceptual integration refers to the overall integration between content areas. How effectively the instructional activities were linked is the major indication of organizational integration. Disciplinary integration is both a conceptual and interpersonal measure, reflecting both the interdisciplinary and team-teaching aspects of the courses. The standard used is an absolute one and thus no CIS course was rated as highly integrated on any level.

F-H. Content Organization. All CIS courses had some kind of overall organizing rationale which gave particular emphasis to when analytic tools, such as concepts, were to be presented and how different types of case examples were to be used. The differences between courses are shown under aspect H, Content Organization.

Taken as examples of interdisciplinary teaching, the CIS courses differed markedly from one another, as can be seen in aspect G of the Table. A related aspect, Team Teaching, is summarized in H. In these ratings, cooperation within the team is an indication of how productively the faculty were able to work together on the design and presentation of the courses. The two ratings of conflict in staff meetings and in lecture sessions show where personal differences were usually expressed. Finally, how well guest lectures were integrated into the course was rated.

I-M. The next five sections of the Table deal with the instructional techniques used in the courses. This included reading lists, lecture sessions, miscellaneous techniques (films, slides, handouts), discussion sections, and grading system. The major features of each cluster of techniques are briefly delineated.

N-O. The students' overall ratings of the courses compared to the average rating for courses in the Cornell College of Arts and Sciences are summarized. Both post- (end of course) and follow-up ratings are presented under aspect N. The final set of ratings (O) indicates how similar to other Cornell courses the students considered the CIS offerings to be.

Table 12. Cross Course Summary

	Course Aspect	Integration	Domination	Peace	Peasants	Ethnicity	Europe
A.	Semester	Spring '71	Fall '71	Spring '72	Fall '72	Spring '73	Fall '73
B.	Course title	Integration & Decentralization: Competing Forms in International Society	Domination & Subordination: Origins, Strategies and Justification	Peace & War	Peasants, Power, and Productivity: Rural Development in the Third World	Ethnicity, Race & Communalism: their Significance for Nation Building & International Relations	The Concept of Europe: Crisis and Continuity in the evolution of an Idea
C.	Total Core Faculty	N=4	N=5	N=5	N=5	N=5	N=3
	Disciplines & interests of Cornell faculty	1.Econ. 2.Pol.Sci. 3.Anthro.-Econ.	1.Econ.-Marxism 2.Pol.Sci 3.Psych.-Soc. Macchiavellianism 4.History-English	1.Pol.Sci.-Peace Studies 2.History-English 3.History-French 4.Physics-Science & Society 5.Pol.Sci.-internat'l	1.Pol.Econ.-Rural Dev't 2.Agr.Tech.-irrigation 3.Anthro.-Econ.	1.Pol.Sci.-population 2.Pol.Sci.-internat'l 3.Pol.Sci.-internat'l racism	1.Pol.Sci.-Mod.Eur. 2.History-French
	Sub Ph.D. Faculty	4.History	5.History & Women's Studies	None	None	None	None

	Course Aspect	Integration	Domination	Peace	Peasants	Ethnicity	Europe
	Teaching Assistants	None	None	None	4 Socio.-Rural Dev't	4 History-Intellectual	3 Pol.Sci.-Mod.Eur.
	Visiting Lecturers	N=3	N=3	N=7	N=5	N=4	N=3
		1.Econ.	1.Commune	1.Anthro.	1.Agr.Econ	1.Pol.Sci.	1.History
		2.Pol.Sci	2.Gay Lib.	2.Econ.-Public Finance	2.Agr.Econ	2.Anthro.	2.Pol.Sci.
		3.Econ.	3.SDS	3.Econ:Public Affairs	3.Anthro.	3.Psych.	3.Pol.Sci.
				4.Psych.	4.Pol.Econ.	4.Rural Soc.	
				5.Chem.	5.Pol.Sci.		
				6.Pol.Econ.			
				7.Pol.Sci.			
	Area of common expertise	France	-----	Peace Studies	Rural Dev't	Internat'l Rel.	France
D.	Student population enrollment	N=68	N=76	N=148	N=77	N=26	N=17
	Percentage by College						
	Agr.	13%	8%	7%	4%	20%	0%
	Arch.	0	5	3	0	0	0
	A.& S.	65	51	56	71	56	77

Course Aspect	Integration	Domination	Peace	Peasants	Ethnicity	Europe
B.& PA	0%	0%	0%	1%	4%	0%
Eng.	7	9	7	8	8	14
Hotel	0	3	4	0	0	0
Hu.Ec.	7	11	9	6	4	5
ILR	7	11	14	3	8	5
Grad.	0	0	0	7	0	0
Uncl.	0	0	0	1	0	0
Total Class %						
Lower	100%	75%	75%	62%	56%	50%
Upper	0	25	25	31	40	50
Other	0	0	0	7	4	0
Repeaters	N=11	N=31	N=35	N=10	N=4	N=2
Average grade	B	B/B+	B	B	B/B+	B
E. Integration						
Conceptual	low	medium	very low	medium high	medium	medium
Organiza'tl	very low	medium	very low	medium high	medium	medium
Disciplin.	very low	medium	very low	medium high	low	medium high
F. Content Organization						
Overall rationale	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Analytic tools	throughout	throughout	throughout	beginning	end	throughout
Case studies	throughout	middle	throughout	end	beginning	throughout
Type of case	country	type	disciplinary	country	country	institutional
G. Interdisciplinary Approach	separation of disciplines	common search	Smørgasbord	Team of separate disc.	outreach from a discipline	History; then Pol.Sci.

Course Aspect	Integration	Domination	Peace	Peasants	Ethnicity	Europe
H. Team Teaching						
Cooperation	low	high	low	high	medium	high
Integration of guests	---	high	very low	low	low	low
Conflict in staff meetings	high	low	low	high	medium	low
Conflict in lectures	high	medium	low	low	high	low
I. Reading list	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Amount required	high	very high	medium high	high	high	high
Focus on general sources	no	no	no	yes	yes	no
J. Lecture Session	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Immediate Faculty reactions to other's lec.	yes	yes	occasionally	no	occasionally	rarely
How often per week	1	1	1	1	1	1
Team lectures	no	all	yes	yes	yes	no
Panels	no	no	no	no	yes	no
Small group discussions	no	no	no	yes	no	yes

Course Aspect	Integration	Domination	Peace	Peasants	Ethnicity	Europe
K. Miscellaneous Techniques						
Films & slides	no	yes	no	yes	yes	no
Handouts	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
L. Discussion Sections	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Number per wk.	1	1	1	1	1	1
Focus	Disciplines	Readings	Topics	Topics	Topics	Topics
Switch leaders	no	once	many times	no	no	no
Faculty led	4	5	6	2	3	0
T.A. led	0	0	0	4	2	1
Size	20	20	25	10-15	5	10-15
M. Grading System	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Short essays	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no
Term papers	no	yes	no	no	yes	no
Examinations	no	no	no	yes	yes	yes
Section grades	yes	no	no	yes	yes	no
N. Student ratings of course as a whole						
Post-	average	high	low	average	average	low
Follow-up	low	low	very low	average	low	--
*Rated similarity to other courses	low	very low	very low	very low	very low	low

Appendix A, Section 2

Follow-up Questionnaire

Follow-up Ratings

The evaluation of the CIS Undergraduate Program is unusual in that follow-up information was obtained from students in the first five courses several months after they had completed the courses, in order to ascertain their later reactions. In the Methodology Chapter this procedure is discussed in detail. This Appendix presents the items contained in the questionnaire and the mean scores for each course. There were nine sections to the questionnaire:

A. Background Information
B. General Readings
C. Lectures
D. Discussion Sections
E. Grading Procedures
F. Content Organization
G. Course Outcomes
H. The Course as a Whole
I. Course Redesign

Included in the Content Organization, Course Outcomes, and Course as a Whole sections, were open-ended and rating items which were used to collect data on the interdisciplinary, problem-oriented, team-teaching aspects of the CIS courses.

A course by group, multivariate analysis of variance was done to isolate those items which significantly (.05 level) differentiate between the first four courses (Integration, Domination, Peace, and Peasants) or between repeaters and non-repeaters in those courses. Because of the limited numbers of repeaters in Europe, it was not included in this analysis and follow-up data was not collected. The results of this analysis are indicated beside each item, as follows:

C=course effect significant
G=group effect significant (repeaters vs. non-repeaters)
C/G=course and group main effects both significant
CG=interaction significant

For purposes of comparison, the mean scores from the College of Arts and Sciences norms are presented on the far right. The possible weaknesses in this data and some caveats in the interpretation of the results are discussed in the Methodology section and the reader should refer to this if he plans to use the mean scores for comparison purposes. In general, the actual mean scores are less important than the patterns across clusters of items.

"Background Information", the first section of the Follow-up Questionnaire, included questions as to the students' current class, sex, and school in which he/she was enrolled, as well as grade-related information, the most important reason for taking the course and for not enrolling in more CIS courses, and plans for after graduation. Students were also asked to estimate how often they attended lecture and

discussion sections and the percentage of assigned readings they had completed.

The next four sections of the questionnaire deal with the instructional techniques used in CIS courses -- Readings, Lectures, Discussion Sections, and Grading Procedures. Many of these are standard questions but some are tailored to the unique characteristics of the CIS program. Other items deal with the effect of readings, lectures, and discussions on the level of interest in the course topic and how well these aspects of the course were integrated.

Section F, Content Organization, was an attempt to find out where the content was first presented (in lectures, readings or discussion sections), how effective different strategies of content presentation were in increasing student interest, and how much overlap there was between these segments of the course.

Section G asked which disciplines were stressed in the course, whether they were integrated, and whether more disciplines should have been included. The students were asked to compare the CIS courses to other introductory courses in social and behavioral science and to assess their personal growth in terms of knowledge of specific problems in International Studies.

The next section is a cluster of items concerning the Course as a Whole. It was designed to disclose summary perceptions of the course. Items 5, 7, 10, and 12 are most important because they deal with the overall organization of the course, the students' interest level, perception of learning, and overall opinion of the course. For each of these items, students were asked to compare the CIS courses with other courses at Cornell before answering, and for purposes of comparison the norm scores for Arts and Sciences courses are included. All but one of the items in this section revealed a significant group effect and half of them showed significant course or interaction effect.

Finally, the students were asked to rate alternative ways of structuring the content, lectures, readings, discussion sections and grading systems if the course were to be offered again.

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CIS COURSES

You are asked to respond to the following questions in order to provide the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education with one measure of the long term effects of courses offered by the Center for International Studies. Your individual responses are confidential but CIS will be given summary information of how students rate their courses. Please answer all questions and keep this form until you meet with the CIUE interviewer.

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please place the appropriate code number within the parenthesis.

1. Which CIS courses have you taken to date: Courses were:

1=CIS 110, Integration and Decentralization - Spring 1971
2 CIS 209, Domination and Subordination - Fall 1971
3=CIS 210, Peace and War - Spring 1971
4=CIS 211, Peasants, Power, and Productivity - Fall 1972
5=CIS 212, Ethnicity, Race, and Communalism - Spring 1973
6=CIS 135, The Concept of Europe

	CIS 110	CIS 209	CIS 210	CIS 211	CIS 212	CIS 135
1=Freshman	1(0)	2(0)	3(0)	4(3)	5(0)	6( )
2=Sophomore	1(0)	2(20)	3(15)	4(7)	5(4)	6( )
3=Junior	1(11)	2(1)	3(4)	4(0)	5(2)	6( )
4=Senior	1(1)	2( )	3( )	4(2)	5(2)	6( )
5=Graduate	1( )	2( )	3( )	4(1)	5(0)	6( )
6=Extramural	1( )	2( )	3( )	4( )	5( )	6( )
2. Sex:						
1=Male	1(3)	2(8)	3(11)	4(7)	5(1)	6( )
2=Female	1(9)	2(13)	3(9)	4(6)	5(7)	6( )

4. School:

0=Agr.& Life Sci.	1(1)	2(4)	3(1)	4(1)	5(0)	6( )
1=Arts & Sci.	1(0)	2(1)	3(0)	4(0)	5(0)	6( )
2=Eng.	1(9)	2(9)	3(9)	4(9)	5(7)	6( )
4-Hu.Ec.	1(0)	2(0)	3(1)	4(1)	5(1)	6( )
5=Hotel	1(1)	2(3)	3(4)	4(1)	5(0)	6( )
6=ILR	1(0)	2(0)	3(1)	4(1)	5( )	6( )
7=Uncl.	1(1)	2(4)	3(4)	4(0)	5( )	6( )
8=Grad.	1( )	2( )	3( )	4( )	5( )	6( )
9=Extramural	1( )	2( )	3( )	4( )	5( )	6( )

5. What grade did you obtain in the CIS course(s) you took?

Grade=	1(10.0)	2(9.57)	3(8.75)	4(8.9)	5(9.6)	6( )

6. The approximate number of courses you have taken at Cornell is

	1(32.8)	2(18.0)	3(23.7)	4(18.0)	5(21.7)	6( )

and your grade point average is

	1(3.18)	2(3.07)	3(3.03)	4(3.1)	5(3.4)	6( )

7. What is your present or intended major?_____

8. Please place the number that corresponds with your most important reason for taking each course in the space provided.

1=interest in topic area of course	1(4)	2(10)	3(10)	4(7)	5(3)	6( )
2=interest in international relations	1(6)	2(7)	3(4)	4(5)	5(2)	6( )
3=previous experience with CIS courses	1(0)	2(0)	3(1)	4(0)	5( )	6( )
4=reputation of faculty involved	1(0)	2(0)	3(0)	4(0)	5( )	6( )
5=recommendation of advisor	1(0)	2(0)	3(0)	4(1)	5( )	6( )
6=advice of a friend	1(0)	2(3)	3(3)	4(0)	5( )	6( )

7=congruence with my schedule that semester

1(0) 2(0) 3(1) 4(0) 5( ) 6( )

8=other

1(2) 2(1) 3(1) 4(0) 5( ) 6( )

9. Please estimate for each CIS course you have taken:

a. The percentage of the scheduled lectures you attended

1(83.4) 2(88.8) 3(88.5) 4(90.4) 5(97.0) 6( )

b. The percentage of the discussion sections you attended

1(88.8) 2(84.6) 3(87.5) 4(90.7) 5(95) 6( )

c. The percentage of the assigned readings you completed

1(85.8) 2(64.3) 3(63.2) 4(87.8) 5(93) 6( )

10. If you have taken just one CIS course, what were your reasons for not enrolling in subsequent CIS courses? Please be specific

11. At the present time what you do you expect to do after graduation?

5=graduate school

1(3) 2(11) 3(6) 4(7) 5(2) 6( )

4=graduate professional school

1(7) 2(5) 3(9) 4(2) 5(4) 6( )

3=business

1(0) 2(1) 3(0) 4(1) 5(0) 6( )

2=other employment

1(1) 2(3) 3(3) 4(2) 5(2) 6( )

1=miscellaneous

1(1) 2(1) 3(2) 4(1) 5(0) 6( )

INSTRUCTIONS. Please answer the questions below in terms of your present perception of the CIS course(s) you have taken in the past. Most of these items use a seven point scale with "1" and "7" defined and "4" standing for the midpoint. For example, if a course is slightly below the midpoint in a given aspect, mark a "3" for that item. Write an "N" if the item does not apply to the CIS course you took.

B. General Readings

1. How would you rate the amount of reading required for the course? A & S norms

1=much too light to 7=much too heavy

C 1(4.67) 2(5.0) 3(4.75) 4(4.7) 5(5.3) 6( ) 4.5

2. Did the readings present a good balance of disciplinary and interdisciplinary materials?

1=too much emphasis on specialized disciplinary topics to 7=readings too general and interdisciplinary

1(3.75) 2(4.10) 3(4.42) 4(4.0) 5(4.0) 6( )

3. In general, what effect did the readings have on your interest in the course topics?

1=decreased interest, were boring to 7=stimulated greater interest

1(4.83) 2(4.48) 3(3.95) 4(3.92) 5(3.6) 6( )

4. How well integrated were the readings with the rest of the course?

1=very well integrated to 7=not at all integrated

G 1(4.00) 2(4.29) 3(4.65) 4(3.39) 5(3.6) 6( )

5. What do you remember as being the:

best reading_____
why_____
worst reading_____
why_____

C. Lectures

6. How would you rate the scope of the lectures? 3.9

1=too broad, superficial to 7=too narrow, didn't span enough topics

CG 1(3.83) 2(3.24) 3(3.15) 4(3.8) 5(3.7) 6( )

7. Were the lecturers open to questions from the audience? A & S norms
1=very open, encouraged questions to 7=not open, discouraged questions

C/G 1(2.67) 2(2.24) 3(2.05) 4(3.00) 5(4.1) 6( )

8. Did including outside guest lecturers aid you in understanding the course content?
1=aided understanding to 7=increased confusion N=no guest lecturers

CG 1(3.55) 2(3.25) 3(3.61) 4(2.69) 5(2.0) 6( )

9. How well integrated were the lectures with the rest of the course?
1=very well integrated to 7=not at all integrated

C 1(4.92) 2(3.76) 3(3.67) 4(2.62) 5(3.7) 6( )

10. In general, what effect did the lectures have on your interest in this area?
1=decreased interest, were boring to 7=stimulated great interest

G 1(3.33) 2(3.76) 3(3.74) 4(4.08) 5(4.0) 6( )

11a. Who was the most effective lecturer?_____ Why?_____
b. Who was the least effective lecturer?_____ Why?_____

12. What were the best, and worst, aspects of the way in which lectures were organized?
Best_____
Worst_____

13. Your CIS course was taught by a team of faculty members. What do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of this technique as compared to the most usual format of one faculty member completely responsible for a course? Please be specific.

D. Discussion Sections

1. Did the discussion leader(s) seem knowledgeable about course content?
1=uninformed to 7=knew content very well

1(6.08) 2(5.52) 3(5.45) 4(6.31) 5(4.6) 6( ) 5.6

A & S norms

2. Was there ample opportunity to ask questions?
1=no opportunity to 7=ample chance

G 1(6.25) 2(6.10) 3(6.40) 4(5.00) 5(5.1) 6( ) 6.3

3. Who did the talking in your sections?
1-students did almost all to 7=sections did almost all

1(4.08) 2(4.48) 3(4.15) 4(5.54) 5(4.7) 6( )

4. How much did you learn from the discussion sections?
1=nothing to 7=a great deal

C/G 1(4.67) 2(3.65) 3(3.0) 4(4.62) 5(4.0) 6( ) 4.4

5. What effect did the discussion sections have on your interest in the course topic?
1=decreased interest, were boring to 7=stimulated great interest

C/G 1(4.50) 2(4.38) 3(3.26) 4(4.39) 5(3.6) 6( ) 2.8

6. How well integrated with the rest of the course were the discussion sections?
1=very well integrated to 7=not at all integrated

1(4.33) 2(3.33) 3(3.84) 4(3.46) 5(3.6) 6( )

7. What were the best and worst aspects of the discussion sections?
Best_____
Worst_____

8. Who led your section?

E. Grading Procedures

A & S norms

9. Did the following aid your learning of the course content?
1=very little to 7=a great deal N=not used in course

short essays	1(4.71)	2(4.54)	3(4.29)	4(3.00)	5( )	6( )
term papers	1(5.25)	2(4.29)	3(4.22)	4( )	5(5.4)	6( )
examinations	1(3.0)	2(4.64)	3(2.0)	4(4.85)	5(4.4)	6( )
section grades	1(4.25)	2(2.83)	3(1.5)	4(3.00)	5(1.9)	6( )

10. Did the papers and/or examinations adequately sample the important material presented in this CIS course?
1=not at all to 7=reflected the important aspects of the course

G 1(4.25) 2(4.67) 3(3.85) 4(4.77) 5(5.0) 6( )

11. Did the papers and/or examinations make you think?
1=not at all to 7=a great deal

G 1(4.83) 2(5.14) 3(5.06) 4(5.46) 5(5.4) 6( )

12. Were the grading procedures suitable for this kind of course?
1=very suitable to 7=not at all suitable for this course

1(4.0) 2(3.81 3(3.45 4(3.77) 5(3.3) 6( ) 3.0

13. Was the grading system fair?
1=very unfair to 7=very fair

1(4.92) 2(4.14) 3(4.42) 4(4.62) 5(5.1) 6( ) 4.9

14. Did you receive adequate feedback on your performance on the papers and/or exams?
1=no answers or guidance given to 7=full explanations provided

CG 1(5.58) 2(4.38) 3(3.7) 4(3.92) 5(4.3) 6( )

15. Overall, how would you rate the grading system?
1=very inadequate to 7=very adequate as a test of my knowledge

1(5.08) 2(3.91) 3(4.21) 4(3.85) 5(4.4) 6( ) 4.4

16. What were the best and worst aspects of the grading system used in this course?
Best_____
Worst_____

F. Content Organization

1. What effect did the following have on your interest in the topic of this course?
1=decreased interest, were boring to 7=stimulated great interest

Analyzing specific case studies selected by the faculty
CG 1(5.25) 2(4.88) 3(4.55) 4(6.15) 5(6.0) 6( )
Learning a model or organizing framework designed by the faculty
G 1(3.00) 2(3.75) 3(3.10) 4(5.15) 5(4.0) 6( )
The use of games or simulations
1( ) 2(3.88) 3(4.21) 4(3.00) 5(5.0) 6( )

2. Approximately what percentage of the content was first presented in:

a weekly lecture
C 1(26.3) 2(34.4) 3(56.4) 4(55.8) 5(30.1) 6( )
readings
1(49.9) 2(5.50) 3(45.5) 4(35.8) 5(57.5) 6( )
discussion sections
1(32.2) 2(17.5) 3(8.23) 4(12.2) 5(7.5) 6( )

3. Approximately how much overlap was there between the course activities?
1=far too much repetition of content to 7=much too little overlap

between lectures and readings
1(5.7) 2(3.9) 3(4.7) 4(4.08) 5(2.9) 6( )
between readings and discussion sections
C 1(3.82) 2(4.05) 3(4.68) 4(4.31) 5(4.9) 6( )
between discussion sections and lectures
1(5.36) 2(4.45) 3(4.37) 4(4.69) 5(4.4) 6( )

4. What were the best and worst aspects of the way in which the content was organized?
Best_____
Worst_____

G. Course Outcome

5. The viewpoints of a number of disciplines were presented in your CIS course(s). Please indicate below which disciplines were included and use the following scale to rate how much each was emphasized.
1=little emphasis in course to 7=strongest emphasis in course

A. The Disciplines

Anthropology	1(2.91)	2(2.90)	3(3.63)	4(3.44)	5(2.0)	6( )
Economics	1(4.5)	2(4.86)	3(4.06)	4(4.91)	5(3.4)	6( )
Government	1(4.83)	2(3.75)	3(4.58)	4(5.25)	5(5.4)	6( )
History	1(4.92)	2(3.86)	3(4.74)	4(2.33)	5(5.0)	6( )
Psychology	1( )	2(4.35)	3(3.53)	4(3.00)	5(2.2)	6( )
Sociology	1( )	2(3.64)	3(3.06)	4(3.60)	5(2.5)	6( )
Other	1( )	2(3.33)	3(3.5)	4(4.60)	5( )	6( )

C

B. Were these disciplines presented in an integrated fashion?
1=each presented largely independently to 7=combined in an integrated presentation

1(2.83) 2(3.76) 3(3.0) 4(3.62) 5(3.9) 6( )

C. Should other disciplines have been covered?
1=no 2=yes

1(1.18) 2(1.24) 3(1.05) 4(1.31) 5(1.3) 6( )

If yes, which ones?

6. Approximately how many introductory courses in the social and behavioral sciences have you taken to date?
1(5.0) 2(5.05) 3(3.95) 4(4.92) 5(5.3) 6( )

Compared to these other introductory courses, how successful was the CIS course in the following areas
1=considerably less successful to 7=much more successful

In providing you with a useful terminology to discuss behavioral and social science phenomena

G 1(4.0) 2(2.86) 3(2.63) 4(3.69) 5(4.4) 6( )

In providing you with the concepts and techniques needed

CG 1(3.60) 2(3.24) 3(2.95) 4(4.77) 5(4.1) 6( )

In giving you a "feel" for how others live and think

CG 1(5.46) 2(4.14) 3(4.24) 4(4.62) 5(4.6) 6( )

In giving you insights relevant to your own life and concerns

G 1(3.73) 2(4.0) 3(3.63) 4(3.54) 5(4.6) 6( )

1. Regarding other courses at Cornell

Do you see any of them as similar to this CIS course?

1=no 2=yes

No	1(8)	2(20)	3(18)	4(10)	5(6)	6( )
Yes	1(4)	2(1)	3(2)	4(2)	5(2)	6( )

If yes, which courses_____

Do you remember what other course you would have taken that semester if this CIS course has not been given?

1-no 2=yes

No	1(8)	2(12)	3(14)	4(9)	5(6)	6( )
Yes	1(3)	2(9)	3(6)	4(4)	5(2)	6( )

If yes, which course_____

Has this CIS course in any way been useful to you in other courses?

1=no 2=yes

No	1(3)	2(6)	3(13)	4(5)	5(3)	6( )
Yes	1(9)	2(15)	3(7)	4(8)	5(5)	6( )

Has your experience in this CIS course influenced your enrollment in any other course(s)?
1=no 2=yes

No	1(9)	2(14)	3(12)	4(8)	5(2)	6( )
Yes	1(3)	2(7)	3(8)	4(5)	5(6)	6( )

If yes, which courses?

2. Have the CIS course(s) you have taken influenced your choice of a major?
1=no 2=yes

No	1(9)	2(18)	3(16)	4(8)	5(5)	6( )
Yes	1(3)	2(3)	3(4)	4(5)	5(3)	6( )

If yes, what was that influence?_____

3. How successful was the total course in providing you with the following
1=quite unsuccessful to 7=very successful

An adequate knowledge of the extent of problem covered
G 1(4.0) 2(3.14) 3(3.60) 4(4.85) 5(5.1) 6( )

Your own conceptual framework to use for organizing material on this problem
CG 1(4.0) 2(3.71) 3(3.60) 4(5.05) 5(4.7) 6( )

Your own conceptual framework to use for analyzing and comparing different approaches to the problem
G 1(3.92) 2(4.19) 3(3.75) 4(4.08) 5(4.1) 6( )

4. Each CIS course attempts to analyze a specific problem. How effective was the total course in providing an understanding of
1=I learned a great deal to 7-I learned very little

The size and immensity of the problem
1(2.67) 2(2.62) 3(2.55) 4(1.54) 5(2.6) 6( )

The role of government policy in solving this problem
C/G 1(2.92) 2(4.5) 3(4.35) 4(3.54) 5(3.3) 6( )

What you can do to deal with this problem
1(6.0) 2(4.0) 3(5.05) 4(4.23) 5(3.9) 6( )

A & S norms

The international aspects of the problem

CG 1(2.25) 2(3.19) 3(3.5) 4(3.46) 5(3.4) 6( )

The relevance of the problem to American Society

1(4.92) 2(3.38) 3(3.39) 4(4.76) 5(4.4) 6( ))

The utility of an interdisciplinary approach to this problem

1(3.5) 2(3.10) 3(3.58) 4(2.05) 5(4.1) 6( ))

5. What do you see as the relative strength and weaknesses of introductory interdisciplinary courses as compared to courses stressing one discipline?

H. Course as a Whole

1. Did the course fulfill your expectations in terms of what you wished to learn on this topic?
   1=not at all to 7=the course fully met my expectations

GG 1(3.83) 2(3.81) 3(3.3) 4(4.77) 5(3.4) 6( ) 4.8

2. Were the faculty willing to help students experiencing difficulty with the course?
   1=seemed unwilling to help to 7=seemed interested in being helpful

C 1(6.25) 2(5.43) 3(5.1) 4(6.23) 5(3.4) 6( )

3. If it were given again the same way, would you recommend it to a friend interested in this area of international relations?
   1=yes, without reservations to 7=no, under no circumstances

1(4.58) 2(4.43) 3(4.75) 4(3.46) 5(4.6) 6( )

FOR THE REMAINING QUESTIONS IN THIS SECTION PLEASE ANSWER BY COMPARING THIS CIS COURSE WITH THE OTHER COURSES YOU HAVE TAKEN AT CORNELL

4. Compared to other courses, how much effort did you invest in this one?
   1=invested much less effort to 7=invested much more effort

C/CG 1(5.0) 2(4.57) 3(3.5) 4(5.15) 5(5.6) 6( ) 4.6

A & S norms

5. The overall organization of the course was
1=much less organized than most to 7=much better organized

C 1(2.33) 2(3.10) 3(2.75) 4'5.46) 4(3.3) 6( )

6. Compared to other courses, how much personal contact outside of class did you have with the faculty?
1=much more than usual to 7=much less

1(3.67) 2(3.67) 3(4.55) 4(3.85) 5(5.0) 6( )

7. My interest level in this course, in comparison with other courses was
1=much lower to 7=much greater

CG 1(4.17) 2(4.19) 3(3.74) 4(5.08) 5(5.1) 6( ) 4.5

8. Compared to other courses, how much independent thinking did this one require?
1=no thinking required to 7=thinking always required

1(4.75) 2(5.10) 3(4.9) 4(5.23) 5(4.6) 6( )

9. The difficulty level of this course was
1=much easier than most to 7=much harder

1(4.42) 2(4.29) 3(4.05) 4(4.46) 5(5.3) 6( ) 4.6

10. The amount I learned in this course, in comparison to other courses was
1=much less to 7=much more

C 1(4.0) 2(3.48) 3(3.35) 4(5.08) 5(4.9) 6( ) 4.5

11. The value of this course to my general education, in comparison to other courses was
1=much less to 7=much more

1(3.92) 2(4.10) 3(3.45) 4(4.69) 5(4.7) 6( ) 4.5

12. Overall, my opinion of this course is that it was
1=a very poor course to 7=an excellent course

1(4.25) 2(4.05) 3(3.4) 4(4.69) 5(3.9) 6( ) 7( ) 4.9

13. CIS courses are intended to be interdisciplinary, problem-oriented courses, stressing the importance of social science insights into international problems. What does that mean to you after taking this CIS course?

COURSE REDESIGN CODE SHEET (Course is CIS ___)

	CONTENT				
MODEL:					
number of weeks	1(3.5)	2(3.85)	3(2.33)	4(4.85)	5(5.2)
when in semester					
1=beginning	1(6)	2(13)	3(11)	4(12)	5(5)
2=middle	1(0)	2(3)	3(1)	4(0)	5(1)
3=end	1(1)	2(5)	3(0)	4(4)	5(0)
4=all	1(2)	2(1)	3(1)	4(0)	5(1)
5=other	1(1)	2(1)	3(1)	4(1)	5(0)
CASE STUDY					
number of weeks	1(9.3)	2(5.79)	3(6.2)	4(7.9)	5(8.3)
number of cases	1(3.67)	2(4.77)	3(4.0)	4(5.7)	5(3.6)
when in semester					
1=beginning	1(1)	2(2)	3(3)	4(2)	5(2)
2=middle	1(1)	2(4)	3(6)	4(6)	5(5)
3=end	1(1)	2(5)	3(0)	4(4)	5(0)
4=all	1(5)	2(2)	3(5)	4(0)	5(1)
5=other	1(1)	2(4)	3(1)	4(0)	5(0)
FILMS, SLIDES					
use					
1=never	1(1)	2(0)	3(0)	4(0)	5(0)
2=lecture	1(5)	2(8)	3(6)	4(7)	5(1)
3=section	1(0)	2(2)	3(2)	4(1)	5(0)
4=both	1(5)	2(9)	3(10)	4(5)	5(5)

NEW MATERIAL					
Percentage					
Lectures	1(36.4)	2(38.6)	3(4.6)	4(53.1)	5(1.33)
Readings	1(39.1)	2(49.8)	3(41.1)	4(34.2)	5(40.8)
Discussion	1(30.0)	2(18.2)	3(18.2)	4(18.3)	5(15.8)
Overlap					
1=low	1(2)	2(6)	3(1)	4(3)	5(1)
2=medium	1(2)	2(10)	3(7)	4(5)	5(5)
3=high	1(3)	2(3)	3(7)	49 3)	5(1)

LECTURES

LECTURES					
Number	1(1.5)	2(1.76)	3(.172)	4(1.61)	5(1.4)
Length (hours)	1(1.61)	2(1.66)	3(1.41)	4(1.46)	5(1.8)
Meet when					
1=morning	1(0)	2(0)	3(0)	4(0)	5(1)
2=afternoon	1(2)	2(2)	3(1)	4(0)	5(1)
3=night	1(2)	2(7)	3(4)	4(0)	5(3)
4=other	1( )	2( )	3(1)	4( )	5(1)
STAFF					
Faculty lectures (weeks)	1(10.3)	2(10.7)	3(5.01)	4(5.75)	5(4.4)
Guest lectures (weeks)	1(4.67)	2(4.3)	3(6.62)	4(6.22)	5(5.4)
Design					
Faculty panels					
1=no	1(3)	2(9)	3(7)	4(6)	5(8)
2=yes	1(6)	2(10)	3(8)	4(6)	5(0)
Films & slides					
1=no	1(0)	2(2)	3(0)	4( )	5(0)
2=yes	1(10)	2(18)	3(17)	4(12)	5(8)
Student questions					
1=no	1(0)	2(1)	3(1)	4( )	5(0)
2=yes	1(10)	2(20)	3(18)	4(13)	5(8)
When?					

[Student questions;
When?]

1=beginning	1(0)	2(0)	3(0)	4( )	5(0)
2=middle	1(1)	2(0)	3(0)	4(1)	5(1)
3=end	1(4)	2(7)	3(13)	4(6)	5(2)
4=all	1(4)	2(8)	3(2)	4(4)	5(4)
5=other	1(1)	2(1)	3(1)	4( )	5(1)
Small discussion groups					
1=no	1(5)	2(2)	3(4)	4(4)	5(0)
2=yes	1(6)	2(16)	3(14)	4(8)	5(8)

READINGS

Readings					
No. pages/week	1(133.9)	2(123)	3(116.3)	4(106.3)	5(121.2)
Specialized, disc.	1(52.5)	2(47.3)	3(50)	4(32.9)	5(58.3)
Gen. Interdisc.	(47.5)	2(52.8)	3(5.0)	4(57.1)	5(52.5)
Cost to students (to nearest $)	1(19.8)	2(17.3)	3(16.8)	4(19.4)	5(12.9)
Cover readings in					
1=lecture	1(0)	2(1)	3(0)	4( )	5(0)
2=section	1(2)	2(3)	3(3)	4(2)	5(3)
3=both	1(8)	2(16)	3(14)	4(1.0)	5[5)

SECTIONS

Sections					
Times/week	1(1.91)	2(1.1)	3(1.11)	4(1.3)	5(1.0)
length (hrs)	1(1.06)	2(1.03)	3(1.04)	4(1.1)	5(1.6)
size	1(15.3)	2(13.5)	3(13.8)	4(12.6)	5(7.1)
Staff					
1=T.A.s	1(0)	2(2)	3(10)	4(1)	5(0)
2=faculty	1(7)	2(10)	3(1)	4(5)	5(2)
3=either/both	1(4)	2(8)	3(7)	4(7)	5(6)
4=other	1(0)	2(0)	3(0)	4( )	5(0
Switch leaders	1(2.2)	2(2.31)	3(3.33)	4(2.44)	5(1.4,

Discuss					
1=readings	1(2)	2(4)	3(0)	4(0)	5(0)
2=lectures	1(0)	2(0)	3(2)	4(0)	5(0)
3=course topics	1(3)	2(7)	3(12)	4(8)	5(6)
4=cur. events	1(0)	2(1)	3(0)	4(0)	5(0)
5=other	1(5)	2(6)	3(2)	4(2)	5( )
			GRADING		
Short essays (%)	1(46.1)	2(36.3)	3(60.3)	4(30.6)	5(7.1)
Term papers (%)	1(39.9)	2(37.7)	3(35.2)	4(28.6)	5(31.1)
Examinations (%)	1(30.0)	2(32.3)	3(36.0)	4(48.4)	5(35.3)
Section Grades	1(20.6)	2(20.9)	3(19.6)	4928.9)	5(23.3)
Exams					
number	1(1.43)	2(1.50)	3(1.71)	4(2.27)	5(1.9)
length (hrs)	1(6.5)	2(4.79)	3(6.8)	4(3.2)	5(1.2)
type					
1=essay	1(7)	2(12)	3(6)	4(8)	5(8)
2=object	1(0)	2(0)	3(1)	4(0)	5(0)
3=both	1(0)	2(1)	3(0)	4(1)	5(0)
4=other	1(0)	2(4)	3(0)	4(1)	5(0)
Essays					
number	1(3.13)	2(2.93)	3(3.64)	4(2.78)	5(08)
length (pgs)	1(6.5)	2(4.79)	3(6.8)	4(3.2)	5(1.2)
type					
1=free	1(1)	2(2)	3(1)	4(4)	5(4)
2=some struct.	1(2)	2(3)	3(8)	4(2)	5(0)
3=assigned	1(1)	2(3)	3(3)	4(3)	5(0)
Termpapers					
Number	1(1.0)	2(1.29)	3(1.27)	4(1.22)	5(1.0)
length (pgs)	1(12.3)	2(11.1)	3(11.2)	4(10.0)	5(10.7)

Type of paper					
1=free	1(2)	2(10)	3(3)	4(6)	5(4)
2=some struc.	1(1)	2(1)	3(5)	4(1)	5(1)
3=assigned	1(1)	2(0)	3(1)	4(1)	5(0)
Section					
Basis of grade					
1=participation	1(8)	2(10)	3(8)	4(9)	5(5)
2=attendance	1(0)	2(1)	3(0)	4( )	5(1)
3=both	1(2)	2(4)	3(1)	4(1)	5(0)
4=other	1(0)	2(1)	3(1)	4( )	5(1)

Appendix A, Section 3

Grade Distribution in CIS Courses

Table 11

Grade Distribution in CIS Courses

	Integration	Domination	Peace	Peasants	Ethnicity
A+	0	0	0	5	0
A	11.7	.27	0	.69	.77
A-	17.6	25.0	6.1	11.1	15.4
B+	29.4	18.4	12.2	9.7	7.7
B	11.8	25.0	28.4	9.7	34.6
B-	13.2	10.5	35.1	8.3	15.4
C+	2.9	5.3	10.8	9.7	7.7
C	4.4	4.0	4.1	.8	7.7
C-	0	0	0	5.6	0
D+	0	0	0	2.8	3.9
D	1.5	0	.7	8.3	0
D=	0	0	0	4.2	0
F	0	0	0	1.4	0
Incomplete	2.9	9.2	2.7	6.9	0

Appendix A, Section 4

Responses of "Repeaters"

to questions on special characteristics of the

CIS Courses

RESPONSES OF "REPEATERS"
to SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS QUESTIONS

C. Question 13: "What do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of team teaching?"

Get a variety of opinions from different viewpoints.

Advantages are that you have an immediate resource outside of the one the lecturer is in, to point out contradictions in the lecture as far as other disciplines go. It would seem odd to teach international relations in any other way but interdisciplinary. I don't see how that could be effectively done. Disadvantages are when personality conflicts between the professors interrupt the flow of learning and discussion.

Advantages: I see that different points of view exist among scholars, a psychologist, an economist, a government major and a historian all seem to approach things with a different perspective.
Disadvantage: that they argued among themselves and conflicts were left unsolved.

Advantages: I think that if the format of the course is carefully formulated it very definitely is enriched if it is taught by several faculty members.
Disadvantages: but several members teaching a course can also destroy a course [209].

The professors need to agree on their plan for the course -- and they should limit their use of the students' time to relating to the students their different opinions (not by sharing among themselves their different points of view).

As interdisciplinary, they shouldn't be monogenized but an intersection of certain disciplines. It was hard to grasp economics or anthro points of view; but good to get a sample of that perspective on the topic; and from a professor who knew just about that -- so one person wouldn't be asked to teach every discipline (impossible).

Advantages: different viewpoints and perspectives to a certain extent, different fields can help broaden perspectives as long as they stick to a general theme.
Disadvantages: Hard to assimilate all the different types of material presented. Hard to apply all the different viewpoints, especially when they disagreed.

Advantages: varying viewpoints.
Disadvantages: repetition.

Advantages: the students get the opportunity to integrate what each prof says and to discern for themselves which opinions to respect. Excellent learning process -- to be exposed to some great minds and how they think on topics concerning us today. It was interesting to have a change of speaker, delivery and style. I guess I appreciated being exposed to many peoples' ideas and biases.

Advantages: exposure to different points of view and approaches of different disciplines; some good teaching is more likely. I think that this approach is more likely to yield a balanced view of the topic instead of a defence of one professor's ideas.
Disadvantages: lack of continuity, perhaps lack of depth in the subject matter.

Advantages: breadth of disciplinary views.
Disadvantages: disunity caused at times.

Advantages: most obviously the presentation of the issue is from a more balanced perspective. Many of the personal idiosyncracies that one prof might add to the lecture are curtailed by his fellow faculty members. The readings are not as monotonous as they would be otherwise. (Many viewpoints and levels to analyze.)

Allows better, broader grasp of subject matter -- a more of a realistic approach when considered from different angles.

Advantages: got different views on topics as would be seen from different disciplines; saw essential way interdisciplinary study necessary for the accurate study of a topic.
Disadvantages: problem that often left unable to pursue adequately one topic under a specific discipline .

Advantages: team teaching in 209 provided really lively discussion and debate; the teachers were honest and excited about subject. In 210 I must honestly say that the major advantage was a change of voice. Rarely did the lecturers get too heated up in any sort of controversy.

Advantages: you get a broader perspective of this topic from a personal viewpoint as well as a disciplinary one; styles vary; tends not to stagnate.
Disadvantages: not always totally coherent throughout the course.

Advantages: get different viewpoints all at the same time.

Advantages: we were able to hear different perspectives. In 209 the instructors worked nicely together.
Disadvantages: Any cohesion that might have existed in 209 I felt was gone in 210. The only thing I didn't like was that it seemed that the lecturers felt that CIS was a different type of course than one which meets in the daytime; and hence were more unprepared

and talked more from the perspective of their own personal philosophies rather than from their disciplines.

Advantages: able to see the differences of opinion which the faculty members had; I learned from their disagreements.

Of course, in an interdisciplinary endeavor, one professor would be hard put to it to present adequate understanding of each topic. One problem was evident in this method in the 210 course -- whereas in the 209 course the professors seemed to have concurred on a certain broad framework, the 210 profs seemed like separate entities, not knowing what the overall view was to be. Perhaps this was because there were so many guest lecturers, along with so many professors.

F. Question 4:"What were the best and worse aspects of the way in which the content was organized?"

209 B: tie up at end of course with alternate ways of living gave purpose.
W: purpose of course not clearly understood for most of the first half of course.

210 B: good attempt to get a true interdisciplinary approach.
W: lectures usually completely irrelevant to rest of course material.

---

209 B: interdisciplinary approach
W: only one night a week

210 B: interdisciplinary approach
W: only one night a week

---

209 B: topics were large and could be explored

210 W: too many small topics; discussion changed quickly from one week to the next. No opportunity for continuity.

---

209 B: liked format of three hour sessions

210 W: too much repetition

---

209 B: allowed freedom to move within format
W: too little connection with sections

210 B: very organized; knew exactly where one was going
W: too much overlap

---

209 B: relaxed, three-way (teacher-teacher-student triangle) discussion
W: perhaps in single reading per week approach

212 B: readings were generally excellent for course approach
W: hard, cold lectures. The students don't even want to respond.

210 B: broad readings related to specific lectures
W: lack of integration of material

211 B: sections synthesize lectures and readings
W: excessive examples in readings

---

210 B: incorporating different disciplines and perspectives and the integration between aspects of the course
W: the reading list was huge; no one could possible do all the reading and we were never really expected to. I didn't even know what I should try to read.

---

210 B: I liked outside and variety of speakers and way info was relevant to today.

211 B: same as above. I was very satisfied with each course.

---

210 B: chronological
W: too broad

211 B: theory leading to application
W: sometimes too specific

---

210 B: the lectures related very well to the reading; organized it.
W: the progression through the semester was hazy, hard to tell where we were headed.

211 B: first general problems were learned, then applied.
W: it was "over-organized" tried to make neat packages and profession out of everything

---

Content was all generally good; fine material, good presentation, but everything started breaking down in analysis and interpretation.

---

209 B: "there was organization?"

---

209 B: each discipline presented, one at a time

210 W: too long on one discipline

---

209 B: topics were large and could be explored

210 W: too many small topics, discussions changed quickly from one week to the next. No opportunity for continuity.

209/210 B: the discussion sections offered a good chance to review the readings
209/210 W: the lectures were boring, not obviously pertinent to anything but professors' opinions.

210/212 B: debate form; amount of lively discussion
210/212 W: we should have discussed weeks subject after the lectures not before; so many short readings.

---

211 B: all three were basically related to each other. Notes passed out each week helped considerably.
W: lectures did not present their material such that I could fully understand and if I had not attended discussion. Instead of discussing she first explained all over again and then we discussed.

---

209 B: a different aspect of the same problem was presented each week. Different disciplines spoke on same topic.

212 W: three intensive case studies become boring and repetitious and then in the later theoretical framework, facts from case studies are tossed out for the tenth time.

110, 209, 210 B: sections, readings and discussion good but
W: did not tie into lecture and lecture readings

G. Question 5: "What do you see as the relative strength and weakness of introductory interdisciplinary courses as compared to courses stressing one discipline?"

Better understand a problem when it is presented from different sides. Secondly, provides wider range of learning to student, taken from different viewpoints and from different fields, thereby giving student more opportunity to come to his own conclusions on the problem.

It is much better when viewing a problem for the first time to see the different ways of solving it or reacting to it. Looking at something either economically or historically or psychologically at the introductory level can bias your view when studying the same topic at a later date.

S: get a broader perspective. See that each argument has many different approaches.
W: get lost in the muddle. Tries to do too much. It is quite hard to be able to understand four different disciplines you know little about, in one course.

S: if it is presented as it should be (a true interdisciplinary approach) it aids understanding in the complexities of a situation by presenting the factors involved and some knowledge of how such factors are interrelated.
W: such an approach has to be learned and in any of the courses I met very few people and instructors from whom the interdisciplinary approach was really even expressed or attempted.

S: ability to analyze a topic, rather than one discipline over many topics.
W: difficult if one hasn't a basic understanding of the perspective of each discipline.

S: different views are presented. Different professors add more to one's understanding of a topic. If the subject is presented clearly, according to the views of several fields, a lot can be learned that does not have to be assimilated into a "structural framework".
W: hard to organize and assimilate the different approaches. Different professors can also wind up being confusing. In trying to put the interdisciplinary material together, the course can get too general and the language used can become almost meaningless (an analytic framework to be used to understand the basic structure of the general scope of... etc.)

It is difficult to use high level terminology in an intro interdisciplinary. I believe there should be no such thing as an introductory interdisciplinary course. It is necessary to have had social and natural science background to benefit fully.

Introductory courses give you a broad understanding of many facets and when you become interested in one particular one, a one discipline course will focus on it. Narrow down a topic for intensive study. Sometimes interdisciplinary courses are too broad and sometimes one discipline courses are too narrow. It's a system of checks and balances.

S : they cover one topic more extensively, reflect the complexity of attempting to solve real world problems more fully.
W: they don't help you to develop a feel for any one discipline and seem to tend to be rather loosely integrated.

S: integrating disciplines, as should be done in dealing with social problems.
W: not the depth really necessary for a real comprehension of any one discipline's framework.

S: it allows the student to have an initial approach towards the subject matter with a broader perspective.
W: is that parts of the disciplines involved may be summarized superficially or erroneously. It becomes easy to slip into generalizations about causative factors in any situation -- as well as avoiding coming to a conclusion about possible solutions.

S: much more overall picture of situation available yet leaves out emphases of one discipline for benefit of whole.

S: Obviously, strength lies in diversity of exposure.

S: broader view of the topic and its relation to the world.
W: don't learn very much in specific about how each discipline perceives the problem and especially how it perceives all other problems.

The topics chosen are such that it is unrealistic to deal with them in any but an interdisciplinary manner.

S: the courses were enjoyable when students can hear the disciplines' response to a problem, not an individual's perspective.
W: I was unable to learn what it would do about the problem.

A chance to integrate many different ideas on a problem and subsequently a chance to attack the problem from more than one single angle.

S: It is very valuable to learn to approach topics from all sides.
W: I don't see much strength in introductory interdisciplinary courses; material in each discipline must be necessarily treated briefly. I think some one discipline course in several of these disciplines first. It is dangerous to approach topics from all sides without adequate knowledge of any of the sides in question.

S: theoretically, much better approach.
W: the effectiveness of the course depends on the ability of the individual instructor to cooperate and get the material across.

Students should have some prior experience with the disciplines to get the most out of courses in CIS. Required reading gives student feeling for literature he'll be exposed to in different disciplines.

S: interdisciplinary, the word itself because you combine so much in one course that one is able to learn about five or more aspects of one problem instead of one view. You are able to work with all the disciplines, which I think is reality, to solve a problem you need not only psychology but economics, anthropology, etc.
W: so much to cover in such a short time. By the time you know the problems, see possible answers and begin to integrate the two, the course is over. But this is true for other courses also.

Basically I prefer them -- are problem-oriented, broadbased. There is some problem of adequate preparation to deal with the problem of learning analytic tools. At least one sees the issues as real, not as mere examples to learn how to research and observe.

I believe an interdisciplinary course is a much more realistic approach to learning. Life is interdisciplinary and the subject matter studied in CIS is directly related to life. My own failure to grasp a great deal from the course is largely due to

psychological problems of mine during the past two years. My overall academic record is bad, however, of all my courses at Cornell, CIS has been the most innovative in its approach. This has impressed me. (I've been preoccupied with things other than school.)

The strength and weaknesses depend on the faculty members and the course construction. 209 helped me a great deal and I enjoyed the cohesiveness of the course and the ability, as a freshman, to speak to faculty members. 210 disappointed me because of the largeness of the course and the attempt to cover many topics in a short period of time. Each professor in 210 talked to the students as if we were experts in his field.

H. Question 13: "CIS courses are intended to be interdisciplinary, problem-oriented courses, stressing the importance of social science insights into international problems. What does that mean to you after taking this CIS course?"

A good approach, but too much to handle in an introductory context. But, these courses did help me realize the variety of different disciplines which are useful in examining any problem.

It seems that these goals have been met fairly well.

The courses were enjoyable when the disciplines' response to a problem, not an individual's perspective, is presented. I was able to see how a discipline applied but I was unable to learn what it would do about the problem.

Shows the student more than one way of looking and perceiving a problem, more than one way of dealing with a problem, different possible solutions or lack of solutions to a problem and the international universality of human problems.

International problems are not problems that can be solved by one answer oriented in one direction; very complex; social sciences involving many aspects of life can provide both backgrounds and answers to the integration of some solution. Or at least give one a better way to understanding what one is facing.

I think that I have a better understanding of the degree of complexity of the problems of preventing war or fostering rural(?) development; more psychological and technical. Social science insights are important to understanding these problems; but now I doubt what contribution social science can make to solving these except by analyzing failures. CIS courses do seem to emphasize the interrelationships between social science disciplines.

A view of a relevant problem is taken by many interdisciplinary approaches (angles) to shed light on the problem from different areas. This helps a student examine given knowledge, compare it with previous knowledge and make hypotheses and conclusions about the problems that are relevant to life today.

Exactly what it says.

The very language of this question is one of my objections to CIS courses -- a social scientific jargon or gobbledygook seems to be obligatory if one wants to speak in terms general enough to cover all the areas involved in the course. If each field is used to look specifically at the problem, however, without being too general or too specific, then I am in favor of the interdisciplinary approach, as I do believe it can broaden one's understanding of the problem.

That sounds just like they were.

It means to me as when I use the number four as above it usually went from the highest to the lowest point of the scale and everywhere in between. For me it did, I feel, what it was intended but most of that learning I felt I had to do on my own and also I found the course and the approach useful beyond international problems -- from everyday personal problems to world problems.

It means that the disciplines often disagree and are in conflict with one another.

Would prefer to discuss this in an interview. Am unsure what is desired.

Interdisciplinary -- more than one -- from four to five fields -- used to approach a specific problem. Problem-oriented, not a general course in subject matter but rather dealing with a topic -- trying to answer one (or a few basic questions). Social science problems dealt with by using the various social science disciplines which are more humanity oriented and for me to identify with.

CIS courses deal with international relations on an interdisciplinary level using various fields of approach to study particular issues. That is a more realistic, still quite theoretical way to deal with social problems.

That CIS courses, using social science insights to examine problems. I don't think 209 was enough internationally oriented, except for a section on colonialism.

We dealt very much with this, we were given the problems from different perspectives (their opinion and ours, etc.) then we came up with our own answers. Social sciences play a major role in international problems.

This means that in order to tackle important problems such as poverty, race problems, war, etc. you must examine the problem in terms of economics, psychology, history, anthropology and the related sciences to get at all the roots and implications of the problems so that a more efficient and practical solution can be arrived at and implemented.

Appendix A, Section 5

The Cornell Inventory

for

Student Appraisal of Teaching and Courses.

The Cornell Inventory for Student Appraisal of Teaching and Courses.

This general course evaluation questionnaire, published by the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education at Cornell, was an important source of comparative data. A copy of the questionnaire, showing the item mean scores for courses in the College of Arts and Sciences, follows. These norms are based on 1971-72 responses of 8,301 students and were used to compare with student ratings on the CIS course Follow-up Questionnaire.

CORNELL INVENTORY FOR STUDENT APPRAISAL OF TEACHING AND COURSES

Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education at Cornell University

You are asked to respond to the following questions in order to provide the teacher with one measure of the success of this course. Your constructive criticism is appreciated.

Background Information

(Place the appropriate code number on the answer sheet provided)

1. Sex: 1= Male 2= Female

2. School:
   0= Agriculture and Life Sciences
   1= Architecture
   2= Arts & Sciences
   3= Engineering
   4= Human Ecology
   5= Hotel Admin.
   6= ILR
   7= Unclassified
   8= Graduate School
   9= Other (e.g. Extramural)

3. Class: 1= Fresh. 2= Soph. 3= Junior 4= Senior 5= Graduate 6= Extramural

4. Approximate grade in this course to date: 1= A 2= B 3= C 4= D 5= F 6= S 7= U 8= Don't Know

5. Approximate cumulative average: 1= 4.0 2= 3.0 3= 2.0 4= 1.0 5= not applicable

6. Is this course in your intended or actual major? 1= Yes 2= No 3= Undecided

7. My most important reason for taking this course was:
   1= it is required for the major
   2= it has a great reputation
   3= the subject matter was of interest
   4= it is required for graduate work
   5= other

Instructions: The following questions are to be answered using a 5-point scale, where "1" and "5" will be defined and "3" always stands for the midpoint. For example, if a course is slightly below the midpoint in a given aspect, mark a "2" for that item. Write a "0" if the question does not apply to this course.

---

8. Did the teacher stimulate your interest in the subject?
   1= destroyed interest; was boring 5= stimulated great interest

9. How much independent thinking did the teacher demand?
   1= no thinking required 5= thinking always required

10. Was the teacher tolerant of other viewpoints?
    1= allowed no contradiction of his viewpoint 5= welcomed differences in viewpoint

11. The difficulty level of the lectures was such that the teacher: 3.1
    1= underestimated my abilities 5= overestimated my abilities

12. Was the teacher's presentation of material organized?
    1= congested; disorganized 5= clear; organized

13. How clear was the teacher's enunciation ?
    1= indistinct; impossible to understand 5= spoke clearly and distinctly

14. How did you find the verbal pace of the lectures?
    1= much too slow 5= much too fast

15. Did the teacher have personal peculiarities that interfered with his effectiveness?
    1= constantly exhibited annoying mannerisms 5= free from annoying mannerisms

16. How would you rate the scope of the lectures ? 2.4
    1= too broad; superficial 5= too narrow; didn't span enough topics

17. Was the teacher willing to help students who had difficulty?
    1= seemed unwilling to help 5= seemed interested in being helpful

18. Overall, how did you find the lectures?
    1= useless; I didn't learn anything 5= extremely valuable; I learned a great deal

G.S. Stock No. G18255

READINGS

(19-24) How valuable were the following readings? (Teacher will specify readings)
1= worthless 5= valuable; I learned a great deal

19. Reading A
20. Reading B
21. Reading C
22. Reading D
23. Reading E
24. Reading F

25. How would you rate the amount of reading required for the course?
1= much too light 5= much too heavy 3.33

26. In general, how much overlap was there between the readings and the lectures?
1= not enough overlap 5= lectures repeated readings to an unnecessary degree 3.02

(If Applicable) **PAPERS**

27. Overall, how much did the assigned papers add to the value of the course?
1= nothing; a useless exercise 5= a great deal; I learned from the work

28. Were the criticisms of the papers adequate?
1= too little feedback 5= very instructive

29. Was the grading of papers fair? 1= very unfair 5= very fair

30. How would you rate the number of papers required? 1= too few 5= too many

(If Applicable) **LABORATORIES**

31. Were the laboratory experiments interesting? 1=boring 5= very interesting

32. Was the lab instructor willing to help students who had difficulty?
1= seemed unwilling to help 5= seemed interested in being helpful

33. Was the relationship between lectures and labs meaningful?
1= no relationship 5= the lectures and labs were well-integrated

34. Overall, how would you rate the lab instructor?
1= very poor 5= excellent

35. Overall, how much did you learn from the labs? 1= nothing 5= a great deal

(If Applicable) **DISCUSSION SECTIONS**

36. Did the discussion leader seem knowledgeable? 1= uninformed 5= knew content very well 4.09

37. Was there ample opportunity to ask questions? 1= no opportunity 5= ample chance 4.51

38. Was the discussion leader willing to help students who had difficulty?
1= seemed unwilling to help 5= seemed interested in being helpful 4.32

39. How interesting did you find the discussion sections? 1=boring 5= very interesting 3.06

40. How much did you learn from the discussion sections? 1= nothing 5= a great deal 3.27

41. Overall, how would you rate the discussion leader? 1= very poor 5= excellent 3.77

(If Applicable) **EXAMINATIONS**

42. Did the examinations adequately sample the important material in the course?
1= not at all 5= exam questions reflected the important aspects of the course 3.66

43. What was the nature of the exam items?
1= too specific and detailed; picky 5= too broad; easy to answer without facts 2.59

44. Did the exams make you think? 1= not at all 5= a great deal 3.74

45. Were the exams an interesting learning experience? 1=not at all 5= very definitely 2.90

46. How would you rate the length of exams? 1= not enough time given 5= ample time 3.11

47. Were the exams free from unnecessary ambiguity? 1= mostly ambiguous 5=quite clear 3.42

48. How would you rate the difficulty of the exams? 1= too easy 5= too difficult 3.44

49. Was the type of examination (multiple-choice, essay, etc.) suitable for the purpose of the course? **4.00**
    1= not at all 5= very suitable for the purpose of the course

50. Was the grading of examinations fair? **3.59**
    1= very unfair
    5= very fair

51. Was there adequate feedback as to what was expected on the exams? **3.69**
    1= no answers or guidance given 5= explanation of answers was provided

52. Overall, how would you rate the examinations in this course? **3.28**
    1= very inadequate 5= very adequate as a test of my knowledge

THE COURSE AS A WHOLE

53. Did the stated objectives of the course correspond with the outcome? **4.01**
    1= no agreement between announced objectives and what was taught
    5= considerable agreement between announced objectives and what was taught

54. Did the course fulfill your expectations in terms of what you wished to learn? **3.51**
    1= not at all 5= the course fully met my expectations

55. Did the teacher tell you what he expected you to learn ? **3.37**
    1= I didn't know what was expected of me
    5= I knew exactly what was expected of me

56. The amount of effort I invested in this course was: **3.42**
    1= much less than for most of my courses
    5= much more than for most of my courses

57. The amount of work required for this course, in relation to other courses giving the same number of credit hours, was: **3.44**
    1= much less than for most of my courses
    5= much more than for most of my courses

58. The difficulty level of this course was: **3.40**
    1= much easier than for most of my courses
    5= much harder than for most of my courses

59. The teaching skills of the teacher in this course, in comparison to my other teachers: **3.65**
    1= much poorer than the majority
    5= much better than the majority

60. My interest level in this course, in comparison to other courses I have taken: **3.33**
    1= much lower than in other courses
    5= much greater than in other courses

61. The amount I learned in this course, in comparison to other courses I have taken: **3.35**
    1= much less than in other courses
    5= much more than in other courses

62. The value of this course to my general education, in comparison to other courses: **3.30**
    1= much less than from other courses
    5= much more than from other courses

63. As a result of this course, are you interested in taking more courses in this field? **3.13**
    1= not at all
    5= very definitely

64. Overall, my opinion of this course is: **3.61**
    1= very poor course
    5= an excellent course

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

The instructor for this course might supply supplementary questions for your response. Use blanks 65-75 on your answer sheet for this purpose.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

When you have completed the quantitative portion of the questionnaire please refer to the "Specific Recommendations" section of your answer sheet. Your constructive criticism about any aspect of the course will be appreciated; the outline is provided merely to remind you of the many aspects that might call for suggestions as to improvement. Thank you for your cooperation !

This is a reuseable booklet; please return it to your teacher.

If you have any comments or suggestions about this questionnaire, please send them to: The Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education, 115 Rand Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14850

Appendix A, Section 6

Topics for Faculty Interview

TOPICS FOR FACULTY INTERVIEW

General

Why teach/take course?

If course were to be given again:

- What parts should remain the same?
- What parts should be changed?

General rating of the course.

Context

Content Area

- Form of interdisciplinarity
- Informational content
- Content organization (including decision processes and models, if any)
- Assumptions about content

Institutional

- Resources available (faculty and support staff)
- Institutional goals
- Peer reactions
- Program goals, if any

Student

- Assumptions about student characteristics on entry
- Assumptions about student learning

Teaching

- Assumptions about teaching techniques
- Decision processes re teaching techniques

Input-Course Model

Goals

- Selection (specification and decision processes)
- Modification during semester
- Goals for future course

Objectives

- Selection (specification and decision processes)
- Were they available in published form?
- Modification during semester
- Testing procedures (specification and decision processes)

Course Organization

- Relationship of goals, objectives and organization -- general
- Organization of teaching procedures
  - Lectures
  - Discussion sections
  - Other
- General rating of organization

Process-Assessment

Initial

- Student characteristics and methods of selection
- Staff characteristics

Procedural

- Attendance
- Lecture ratings
  - Informative
  - Intelligible
  - Core staff
  - Outside staff
- Organization of content
- Interdisciplinarity
  - Readings
  - Lectures
  - Discussion groups
  - Other

Student-Staff Interaction

Discussion Groups

- Leadership
- Staff participation
- Student participation

Staff Interaction

- Staff meetings
- Informal contacts

Product Outcomes

Testing Procedures

- Student reactions
- Student performance

Intermediate Outcomes

- Midterm or other procedures

End of Course

- Final examination
- End of course questionnaire (if given)
- Assessment of student learning (general)
- Assessment of staff satisfaction (general)

Follow-up

- Further staff interactions
- Transfer of teaching techniques (including interdisciplinarity)
- Effect on other professional work of staff (including teaching)
- Effects on students
  - Selection of major
  - Selection of future courses (including content and interdisciplinarity)
  - Incorporation into other courses

Appendix

B

The Individual Courses

This section of the Appendix is designed to aid individuals who might be interested in teaching a course in one of the areas covered by the program. Each of the courses is considered separately and these subsections include a brief description of the offering and an indication of its importance within the evaluation. An analysis of the course content organization and a listing of the readings covered during the semester are included.

In addition to this discussion, the forms utilized in the assessment of each course are duplicated, with the item means filled in. Beginning of semester (pre-), midsemester (mid-), and end-of-semester (post-) questionnaires are available for the last three courses in the program. For the earlier courses, end-of-course and follow-up questionnaires are the only data sources available on student reactions.

It is important to note that these subsections are not complete evaluations of each course, nor do they include all the information that was available. These summary assessments are provided to aid readers interested in presenting a course in one of the areas represented and for those who want more information on the student data sources used to develop the conclusions discussed in the body of this report.

Section 1

CIS 110: Integration and Decentralization

CIS 110: Integration and Decentralization

In Chapter II the genesis of the Undergraduate Program was analyzed in detail. CIS 110, "Integration and Decentralization: Competing Forces in International Society", was the embodiment of the goals and ideals of the members of the committee which established the Program. This was also the course that proved their view to be faulty, partially inappropriate, and probably unworkable at Cornell. The result was a major change in the way CIS courses were organized thereafter, and a minor change in the goals of the Program.

CIS 110 was described in a flyer as a course that would attempt to answer such "human questions" as

> "How large and impersonal can any political unit afford to become without alienating its members? Are increased centralization, increased uniformity of material life and culture, the price we have to pay for an industrial society? What has been and will be the fate of the smaller unit? Can a local unit survive, or be created, which governs itself? With which can the individual identify? In which can he participate? Is the homeland to be a hometown, a region, the nation, or something new? What <u>can</u> it be in the modern world?"

The arguments for, and implications of, both integrating and decentralizing forces were to be discussed within the context of four cases: Modern France, Western Europe, the Hapsburg Empire, and Modern Yugoslavia. Each was chosen to illustrate a different pattern of centralizing and decentralizing forces.

Evaluation data on this first course was somewhat scanty, but brief post- form, follow-up responses, an interview with one of the four faculty members, and a detailed report by another faculty member were available for analysis. The post- form, developed by students outside the course as part of a course evaluation at Cornell, is included in this subsection.

Within the context of the total program, the content organization of Integration was significant because it was the only course in the entire Program to be structured around four case studies. Initially, fifteen cases were nominated but through a process of voting this was reduced to four: France, Western Europe, Yugoslavia, and the Hapsburg Empire. The selection of these particular cases was something of an act of daring on the part of the course staff, since none was an expert on any of these, although there was some shared expertise on France. The organization and associated readings are presented on the next page.

Actually, the interdisciplinary, team-teaching aspects of the course began to unravel when the faculty found they were unable to agree on a conceptual framework for the analysis of the first case, France. Evidently the faculty was confident that they could achieve a balance between interdisciplinary synthesis and disciplinary rigor, but the initial setbacks led to some disenchantment with the interdisciplinary aspects of the course.

The way the instructional aspects of the course were implemented reflected this disenchantment. The course was divided so that the lecture meetings, which everyone attended, were interdisciplinary, while the discussion sections were of a disciplinary nature. The discussion of France in the common sessions was characterized by a certain amount of interpersonal conflict as faculty members criticized each other's views. As the semester progressed, faculty and students withdrew into the disciplinary sections and attendance in the common sessions and the associated reading declined. Staff meetings became increasingly unproductive. Ironically, Integration disintegrated and became four parallel courses rather than one integrated offering. Unfortunately, the breakdown of the course prevented any real assessment of the possible value in organizing a whole course around a limited set of cases. The students recommended that the case studies be supplemented by an analytic framework to be considered early in the course.

The following is a list of A) the reading material to be used by one or more of the discussion sections; B) the lectures and reading materials for the weekly general meetings.

FRANCE

A.
1. Aron, Raymond. France, Steadfast and Changing
2. Cairn, John C. France
3. Dickinson, Robert E. The City Region in Western France
4. Grosser, Alfred. French Foreign Policy under De Gaulle
5. Hoffmann, Stanley, et al. In Search of France
6. Luethy, Herbert. France Against Herself
7. Newhouse, John. De Gaulle and the Anglo-Saxons
8. Sheahan, John. An Introduction to the French
9. Wylie, Lawrence. Village in the Vaucluse
10. Wylie, Lawrence, Chanzeaux: A Village in Anjou

B.
Feb. 4 Luethy, France vs. Herself, Part I
Feb.11 Wylie, Vaucluse
Feb.18 Reading to be selected
Feb.25 Hohenberg, Paul. A Primer on the Economic History of Europe, Ch. 11
Goguel. In Hoffmann, In Search of France
Mar. 4 Grosser, French Foreign Policy, Ch. 1-3, 7

HAPSBURG EMPIRE

A. 1. Den Hollander, A.N.V. "The Great Hungarian Plain: A European Frontier", in Comparative Studies in Society and History, Vol. III (1961), No. 1 & 2
2. Jelavich, Charles & Barbara. The Hapsburg Monarchy: Toward a Multinational Empire or National States?
3. Kahn, Robert A. The Hapsburg Empire: A Study in Integration and Disintegration
4. MacArtney, Carlile A. The Hapsburg Empire, 1970-1918

B. Mar.11 1. Den Hollander, "Great Hungarian Plain"
2. Jelavich, Hapsburg Monarchy
3. Papers*

* For this topic, each teacher will write an interpretive essay which will be circulated to the students and provide the basis for a weekly general meeting.

WESTERN EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

A. 1. Deutsch, Karl. Nationalism and its Alternatives
2. Graubard, Stephen (Ed.). A New Europe?
3. Sampson, Anthony. Anatomy of Europe
4. White, Theodore H. Fire in the Ashes

B. Apr. 8 1. White, Fire in the Ashes, ch. 3
Hohenberg, Primer, Part III
Apr.15 1. White, Fire in the Ashes, ch. 12
2. Sampson, Europe
Apr.22 Reading to be selected

YUGOSLAVIA

A. 1. Andric, Ivo. The Bridge on the Drina
2. Bicanic, Rudolf. "Economics of Socialism in a Developed Country", in Foreign Affairs, July 1966, pp.643-50
3. Halpern, Joel M. A Serbian Village
4. Vucinic, Wayne S. (Ed.). Contemporary Yugoslavia: Twenty Years of Socialist Experiment

B. Apr.29 1. Andric, Drina
2. Bicanic, in Foreign Affairs
May 6 Halpern, Serbian Village
May 13 Cobban, Alfred. The Nation-State and National Self-Determination

Also to be used:

1. Franklin, S.H. The European Peasantry: the Final Phase
2. Moore, Barrington, Jr. The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy
3. Pitt-Rivers, Julian (Ed.). Mediterranean Countrymen
4. Potter, J., M. Diaz, & G. Foster (Eds.). Peasant in Society: a Reader
5. Wolf, Eric. Peasants
6. Bohannan, Laura. Return to Laughter

Student reactions to the course were mixed. When they considered Integration as an introductory, disciplinary offering, their ratings were often positive or at least comparable to the mean for nine other introductory courses (Post Questionnaire). However, on the follow-up, when they considered the interdisciplinary and integrated aspects of the course, ratings were generally low. At the end of the semester, the general rating of Integration was 8/10 of a point below the average for other introductory courses and on the follow-up it dropped another 8/10 point. The overall ratings for interest level and amount of perceived learning were average for CIS courses. The major student complaints concerned the lack of integration and the over-emphasis on one discipline at the expense of others. There was a general feeling that an in-depth, parallel consideration of more than one discipline was impossible. One student first indicated that she was in favor of the interdisciplinary approach but then went on to say:

> "The major difficulty that I find with an interdisciplinary approach -- one that was present in CIS [110] -- is the tendency to get bogged down in differences of theory and lose track of the material at hand (same material facing all disciplines). Approaches are tools, not ends or goals."

CIS 110 received the lowest rating for disciplinary integration (2.2) on the follow-up form which compared all the CIS courses, but students did not feel that other disciplines should have been included.

The faculty post-mortem reports also exhibit considerable dissatisfaction with the interdisciplinary aspect of the course. Too narrow adherence to one discipline was seen as the major problem, with the result that students learned only one disciplinary viewpoint. In an Appendix to a grant proposal it was concluded that:

> "In the opinion of faculty and students, all of those who participated in the course learned a great deal about a set of international problems involving the issues of centralization but that precisely in the area in which it was intended to be most stimulating and innovative -- that is as an interdisciplinary effort -- the course fell short of expectations."

Indeed, there seems to be a general feeling of chagrin in the faculty reports because the course fell short of the original high expectations.

Integration illustrated the difficulty in balancing the competing demands of interdisciplinary-integration and disciplinary emphases. The outcomes of the course suggest that the original program goal, i.e. to provide both interdisciplinary insights and the equivalent of a disciplinary introduction, was too ambitious, particularly since the teaching team had trouble working together and was unable to formulate a common interdisciplinary framework. The Center for International Studies was well aware of the problems in this course and instituted major changes in the Program. These were reflected in the next course, Domination and Subordination.

CIS 110: Questionnaire

1. Difficulty of course: Courses taught in college vary as to the demands upon the student, the approach to the subject, and the content of the course. On this basis please rate the difficulty of the course:

1 major	4 little	M_1* = 2.5
2 much	5 minor	M_2* = 3.6
3 average		

2. Organization of course: In a well-organized course, all topics are considered a meaningful sequence. The course proceeds at the proper speed so that at no time is one rushed to cover vast amounts of material. Proper emphasis is placed on those elements of the course which are significant points. The course is not cluttered with non-essentials, but enough detail is brought in to give generalities meaning. On this basis, please rate the organization of this course:

1 poor	4 good	M_1 = 2.7
2 fair	5 excellent	M_2 = 3.5
3 average		

3. Independent thinking: A good instructor does not solve problems for his students but rather helps them to solve problems for themselves. The problems he assigns, the questions he gives on examinations, and the class work stimulates learning and the ability to think. On this basis, please rate your instructor on the degree to which he encourages independent thinking:

1 poor	4 good	M_1 = 3.8
2 fair	5 excellent	M_2 = 3.7
3 average		

4. Tolerance of disagreement: A good instructor tolerates and welcomes disagreement. He tries to understand the student's point of view and does not force students to accept his own position. He shows no personal prejudice either in grading students or in conducting the class. On this basis, please rate your instructor's tolerance of other viewpoints.

1 poor	4 good	M_1 = 3.9
2 fair	5 excellent	M_2 = 3.8
3 average		

5. Ability to explain: A good instructor has the ability to give helpful explanation, knows which parts of the subject or experiments are difficult for the student, and clarifies them. He grasps the meaning of the student's questions and presents clear and complete answers to them. On this basis, rate your instructor's ability to explain.

1 poor	4 good	M_1 = 3.7
2 fair	5 excellent	M_2 = 3.8
3 average		

*Note: M_1 = Mean for CIS 110 (N-21); M_2 = Mean for nine introductory courses (N=425)

6. Interest level of course: A good course doesn't only inform, but also stimulates the student to research the subject more fully. On this basis please rate the interest level of this course.

1 very low	4 high	$M_1 = 3.3$
2 low	5 very high	$M_2 = 3.5$
3 average		

7. Instructor's quality: There is a quality which makes instructors truly great teachers. Thinking back to those instructors you have had who possessed this quality, please rate your instructor.

1 poor	4 good	$M_1 = 3.4$
2 fair	5 excellent	$M_2 = 3.6$
3 average		

8. Evaluation of course: You have evaluated various aspects of this course. There are many intangible qualities which have not been included. What would your overall opinion of this course be?

1 poor	4 good	$M_1 = 3.4$
2 fair	5 excellent	$M_2 = 3.6$
3 average		

Section 2

CIS 209: Domination and Subordination

CIS 209: Domination and Subordination

CIS 209, Domination and Subordination, was both the most interesting and most exasperating course in the Undergraduate Program. Taken as an innovative course design, it was an audacious attempt to use a heterogeneous group of faculty to analyze a topic area that has seldom been considered from an interdisciplinary perspective. Student and faculty reactions were positive at the end of the course, but the faculty enthusiasm moderated in later interviews. From the standpoint of the Center for International Studies, the course was a source of considerable travail because it became bitterly involved in University and Center politics. This controversy influenced crucial program and course design decisions that directly affected the content and form of subsequent course offerings. Before considering the total course, a brief analysis of this conflict seems appropriate, especially since it started before the course formally began.

The CIS 209 Controversy. As was pointed out in Chapter I, the Center for International Studies was primarily concerned with the coordination and administration of external and internal funds used for a variety of International Studies activities. It includes a number of committees, groupings of faculty with common interests. In the late sixties, money for International Studies began to become scarce, with a resulting cutback in the monies available to some of the committees. One area studies group in particular was dissatisfied with their new allocation and requested that the Dean of the Faculty and the Faculty Council of Representatives investigate the academic relevance and quality of the Domination course. This led to a wider controversy over the appropriateness and right of centers to offer undergraduate courses. These issues became involved in a set of larger disputes which were part of a conservative reaction to policy changes growing out of the turmoil of the late 1960's.

CIS's reaction, as expressed in various memos and letters, took a number of forms. The Center argued that 1) funding decisions were not the province of the faculty, 2) the Undergraduate Program had been accepted by the appropriate faculty agencies (the Educational Policy Committees of each College concerned), and 3) documentary evidence showed that occasional course offerings were a legitimate center activity. The issues of academic freedom was touched on only briefly. In addition, the Director of CIS offered to set up a meeting between the staff of CIS 209 and the Area Studies Committee (the latter declined) and to allow a representative of that committee to attend meetings of the CIS Executive Committee.

The Center decided to assign the responsibility for future course offerings to selected committees within CIS and a review board was established to pass on future courses before they were submitted to the Educational Policy Committees of the colleges. This decision represents a major policy shift away from the earlier practice of simply providing support for ad hoc groups of faculty interested in a specific topic.

Content Organization of CIS 209. The organization of content in Domination followed a complex model. It combined four content areas (disciplinary background, types of domination/subordination, general theories and future prospects) with a mixture of case examples, case countries and the presentation of theoretical material. Unlike the previous course, all students were to be exposed to the same materials. This was an ambitious attempt to give an overview of domination and subordination from a wide variety of perspectives across different levels of analysis. Student reactions, particularly on the follow-up questionnaire, indicated that the design was too ambitious and led to confusion as well as learning.

During the Spring, there were five or six long planning sessions to set up the list of course topics. Each week two of the course staff were responsible for that week's content and they met separately to coordinate their presentations. Two weeks were devoted to introducing the disciplinary perspectives of Political Science, Economics, History, and Psychology. The next six weeks considered types of domination and subordination at three different levels of analysis: between individuals and groups within societies (Male-Female, and Worker-Manager-Owner), as ways of organizing entire societies (German National Socialism-Liberalism and Pluralism in the United States) and finally between countries or societies (War, Imperialism, Colonialism, and Neocolonialism). These lectures concentrated on the analysis of cases by pairs of disciplines.

Two topics were covered in the last five weeks -- general theories and possible future options. The theoretical discussions centered on neo-Freudian, Marxist, and Weberian models as unified approaches to the aspects of domination and subordination covered in the preceding sections of the course. Finally, two weeks were set aside to investigate the options open to individuals, small groups, and nations. There was no general theoretical model of domination/subordination that was used by the faculty to link together the heterogeneous material. The organization of topics is presented below:

Part A. Background: the approach of each discipline to the study and interpretation of domination/subordination relationships

1. Political Science and Economics
2. History and Psychology

Part B. Types of domination/subordination: 1) between individuals and groups within societies; 2) as ways of organizing entire societies; 3) between countries or societies

3. Worker-Manager-Owner Relationships
4. Male-Female
5. German National Socialism
6. Liberalism and Pluralism in the United States
7. War
8. Imperialism, Colonialism. Neo-Colonialism

Part C. General Theories: theories developed to try to account for domination/subordination at several levels, in a unified way

9. Neo-Freudian Theory
10. Marxian Theory
11. Weber and the Rationalization of Society

Part D. Beyond Domination

12. Beyond Dominance? Options open to individuals and small groups
13. Beyond Dominance? Options open to nations

One characteristic of the faculty approach to Domination deserves special mention before discussing reactions to the course. In terms of disciplinary affiliations, personality characteristics, and ideological biases, this was a very mixed group, but by accepting diversity as "given", their teaching, rather than reflecting a consistency or coherence, illustrated that Domination could be viewed in different ways. By agreeing to disagree and by publicly airing their differences, they attempted to display the complexity of the material covered in the course.

The conceptual complexity of Domination extended to the course design. Of all the CIS courses, 209 had the longest, most intricate and detailed reading list. On the average, students were asked to read over 200 pages a week with another 100 pages recommended as additional reading. This list is reproduced below. The lecture sessions were also unusual because they combined team lectures by two of the course faculty, faculty reactions to the points presented, small group discussions, and large group discussions in a marathon format. Section meetings were reserved for discussion of the readings.

A peculiar pattern emerges when student and faculty reactions to this course are analyzed. Data was available on an end-of-course form administered by the course faculty (duplicated below) and on the follow-up form and follow-up interviews with faculty. The faculty assessment of Domination was generally positive. This course provided the clearest evidence of the positive intellectual and social impact that can occur in teaching this kind of course. Student perceptions expressed on the end-of-course form were also positive; some of these ratings were the highest obtained in any CIS course. On the follow-up, however, the ratings dropped far lower. Part of this drop may be due to sample differences, but it is also possible that after the initially high enthusiasm students became aware of the problems in the course. These included limited integration between topics, considerable ambiguity, and, for some students, excessive conflict between faculty members. These problems seem to be inherent in the kind of approach to teaching chosen by the faculty.

Overall, Domination represents an interesting attempt to structure a theme-oriented course. This is a more difficult task than organizing a course around a circumscribed topic such as Rural Devel-

opment. The difficulty is enhanced when the content area involves a basic human dynamic that operates at all levels, from individual to international. A later course on Ethnicity, Race and Communalism encountered the same problem and the faculty adopted a similar strategy to that used in CIS 209. They separated disciplines, case examples, and theories and attempted to deal with the full range of levels. The indications are, however, that the strategy was only partially successful. Those students who were able to cope with considerable ambiguity apparently found the course valuable but the limited data does not justify a positive assessment of the learning achieved by the group as a whole.

Reading Lists and Organization of CIS 209.

Angelou, Maya. I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings
Aronoff, Joel. Psychological Needs and Cultural Systems
Bachrach, Peter & Morton Baratz. Power and Poverty
Baran, Paul & Paul Sweezy. Monopoly Capital
Baumer, Franklin. "Intellectual History and Its Problems" (reprint)
Boulding, Kenneth. Economics as a Science, and
Primer on Social Dynamics
Bramson, Leon & George Goethals (Eds.). War
Clausewitz, Karl von. War, Politics and Power
Dahl, Robert. Modern Political Analysis (Rev. ed.), and
Preface to Democratic Theory
Erikson, Erik. Childhood and Society
Fanon, Frantz. The Wretched of the Earth
Ferkiss, Victor. Technological Man
Figes, Eva. Patriarchal Attitudes
Friedman, Milton. Capitalism and Freedom
Fromm, Erich. Escape from Freedom
Marx's Concept of Man
The Sane Society
Green, Hannah. I Never Promised You a Rose Garden
Harrington, Alan. Life in the Crystal Palace
Hinton, William. Fanshen
Horowitz, D. (Ed.). Marx and Modern Economics
Huxley, Aldous. Brave New World
Jackson, D. Bruce. Castro, the Kremlin and Communism in Latin America
Ladner, Joyce. Tomorrow's Tomorrow
Laing, R.D. The Politics of Experience
McCullers, Carson. Member of the Wedding
McDermott, John. "Technology: the Opiate of the Intellectuals" (reprint)
Magdoff, Harry. "The Logic of Imperialism" (reprint)
Mandel, Ernest. Marxist Economic Theory, Vol. I
Melman, Seymour, (Ed.). The War Economy of the United States
Michaels, Pat. "Teaching and Rebellion at Union Springs" (reprint)
Mills, C. Wright. The Marxists
Reich, Charles. The Greening of America
Rhodes, Robert (Ed.). Imperialism and Underdevelopment
Robinson, Joan. Freedom and Necessity

Schattschneider, E.E. 200 Million Americans in Search of a Government
Scott, Ann (Ed.). The American Woman
Thompson, Edward P. The Making of the English Working Class
Vital, David. The Inequality of States
Weiss, John (Ed.). Nazis and Fascists in Europe, 1918-45
Wolff, Robert P. et al. A Critique of Pure Tolerance

Also the following periodicals:

Liberation (May 1971)
New University Thought (November-December 1969)
Saturday Review (July 24, 1971)
Transaction (November-December 1970)
Upstart (January 1971) and (May 1971)

Part I. Sept. 9-23: Political Science and Economics

Dahl, Robert	"A Critique of the Ruling Elite Model", in Willis Hawley & Frederick Wirt, The Search for Community Power, pp. 151-8
Bachrach, & Baratz	Power and Poverty, ch. 1-3
Boulding	Economics as a Science, ch. 1, "Economics as a Social Science"
Robinson, Joan	Freedom and Necessity, ch. 1, "The Origin of Society" and ch. 2, "Isolated Economics"
Mandel, Ernest	Marxist Economic Theory, Vol. I, ch. 1, "Labor, Necessary Product, Surplus Product", and ch. 3, "Money, Capital and Surplus Value"

Additional recommended reading:

Dahl, Robert	Modern Political Analysis, ch. 3-4
Schattschneider, E.E.	200 Million Americans... ch. 1
Boulding, Kenneth	Op.cit., ch. 4, "Economics as a Political Science", and ch. 6, "Economics as a Moral Science"
Robinson, Joan.	Op.cit., ch. 3, "Land and Labor", and ch. 4, "Race and Class"
Mandel, Ernest	Op.cit., Introduction (on Marxism as a method of analysis), and ch. 2, "Change, Commodity, Value"

Sept. 16-23

Baumer, Franklin	"Intellectual History and Its Problems"

Davis, David B.	The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture, "The Historical Problem: Slavery and the Meaning of America", pp. 3-28
Fromm, Erich	The Sane Society, ch. 3, "The Human Situation: The Key to Humanistic Psychoanalysis"
Boulding, Kenneth	A Primer on Social Dynamics, ch. 1-3

Additional recommended reading:

Sweezy, Paul	"Modern Capitalism", in Monthly Review (June 1971), pp. 1-10
Robinson, Joan	Op.cit., ch. 6, "Capitalist Expansion"
Sombart, Werner	"Capitalism", in Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences
Boulding, Kenneth	Economics as a Science, ch. 3, "Economics as a Behavioral Science"

Part II. Some types of domination/subordination: 1) between individuals and groups within societies; 2) as ways of organizing entire societies; 3) between countries or societies

Sept. 23-30: Worker-Manager-Owner Relationships

Thompson, Edward P.	The Making of the English Working Class, ch. 6, "Exploitation"
Fromm, Erich	Op.cit., ch. 5, pp. 76-147, "Man in Capitalistic Society", and first three pages of ch. 8
Lynd, Staughton (Ed.)	"Personal Histories of the Early CIO", Radical America (May-June 1971), pp. 49-76
Watson, Bill	"Work: Counter-Planning on the Shop Floor", Radical America (May-June 1971)
Sullivan, George	"Rank and File Upsurge in the International Brotherhood of Teamsters", Liberation, (May 1971), pp. 28-32
Gorz, Andre	"Workers' Control", Upstart (January 1971), pp. 1-14
Harrington, Alan	Life in the Crystal Palace, Introduction and ch. 1
Fromm, Erich	Op.cit., remainder of ch. 5

Marx, Karl	Capital, Vol. I, ch. 10, "The Working Day"
Harrington, Alan	Op.cit., ch. 2, "The Middle Depths", ch. 9, "The Method", ch. 12, "I Believe What is Absurd", ch. 15, "I Quit"
Langer, Elinor	"Inside the New York Telephone Company", New York Review of Books (March 12 & 26, 1970)

Sept. 30-Oct. 7: Male-Female

Figes, Eva	Patriarchal Attitudes -- at least 100 pp.
Dornan, Doug	"First you must Learn to Smile as You Kill", Liberation (May 1971), pp. 33-43
Freeman, Jo	"Growing up Girlish", Transaction (Nov.-Dec. 1970), pp. 36-43
Hare, Nathan & Julia	"Black Women, 1970", ibid., pp. 65-68
Bart, Pauline	"Mother Portnoy's Complaints", ibid., pp. 69-74
Fields, Rona	"Signs of Sexual Condescension in Men"
Sexton, Patricia	"The Working Class Wife", in Ann Scott (Ed.), The American Woman
Gregory, Dick	"My Momma", in ibid
Phelps, Linda	"Death in the Spectacle: Female Sexual Alienation", Liberation (May 1971), pp. 23-27
Langer, Elinor	"Inside the New York Telephone Company" New York Review of Books (March 12 & 26, 1970)
Ladner, Joyce	Tomorrow's Tomorrow
Angelou, Maya	I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings
McCullers, Carson	Member of the Wedding

Oct. 7-14: German National Socialism

Fromm, Erich	Escape from Freedom, ch. 5-6, "Psychology of Nazism"
Erikson, Erik	Childhood and Society, "The Legend of Hitler's Youth"
Weiss, John (Ed.)	Nazis and Fascists in Europe, 1918-45 Introduction, Section 2, "Fascist Totalitarianism and Social Policies", pp. 129-66, and first three items in Section 3, "Fascism as an International Phenomenon", pp. 167-95

Additional recommended reading:

Kahler, Erich	The Tower and the Abyss, ch. 3, "The Split from Without: Totalization and Terror"
Brady, Robert	Business as a System of Power, preface (by Robert Lynd), and ch. 1, "The New Order for German Business"

Oct. 14-21: Liberalism and Pluralism in the United States

Wolff, Robert P., et al	A Critique of Pure Tolerance, "Beyond Tolerance"
Bachrach & Baratz	Power and Poverty, ch. 5-8, "Poverty Race and Politics in Baltimore"
Mason, E.S.	The Corporation in Modern Society, Introduction and Foreword
Galbraith, J.K.	American Capitalism, ch. 1-3
Michaels, Pat	"Teaching and Rebellion at Union Springs"
Women, N.U.C.	"The Arrogance of Social Science Research: Manipulating the Lives of Black Women", Upstart (January 1971), pp. 45-54
Wineman, David	"Captors, Captives and Social Workers... in Settings that Hate People", New University Thought (Nov.-Dec. 1969)
Illich, Ivan	"The False Ideology of Schooling", Saturday Review (Oct. 17, 1970), pp. 56-8

Schuldenfrei, Richard	"Notes on Free Speech", Upstart (May 1971), pp. 57-9
Stone, Alan	"Modern Capitalism and the State: How Capitalism Rules", Monthly Review (May 1971), pp. 31-6

Additional recommended reading:

Wright, Roland	"The Stranger Mentality and the Culture of Poverty", New University Thought (Fall 1969), pp. 3-16
Dornan, Doug	"First You Must Learn to Smile as You Kill", Liberation (May 1971), pp. 33-43
Lichtman, Richard	"The Ideological Functions of the University", Upstart (January 1971), pp. 22-40
Hacker, Andrew	The End of the American Era, ch. 3, "Corporate America"
Dahl, Robert	A Preface to Democratic Theory, "American Hybrid", especially p. 31 ff.
Balbus, Isaac	"Ruling Elite Theory vs. Marxian Class Analysis, Monthly Review (May 1971).
Baran & Sweezy	Monopoly Capital, ch. 3, "The Giant Corporation"
Friedman, Milton	Capitalism and Freedom

Oct. 21-28: War

von Clausewitz, Karl	War, Politics and Power, ch. 1, "What is War?", ch. 2, "Ends and Means in War", ch. 21, "Influence of the Political Object on the Military Object: War as an Instrument of Policy"
Beard, C.A.	"In Case of Attack in the Atlantic", in R. Divine (Ed.), Causes and Consequences of World War II, pp. 98-113
Wolf, E.R.	"The Algerian Peasant Revolt", Transaction (May 1970), pp. 33-46
Freud, Sigmund	"Why War?" in Bramson & Goethals (Eds.), War, pp. 71-80
Durbin & Bowlby	"Personal Aggressiveness and War", in ibid., pp. 177-94
Levinson, Daniel	"Authoritarian Personality and Foreign Policy", in ibid., pp. 133-50

Allport, Gordon	"The Role of Expectancy", in ibid., pp. 177-94

Additional recommended reading:

Baran & Sweezy	Monopoly Capital, ch. 7., "The Absorption of Surplus: Militarism and Imperialism"
Melman, Seymour (Ed.)	The War Economy of the United States, "From Private to Pentagon Capitalism", pp. 1-8
Dibble, V.K.	"The Garrison Society", in ibid., pp. 179-86
Barnet, R.J.	"The Worried Taxpayer's Guide to the Defence Budget", in ibid., op. 44-50

Oct. 28-Nov. 4: Imperialism, Colonialism, Neo-Colonialism

Pannikar, K.M.	"The View of an Asian Scholar", in Robin Winks (Ed.), The Age of Imperialism, pp. 143-53
Strachey, John	The End of Empire, ch. 21, "My Brother's Keeper?"
Fanon, Frantz	The Wretched of the Earth, ch. 1, "Concerning Violence", and conclusion
O'Connor, James	"International Corporations and Underdevelopment", Science and Society (Spring 1970), pp. 42-60
Magdoff, Miller, Bennet & Alapatt	The Logic of Imperialism
Pool, John	"A Note on Foreign Investment", URPE Newsletter (July 1971), pp. 10-13
Illich, Ivan	"Outwitting the Developed Countries"
Barnham, James	"The Joys and Sorrows of Empire", National Review (July 13, 1971), p. 749
Ahmad, Eqbal	"Counter Insurgency", Upstart (May 1971), pp. 7-22
Matossian, Mary	"Ideologies of Late Industrialization", in John Kautsky (Ed.), Political Change

Additional recommended reading:

Thomas, Robert K.	"Colonialism: Classic and Internal", and "Powerless Politics: The Pine Ridge Sioux Reservation", New University Thought (Winter 1966-67), pp. 37-53
Baran & Sweezy	Monopoly Capital, ch. 7, "The Absorption of Surplus: Militarism and Imperialism"
Magdoff, Harry	"The Impact of U.S. Foreign Policy on Underdeveloped Countries", Monthly Review (March 1971), pp. 1-9
MacEwan, Art	"Capitalist Expansion, Ideology and Intervention", Upstart (May 1971), pp. 24-41
Frank, Andre	"The Development of Underdevelopment", in Robert Rhodes (Ed.), Imperialism and Underdevelopment, pp. 4-17
Baran, Paul	"The Political Economy of Backwardness", in ibid., pp. 283-301
Ackerman, Frank	"Who's Afraid of Development Economics?", Upstart (May 1971), pp. 45-55

Part III. General Theories: Theories to try to account for domination/subordination on several levels in a unified way.

Nov. 4-11: Neo-Freudian Theory

Aronoff, Joel	Psychological Needs and Cultural Systems pp. 1-222 (omit ch. 6, 8, and 9)

Additional recommended reading:

Laing, R.D.	The Politics of Experience
Green, Hannah	I Never Promised You a Rose Garden

Nov. 11-18: Marxian Theory

Baran & Sweezy	Monopoly Capital, Introduction and ch. 3, "The Tendency of Surplus to Rise"
Fromm, Erich	Marx's Concept of Man, ch. 1-4
Rubel, Maximilien	"Notes on Marx's Conception of Democracy", New Politics (Winter 1962), pp. 78-90
Dobb, Maurice	"Classical Political Economy and Marx", in D. Horowitz (Ed.), Marx and Modern Economics, pp. 49-66

Sweezy, Paul	"A Crucial Difference between Capitalism and Socialism", in ibid., pp. 315-24
Baran, Paul	"The Concept of the Economic Surplus", in ibid., pp. 326-50

Additional recommended reading:

Mills, C. Wright	The Marxists, ch. 1, "Ideals and Ideologies", ch. 2, "A Celebration of Marx"; ch. 5, "Rules for Critics"
Mandel, Ernest	Marxist Economic Theory, Vol. I, ch. 5, "The Contradictions of Capitalism"

Nov. 18-Dec. 2: Weber and the Rationalization of Society

Loewith, Karl	"Weber's Interpretation of the Bourgeois-Capitalistic World in Terms of the Guiding Principle of Rationalization'", in Dennis Wrong (Ed.), Max Weber, pp. 108-22
Bell, Daniel	"Technocracy and Politics", Survey (Winter 1971), pp. 1-37
Loewenstein, Karl	Max Weber's Political Ideas in the Perspective of our Time, "The Position of the Bureaucracy in Modern Society", pp. 30-40
Schick, Allen	"The Cybernetic State", Transaction (Feb. 1970), pp. 14-27
Brzezinski, Zbigniew	"America in the Technetronic Age", Encounter (January 1968), pp. 16-26
McDermott, John	"Technology: the Opiate of the Intellectuals", New York Review of Books (July 31, 1969), pp. 25-35

Additional recommended reading:

Schaar,& Wolin	"Education and the Technological Society" New York Review of Books (Oct. 9, 1969), pp. 3-6
Mitzman, Arthur	The Iron Cage: An Historical Interpretation of Weber
Organski, A.F.K.	The Stages of Political Development, "The Politics of Abundance"
Ferkiss, Victor	Technological Man
Juxley, Aldous	Brave New World

Part IV. Beyond Domination

Dec. 2-9: Beyond Dominance? Options open to individuals and small groups

Rotter, Julian	"External Control and Internal Control" Psychology Today (June 1971), pp. 37-42
Christie, Richard	"Machiavellianism", Psychology Today (November 1970), pp. 82-6
Micossi, Anita	"Conversion to Womens' Lib", Transaction (Nov.-Dec. 1970), pp. 83-90
Benedict, Ruth	"Patterns of the Good Culture", Psychology Today (June 1970), pp. 51-5, 74-7
Anonymous	"Twin Oaks", Mother Earth News (January 1970), pp. 56-9
Reich, Charles	The Greening of America, "The Corporate State
Revel, J.F.	"Without Marx or Jesus", Saturday Review (July 24, 1971), pp. 14-31
Noyes, Pierrepont	My Father's House, ch. 3, "A Child's World"; ch. 4, "My Mother"
Lockwood, Maren	"The Experimental Utopia in America", Daedalus (Spring 1965), pp. 401-17

Dec. 9-16: Beyond Dominance? Options open to Nations

Jackson, D. Bruce	Castro, the Kremlin and Communism in Latin America, ch. 3, 4, 6
Rubinstein, Alvin Z.	Yugoslavia and the Non-aligned World, ch. 1, "The Uncertain Years"
Hinton, William	Fanshen
Gurley, John	"Maoist Economic Development: The New Man in the New China", URPE (Fall 1970), pp. 26-38

Certain taped interviews will be available in Uris Listening Room. Details given in class.

Additional recommended reading:

Fagen, Richard	The Transformation of Political Culture in Cuba, Conclusion
Vital, David	The Inequality of States, ch. 6-8
Moran, Theodore H.	"Dependencia and the Future of Nationalism in Chile"

Date_____
Course CIS 209
Professor_____
Laboratory Instructor_____
Discussion Leader_____

Do not sign your name

CORNELL INVENTORY FOR STUDENT APPRAISAL OF TEACHING AND COURSES

Published by Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

You are asked to respond to the following questions in order to provide the teacher with one measure of the success of this course. Your constructive criticism is greatly appreciated.

SECTION A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

(Place appropriate code number on line at right)

1. Sex
   1 = Male
   2 = Female

_____

2. School

0 = Agriculture	N=6	
1 = Architecture	4	
2 = Arts & Sciences	72	
3 = Engineering	7	
4 = Home Economics	0	
5 = Hotel	2	
6 = ILR	8	
7 = Unclassified	0	
8 = Graduate School	0	
9 = Other (Specify_____)		_____
Human Ecology	13	

3. Class
   1 = Freshman
   2 = Sophomore
   3 = Junior
   4 = Senior
   5 = Graduate
   6 = Extramural

_____

G. S. STOCK NO. 618288

4. Approximate grade in this course to date
   1 = A
   2 = B
   3 = C
   4 = D
   5 = F
   6 = Don't know

_____

5. Approximate cumulative average
   1 = 1.0
   2 = 2.0
   3 = 3.0
   4 = 4.0
   5 = Not applicable

_____

6. Is this course in your intended or actual major?
   1 = Yes
   2 = No
   3 = Unknown

_____

INSTRUCTIONS: The following questions are to be answered using a 7-point scale, where "1" and "7" will be defined and "4" always stands for the midpoint. For example, if a course is slightly below the midpoint in a given aspect, mark a "3" for that item. Write a "0" if the question does not apply to this course.

SECTION B

TEACHING

	Raw Scores				Adjusted Mean (5 pt. scale)	Arts & Sciences Norms
	*F1	F2	F3	F4		
7. Did the teacher stimulate student interest in the subject? 1 = destroyed interest; was boring 7 = stimulated great interest; inspired independent effort	5.2	5.1	5.0	3.8	3.5	3.5
8. How much independent thinking did he demand of students? 1 = no thinking required 7 = thinking always required	5.3	5.2	5.1	4.2	3.6	3.5
9. Was he tolerant of other viewpoints? 1 = allowed no contradiction of his viewpoint 7 = welcomed differences in viewpoint	5.0	5.1	5.1	3.2	3.5	3.7

* F = faculty member

		Adjusted Mean	Arts & Sciences Norms
	F1 F2 F3 F4		
10.	Did he teach at an appropriate level? 1 = he underestimated students' abilities 7 = he overestimated students' abilities	3.3	
	4.8 4.5 4.5 4.0		
11.	Was his presentation of material organized? 1 = congested; disorganized 7 = clear; organized	3.8	3.9
	4.0 6.0 4.9 4.9		
12.	How clear was his enunciation? 1 = words very indistinct; often impossible to understand 7 = spoke clearly and distinctly	4.0	4.4
	5.9 6.3 4.0 6.0		
13.	How did you find the verbal pace of the lectures? 1 = much too slow 7 = much too fast	3.3	3.3
	4.8 4.4 4.9 3.9		
14.	Did he have personal peculiarites that interfered with his effectiveness as a teacher? 1 = constantly exhibited annoying mannerisms 7 = free from annoying mannerisms	3.9	4.2
	4.9 5.9 6.0 4.4		
15.	Was he willing to help students who had difficulty? 1 = seemed unwilling to help 7 = actively helpful	4.1	4.1
	6.0 5.8 6.0 4.6		
16.	How would you rate the scope of the lectures? 1 = too broad; sketchy and superficial treatment 7 = narrow; doesn't span enough material	3.0	2.9
	3.9 4.1 4.0 3.8		
17.	Over-all, how did you find the lectures? 1 = useless 7 = extremely valuable	3.5	3.7
	4.8 5.3 4.9 4.1		
Rank:	2.4 2.1 2.4 2.9		

SECTION C

READINGS

18-23 How much did you get out of the following readings?
1 = nothing
7 = a great deal
(Instructor will specify readings)

18.	Reading A		
19.	Reading B		
20.	Reading C		
21.	Reading D		
22.	Reading E		
23.	Reading F		

3.5

24. How would you rate the amount of reading required for the course?
1 = not enough
7 = too much

4.3 3.3

25. In general, how much overlap was there between the readings and the lectures?
1 = not enough overlap; too disconnected
7 = lectures repeated the readings to an unnecessary degree

2.8 3.0

26. How would you rate the scope of the reading?
1 = too broad; superficial coverage
7 = too narrow and specific

2.6 --

SECTION D (if Applicable)

PAPERS

27. Over-all, how much did the assigned papers add to the value of the course?
1 = nothing
7 = a great deal

3.7 3.6

		Adjusted Mean	Arts & Sci. Norms
28.	Were the criticisms of the papers adequate 1 = too little feedback 7 = a great deal of feedback	3.4	2.9

SECTION E

DISCUSSION SECTIONS

		F1	F2	F3	F4	
29.	Was there ample discussion in sections? 1 = no opportunity 7 = ample opportunity	5.2	6.2	6.2	4.1	3.7
30.	Was the section leader willing to help students who were having difficulty? 1 = seemed unwilling to help 7 = actively helpful	5.6	6.1	6.5	4.3	4.2
31.	Over-all, how would you rate the section adviser as a teacher? 1 = very poor 7 = excellent	5.1	5.9	5.8	4.0	3.6
32.	How much did you get out of the sections? 1 = nothing 7 = a great deal	5.0	5.4	5.9	4.3	3.3

[Section F not administered.]

[Section G not administered]

SECTION H

	Adjusted Mean	Arts & Sciences Norms

THE COURSE AS A WHOLE

47.	Were the objectives of the course clear? 1 = unclear 7 = very clear	3.4	
48.	The amount of effort I invested in the course: 1= very little 2= a great deal	2.5	3.4
49-52	Compare this course with others you have taken at Cornell, in the following ways: 1 = much worse than the majority 7 = much better than the majority		
49.	The teaching skills of the teacher	3.8	3.7
50.	The interest level of the course	5.0	3.3
51.	The difficulty of the course: 1 = much easier 7 = much harder	3.8	3.4
52.	The value of the course to your education 1 = much less than the majority 7 = much greater than the majority	4.0	3.3
53.	Over-all opinion of the course: 1 = very poor 7 = excellent	3.9	3.6

Section 3

CIS 210: Peace and War

CIS 210: Peace and War

This was the third course in the program. It followed, and was in part a reaction to, the largely successful but quite controversial offering, Domination and Subordination. Peace embodied the new policy of assigning the responsibility for undergraduate courses to standing committees within CIS in an attempt to draw upon available teaching resources and to counter some of the academic criticisms of the previous course.

In the syllabus the course was described as follows:

> "From the points of view of seven disciplines, this course will inquire into the causes of war and the prerequisites for peace. After studying the anthropological, psychological, and historical roots of war, we will examine particular techniques and proposals for the prevention of war. This, and, we hope, much more."

Since Peace and War is an inherently complex subject that involves a variety of disciplines, CIS 210 did not develop an organizational framework. The content was structured around disciplinary insights rather than around case studies. This approach succeeded in presenting many perspectives but failed to integrate them.

Specific content in the course depended on the interests and competencies of the individuals who served as guest lecturers. There was an attempt to move from the anthropological, psychological, historical and economic causes of war, to a consideration of techniques and proposals for preventing war, with particular emphasis on technological, historical, and political factors. At the conclusion of the course, the five members of the faculty joined in discussing the question: "Where do we go from here?" The progression of course topics is shown below and the syllabus follows.

Jan. 27	Anthropology and the Roots of War
Feb. 1	History I
Feb. 10	History II
Feb. 17	Economics and War I
Feb. 24	Economics and War II
Mar. 2	Political Economics
Mar. 9	Insights from Psychology
Mar. 16	Some Historical Proposals for Peace
Mar. 30	Controlling Military Technology
Apr. 6	Technology and the Arms Race
Apr. 13	Revolution and Guerrilla War
Apr. 20	International Systems and Peace
Apr. 27	World Government: Impossible or just undesirable?
May 4	General Symposium: Where do we go from here?

CIS 210: Syllabus

January 27: Anthropology

Lorenz, Konrad. On Aggression (Harcourt, Brace & World)
Andrey, Robert. African Genesis (Atheneum, 1961)
Fried, Morton & Marvin Harris & Robert Murphy. War: The Anthropology of Armed Conflict and Aggression (Natural History Press)

February 3, 10: History

Oman, C.W.C. The Art of War in the Middle Ages (Cornell PB)
Hinsley, G.H. Power and the Pursuit of Peace (Cambridge University Press), pp. 1-91
Rosecrance, Richard. Action and Reaction in World Politics (Little Brown), ch. 2, 3, 7, 8, 9
Bullock, Alan. Hitler: A Study in Tyranny (Harper PB), ch. 8
Churchill, Winston. The Gathering Storm (Houghton Mifflin PB), ch. 17
Julitte, Pierre. Block 26: Sabotage at Buchenwald (Doubleday)

February 17, 24; March 2: Economics

Barnet, Richard J. The Economy of Death (Atheneum PB)
Miller, J.C. (Ed.). Why the Draft? (Penguin PB)
Rostow, Walt W. The Stages of Economic Growth (Cambridge University PB)
Schumpeter, Joseph. Imperialism and Social Growth (Meridian), pp. 3-98
Kurth, James R. "A Widening Gyre: The Logic of American Weapons Procurement", Public Policy, Summer 1971
Lenin, V.I. Imperialism (International Publishers PB)
Russett, Bruce. What Price Vigilance? (Yale)
..... Report from Iron Mountain (Penguin PB)

March 9: Psychology

Bramson & Goethals (Eds.) War (Basic Books PB)
Jervis, Robert. "Hypotheses on Misperception", World Politics, April 1968; in Quester, C. (Ed.) Power, Action and Interaction (Little, Brown PB)

March 16: History

Beales, A.C.F. The History of Peace (Dial)
Brock, Peter. Twentieth Century Pacifism (Van Nostrand PB)
Bainton, Roland. Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace (Abingdon)

March 30; April 6: Technology

Calder, Nigel. Unless Peace Comes (Viking PB)
Huntington, Samuel. "Arms Races: Prerequisites and Results", Public Policy, 1958; in Quester, op.cit.
Bull, Hedley. The Control of the Arms Race (Praeger)
York, Herbert. Race to Oblivion (Simon & Shuster)
Kuhn, Thomas. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (Chicago)
Feld, Bernard T. (Ed.) Impact of New Technologies on the Arms Race (MIT PB)
Prossony, Stefan & J.E. Pournelle. The Strategy of Technology (Dunellen)
Aron, Raymond. The Great Debate (Doubleday Anchor PB)

April 13, 20, 27: Politics

Waltz, Kenneth. Man, the State, and War (Columbia PB)
Greene, Philip. Deadly Logic (Schocken PB)
Kahn, Herman. Thinking about the Unthinkable (Horizon PB)
Fabian, Larry L. Soldiers without Enemies (Brookings PB)
Hoffmann, Stanley. "International Systems and International Law", World Politics, October 1961; in Quester, op.cit
Levine, Robert. "Facts and Morals in the Arms Debate", World Politics, June 1962; in Quester, op.cit
Leites, Nathan & Charles Wolfe. Rebellion and Authority (Markham)
Taber, R. The War of the Flea (Citadel PB)

Peace had a particular importance in the overall CIS Undergraduate Program because it tested some of the effects of minimal course integration on attitudes and learning. The post interviews with faculty indicate that Peace was largely the creation of one individual, the head of the Peace Studies Program. Team-teaching was a minor concern in the course and there were few planning or staff meetings. Half the lectures were given by guest lecturers.

Peace was interdisciplinary in that it included the widest range of disciplines of any CIS course, (a range that encompassed physical, behavioral, and social sciences), but this diversity was presented as diversity -- not integrated into any overall formulation. In effect, a variety of experts gave the viewpoint of their particular disciplines but it was up to the students to develop their own interdisciplinary synthesis.

Student ratings and comments on the follow-up questionnaire and on the post- form indicated that this synthesis did not occur. In terms of perceived learning, Peace was either the lowest or second lowest on a variety of questions and, (along with Integration), received low ratings for integration and content overlap. To quote one student:

> "CIS 210 was a course in which many and unrelated facts and theories were thrown at me. I was not prepared for it. I lost interest when I lost the terribly obscure 'course logic'."

The manner in which the course was presented reflected and augmented the lack of conceptual organization. Since half the lectures were given by outsiders and there were few staff meetings, there was little continuity. Experience with the first CIS course had suggested possible disadvantages in having only one disciplinary viewpoint for each section all semester, so section leaders were switched every two or three weeks. This limited the chance of students "putting things together" in discussions. An additional problem was that the readings were assigned by the different lecturers and were as diverse as the lectures themselves. According to the students, the topics assigned for essays (which determined part of their course grades) were too broad and were of little aid to their learning. Grades were unusually low in CIS 210 as compared to other CIS courses.

On the post- form and the follow-up form, most of the ratings of Peace were low. In particular, the ratings for integration and the overall appraisal of the course were well below the norms for College of Arts and Sciences courses. Student perceptions of the various course activities also tended to be negative and staff interviews revealed considerable disappointment with the course.

Despite the fact that Peace was less successful than other CIS courses, it was a worthwhile effort because (together with Integration and Decentralization) it demonstrated the crucial role that integration of content and course components plays in a course of this type. This conclusion was substantiated in a different way in the next course, Peasants, Power, and Productivity, which dealt with rural development.

CIS 210: Questionnaire

Instructions: The following questions are to be answered using a 7-point scale, where "1" and "7" will be defined and "4" always stands for the midpoint. For example, if the course is slightly above the midpoint in a given aspect, mark a "5" for that item.

Overall, how much did the assigned papers add to the value of the course?

1 = nothing 7 = a great deal

[Mean rating: Post- = 3.1; Follow-up = -- Arts & Sciences norm = 3.6]

Were the objectives of the course clear?

1 = unclear 7 = very clear

[Mean rating: Post- = 2.8; Follow-up = -- Arts & Sciences norm = --]

The amount of effort I invested in the course was:

1 = very little 7 = a great deal

[Mean rating: Post- = 3.2; Follow-up = 2.7 Arts & Sciences norm = 3.4]

Compare this course with others you have taken at Cornell.

The interest level of the course was:

1 = much less interesting than the majority
2 = much more interesting than the majority

[Mean rating: Post- = 3.3; Follow-up = 2.8 Arts & Sciences norm = 3.3]

The difficulty of the course was

1 = much easier 7 = much harder

[Mean rating: Post- = 3.3; Follow-up = 3.0 Arts & Sciences norm = 3.4]

The value of the course to your education:

1 = much less than the majority
7 = much greater than the majority

[Mean rating: Post- = 3.2; Follow-up=2.6 Arts & Sciences norm = 3.3]

Overall opinion of the course:

1 = very poor 7 = excellent

[Mean rating: Post- = 3.0; Follow-up = 2.6 Arts & Sciences norm = 3.6]

Section 4

CIS 211: Peasants, Power, and Productivity

CIS 211: Peasants, Power, and Productivity

Peasants, Power, and Productivity, the fourth course in the Center for International Studies' Undergraduate Program, was the first to be scrutinized in-depth as part of the evaluation of the whole program.

CIS 211 was the second course in the progrmm to deal with aspects of rural development, but unlike the earlier offering, Integration and Decentralization, it concentrated on Third World countries and the factors which affect the implementation of rural policies. "Development" was used in a broad sense to include change from subsistence agriculture to large-scale farming and urbanization calling for effective use of technology and capital.

The content of the course was organized so as to optimize certain course aims which were prepared in advance and were discussed at the first staff meeting, which the evaluator attended. They were:

1) to provide students with an awareness of the problem and the prospects for rural development in Third World countries
   a) to provide an analytical framework for understanding the inter-relatedness of macro-, micro-, and technical factors affecting success/failure in rural development efforts;
   b) to provide factual knowledge of conditions in the rural sectors of Third World countries and a "feel" for the immensity and urgency of rural problems;
   c) to provide substantive and analytical bases for evaluating rural development policies and formulating programs of public or private action to promote rural development.

These aims imply both cognitive and affective growth. The cognitive goals are discussed in the chapter covering the conventional instructional techniques used in the courses. The affective aims were that students would:

1) come to appreciate the complexity of the problem and acquire a "feel" for its immensity and urgency;
2) feel confident in their factual knowledge of this area of study;
3) feel that they have a conceptual framework for analyzing material concerning rural development.

Furthermore, it was hoped that:

4) students would retain or increase their interest in this area of concern;
5) take more courses in rural development and related subjects.

"Peasants, Power, and Productivity: Strategies of Rural Development" was the full title of CIS 211. As the name implies, the course

was to deal with three clusters of factors influencing the success or failure of rural development strategies in the Third World. Consequently, the course content was divided into three main components. Before the midterm exam, an analytic framework or conceptual model was presented during the first seven weeks of the course. This included an introductory session on the context of rural development, three sessions on the micro-, macro-, and technical considerations affecting decision-making and three sessions designed to relate each of the macro-, micro- and technical to each other.

In the second half of the course the analytic model was compared with current situations. The development strategies of India were studied during a three week period and then two more weeks were devoted to countries which represented either bureaucratic or ideological/political strategies for rural development. Revolutionary land reform in China and Mexico were the topics of the last two sessions. The material covered in the fourteen weeks of the semester are presented below.

I. The Rural Environment

A. Introduction
1. The Context of Rural Development

B. Three Focuses of Analysis
2. The Micro Matrix of Decisions: the peasant community
3. The Macro Matrix of Decisions: the political process
4. The Technical Matrix of Decisions: the production process

C. Relating the Foci to each other
5. Culture and Rationality: peasants and production
6. Center and Periphery: peasants and the state
7. Development Programs and Policies: the state and production

II. Midterm Examination

III. Strategies of Rural Development (India)
8. Technological Innovation as a Means of Change
9. Economic Policies and Planning as a Means of Change
10. Politics and Administration as a means for changing the rural environment in India

IV. Strategies and Experiences in Other Countries
11. Bureaucratic Strategies: Philippines and Taiwan
12. Political Strategies: Kenya and Tanzania
13. Political Revolution: China
14. Land Reform: Mexico

V. Final Examination

A number of films and slides were shown to give a visual experience of the conditions of peasant life in various countries. Readings

provided factual information and handouts guided student understanding. The faculty felt, however, that the discussion sections were the most important factor because here the students could relate readings with lecture material and/or test and expand their knowledge of rural development.

The midterm examination was planned to test the students' ability to apply the analytic framework to analysis of an unfamiliar case. The final examination was to determine whether students could integrate material from several case studies.

The results of the evaluation of Peasants were somewhat mixed. Overall, this was one of the most successful CIS courses. Both at the end of the semester and on the follow-up questionnaire it was rated close to the mean for courses in the College of Arts and Sciences. The major problems seem to have been an overemphasis on the analytic framework in the first half of the course and underemphasis on the framework in the second half. In the second half of the course, students were confronted with case studies in six different countries, each of which was presented mainly by outside lecturers who did not tie their material to the framework or to earlier segments of the course. As a result, by the end of the semester, students became confused and dissatisfied and did poorly on the final exam. In spite of this, however, this was a well designed course; its major problems were in the execution of the design.

Peasants, Power and Productivity highlighted the importance of the discussion section format. Students in sections led by graduate students performed significantly better on examinations and rated the course more favorably than did students in faculty-led sections. The findings relative to discussion sections confirm what has been published concerning the effect of discussion group dynamics on intellectual performance and satisfaction, namely that students seem to learn better and enjoy the experience more when they are given an opportunity to explore the implications of material presented in the course. They do less well when discussion takes the form of mini-lectures by the faculty.

The evaluation of Peasants was important because it established the basic design for evaluation of all six CIS courses. It took form gradually as a result of interactions between the Principal Investigator and the course faculty. The methodology section presents more details of the procedures. Unfortunately, it was impossible to observe the planning sessions of CIS 211 but evaluation personnel were present at staff meetings, lecture sessions, and a sample of discussion sections. Pre-, midterm, post-, and follow-up questionnaires completed by the students, as well as faculty interviews after the course, provided supplementary material for the evaluation.

While Peasants was still in progress, the next CIS course, Ethnicity, was being designed. The evaluator attended the design sessions and provided continuing feedback to the new faculty group concerning the successes and problems in CIS 211.

The following descriptive and evaluative materials on CIS 211 include course materials: a handout given to students on "Basic Concepts", one on "Framework for Comparative Analysis of Case Studies", the course syllabus, and a copy of the Final Examination. In addition, the evaluation's pre-questionnaire, with means, mid-semester questionnaire, with means, and the final questionnaire, with means, are included.

CIS 211: Peasants, Power and Productivity - Basic Concepts

There are a number of basic concepts used in this course which it may be helpful to list. Simple definitions will not help much, though some orienting or delimiting phrases are useful. We discovered that the ideas behind these had more general applicability than most definitions can suggest. Thus, we expect that you will develop your own understanding of these concepts from the lectures, discussion sections and readings. The concepts are capitalized and those concepts to which they relate are underlined.

I. The MICRO matrix of decisions: the set of factors interacting at the "local" level and pertaining to rural development; MICRO means "small".
   A. PEASANTRY: rural people, essentially agriculturalists, with low productivity in absolute terms and little power in relative terms.
   B. FAMILY and KINSHIP: the significance of consanguinary relationships, especially as these are the basis of decision-making units.
   C. VILLAGE and COMMUNITY: the significance of small-scale social organization, in terms of productivity and in terms of power relationships.
   D. RELIGION and CULTURE: the significance of values and ideology as organized systems of thought as these bear on rural development.
   E. SOCIAL STRUCTURE and STRATIFICATION: the significance of social organization and of differentials in status and other resource endowments.

II. The MACRO matrix of decisions: the set of factors interacting at the "national" level and pertaining to rural development; MACRO means "large".
   A. THE STATE: the set of authoritative institutions and roles having powers of policy and decision-making and of enforcement.
   B. POLITICS and ADMINISTRATION: two aspects of the political production processes, one oriented more to inputs, the other to outputs.
   C. AUTHORITY: the right to make binding decisions, derived from occupancy of authority roles as socially defined by a political division of labor.
   D. LEGITIMACY: the normative expectation or belief on the part of persons that the authority roles, their occupants (incumbents), and/or their scope of decision-making are right and proper.
   E. POLICY: the combination of resources as outputs of the political process.
   F. STRATEGY: the combination of policies over time to achieve certain objectives.
   G. PLANNING and BUDGETING: the prospective allocation of resources by the authorities over a long-run or short-run period.
   H. REFORM and REVOLUTION: changes in the macro-allocation of resources, either gradually or in a limited way, or drastically or in a large way, through the use of political resources to achieve these objectives.

III. The TECHNICAL matrix of decisions: the set of factors interacting in "physical" processes of production.

A. AGRICULTURE: the production of crops and/or livestock; may also include the way of life associated with this production.
B. CLIMATE: the combination of temperature and water resources.
C. VARIETIES: specific genetic strains of crops and/or livestock having certain production potentials.
D. RISK: possibility/probability of crop failure due to climatic or other conditions or of uneconomic price for crop at time of harvest or marketing; UNCERTAINTY prevails when there is little or no knowledge of probability and there is only the possibility of various outcomes.
E. MARKETING: the distribution through sale of the outputs of agricultural production.
F. LAND TENURE: the distribution of rights to use land and/or its produce as sanctioned by law and/or custom.

IV. A number of concepts originated to deal with problems in one area have a broader applicability. We find a number of basic concepts apply to the micro, macro, and technical matrices.

A. ENVIRONMENT: the set of factors surrounding persons or groups as decision-makers; these factors may be physical, economic, social, cultural, political, or institutional, or some combination of these.
B. TECHNOLOGY: the application of knowledge to production processes to increase their productivity or efficiency; this knowledge may be physical, biological, mechanical, social, organizational, administrative, or psychological.
C. PRODUCTIVITY: the output of production processes, seen not just in quantitative terms but in qualitative terms also; ultimately considered in terms of the satisfaction people derive from the outputs; this satisfaction can be economic, social, political, or other.
D. POWER: the ability to achieve ends and satisfy needs; deriving from resources as means to achieve ends and satisfy needs; there are diverse kinds or bases of power: economic, social, informational, political, moral, and physical; often synonymous with "control".
E. INFRASTRUCTURE: structures or patterns of activity or exchange that by their establishment and regularity make production processes easier, more predictable and/or more efficient; physical or economic infrastructure is most commonly understood, but social and political, even cultural infrastructure can be identified and analyzed.
F. DEVELOPMENT: the achievement of higher levels or capacities for satisfying human needs and wants; this is what increased economic Gross National Product per capita does in one dimension, but social and political development can be viewed analogously; RURAL DEVELOPMENT applies to the achievement of higher satisfaction of the needs and wants of rural people.

V. PRODUCTION PROCESSES are involved in various aspects of individual and group activity, commonly identified in terms of economic, social, or political processes.

A. RESOURCES or FACTORS OF PRODUCTION: the inputs in economic, social, or political production processes; land, labor, and capital for economic production, and other resources for the other processes.

B. RESOURCE ENDOWMENTS: the stock of resources which persons or groups have and which they can, at least potentially, contribute to production processes.

C. INPUTS and OUTPUTS: the basic elements in production processes, the factors of production as inputs, and goods of various sorts as outputs; outputs include goods and services in economic terms, but also things like esteem and deference, security and self-respect, participation and power.

D. DISTRIBUTION: basically, outputs are distributed to/among those individuals and groups who contributed the inputs for the production process; "to those who have shall be given, from those who have not shall be taken away".

E. EFFICIENCY: the relationship between outputs and inputs; the more outputs can be produced from a given amount of inputs, or the fewer inputs required to produce a given amount of outputs, the more efficient is the production process; this may be distinguished from EFFECTIVENESS which refers to the achievement of gross outputs or objectives apart from the input costs of producing them.

F. RATIONALITY: refers to the choice of the method of production which yields the greatest output with respect to available inputs; the measurement of each hinges on valuations of each, not sheer amounts, hence judgments about rationality depend on people's valuations.

G. DECISION-MAKING: involves weighing alternative courses or methods of production and choosing among them; it may involve technical processes or other processes at the micro or macro level.

VI. Many of the issues/problems of development relate to the matter of DUALISM, which is manifested in various ways.

A. TRADITION-MODERNITY: this common dichotomy refers to values or practices that are presumed to be inherited and relatively unchanging (traditional) or invented and relatively adaptive (modern); this dichotomy is often expositionally convenient, but it is analytically abstruse, relating to but being less illuminating than other expressions of dualism.

B. SUBSISTENCE-SURPLUS: economics, and their related technologies, may produce only enough for people's subsistence needs, or may produce a surplus which can be traded with others to meet needs that cannot be satisfied from within the subsistence community.

C. CENTER-PERIPHERY: politics and societies commonly have a "center" -- a political-administrative structure and a common culture-- which is established vis-a-vis a "periphery" -- of diverse, independent, even relatively isolated and small-scale communities; in the process of development, it is commonly thought that the "periphery" is integrated with the "center" to constitute a more unified nation and society.

D. RURAL-URBAN: like other dualisms, this correlates roughly with the others; these can be distinguished from one another by population densities and by dominant modes of economic activity (agriculture vs. industry); to some extent "rural" is the primordial and residual category, but it has certain characteristics such as low productivity and little power, which pose special problems for development in Third World countries.

This enumeration does not encompass all the concepts used in the course, and attaining an understanding of them requires more than shaping and memorizing definitions. We have sketched them out here to provide a cognitive map for the subject area covered by the course.

CIS 211: Framework for Comparative Analysis of Case Studies in Rural Development

I. Analyzing the Environment

A. Physical Factors - differences more or less favorable to increased agricultural production
   1. Geography - size of country, contiguity of land area, range of altitudes, location vis-a-vis other countries
   2. Climate - temperature (level and variability), seasonality
   3. Soils - (fertility, location, plains, valleys, hills), drainage
   4. Water - rainfall (amount and distribution), water systems (lakes, rivers, streams, underground water)
   5. Natural resources - minerals, timber, fisheries (complementarity with or substitutability for agriculture)
   6. Cropping possibilities - crops that can be grown

B. Economic Factors - differences more or less favorable to increased agricultural production and social/political well-being
   1. Land tenure system - size and distribution of holdings
   2. Labor force - levels of skill, scarcity or surplus
   3. National product - level and distribution, savings and investment
   4. Per capita income - level and composition by sectors (e.g., industry)
   5. Infrastructure - roads, power (electricity), communications (media)
   6. Marketing - scope of exchange, efficiency of system

C. Social and Cultural Factors - differences more or less conducive to cooperation or conflict
   1. Population - rate of growth, age structure, density
   2. Urbanization - rate of growth, distribution of urban centers
   3. Social structure
      a. Divisions - according to caste, class, clan, race, ethnicity, etc.
      b. Elites - relation with rest of society (attitudes, power, etc.)
   4. Cultural homogeneity or diversity
      a. Attitudes toward family, land, etc.
      b. Attitudes toward authority (deference, participation, etc.)

D. Political and Administrative Factors - differences making for more or less linkage between center and periphery
   1. National government
      a. Political linkages - e.g. party, interest groups
      b. Administrative linkages - civil service, extension
      c. Enforcement linkages - army and police
   2. Regional and local governments - responsiveness to "center" or people
   3. Ideology - directing and coordinating the government's allocations and appeals

E. External Factors - differences making for more or less dependence
   1. Foreign aid and investment - sources? domestic participation?
   2. Patterns of trade - concentrations of exports or imports by kind or country?
   3. Technology - imported or indigenous? direction of research efforts?
   4. Foreign models - prestige accorded to institutions/values of which countries?

II. Changing the Environment

A. Leadership - variables affecting direction and effort for change
   1. Ideology - "vision of what constitutes good society" -- more or less different from status quo? more or less egalitarian?
   2. Sources of support - what sectors provide most of the economic, political, and other resources used in acquiring and exercising authority? urban-rural, business-bureaucratic, power-military?
   3. Responsiveness - what sectors receive most of the benefits? (may be same as in 2 but not necessarily the same; regime can favor sectors such as untouchables or tenant farmers)
   4. Stability - probability of remaining in positions of authority (function of regime's power and of power of possible challengers)
   5. Preferred means - predisposition (apart from 1, 2, or 3) to use or to not use certain means? direct-indirect, democratic-authoritarian, market allocations-planning, conflict avoiding-conflictual

B. Strategies - with respect to various "continuua"
   1. Capital-intensive to labor-intensive (cf. Meller, et al.)
   2. International exchange to domestic mobilization (cf. Hunter)
   3. Political vs. bureaucratic vs. entrepreneurial (cf. Hunter)
   4. "Balanced" effort (all sectors) vs. "unbalanced" effort (selected sector) (cf. Hirschman)
   5. Short-run gains (growth) vs. long-run gains (development)
   6. Egalitarian vs. inegalitarian distribution of benefits and costs
   7. Agricultural vs. industrial emphasis
   8. Market mechanisms vs. centralized planning
   9. Centralized direction vs. decentralization
   10. National vs. regional vs. community development emphasis

CIS 211: Peasants, Power and Productivity - Course Syllabus

I. The Rural Environment

A. Introduction

1. The Context of Rural Development

Topics:
1. Scope of Rural Development
2. Interdisciplinary Nature of the course
3. Course goals
4. Evaluation of the course
5. Introduction to the analytic framework

Readings:
Nair, K. Blossoms in the Dust (ch. 1-12, 24)
Millikin & Hapgood. No Easy Harvest: the dilemma of agriculture in underdeveloped countries (ch. 1, 2)

B. Three Focuses of Analysis

2. The Micro Matrix of Decisions: the peasant community

Topics:
1. Relationship of Anthropology to international studies
2. Social Organization and patterns of thought
3. The community or family unit of decision making

Readings:
Wolf, E. Peasants (pp. 18-80)
Hunter (pp. 30-54)

3. The Macro Matrix of Decisions: the political process

Topics:
1. Relationship of micro and macro matrix-definitions
2. Power, powerlessness and the political process
3. The political structure defined
4. The state as an institution
5. Political participation concepts

Readings:
Bendix, R. Nation Building and Citizenship (ch. 7)
Hunter (ch. 3)

4. The Technical Matrix of Decisions: the production process

Topics:
1. Third World poverty and international agriculture
2. Effect of the physical ecology and risk
3. The factors in the production process
4. Analysis of Nair, Blossoms in the Dust
5. Characteristics of peasant agriculture

Readings:
Hunter (ch. 5)
Millikin & Hapgood (ch. 3)
Zinkin, M. "Risk is the Peasant's Lot"

C. Connecting the Focuses

5. Culture and Rationality: Peasants and Production

Topics:
1. Relationships between culture and technology
2. Example -- India's sacred cattle
3. Example -- New Guinea's pig rituals
4. Policy implications of the examples
5. The misplaced dichotomy of "tradition" versus "modernity"

Readings: Epstein, T.S. Economic Development and Social Change in South India (pp. 1-192 on Wangala, a wet village)

6. Center and Periphery: peasants and the state

Topics:
1. Dualism as a concept
2. Technological dualism
3. Cultural dualism
4. Peasant-state relations over time
5. Center-periphery relationships
6. Implications for rural development

Readings: Epstein (pp. 193-335 on Dalena, a dry village)

7. Development Programs and Policies: the state and production

Topics:
1. Survey of the analytic framework
2. Definition of development
3. Elements of development strategy
4. Approaches to development objectives
5. Instrumentalities for promoting development
6. Some consequences of development

Readings: Hunter (ch. 4, 6, 7)
Millikin & Hapgood (ch. 4, 5, 6, 7)

II. Midterm Examination

III. Strategies of Rural Development

A. Changing the Rural Environment

Topics:
1. Basic importance of technological innovation
2. Six basic theses
3. Biologic innovation (rice, wheat, other crops)
4. A green revolution?
5. Irrigation

Readings: Brown, L. Seeds of Change: the green revolution and development in the 1970's (ch. 1, 3, 4)
Weaver, T. "The farmers of Raipur"

9. Economic Policies and Planning as Means of Change

Topics:
1. Broad strategies of rural development
2. Current Indian policy issues
3. Problems of participation in rural growth

Readings:
Hunter (ch. 11)
Mellor, J. Developing Rural India (ch. 1)

10. Politics and Administration: as means for changing rural environment

Topics:
1. Guidelines for analysis
2. The basic context of governmental manipulation
3. The mechanisms of manipulation
4. Political aspects of manipulation

Readings:
Hunter (ch. 8, 9)
Frankel F., India's Green Revolution: economic gains and political costs (pp. 3-80)
Frankel, F. "The politics of the green revolution"
Nicholson, N. "Political aspects of Indian food policy"

B. Strategies and Experiences in other Countries

11. Bureaucratic Strategies: Philippines and Taiwan

Topics:
1. Philippines -- background
2. Past attempts at improving the peasant's lot
3. Increasing agricultural productivity
4. Taiwan -- background
5. Past attempts
6. Increasing agricultural productivity

Readings:
Golay, F. The Philippines: Public Policy and Economic Development
Shen, T. Agricultural Development in Taiwan since World War II

12. Political Strategies: Kenya and Tanzania

Topics:
1. Importance of countries as type cases
2. Basic issues and realities
3. The physical and economic environments
4. Historical backgrounds
5. Post-Independence
6. The Iraqw tribe in west Tanzania

Readings:
Segal, A. "The politics of land in east Africa"
Government of Kenya "African socialism and its application to planning in Kenya"
Clayton, E. "Agrarian reform, agricultural planning and employment in Kenya"
Nyerere, J. Ujama: Essays in Socialism (ch. 1, 2, 7, 8)

13. Political Revolution: China

Topics:
1. Life in rural China (micro)
2. Strategy for rural development (macro)
3. Relevance to other countries

Readings:
Myers, R. The Chinese Peasant Economy (pp. 292-95)
Snow, E. Red Star over China (pp. 214-18)
Chao, K. Agricultural Production in Communist China, 1945-1965 (ch. 2)
Chen, J. New Earth (pp. 11-80)
Myrdal, J. Report from a Chinese Village (part III, pp. 118-151)
China Reconstructs, "Some basic facts about the People's communes"
Khan, A. "Class struggle in Yellow Sandhill Commune"

14. Land Reform: Mexico

Topics
1. The Mexican revolution and national consolidation
2. Cardenas: populist and Agrarianist
3. Towards a modern agriculture

Readings:
Fuentes, C. The Death of Artemio Cruz (excerpts)
Casanova, P. Democracy in Mexico (pp. 71-103)
Hansen, P. The Politics of Mexican Development (pp. 71-83)
Ross, J. The Economic System of Mexico (pp. 1-16)
Lassen, C. "Factors affecting the development of commercial agriculture in Mexico, 1946-58"
Johnson, S. The Green Revolution (pp. 3-19)
Wellhausen, E. "The urgency of accelerating production on small farms"

IV. The Final Examination

CIS 211: Peasants, Power and Productivity - Midterm Examination

Question 1: worth 15 points; take no more than 10 minutes on this.

Choose one of the three following factors and discuss how it influenced the rural development efforts made in Harsila, Kuman:

a. The annual summer migration of men and cattle to the Himalayan pastures;

b. The culturally-defined division of agricultural labor according to "male" and "female" roles;

c. Patron-client relations within Harsila itself.

Question 2: worth 15 points; take no more than 10 minutes on this.

There are various micro, macro, and technical factors shown in the case study that affect rural development in Harsila. Identify as many as five factors in each category. Any factors you would like to mention that you think do not fit one of the categories will also count if explained adequately.

Question 3: worth 70 points; take remaining available time on this:

What elements affected Kumanese villagers' unwillingness to adopt the Japanese method of paddy cultivation? Please be as specific as possible and show the interaction between the various elements.

(Note: the case study used for this Midterm Examination was adapted from:

Sanwal, R.D. "Agricultural extension in a Kumanese village")

CIS 211: Peasants, Power and Productivity - Final Examination

Question 1:

In the course, we have considered a number of organizational models for changing the rural environment. We have examined them largely in the particular rural contexts in which they were devised and established, not addressing directly the "transferability" of these models to another country context. We have asked you to think about the transferability question as a way of synthesizing your understanding of these models and of means and possibilities for rural development. We want you to consider and discuss specifically two organizational models: a) the small-farmer organization model, exemplified by Farmers' Associations in Taiwan or FACOMAs in the Philippines; and b) the collective or communal model exemplified by Ujama villages in Tanzania or communes in China.

1. What preconditons (micro, macro, technical) would have to be satisfied in order for each of the respective models to be transferred successfully to India?
2. Underline the preconditions you believe are not already reasonably satisfied in India.
3. What policy measures would have to be introduced in India to establish supportive conditions for each of the respective models where these do not exist already?
4. Circle the policy measures that you believe could be reasonably implemented in India.
5. What overall conclusion do you come to about the transferability of the models as developed in these specific countries to India under foreseeable conditions?

Question 2:

While no country's experience in rural development can be counted as an unqualified success, and many are judged as failures, each experience presents some unique lessons that are perhaps broadly applicable. We want you to consider one country from each of these two groupings: 1) China, Taiwan, Tanzania; 2) Kenya Mexico, Philippines; and to discuss the two countries with respect to the following questions:

1. State the four most important conditons and the four most important policies that have affected rural people in each of the two countries.
2. Compare the two strategies of rural development which are represented by the experience in each of the two countries; how do the strategies differ and in what ways are they similar?
3. Assume you were called in to advise the president of Brazil about rural development. From your knowledge of conditions, policies, strategies, etc., state the ten most appropriate questions eliciting the critical information you would want to know in order to advise on a suitable plan for Brazil. (Choose "most important questions" since grading will be on quality of the questions.)

Question 3:

Assume that you are a rural development consultant asked by a Third World country to evaluate the respective strategies of a)"building on the best", i.e., of utilizing and focusing on the resources of the best-endowed regions and the best-endowed rural groups; and b) "building on the rest", i.e., of utilizing and focusing on the resources of those regions and groups less well endowed.

1. Indicate what you believe to be the advantages and liabilities of each strategy, giving supporting evidence from the country experiences you are familiar with from the course.
2. Indicate what critical conditions or questions would have to be satisfied for each strategy to success.

Question 4:

It is said by some that development agents are "tools of imperialism" contributing to the exploitation of poor countries or forestalling radical change. On the other hand, it is said that inaction in the face of poverty and distress is inhuman and that anyway, even non-intervention constitutes a form of intervention. Using your knowledge of the Indian, Tanzanian and Mexican cases:

1. Develop the arguments both for and against involvement by foreign technical assistance personnel in Third World rural development.
2. Develop the arguments both for and against involvement by the educated elite of these countries in their countries' rural development.
3. Under what conditions would you consider it justified for "outsiders" to be involved in Third World rural development activities? Make your analysis as specific as possible.

CENTER FOR IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Cornell University

RAND HALL, ITHACA, NEW YORK 14850

The Center for the Improvement of Undergraduate Education (CIUE), Rand Hall, is collaborating with the Center for International Studies on an evaluation of the undergraduate international studies program at Cornell. The aim of this assessment is to obtain information which will increase the effectiveness and utility of present and future CIS courses and part of the support for this effort has been provided by the United States Office of Education because of their interest in international studies.

CIS 211 is an important part of the undergraduate program and will be evaluated this semester. Enclosed is a form which is the first of a number of CIUE questionnaires to be given during the semester. The main purpose of these initial questions is to determine the characteristics and expectations of students taking the course. Similar questions will be used later in the semester to study if the course is having dissimilar impacts on different subgroups of students.

Your response to CIUE questionnaires are confidential and to protect this confidentiality, you are asked not to sign each form but to make up your own four digit identifying code number which you will use throughout the semester. The CIS 211 staff will not have access to these codes, but have indicated that they would like to read over the unsigned forms.

Whiton Paine, a Research Associate at the Center for the Improvement of Undergraduate Education, is primarily responsible for this evaluation and if you have any questions during the semester please feel free to call him at X6-6214.

James B. Maas, Director

CIS 211: Questionnaire

The following is the first questionnaire in the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education's evaluation of CIS 211. Your responses to the questions below will be confidential and will not be available to the staff of CIS 211. When you have completed these items please place the questionnaire in the envelope provided, seal it and return it to your discussion group leader.

Name_____ Student Number_____

Sex_____Age_____ Phone_____

Home Address_____ Campus address_____

Background

(Circle 1; with A=4.0)

1) What was your approximate cumulative average in high school?
4.0 3.5 3.0 2.5 2.0 1.5 =3.6

2) What is your average at Cornell?
4.0 3.5 3.0 2.5 2.0 1.5 =3.1

3) Approximately what were your S.A.T. scores?
Verbal_____ 626
Mathematics_____ 664

4) How many years of your primary and secondary schooling were spent in the following types of schools?

Parochial	( )years	.81
Private, non parochial	( )years	2.1
Public	( )years	9.2

5) How many years have you lived in the following environments?

Farm	( )years	1.5
Rural/Small Town	( )years	2.9
Suburban	( )years	15.7
Urban	( )years	9.1

6) What is your father's occupation?_____

7) What aspects of your family background do you see as relevant to your interest in rural development or international relations?

8) What aspects of your personal experience do you see as relevant to your interests in rural development or international relations?

Content Related to CIS 211

9) How many of the following types of courses have you had at Cornell or at another college or university? (Note: Where appropriate, the same course may be counted in more than one category).

a) Courses sponsored by the Center for International Studies (1.3)
b) Courses which directly compared two or more cultures or countries (2.0)
c) Courses dealing mainly with a culture or society other than that of the United States (2.5)
d) Courses dealing with problems of rural development (1.5)
e) Courses organized around a specific problem or topic such as population, poverty, crime, etc. (1.9)
f) Courses involving systems theory, cybernetics, ecological theory or similar attempts to define the interrelated nature of factors effecting phenomena (1.8)
g) Interdisciplinary courses involving teachers with different viewpoints (2.4)
h) Anthropology, Sociology, Social Psychology (3.5)
i) Agriculture, Technological Subjects (3.7)
j) Political Science, Economics, History (3.8)

10) Please use the following scale for the next four items:

1=never
2=seldom
3=occasionally
4-frequently
5=always

a) How often do you read a major metropolitan newspaper such as the Philadelphia Inquirer, Baltimore Sun or New York Times? (3.7)
b) How often do you read general periodicals presenting some analysis of international or agricultural topics? (Examples: Time, Newsweek, etc.) (3.8)
c) How often do you watch the daily T.V. news shows? (2.7)
d) How often do you watch T.V. programs dealing with international or rural topics? (2.3)
e) How often do you read specialized books or articles on international or rural topics? (2.8)
f) What periodicals do you read regularly? (Please list).

Who is your discussion group leader?

Course Expectations

11) Please use the scale below to predict the amount of learning and enjoyment you now expect from the following aspects of CIS 211.

1=very little or no learning or enjoyment 5=a great deal of learning or enjoyment expected

		Learning	Enjoyment
a)	The Monday evening lectures	(3.4)	(3.7)
b)	Films on rural life and development	(4.0)	(3.0)
c)	The large group discussion after each Monday lecture	(2.6)	(3.8)
d)	The small group discussions	(3.8)	(4.3)
e)	The assigned readings	(3.3)	(4.4)
f)	The interdisciplinary nature of CIS 211	(4.2)	(3.4)

12) Who was your first preference for a discussion group leader?

13) I now think that the amount of work required for CIS 211, in relation to other courses with the same number of credit hours, will be: (Please use the following scale)

1=much less than for most of my courses
5=much more than for most of my courses (3.3)

14) At the present time the difficulty level of this course seems to be:

1=much easier than most of my courses
5=much harder than most of my courses (4.1)

15) CIS 211 is organized to present and illustrate a specific approach to the problems of rural development. On the basis of the first lecture, the first discussion and what you have read, how valuable to you do you think this model will be as a conceptual tool for understanding this complex subject?

0=not sure
1=of little or no value (2.7)
5=of great value

16) At the present time, how difficult do you think it would be to use this model to deal with specific rural development problems?

0=not sure
1=could be used with great difficulty (4.1)
5=could be applied quite easily

17) Overall, my present opinion of the course is

1=very poor course
5=an excellent course (4.1)

CIS 211: Midsemester Ratings

Your ratings are confidential. Please use campus mail to return this form to CIUE.

Name_____ Discussion Section_____

I. Below is a list of the components of CIS 211. Please rate the amount of learning and enjoyment you have obtained from each. The rating scale is:

1=very little or no (learning) or (enjoyment) 5=a great deal of (learning) or (enjoyment) N=I have not read; did not attend

		(learning)	(enjoyment)	
A.	How do you rate the assigned readings?			
1.	Nair - Blossoms in the Dust	(2.9)	(3.3)	
2.	Hunter - Modernizing Peasant Societies	(3.6)	(2.9)	
3.	Millikin & Hapgood - No Easy Harvest	(3.4)	(2.7)	
4.	Wolf - Peasants	(2.6)	(2.1)	
5.	Zinkin - "Risk is the peasant's lot"	(2.6)	(2.7)	
6.	Bendix - Nation Building and Citizenship	(2.8)	(2.2)	
7.	Epstein - Economic Development and Social Change in S. India	(4.3)	(3.7)	
8.	How do you rate the readings as a group?	(3.7)	(3.3)	=6.3
B.	What are your ratings of the Monday Lectures you attended?			
1.	Context of rural development	(2.5)	(2.3)	
2.	Peasant community: micro matrix	(3.2)	(2.8)	
3.	Political process: macro matrix	(2.8)	(2.2)	
4.	Production process: technical matrix	(3.3)	(3.2)	
5.	Culture and rationality: micro/tech.	(3.3)	(2.9)	
6.	Center & periphery: micro/macro	(2.7)	(2.3)	
7.	Development programs & policies: macro/tec.	(2.0)	(1.8)	
8.	How do you rate the lectures as a group?	(3.0)	(2.7)	=4.8
C.	In general, how would you rate the following:			
1.	The discussion sections? (Number you attended? 6.4)	(3.5)	(3.4)	
2.	The handouts on assigned readings?	(3.4)	(2.4)	
3.	The handouts on the Monday night lectures?	(3.8)	(2.7)	
4.	The course as a whole?	(3.8)	(3.3)	=4.6

II. Many aspects of CIS 211 have been designed to facilitate specific course goals. Please indicate how successfully these goals have been met for you at this time. The rating scale is:

1=little or no success 5=a great deal of success

A. The lectures are organized to present the micro, macro, technological analytic framework or model. How successful have they been? (3.7)

B. Have the readings served the following functions for you?
   1. to provide factual material on peasant societies 3.9
   2. to illustrate how the basic concepts of the analytic framework operate in rural contexts 3.1

C. The discussion sections are to provide you with an opportunity to integrate the readings and lectures. Have they? 3.1

D. The analytic framework was designed to serve as a tool to help you understand and organize the material in the assigned readings. Have you been successful in using it this way? 3.2

III. Assume that this course would be given again next Fall. What parts of the course should be kept as they are and what parts should be changed? Please use the back of this sheet for your conclusions.

CIS 211: Final Questionnaire

You are asked to respond to the following questions in order to provide the Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education with one measure of the effects of CIS 211. Your individual responses are confidential but both the CIS 211 faculty and CIUE will be given summary information on how students rate this course. Please answer all items and seal this form in the enclosed envelope.

Name_____Discussion section_____

Background Information

Please place the appropriate code number within the parentheses.

1. Class: 1=Fresh. 12.7 2=Soph. 47.9 3=Junior 15.5 4=Senior 15.5 5=Grad. 7.0 6=Extramural 1.4 ( )

2. Sex: 1=male 56.3 2=female 42.3 ( )

3. School: ( )

2.8	0=Ag. & Life Sciences	6=ILR	2.8
1.4	1=Architecture	7=Unclassified	1.4
71.8	2=Arts & Sciences	8=Graduate School	7.0
7.0	3=Engineering	9=Other (e.g. extra-mural)	
6.6	4=Human Ecology		

4. What grade do you expect to obtain in CIS 211?

1=A	23.9	5=F	
2=B	47.9	6=S	42.8
3=C	4.2	7=U	16.9
4=D	1.4	8=don't know	

5. My most important reason for taking this course was:

1=interest in rural development	52.1
2=interest in international relations	28.2
3=previous experience with CIS courses	51
4=reputation of faculty involved	1.4
5=other	8.5

Instructions: The following questions are to be answered using a 5-point scale, where "1" and "5" will be defined and "3" always stands for the midpoint. For example, if a course is slightly below the midpoint in a given aspect, mark a "2" for that item.

Lectures

Please rate the CIS 211 lecturers by using the following scale:
1=too low 5=too high

	Lecturers #1	#2	#3	Visitors
6. Difficulty level of lecturers				
7. Amount of material covered				
8. Abstractness of content				
9. Clarity of presentation				
10. Your interest in lecturers' topics				

11. Were the lecturers open to questions from the audience?
1=very open 5=not open (2.3)

12. To what extent were the lectures on specific case countries compatible with the earlier lectures on the analytic framework?
1=not at all compatible 5=very compatible (3.2)

13. In general, what effect did the lectures have on your interest in rural development?
1=decreased interest; were boring 5=stimulated great interest (3.3)

Discussion Sections

1. Did the discussion leader seem knowledgeable?
1=uninformed 5=knew content very well (4.2)

2. How much independent thinking did the discussion leader demand?
1=no thinking required 5=thinking always required (3.0)

3. How much new material did the discussion leader present?
1=brought in little new material 5=brought in a great deal (3.0)

4 Was there ample opportunity to ask questions?
1=no opportunity 5=ample chance (4.1)

5. Who dominated the discussion in sections?
1=discussion leader dominated almost completely
2=students dominated almost completely (2.3)

6. How interesting did you find the discussion sections?
1=boring 5=very interesting (3.2)

7. How much did you learn from discussion sections?
1=nothing 5=a great deal (3.3)

8. In general, how much overlap was there between topics covered in reading, lectures, and discussion sections?
1=not enough overlap 5=too much repetition of same material (3.2)

9. In general, what effect did the discussions have on your interest in rural development?
1=decreased interest, were boring 5=stimulated great interest (3.2)

Examination

10. Did the midterm adequately sample the important material in the course?
    1=not at all 5=reflected the important aspects of the course (3.3)

11. Did the exam make you think?
    1=not at all 5=a great deal (3.5)

12. Was the exam an interesting learning experience?
    1=not at all 5=very definitely (3.4)

13. How would you rate the difficulty of the exam?
    1=too easy 5=too difficult (2.9)

14. Was the type of examination suitable for the purpose of the course?
    1=not at all 5=very suitable (3.7)

15. Was the grading of the midterm fair?
    1=very unfair 5=very fair (3.4)

16. Was there adequate feedback as to what was expected on the exam?
    1=no answers or guidance 5=explanation of answers provided (3.3)

17. Overall, how would you rate the exam in this course?
    1=very inadequate 5=very adequate (3.2)

General Readings

1. How would you rate the amount of reading required for the course?
   1=much too light 5=much too heavy (3.9)

2. How would you rate the scope of the readings?
   1=too broad, superficial 5=too narrow, didn't span enough (2.7)

3. Approximately what percentage of the assignments have you read to date? (71.2%)

4. How would you rate the amount of learning you obtained from readings on specific countries?
   1=very little or no learning 5=a great deal of learning

India	Taiwan	Philippines	Kenya	Tanzania	China	Mexico
4.1	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.8	3.6

5. In general, how much overlap was there between the readings and the lectures?
   1=not enough overlap 5=lectures repeated readings too much (2.7)

6. In general, what effects did the readings have on your interest in rural development?
   1=decreased interest, were boring 5=stimulated great interest (3.3)

The Course as a Whole

7. Did the course fulfill your expectations in terms of what you wished to learn?
   1=not at all 5=the course fully met my expectations (3.2)

8. Were you aware of what was expected of you in this course?
   1=didn't know what was expected 5=knew exactly (2.9)

9. The amount of effort I invested in this course was:
   1=much less than for most my courses
   5=much more than for most my courses (3.2)

10. The amount of work required for this course in relation to other courses giving the same credit hours, was:
    1=much less 5=much more (3.2)

11. The difficulty level of this course was:
    1=much easier than most 5=much harder than most (3.1)

12. The overall organization of this course in comparison to others I have taken was:
    1=much poorer 2=much better (3.5)

13. My interest level in this course in comparison to others was:
    1=much lower 5=much greater (3.5)

14. The amount I learned in this course compared to others was:
    1=much less 5=much more (3.4)

15. The value of this course to my general education, in comparison to other courses was:
    1=much less 5=much more (3.3)

16. Overall, my opinion of this course is:
    1=very poor course 5=an excellent course (3.6)

Course Goals

How successful has the total course been in providing you with the following: 1=quite unsuccessful 5=very successful

A. A general knowledge of rural development problems (4.0)
B. A general appreciation of the prospects for achieving rural development in the countries studied (3.6)
C. A "feel" for the immensity and urgency of rural problems (3.7)
D. An understanding of the international dimensions of rural development (3.5)
E. A conceptual framework for:
   1. Analyzing rural development problems (3.8)
   2. Evaluating rural development policies (3.4)
   3. Formulating development programs (2.8)
F. An awareness of the importance of using an interdisciplinary approach to analyze and deal with a specific problem affecting human beings (4.2)

Various aspects of CIS 211 were designed to aid your learning in specific ways. How successfully has the course met these course goals for you at this time? 1=quite unsuccessful 5=very successful

A. In general, the lectures:
   Clearly presented the three-part analytic framework (3.6)
   Illustrated the major significance of the case examples (3.3)

B. The handouts:
   The lecture outlines aided in organizing the material (3.7)
   The reading guides highlighted the major points (3.1)
   The handout on concepts clearly defined the major concepts dealt with in the course (3.5)
   The Comparative Analysis Framework handout aided in comparing major rural development factors in different cases (3.4)

C. The readings:
   Provided factual information on peasant societies (3.7)
   Gave adequate information on examples of rural development (3.5)
   Illustrated how micro, macro, technological factors interact in a variety of rural environments (3.5)

D. The discussion sections:
   Provided an opportunity to integrate the readings and lectures (3.5)
   Allowed for testing and extending knowledge of rural development (3.2)

E. The midterm examination:
   Aided in integrating the material covered in the first 7 weeks (3.4)
   Increased the ability to use the analytic framework on new material (3.3)

Course Outcomes

As a result of your experience in the course, how much do you feel you have learned about the following: 1=very little 5=a great deal

A. Conditions in the rural sectors of the Third World (3.6)
B. Rural development policies in the Third World (3.4)
C. How anthropologists study peasant societies (2.7)
D. How political economists analyze development policy (3.0)
E. How agricultural technologists increase agricultural productivity (3.9)
F. The relationships among the five above (3.5)

Approximately how many introductory courses in the social and behavioral sciences have you taken?

Compared with these other introductory courses, was CIS 211 more or less successful in the following areas. The scale is
1=much more successful 5=much less successful

A. In providing a useful terminology for categorizing social and behavioral science phenomena
B. Suggesting a useful framework for organizing information on how human beings behave
C. Giving a "feel" for how other people live and think
D. Providing you with insights relevant to your own life and concerns
E. Are there any other courses at Cornell that you see as similar to CIS 211? Yes_____ No_____. If yes, please list them below and indicate how you see them as similar.

As a result of your experiences in this course, how likely are you to take the following types of courses in the future?
1=quite unlikely 5=very likely

A. Agricultural Technology
B. Anthropology
C. Economics
D. International Studies
E. Political Science
F. Interdisciplinary Studies
G. If you are at all likely to choose such courses in the future, what would be the main basis of your choice? (Circle one)
   1. Interest in rural development
   2. Interest in specific disciplines
   3. Interest in interdisciplinary approaches

20. Has CIS 211 affected your choice of a major? Yes___ No____
If yes, please indicate what that effect was.

Interdisciplinarity

In your opinion, approximately what percentage of the course time was spent stressing the following?

A. The micro level
B. The macro level
C. Technological level
D. The interaction of A, B, C

How would you have preferred these emphases to have been distributed?
A=(26%) B=(26%) C=(21%) D=(30%)

CIS 211 was an interdisciplinary course involving staff with expertise in Anthropology, Agricultural Technology, Political Science, and Economics. Assume that there are three main types of interdisciplinarity. These are:

DIF Differentiation -- emphasizing the ways in which each discipline can make a unique contribution to the study of rural development

COM Communality -- emphasizing the concepts and methodologies which are common to two or more of these disciplines

SYN Synthesis -- emphasizing that the study of rural development must incorporate both the similarities and the differences between these disciplines into some sort of integrated framework

N None of these

In your opinion, which of these types of interdisciplinarity characterizes the following: (please circle)

A.	The readings as a whole	DIF	COM	SYN	N
B.	The lectures as a whole	DIF	COM	SYN	N
C.	The discussion sections	DIF	COM	SYN	N
D.	The course organization	DIF	COM	SYN	N
E.	Your understanding of rural development	DIF	COM	SYN	N

Assume that there are two possible ways of training people to participate in rural development policy in Third World nations. These would be:

DIS Discipline-Oriented -- specialized training in either Agricultural Technology, Anthropology, or Political Economics (plus some expertise in the interpersonal skills needed to work with specialists in other disciplines) or,

PROB Problem-Oriented -- less specialized training which stresses the relationships between these three areas of expertise (plus some instruction in the interpersonal skills needed to use the contributions of consultants).

	DIS	PROB
A. Which type of training would you prefer for yourself?		
B. Which type of training would be most appropriate for a		
1. University teacher?		
2. Government planner?		
3. Researcher?		
4. Block development officer?		
5. Village level worker?		
C. Which of them characterizes CIS 211 as a course?		

Potpourri

Please circle the number of lectures and discussion sections you have attended.

Lectures	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0
Discussions	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

At this point, what do you think are the most important roles for furthering rural development in the Third World? (Number in rank order as many as you want.)

___Community development or extension worker
___Development bank staff
___Development planner
___Engineer or technician
___Journalist
___Politician
___Researcher in Third World
___Researcher in United States
___Revolutionary
___Scientist
___Teacher in Third World
___Teacher in United States
___Other

Below is a list of specific readings for CIS 211. Please rate the amount of learning you have obtained from each. This information will be useful to the course staff when this course is given in the future. The scale is: 1=very little learning 5=a great deal of learning N=have not read

Millikin & Hapgood - No Easy Harvest
Epstein - Rural Development and Social Change in S. India
Hunter - Modernizing Peasant Societies
Brown - Seeds of Change
Mellor - Developing Rural India
Nicholson - "Political Aspects of Indian Food Policy"
Weaver - "The Farmers of Raipor"
Dantwala - From Stagnation to Growth
Frankel - India's Green Revolution

Assume that CIS were to be given again. What parts would you keep the same?

What parts of the course would you change?

Section 5

CIS 212: Ethnicity, Race, and Communalism

CIS 212: Ethnicity, Race, and Communalism

The fifth course in the CIS program, "Ethnicity, Race, and Communalism: their significance for Nation Building and International Relations" was the second course to be evaluated in depth. It differed in many ways from the preceding course, Peasants, partly because the faculty tried to build on the experiences of the earlier course. It was unique among CIS courses because of the plan to use a core faculty from one discipline (Political Science) and introduce the interdisciplinary elements through the readings and guest lectures.

No previous CIS course focused attention on racial, communal and ethnic issues, although some aspects of these were involved in Integration (CIS 110) and Domination (CIS 209). Following the example of Peasants (CIS 211), the course content of Ethnicity was divided between analytic material and case studies but only three countries were considered. These were introduced early in the semester, without any formal model or analytic framework. CIS 212 was described as:

> "An introduction to the problems of societies in which various religious, ethnic, racial, and linguistic groups must co-exist within a single political system. Drawing mainly from three case studies, Malaysia, Canada, and South Africa, the course (1) presents key concepts, analytical methods and issues of inter-ethnic, inter-racial, and inter-communal relations; (2) examines the experiences of various societies in dealing with them; and (3) explores their transnational and international dimensions. The course will utilize films, panel discussions, and small group discussions, as well as lectures.

Ethnic, racial, and communal issues are increasingly important in International Studies. To quote one member of the course faculty, "In fifteen years a good part of the news is going to be ethnic and racial conflict." However, this is an area of considerable controversy, sporadic and uneven scholarship, and inadequate methodology. The CIS 212 faculty was aware of the intellectual problems as well as the pedagogical difficulties in earlier CIS courses. They attempted to avoid both kinds of problems by organizing the content so students would be exposed to concrete facts before they were introduced to theory and analytic tools. This design was the opposite from the one used in Peasants but it, too, was not as successful as was expected because students did not carry over their learning from the first to the second half of the course. The topics covered were as follows:

I. Introduction

II. Case Countries

South Africa
- Background
- Prospects for Change

Malaysia
- Background
- Ethnic Political Issues

Canada
- Background
- The future prospects

III. Midterm Examinati n

IV. Tools of Analysis

Levels and Modes of Analysis
- Interpersonal
- Ethological

Management of Communal Conflict
- Key issues
- Approaches
  - Ethnic Mobilization from Below
  - Government Policy from Above

Pluralism and the Nation State

Ethnicity, Race, and the International System

V. Final Examination

The three countries, South Africa, Malaysia, and Canada, were chosen because they illustrate different approaches to the management of racial, ethnic, and communal conflict. Specific analytic tools for deeper analysis of these approaches were presented later in the course.

The first reading assignments provided factual information on the background and present conditions in the three case countries. Later assignments illustrated the use of various methods of analyzing the problems. An expanded syllabus is presented below.

The three members of the core faculty and the two graduate teaching assistants each led weekly two-hour discussion sections of about five students. A handout defining some basic concepts, lecture outlines, and films were additional teaching techniques and were used with exceptional skill. Student grades were based on a midterm and final examination plus a term paper. The grading system was devised during the semester; the other aspects of the course were decided earlier, in the planning sessions.

A policy decision was made during the planning stages which may have important implications for the CIS program. Objections were

raised in another department of the University that the topic of CIS 212 encroached on the area of one of its courses. Although there was only one title in common on the two reading lists, the CIS faculty reluctantly decided to bar American materials and topics from their course. From a pedagogical point of view this was unfortunate since the students were American and much of the work on Ethnicity and racial topics has related to American life.

The evaluation procedures used to analyze this course were essentially the same as those for the previous course. However, the evaluator was present during the planning sessions for Ethnicity. Pre-, mid-term, and post- questionnaires were prepared which included many of the same items that appeared on the Peasants forms. The follow-up questionnaire was administered one semester after the course ended and was identical to the one used for the earlier course. The evaluator also attended staff meetings and had interviews with the Ethnicity faculty after the conclusion of the course. Data on the discussion sections were collected by rating videotapes of the meetings. In general, the statistical analysis of the data collected was limited due to the small number of students who enrolled in the course. Evaluation forms are reproduced below and the evaluation design is discussed in more detail in the chapter dealing with the methodology.

In CIS 209, Domination, an attempt had been made to work with the course faculty on delineating cognitive and affective aims. A set of goals was drawn up but it was seldom considered when the faculty made design and implementation decisions. However, the evaluator provided considerable feedback on student reactions to the preceding course and this information influenced some design decisions. Information from the student rating forms also was passed on to the faculty, but whatever beneficial effect this had was offset by interpersonal conflicts in the teaching team.

Despite considerable effort, Ethnicity was not as successful as had been anticipated. At the beginning, both students and faculty had high expectations. For example, on the pre-form (reproduced below), the students' expectation rating for the course was 4.4 on the five point scale. To some extent this reflects a selection process since of the 66 students who indicated interest in the course, only 26 finished it. Those who "dropped" were contacted and the most common reasons they gave for their decision were 1) a low opinion of the preceding CIS course, or 2) dissatisfaction with the approach to ethnicity taken in CIS 212. The latter reaction was typical for students from minority groups.

As a course design, Ethnicity had much to recommend it, but two major problems limited its success. First, serious interpersonal difficulties between some members of the teaching team were reflected in the lecture sessions. Second, Ethnicity began to come apart in the second half of the semester. Students were unable to relate their earlier learning from the three case studies to analytic concepts and the presentations of different disciplines. Students rejected both aspects of the course but their negative reaction to faculty conflict was particularly severe. One student commented:

"I hope the faculty have enough self control to see that the questions they raise are to the point and that they listen and respect the answers given by the other person. From what I observed, sometimes the pointless argument really irritated the students and made them confused."

Overall, the course was rated 3.5 -- close to the mean score for all courses in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Three other circumstances revealed in the evaluation are worthy of mention. As was the case in Peasants (CIS 211), the discussion sections led by graduate students appeared to be more successful than faculty-led sections. Students in these sections rated the course more favorably and tended to do better on examinations than those in faculty-led discussion groups. The difference in grades for CIS 212 may not be significant because pairs of faculty members graded the exams but no two pairs graded similarly. The pattern, however, is similar to that in Peasants: discussions led by graduate students had a greater impact. In CIS 212 this impact showed up as a variable commitment to certain sets of attitude statements regarding ethnic, racial, and communal issues. This was an outcome which the faculty had not foreseen and most were disquieted by the idea that a course could have this effect.

The evaluation of Ethnicity suggests that in a complex, interdisciplinary, team-taught course, the failure of one or two major aspects may have major consequences for the students' perception of the course. Most of the components of the course were handled well but it is the evaluator's impression that the decrease in integration and increase in faculty conflict at the end of the course affected the students reactions to the course as a whole.

The course syllabus and reading list, the mid-term and final examinations, and the pre- midterm, and final questionnaires for CIS 212 follow.

CIS 21? CONTENT ORGANIZATION

Introduction and Case Countries

I. Introduction

A. Topics

1. Importance of the problem
2. Organization of the course
3. Interests of the course faculty
4. Film and Discussion - "Christians at War"

B. Readings

Pierre van den Berghe, Race & Racism
(s) Philip Mason, Patterns of Dominance
(s) Ashley Montagu, A Statement on Race, 3rd edition

II. South Africa - Background

A. Topics

1. Description of the land
2. The peoples and the economy
3. The History
4. Film - "Three Wise Men of the World" (by S.A.Government)
5. Film - "Phela Ndaba" (by S.A.Underground)

B. Readings

Heribert Adam, Modernizing Racial Domination
(s) Richard Rive, ed. Quartet: New Voices From South Africa

III. South Africa - Prospects for Change

A. Topics

1. Change from within
   a. The whites
   b. Pressures from below
2. Changes from outside
3. Alternatives to the status quo
4. Panel

B. Readings

Same as last week

IV. Malaysia - Background

A. Topics

1. Geography
2. Ethnic pluralism and demography
3. Economic and occupational structure
4. Political System
5. Bumiputera vs Malaysian Malaysia
6. Film - "Berjaya" (Malaysian information Service)

Note (s) indicates a supplementary reading

B. Readings

Victor Purcell, Malaysia
J. Norman Parmer, "Malaysia," pp.281-365 in George Kahin, Governments and Politics of Southeast Asia, 2nd ed.
(s)J.Anthony Burgess Wilson, The Long Day Wanes: A Malayan Trilogy

V. Malaysia - Ethnic Political Issues

A. Topics (Panel)

1. Linguistic policy
2. New Economic Policy
3. Malaysian Communist Party

B. Readings

Milton J. Esman, Administration and Development in Malaysia Chapter 2, "The Malaysian Context," pp. 16-65
John Henderson, et. al, Area Handbook for Malaysia Chapter 3 and 16, pp. 25-72, 381-394
Government of Malaysia, Second Malaysia Plan, 1971-1975, Chapters 1 & 3 pp. 1-9, 36-48

VI. Canada - Background to the Contest of the Canadian Dilemma

A. Topics

1. The land and its peoples
   a. Founding races
   b. The ethnic mosaic
2. Challenges of Bilingualism
3. Quebec and French Canadian Society
4. Socioeconomic Structure
5. Political structure (not covered)
6. Film - "Acadia, Acadia" (National Film Board)
7. Film - "Ballad of Crowfoot (National Film Board)

B. Readings

(s) Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Vol. 1, 169 pages
(s) John Porter, The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada, pp. 60-104, passim

VII. French Canada - Withdrawal - Participation - Self Assertion

A. Topics

1. Background
2. The Quiet Revolution
   a. Changes within Quebec
   b. Reactions to Quebec
3. Effects on the Canadian Political System

B. Readings

Kenneth D. McRae, "The Structure of Canadian History," Chapter 7, pp. 219-274 in Louis Hartz, The Founding of New Societies.
(s) Hubert Guindon, "Social Unrest, Social Class, and Quebec's Bureaucratic Revolution," Queen's Quarterly, LXXI (Summer 1964).
(s) Jean-Marc Leger, "Where Does Neo-Nationalism Lead?", in Ramsy Cook, ed., French-Canadian Nationalism: An Anthology pp. 304-313.
(s) Pierre Elliott Trudean, Federalism and the French Canadian pp. 3-51, on "Quebec and the Constitutional Problem".
(s) Solange Chaput-Rolland and Gwethayln Graham, Dear Enemies.
(s) Hugh MacLennan, Two Solitudes.
(s) Gad Horowitz, Canadian Labour in Politics, chapter 1, "Conservatism, Liberalism, & Socialism in Canada," pp. 3-19.

CIS 212

MID-TERM EXAM

A. PART I: Write for one hour on any one of the following questions:
1) What are the prospects during the next decade for minimizing ethnic and racial violence in Canada, Malaysia, and South Africa? Compare and contrast.
2) How do ethnic and race relations affect access to economic resources in Canada, Malaysia, and South Africa? Compare and contrast.

B. PART II: Write for one hour on any two of the following questions:
1) "It remains to be seen whether industrialization and pigmentocracy are incompatible." What does the South African experience indicate?
2) "Quebec is not a province like the others." Discuss the implications of this proposition.
3) What is the Alliance Party in Malaysia and how has it contributed to regulating ethnic conflict in that country?

Tools of Analysis

VIII. Key Issues in Conflict Resolution

A. Major Topics

1. Forms of violence
2. Violence and conflict

B. Major Readings

Charles W. Anderson, et. al, Issues of Political Development "Introduction," pp. 1-97.
Donald L. Horowitz, "Multiracial Politics in the New States: Toward a Theory of Conflict" paper presented at 65th meeting of the American Political Science Assoc. 1969, 36 pages.
(s) United States National Advisory Commission on Civil Dividers (Kerner Commission), Report (Washington, DC, 1968), pp. 1-16.

IX. Levels d Modes of Analysis - Interpersonal to international

A. Topics

1. Socio-Psychological Aspects of Individual and Group Attitudes and Behavior.
   a. Culture, societal change and racism
   b. Social and psychological consequences of racism
   c. Refocus: education
2. Expanding the horizons of race relations investigation.
   a. Trends in the development of race studies
   b. The UNITAR approach
      i. Promises and limitations
      ii. Aspects of the approach
3. Sub-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary insights.

B. Readings

Robin Horton, "African Traditional Thought and Western Science," Part I, Africa, Vol. 37 (1967), pp. 50-71

William Labov, "Academic Ignorance and Black Intelligence," The Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 229, No.6 (June 1972), pp. 59-67

Richard B. Lee, "Eating Christmas in the Kalaharf," Natural History, Vol. 78, No.5 (December 1969), pp. 114.

United Nations, International Conference on Human Rights. "Guidelines for a Study of the Effectiveness of Policies and Measures Against Racial Discrimination, 1968, 24 pages.

"Unitar and Race Relations, "Objective: Justice," III, No.1 January-March 1971), pp. 32-36.

(s) R. A. Schermerhorn, Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research (Random House, 1970), pp. 3-29; 39-41; 50-59.

(s) Horton, op. cit., Part II, Africa, Vol. 37 (1967), pp. 155-187.

X. Ethnic Continuity and Ethology - The Andean People

A. Topics

1. Topics in the readings
   a. Example of Jose Maria Arguedas
   b. Background
2. Problem of Andean Farming
3. The Andean People

B. Readings

Norman Gall, "Peru: The Master is Dead," Dissent, XVIII, No. 3, (June 1971), pp. 281-293, 306-309.

William E. Carter, Aymara Communities and the Bolivian Agrarian Reform.

William W. Stein, "Race, Culture, and Social Structure in the Peruvian Andes," Lecture presented at University of Pittsburgh, June 20, 1972.

XI. The Management of Communal Conflict - the View From Above

A. Topics

1. Communal relations
   a. Importance of conflict over real values
   b. Importance of territorial state as unit of analysis
2. Major perspectives
   a. Ethnic mobilization
   b. Conflict management
   c. Conflict resolution
3. Processes of communal conflict management
4. Possibilities for government on a consensual basis

Readings

Esman, Administration and Development in Asia, Chapter 8, pp. 246-283.
John A. Porter, The Vertical Mosaic, pp. 285-290; 347-350; 361-365; 389-390; 395-398; 405-412; 440-443; 520-523; 552-558.
John Burton, Conflict and Communication, Chapters 1 and 2, pp. 40-87, if time permits.
Milton J. Esman, "The Management of Communal Conflict," Public Policy, (forthcoming), 41 pages.
(s) U.S. Commission on Civil Disorder, op. cit., pp. 16-29.
Leonard M. Thompson, Politics in the Republic of South Africa, (Little, Brown 1966), Chapter 4, pp. 96-164.

XII. Plural Societies - The Challenge From Below

A. Topics

1. Film - "CBS Report: Chicano"
2. Social mobility and ethnic mobilization
3. The international system
4. Cultural nationalism
5. Forms of pluralism

B. Readings

Michael G. Smith, The Plural Society in the British West Indies, Chapter 4, pp. 75-91.
Leo Kuper, ed., Pluralism in Africa, Chapter 1, pp. 7-26.
Andre Gunder Frank, "The Development of Underdevelopment," pp.4-17, in Robert I. Rhodes, Imperialism and Underdevelopment.
Paolo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, (1971), Chapter 1, pp. 19-36.
Franz Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, pp.148-164.
(s) Nelson, Mandela, No Easy Walk to Freedom, pp. 145-189.
(s) Pierre Vallieres, White Niggers of America, esp. chapters 1&7.
(s) Michael Leigh, "Party Formation in Sarawak," Indonesia (S.E.A.P.), No. 9 (1970), pp. 189-224.
W. H. Roff, The Origins of Malay Nationalism, especially pp.211-256.
(s) Paul Baran, "The Political Economy of Backwardness," pp. 285-301, in Rhodes, op. cit.

XIII. Pluralism and the Future of Nation States

A. Topics

1. Planet earth in 1973
2. The nation and the state
3. Seven alternatives to a world of independent states

B. Readings

Alfred Cobban, The Nation State and National Self Determination.

XIV. Ethnicity, Race and the International System

A. Major Topics

1. Analytic perspectives on linkages, sequences and interactions
   a. Domestic/External
   b. National/International
2. Toward an International sequence perspective
3. Trends and prospects

B. Readings

Harold Issacs, "Color in World Affairs," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 47, No. 2, (January 1969), pp. 235-250.

Locksley Edmondson, "The Challenges of Race: From Entrenched White Power to Rising Black Power," International Journal, Vol. 24, No. 4 (Autumn 1969), pp. 693-716.

Walker Connor, "Ethnology and the Peace of South Asia," World Politics, Vol. 22, No. 1 (October 1969), pp. 51-86.

"Lusaka Manifesto on Southern Africa" proclaimed by East and Central African Heads of State, (April 1969), ca. 6 pages.

Francois-Albert Angers, "Why We Shall Never Accept Conscription for Overseas Service," pp. 228-236 in Ramsay Cook, ed., French-Canadian Nationalism: An Anthology.

Hon. Paul Martin, Fereralism, and International Relations, pp.29-33; 37-43; 47-48.

Marcel Cadieux, "Quebec in World Affairs - Myth or Reality?," Speech...March 2, 1968, (Ottawa: Department of External Affairs, Statements and Speeches, No. 28/10), 6 pages.

(s) Locksley Edmondson, "Caribbean Nation-Building and the Internationalization of Race: Issues and Perspectives" in Wendell Bell and Walter E. Freeman, Eds., Ethnicity and Nation-Building: Local and International Perspectives (Sage Publications forthcoming).

(s) Adam, op. cit., re-read Chapter 5, pp. 119-144.

(s) J. Frankel, "Malaysia and Singapore: Two Foreign Policies in Interaction," Yearbook of World Affairs 1970, Vol. 24, pp. 102-124

(s) Nancy McH. Fletcher, The Separation of Singapore from Malaysia (Cornell Southeast Asia Program, Data paper '73; July 1969).

CIS 212

MID-TERM EXAM

PART I. Write for one hour on any one of the following questions:

1) What are the prospects during the next decade for minimizing ethnic and racial violence in Canada, Malaysia, and South Africa? Compare and contrast.

2) How do ethnic and race relations affect access to economic resources in Canada, Malaysia, and South Africa? Compare and contrast.

PART II. Write for one hour on any two of the following questions:

1) "It remains to be seen whether industrialization and pigmentocracy are incompatible." What does the South African experience indicate?

2) "Quebec is not a province like the others." Discuss the implications of this proposition.

3) What is the Alliance Party in Malaysia and how has it contributed to regulating ethnic conflict in that country?

3/12/73

CIS 212

FINAL EXAMINATION

Please choose any two of the four questions to answer.

1. Can communally plural societies be governed on a consensual basis? Give explicit reasons in answering and refer to case studies where applicable.

2. There are at least two major types of conflict analysis: the analysis of class conflicts and the analysis of communal (ethnic, racial, and religious) conflicts. To what extent are these two types of conflicts mutually exclusive, and to what extent do they operate simultaneously? Discuss with reference to at least two case studies.

3. Strong cases are made in plural societies both for assimilation and for the maintenance of communal identities. Weigh and assess both approaches with special reference to the individual and to group development. Discuss with reference to at least two case studies.

4. "In the modern world," states the UNITAR Guidelines, "international implications of national racial problems are of the utmost importance. Two main directions are (a) the national 'race' problem becoming an international issue; (b) trends in world politics deeply influencing, for better or for worse, the evolution of the national racial situation."

   Discuss this proposition with reference to at least two situations of racial, ethnic, or religious relations.

CIS 212: Pre-Questionnaire

Academic Background Information

Please place the appropriate number within the parentheses

1. What discussion section did you sign up for in CIS 212? Rating

Tu 1:30	Wed 10:10	Wed 1:30	Th 1:30	Th 1:30
5	5	7	4	4

2. Class:

1=Fresh	2=Soph	3=Junior	4=Senior	4=Grad	6=Extramural
16%	40%	16%	24%	0	4%

3. Sex:

1=Male	2=Female
46	52

4. School:

0=Agric. & Life Sciences	5=Hotel Administration
1=Architecture	6=ILR
2=Arts & Sciences	7=Unclassified
3=Engineering	8=Graduate School
4=Human Ecology	9=Other (e.g. Extramural)

5. What is your present or intended major? _____

6. My most important reason for taking this course was:

1=interest in course topic	52	4=reputation of faculty involved	
2=interest in international relations	36		
3=previous experience with CIS courses	8	5=other	_____

7. What is your approximate cumulative average:

high school	(3.5)
Cornell	(3.0)

8. Approximately what were your S.A.T. scores:

Verbal	608
Mathematics	624

9. How many of the following types of courses have you had at Cornell or another college or university? (Note: where appropriate, the same course may be counted in more than one category.)

Courses sponsored by the Center for International Studies	(0.6)
Interdisciplinary courses involving teachers with different viewpoints	(1.1)
Courses dealing mainly with countries or societies other than the U.S.	(1.7)
Courses organized around a specific problem such as population, poverty, crime, etc.	(1.3)
Courses in Political Science, History and Economics	(2.5)
Courses in Anthropology, Sociology or Social Psychology	(2.7)

10. What languages other than English do you know and where did you learn them?

11. What countries other than the U.S. have you:
travelled in or visited
lived in for two weeks or more

Course Content Background

The first half of CIS 212 will present material on Canada, Malaysia, and South Africa. In order to most effectively present this material, we need to know how much prior information you have on these countries. Your answers or lack of same will in no way effect your grade.

I. What are the major ethnic, linguistic, racial, and religious groups in each of the countries and approximately what percentage of the total population is in each group.

	CANADA % of pop.	MALAYSIA % of pop.	SOUTH AFRICA % of pop.
Major Ethnic Groups			
Major Racial Groups			
Major Religious Groups			
Principal Languages			

III. What influences from outside these countries (e.g. the U.N., other Government, Big Business, Political Movements) have affected their internal ethnic, religious, and racial problems?

CANADA	MALAYSIA	SOUTH AFRICA

Course Expectations

1. Please use the scale below to predict the amount of learning and enjoyment you NOW expect from the following aspects of CIS 212.

1=very little or no learning or enjoyment 5=a great deal of learning or enjoyment n=not sure

	Learning	Enjoyment
The Monday evening lectures	(4.2)	(4.0)
Films on topics covered in lectures	(4.0)	(4.3)
The three case studies	(4.4)	(3.8)
The small group discussions	(3.7)	(3.7)
The assigned readings	(4.1)	(3.3)
The interdisciplinary nature of CIS 212	(4.6)	(4.3)

2. I now think that the amount of work required for CIS 212 in relation to other courses with the same number of credit hours (4), will be:

1=much less than for most courses 5=much more n=not sure (3.7)

3. At the present time the difficulty level of this course seems to be:

1=much easier than most courses 5=much harder n=not sure (3.3)

4. What grade do you expect to obtain in CIS 212?

0=don't know	36	2=B	32	4=D	4.0	6=S	4.0
1=A	16	3=C	8	5=F	---	7=U	---

5. Overall, my present expectation is that the course will be

1=very poor 5=excellent course n=not sure (4.4)

6. What do you expect to gain from this course?

7. Do you have any suggestion about how the course could be made more useful for you?

CIS 212 Optional Items

CIS 212 deals with the sensitive issues of ethnicity, race, and communalism. These are personal as well as intellectual issues and thus your opinions and feelings are part of the course. Because they are personal, your responses to the questions below will be confidential and if you feel that any item invades your privacy, please leave it blank.

A. 1. How would you define yourself in:

Ethnic Terms _____

Religious Terms _____

Racial Terms _____

A. 2. How strong is your personal sense of

1=extremely strong 5=extremely weak

Ethnic Identify	(3.0)
Religious Identity	(3.3)
Racial Identity	(3.0)

3. Are there aspects of your life which directly affect your sense of ethnic, religious and/or racial identity (e.g. family, neighborhood, organizations, friends, employment, schools)?

yes= 6 no= 20

If yes, please describe below:

4. Societies have many ways of dealing with linguistic, ethnic, racial, and religious differences (e.g. genocide, domination, assimilation, self-determination, melting pot, pluralism). In general, which do you see as the best strategy and why?

5. Do you believe that university admissions and government jobs should be distributed according to (circle one):

A. Individual merit only
B. Ethnic, racial, or religious quotas only
C. Other (please specify)_____

B. Below are a set of statements about racial, religious, and ethnic groups. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each by using the following scale:

1=strongly agree 5=strongly disagree

6. It is desirable to organize living units on campus limited to members of certain:

	Your Rating	Which groups in particular?
Ethnic Groups	(3.7)	_____
Religious Groups	(3.6)	_____
Racial Groups	(3.6)	_____

7. Do you believe that Cornell's admissions policies should give preferential treatment to members of certain:

Ethnic Groups	(3.5)	_____
Religious Groups	(4.3)	_____
Racial Groups	(2.9)	_____

. It is easy for me to discuss freely my Ethnic, Religious, and/or Racial feelings with a member of a different:

Ethnic Group	(1.5)	_____
Religious Group	(1.7)	_____
Racial Group	(2.4)	_____

B. 9. I am very sensitive to and aware of the major viewpoints of other

Ethnic Groups	(2.6)	_____
Religious Groups	(2.6)	_____
Racial Groups	(2.4)	_____

10. What personal experiences have you had with the problems of ethnicity, race, and communalism, and how do you see them as relevant to CIS 212?

CIS 212: Midsemester Ratings

Your Code_____ Section: T 1:30 W 10:10 W 1:30 Th 10:10 Th 1:30

I. There were sets of readings on the three case studies. Which was the best and worst?

A. Best_____Worst_____

B. Of all the readings, which were the two best and two worst individual readings?

1. Best_____Why?_____
2. Best_____Why?_____

.....

3. Worst_____Why?_____
4. Worst_____Why?_____

II. Which was the best, and the worst, Monday evening session?

A. Best_____Why?_____
B. Worst_____Why?_____

III. Below is a list of the components of CIS 212. Please rate the amount of learning and enjoyment you have obtained from each.

1=very little learning or enjoyment 5=a great deal of learning or enjoyment

	Learning	Enjoyment	Comments
The discussion sections	(3.6)	(3.8)	_____
Total set of readings	(4.1)	(3.1)	_____
Total set of lectures	(3.6)	(3.5)	_____
The movies used	(3.9)	(4.3)	_____
Faculty panels on Mondays	(3.4)	(3.3)	_____
Midterm examination	(2.8)	(2.6)	_____
The course as a whole	(4.0)	(4.0)	_____

IV. Up to this point in the course

A. What percentage of the readings have you completed? (91.6%)
B. How many of the eight Monday night lectures have you attended? (7.5)
C. How many of the eight discussion sections have you attended? (7.5)

V. Many aspects of CIS 212 have been organized to facilitate specific course goals. Please indicate how successfully these goals have been met for you at this time.

1=little or no success 5=a great deal of success

A. Have the lectures provided you with an introduction to the case studies? (3.8)

V. B. Have the readings:

Given you adequate information on the extent and forms of ethnicity, race, and communalism in the three case studies? (3.9)
Illustrated how different social scientists analyze such situations (3.6)

C. Have the discussion sections:

Aided you in integrating the material from lectures and readings? (3.8)
Increased your knowledge of course topics? (3.6)
Given you an opportunity to express your opinions and ideas? (4.2)

D. Has the course as a whole

Provided you with a useful terminology to discuss the course topics? (3.6)
Provided you with adequate concepts for the analysis and comparison of ethnicity, race, and communalism in different countries? (3.8)
Increased your interest in this area of international studies? (4.2)
Changed your attitude toward these kinds of problems? (3.1)

VI. Assume that this course were to be given again. What parts of the course should be kept as they are and what should be changed? Please use the back of this sheet for your recommendations.

CIS 212: Final Questionnaire

You are asked to respond to the following questions in order to provide one measure of the success of CIS 212. Please answer all items and seal this form in the enclosed envelope.

Your Code____Your section: T 1:30 W 10:10 W 1:30 Th 10:10 Th 1:30

Instructions: Please use the five point scales for the following questions. "1" and "5" are always defined and "3" stands for the midpoint. For example, if CIS 212 is slightly below the midpoint in a given aspect, mark a "2". If you are not sure, use an "n". Also, if you would like to make additional comments please do so on the back of the sheets.

A. Monday Night Sessions

1. In general, the difficulty level of the lectures was such that the course faculty:
   1=underestimated my abilities 5=overestimated my abilities (2.7)

2. How would you rate the scope of the lectures?
   1-too broad; superficial 5=too narrow (2.8)

3. To what extent were the lectures by outside "guest" lecturers consistent with the lectures by the course faculty?
   1=not at all 5=very consistent (3.2)

4. Were the course faculty open to questions from the audience?
   1=very open 5=not open (2.5)

5. To what extent were the lectures since the midterm compatible with the earlier lectures on the three countries?
   1=not at all 5=very compatible (3.0)

6. In general, what effect did the lectures have on your interest in Ethnicity, Race, and Communalism?
   1=decreased interest 5=stimulated great interest (3.1)

7. How many of the 14 Monday night sessions have you attended? (13.9)

8. In the future, should the following be continued?
   1=yes, definitely 5=no, certainly not

   Occasional panels of faculty and graduate students (1.8)
   Films on course topics (1.3)
   Faculty members in the audience immediately questioning the speakers? (3.2)

9. Since the Midterm, which were the two best and two worst Monday evening sessions and why?

   1. Best_____Why?_____
   2. Best_____Why?_____

   .....

   3. Worst_____Why?_____
   4. Worst_____Why?_____

B. Grading Procedures

1. Did the midterm adequately sample the important material in the course?
   1=not at all 5=reflected the important aspects of the course (3.2)
2. Overall, how much did the term paper add to the value of the course?
   1=nothing 5=a great deal (3.9)
3. Do the final exam study questions adequately cover the important material?
   1=not at all 5=reflected the important aspects of the course (4.0)
4. Are the procedures for awarding section grades fair?
   1=very fair 5=quite unfair (2.5)
5. Overall, how would you rate the grading procedures in this course?
   1=very inadequate 5=very adequate (3.0)
6. How could the grading procedures be improved?

C. Discussion Sections

1. Did the discussion leader seem knowledgeable?
   1=uninformed 5=knew content very well (4.4)
2. How much independent thinking did the discussion leader demand?
   1=no thinking required 5=thinking always required (3.5)
3. How much new material did the discussion leader present in the sections?
   1=brought little new material 5=brought a great deal of new information (3.3)
4. Was there ample opportunity to ask questions?
   1=no opportunity 5=ample chance (4.3)
5. Who dominated the discussion in the sections?
   1=leader almost completely 5=students almost completely (2.2)
6. How interesting did you find the discussion sections?
   1=boring 5=very interesting (3.4)
7. How much did you learn from the discussion sections?
   1=nothing 5=a great deal (3.4)
8. In general, how much overlap was there between the topics covered in readings and lectures and the topics covered in discussion sections?
   1=not enough overlap 5=too much repetition (3.0)

9. In general, what effect did the discussions have on your interest in Ethnicity, Race, and Communalism?
   1=decreased interest 5=stimulated great interest (3.4)

10. How many of the 14 discussion sections have you attended? 12.7

11. How could the discussion sections be improved?

D. General Readings

1. How would you rate the amount of reading required for the course?
   1=much too light 5=much too heavy (3.8)

2. How would you rate the scope of the readings?
   1=too broad, superficial 5= too narrow (3.0)

3. In general, how much overlap was there between the readings and the lectures?
   1=not enough 5=too much repetition (3.4)

4. In general, what effect did the readings have on your interest in Ethnicity, Race, and Communalism?
   1=decreased interest 5=stimulated great interest (3.4)

5. Approximately what percentage of the assignments have you read to date? (80.7)

6. Since the Midterm, which were the best and worst individual readings, and why?

   1. Best_____ Why?_____
   2. Best_____ Why?_____

   .....

   3. Worst_____ Why?_____
   4. Worst_____ Why?_____

7. In the future should the following be continued?
   1=yes, definitely 5=no, certainly not

   Presenting three case studies during the first half of the course? (2.5)
   Presenting the analytic concepts later in the semester? (2.6)

8. How could the readings be improved?

E. Course Outcomes

1. As a result of your experiences in the course, how much do you feel you have learned about the following:
   1=very little 5=a great deal

   Conditions in other countries (4.0)
   Governmental Ethnic, Racial, and Communalism policies outside U.S. (4.1)
   How political scientists analyze governmental policy (3.6)
   How anthropologists, sociologists, and psychologists study this area (2.4)
   The relationships among the four above (2.3)
   The interdisciplinary approach to Ethnic, Racial, and Communal problems (3.1)

2. Approximately how many introductory courses in the social and behavioral sciences have you taken? (e.g. Psy.101; Anthro.101.) (3.5)

Compared with these other introductory courses, was CIS 212 more or less successful in the following areas:
1=CIS 212 much more successful 5=CIS 212 much less successful

In providing a useful terminology for categorizing social and behavioral science phenomena (3.0)
Suggesting a useful framework for organizing information on how human beings behave (3.2)
Giving a "feel" for how other people live and think (2.7)
Providing insights relevant to your own life and concerns (2.8)
Are there any other courses at Cornell that you see as similar to CIS 212?

Yes____ 18.2% No____ 81.8%

3. As a result of your experiences in this course, how likely are you to take the following types of courses in the future:
1=quite unlikely 5=very likely

Economics/History (3.2)
Anthropology/Sociology/Psychology (3.5)
International Studies (3.6)
Political Science/Government (3.5)
Interdisciplinary courses or specific problems (3.9)
If you are at all likely to choose such courses in the future, what would be the main basis of choice? (circle one)

Interest in issues of Ethnicity, Race, Communalism 30.4%
Interest in specific disciplines 26.1
Interest in interdisciplinary approaches 39.1
Other 4.3

4. Has CIS 212 affected your choice of a major? If yes, please indicate what that effect was.

Yes____ 13.0% No____ 87.0%

5. Please use the following scale for the next four items.
1=very seldom 5=very frequently

How often do you read a daily paper? (3.7) Which_____
How often do you read a newsmagazine?(3.6) Which_____
How often do you watch the TV news? (1.9) Which_____
How often has CIS aided your understanding of the informatinn on Ethnic, Racial, and Communalism conflict presented in newspapers, newsmagazines, and television? (3.3)

F. Teaching Goals

Various aspects of CIS 212 were designed to aid your learning in specific ways. How successfully has the course met these course goals for you at this time?
1=quite unsuccessful 5=very successful

A. In general, the lectures:
   1. Clearly introduced the major concepts in the course. (3.7)
   2. Illustrated the major significance of the case examples. (4.0

B. The handouts:
   1. The lecture outlines aided in organizing the lecture content. (3.8)
   2. The handout on definitions clearly defined the major terms dealt with in the course. (3.5)

C. The readings:
   1. Provided factual information on the 3 countries. (4.4)
   2. Gave adequate information on the topics covered. (3.7)
   3. Illustrated how political, social, and individual factors interact in a variety of countries. (3.4)

D. The discussion sections:
   1. Provided an opportunity to integrate the readings and the lectures. (3.4) (3.4)
   2. Allowed you to test and extend your knowledge of the course topic. (3.3)

G. The Course as a Whole

1. Did the course fulfill your expectations in terms of what you wished to learn?
   1=not at all 5=fulfilled all expectations (3.3)

2. Were you aware of what was expected of you in this course?
   1=didn't know what was expected 5=knew exactly (2.9)

3. The amount of effort I invested in this course was
   1=much less than for most courses 5=much more... (3.8)

4. The amount of work required for this course, in relation to other courses giving the same number of credit hours was
   1=much less than for most 5=much more than for most (3.8)

5. The difficulty level of this course was
   1=much easier than for most 5=much harder than for most (3.5)

6. The overall organization of this course, in comparison to others was
   1=much poorer than most 5=much better than most (3.3)

7. My interest level in this course, in comparison to other courses I have taken was
   1=much lower 5=much greater (3.4)

8. The amount I learned in this course, in comparison to other courses was
   1=much less 5=much more (3.4)

9. The value of this course to my general education, in comparison with other courses, was
   1=much less 5=much more (3.6)

10. Overall, my opinion of CIS 212 is that it is
   1=a very poor course 5=an excellent course (3.5)

H. Course Redesign

Thank you for helping us evaluate CIS 212. We would appreciate any additional recommendations you might make about which parts of this course should be changed or kept as is if CIS 212 is given again. Please use the back of this sheet if you need more space.

I. CIS 212 Optional Items

CIS 212 deals with the sensitive issues of Ethnicity, Race, and Communalism. These are personal as well as intellectual issues and thus your opinions and feelings are part of the course. Because they are personal, your responses to the questions below will be confidential and if you feel that any item invades your privacy please leave it blank.

1. How strong is your personal sense of
   1=extremely strong 5=extremely weak

   Ethnic Identity (3.1)
   Religious Identity (3.6)
   Racial Identity (3.1)

2. Societies have many ways of dealing with linguistic, ethnic, racial, and religious differences (e.g. genocide, domination, assimilation, self-determination, melting pot, pluralism). In general, which do you see as the best strategy, and why?

3. Below are a set of statements about racial, religious, and ethnic groups. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each by using the scale:

   1=strongly agree 5=strongly disagree

   A. Do you believe that Cornell's admissions policies should give preferential treatment to members of certain:

   Ethnic Groups (2.8)
   Religious Groups (4.3)
   Racial Groups (2.4)

   B. It is easy for me to discuss freely my Ethnic, Religious, and/or Racial feelings with a member of a different:

   Ethnic Group (1.6)
   Religious Group (1.8)
   Racial Group (2.2)

C. I am very sensitive to and aware of the major viewpoints of other:

Ethnic Groups	(2.5)
Religious Groups	(2.7)
Racial Groups	(2.4)

4. Have your experiences in CIS 212 had an impact on your attitudes toward ethnic, racial, and communalism problems?

1=little or no impact 5=a great deal of impact (3.4)

If there was an impact, what was it?

Section 6

CIS 135: The Concept of Europe

CIS 135: The Concept of Europe

Europe was the sixth course in the Center for International Studies Undergraduate Program and the last to be given under the three year mandate for this program. Like the earlier course, Integration and Decentralization (CIS 110), the "Concept of Europe" concentrated on European experiences. Unlike the earlier course, however, Europe was less interdisciplinary and more concerned with the major political and institutional factors influencing European integration. This course was particularly useful from an evaluation standpoint because it demonstrated the effects of a problem-oriented course which used a minimum of resources. In many ways, it was similar to a conventional, International Relations course.

CIS 135 was titled "The Concept of Europe: Crisis and Continuity in the Evolution of an Idea" and was cross-listed with the History and Government Departments. The course description read:

> "CIS 135: The Concept of Europe: Crisis and Continuity in the Evolution of an Idea. (Also History 135 and Government 135.) Fall term. Credit: three hours. Hours to be arranged.
> Examination of the evolution and development of the concept of Europe from its origins to the present time. Particular emphasis is given to postwar European developments both in terms of the effort to integrate the west European states in a European Community and in terms of the relationship of western Europe to eastern Europe and to the United States. The crisis of western European culture as reflected in the protest movements of the younger generation, rejection of contemporary social and political values, and efforts toward supra- and infranational regionalization will serve as principal points of departure for the contemporary period. Faculty participants will be drawn from the disciplines of Economics, History, Political Science and Sociology."

Three members of the faculty were drawn from the Departments of Government and History, as were the three visiting lecturers. The students' interests and backgrounds were varied but about one third had a fairly well defined interest in Europe.

Essentially, CIS 135 combined an historical introduction with an extended analysis of the political, social, and institutional factors which effect European integration. This organization reflects the conventional assumption that students need an historical background before they can analyze present conditions. There was little interdisciplinarity and the team-teaching aspects of the course were rudimentary.

An unusual degree of flexibility was the most outstanding characteristic of this course. CIS 135 involved a set of assigned readings (see below), weekly lectures combined with a question and answer session, occasional discussion meetings, and a midterm and final examination.

These instructional components were not pre-established, as in CIS 211 and 212, and there were modifications made from week to week.

As stated above, this course used a minimum of instructional and other resources. The staff was composed of two Cornell faculty members and a graduate student. There were few planning or staff meetings (a major time commitment of previous CIS courses). During the semester, discussion meetings were infrequent and ad hoc. In some instances, the lecture material seemed to be drawn from other, more advanced courses taught by the faculty. The principal lecturer did the majority of design and implementation work, which was a very different pattern from the team efforts in other CIS courses. From the standpoint of the Center for International Studies, CIS 135 was an inexpensive course; there was no program coordinator employed and the course utilized few other CIS resources.

The assessment of Europe was less comprehensive than the evaluation of the previous two courses (CIS 211 and CIS 212), for several reasons: 1) the very low enrollment (17); 2) the relative simplicity of the course design; and 3) the desire of the professor in charge that evaluation have a minimal impact on course activities. Thus, evaluation personnel were not present in any of the planning sessions or at any staff meetings and did not influence the design or scoring of the course examinations. There was some contact with the faculty before and during the semester; pre-, mid-semester, and post-questionnaires were designed, discussed, and administered (see below). After the course ended, interviews were held with the faculty. These were the primary sources of evaluation data.

Student and faculty reactions to the course were generally negative, despite initially high expectations by both groups. On the mid-semester questionnaire, students expressed approval of the lectures but they down-graded the rest of the course, particularly the readings and discussions after the lectures. The same kind of responses appeared on the final questionnaire and many of the items rating the course as a whole were the lowest for any CIS course. The overall rating of Europe was 8/10 of a scale point below the mean for College of Arts and Sciences courses and it is the only CIS course to have been rated below the midpoint of the five point scale. The faculty expressed considerable dissatisfaction with the way in which the course was received by students.

Basically, the evaluation suggests that a course using minimal resources has less impact on students and faculty than one in which more is invested. This essentially conventional, introductory course was less successful than other, more innovative offerings -- but it is important to note that the difference was not spectacularly great.

The course syllabus, pre-questionnaire, midsemester and final examinations follow.

CIS 135: The Concept of Europe -- Syllabus

1. The Concept and Origins of Europe

   H. Butterfield, Christianity in European History (London: Collins 1952)
   D. Hay, From Roman Empire to Renaissance Europe (London: Metheun, 1953)

2. Modern Europe in Europe and Overseas

   Archibald Lewis, An Emerging Medieval Europe, 400-1100 (New York: Knopf, 1967)
   J.H. Parry, The Establishment of the European Hegemony, 1415-1715 (London, 1949)
   Nowell, The Great Discovery

3. The Meaning of Europe in the Nineteenth Century

   Matthew S. Anderson, Ascendancy of Europe, Aspects of European History, 1815-1914 (London: Longman, 1972)
   A.J.P. Taylor, The Struggle for the Mastery of Europe, 1848-1918 (London: Oxford University Press, 1971)

4. Europe Between the Wars

   E.H. Carr, The Twenty Years Crisis (London: Macmillan, 1939)
   A.J.P. Taylor, From Sarajevo to Potsdam (London: Thames and Hudson, 1966)

5. The Reconceptualization of Europe: The Voluntarist Strain

   J. Lukacs, Decline and Rise of Europe (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965), pp. 1-54
   J. Freymond, Western Europe since the War (New York: Praeger, 1964) ch. 1-4
   Lord Gladwyn, The European Idea (New York: Praeger, 1966)
   George Lichtheim, The New Europe (New York: Praeger, 1964)

6. The Institutionalization of the European Idea

   Ernst B. Haas, The Uniting of Europe, preface to 1968 edition (Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press, 1968)
   Raymond Aron, "Old Nations, New Europe", in Graubard (Ed.), A New Europe (Boston: Beacon, 1963, 1964) (also in a special edition of Daedalus, Winter, 1964)
   M. Kohnstamm, "The European Tide", in Graubard (Ed.), A New Europe
   J. Freymond, Western Europe since the War

7. The Political Dynamics of Neo-Functional Integration

L. Lindberg, The Political Dynamics of European Economic Integration (Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press, 1963), pp. 14-103

8. The Interpenetration of Europe and America in the Technological Age

Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, The American Challenge (New York: Atheneum, 1968)

9. The Structure of Protest: Student Politics in Europe and America

T. Roszak, The Making of a Counter Culture (Garden City: Doubleday, 1969)
K. Kenniston, "The Sources of Student Dissent", Journal of Social Issues, 23:3

Englehardt, "The Silent Revolution in Europe" (Xerox copy handed out)

10. The Structure of Protest: Class and Conflict in European Industrial Society

R. Dahrendorf, "Recent Changes in the Class Structure of European Societies", in Graubard (Ed.), A New Europe
Seymour M. Lipset, "The Changing Class Structure and Contemporary European Politics", in Graubard (Ed.), A New Europe
Alain Touraine, "Management and the Working Class in Western Europe," in Graubard (Ed.), A New Europe
Kutzenstein, The End of Ideology

11. The Democratic Quandary: Participation versus Rationalization

Alfred Grosser, "The Evolution of European Parliaments", in Graubard, op.cit
Karl D. Bracher, "Problems of Parliamentary Democracy in Europe", in Graubard, op.cit
Andrew Schoenfeld, Modern Capitalism, The Changing Balance of Public and Private Power (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), Part 4, "An Essay on Some Political Implications of Active Government"

12. Alternative Futures: European Models

D. Calleo, Europe's Future (New York: Horizon Press, 1967; W.W. Norton, 1965)
R. Pryce and J. Pinder, Europe and De Gaulle (Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1969)

13. Alternative Futures: Transatlantic Models

P. Uri, Partnership for Progress (New York: Harper and Row, 1963)
H. van b. Cleveland, The Atlantic Idea and its European Rivals (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966)

*14. Alternative Futures: The Crisis of Industrial Society

R. Heilbroner, The Limits of American Capitalism (New York: Harper and Row, 1966)
Jacques Ellul, The Technological Society (New York: Knopf, 1964)

* Omitted

CIS 135: Pre-Questionaire

1. Your Questionnaire Code Number_____Date_____

I. Academic Background Information

Please place the appropriate number within the parentheses.

1. Class: 1=Fresh 2=Soph 3=Junior 4=Senior 5=Grad 6=Extramural
2. Sex: 1=Male (3) 2=Female (8) (6) (5)
3. School:

0=Agri.& Life Sciences		5=Hotel Administration	
1=Architecture		6=ILR	1
2=Arts & Sciences	17	7=Unclassified	
3=Engineering	3	8=Graduate School	
4=Human Ecology	1	9=Other (e.g. Extramural)	

4. What is your present or intended major?
5. My most important reason for taking this course was:

1=interest in European studies	9
2=interest in international relations	9
3=previous experience with CIS course	2
4=reputation of faculty involved	
5=recommendation of advisor	
6=advice of a friend	
7=congruence with my schedule	1
8=other	1

6. What is your approximate cumulative average:

in high school 3.7
at Cornell 3.3

7. Approximately what were your S.A.T. scores:

verbal 656
mathematics 679

8. How many of the following types of courses have you had at Cornell or another college or university? (Note: where appropriate, the same course may be counted in more than one category.)

Courses sponsored by the Center for International Studies	(.5)
Interdisciplinary courses involving teachers with different views	(.8)
Courses dealing mainly with countries or societies other than the U.S.	(2.1)
Courses organized around a specific problem such as population, poverty, crime, etc.	(1.1)
Courses in Political Science, History and Economics	(5.8)
Courses in Anthropology, Sociology or Social Psychology	(1.8)

9. What languages other than English do you know? 1.3

Where did you learn them?_____

10. What countries other than the U.S. have you

Traveled in or visited	4.3
Lived in for two weeks or more	1.2

11. How knowledgeable do you think you are about the following:
1=I know very little 5=a great deal n=not sure

Ancient European History	(2.0)	What periods?_____
Modern European History	(2.8)	What periods?_____
European politics	(2.4)	What countries?_____
European/American relations	(2.6)	In what areas?_____

12. What are the main sources of your knowledge of Europe?

1=personal travel 3=newspapers or periodicals 5=other
2=formal course work 4=books and scholarly papers

11. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
1=strongly agree 5=strongly disagree n=not sure

Europe is a state of mind and not a geographic entity	(2.6)
Potentially, Europe could be the most important factor in the modern world	(2.4)
The creation of a common European currency would require political integration	(2.4)
European culture is not an outgrowth of Graeco-Roman culture	(3.6)
Modernity is essentially a European phenomenon	(2.8)
European power is predominantly industrial rather than political	(3.4)
Cornell should offer more courses on modern Europe	(1.4)

14. What do you see as the three major national, and three major cross national issues affecting Europe today and how do you expect these issues to affect the further political and economic integration of this area? (Use back of page if you wish.)

II. Course Expectations

1. I now think that the amount of work required for CIS 135 in relation to other courses with the same number of credit hours (3), will be

1=much less than for most courses 5=much more n=not sure (3.6)

2. At the present time the difficulty level of this course seems to be

1=much easier than most courses 5=much harder n=not sure (3.0)

3. Please use the scale below to predict the amount of learning and enjoyment you NOW expect from the following aspects of CIS 135.
1=little or no learning or enjoyment 5=a great deal of learning or enjoyment n=not sure

	Learning	Enjoyment
the historical content of the course	(4.0)	(4.1)
the political science emphases	(3.7)	(4.1)
the interdisciplinary nature of CIS 135	(3.9)	(3.9)
the lectures on Tuesday nights	(4.0)	(3.7)
the discussions on Tuesday nights	(3.2)	(3.5)
the assigned readings	(3.9)	(3.2)

4. What grade do you expect to obtain in CIS 212?

0=don't know	9	2=B	5	4=D	6=S
1=A	5	3=C	1	5=F	7=U

5. To what extent should the following be stressed in CIS 135
1=little stress 5=should be covered in detail

The history of Europe	(2.9)
Contemporary European politics	(4.2)
Problems of modernization	(3.8)
European/American relations	(3.9)
Analysis of the concept of the nation state	(3.1)
The political and economic integration of Europe	(4.2)
The sociological analysis of European cultures	(3.8)

6. Overall, my present expectation is that the course will be

1=very poor 5=an excellent course n=not sure (4.1)

7. What do you expect to gain from this course?

8. Do you have any suggestions about how the course could be made more useful to you?

CIS 135: Midsemester Questionnaire

Your ratings are confidential. Please use the code number you used on the first questionnaire for this course. Your code number_____

1. Regarding the lectures, which was the
   A. Most successful:"Europe between the Wars; Meaning of Europe in the 19th Century"
      Why? "Interesting, well organized and presented, tied things together"
   B. Least successful:"Dynamics Neo-Func. Integration; Concept and Origins"
      Why? "Boring, too limited, dull, irrelevant"

2. Regarding the readings, which was the
   A. Most successful:"Ascendency of Europe; W. Europe since the War"
      Why? "Good information, interesting, relate concept to rest of world"
   B. Least successful:"Estab. of European Hegemony; Christianity in European History"
      Why? "Boring, too limited, dull, irrelevant"

3. Below is a list of the components of CIS 135. Please rate the amount of learning and enjoyment you have obtained from each.
   1=very little 5=a great deal n=no opinion

	Learning	Enjoyment
the lectures	(4.1)	(3.4)
the discussions after lectures	(2.1)	(2.2)
the readings	(2.9)	(2.3)
the discussion sections	(3.0)	(3.1)
the midterm examination	(2.8)	(1.9)

4. The various aspects of CIS 135 have been designed to facilitate specific course goals. Please indicate how successfully these goals have been met for you at the present time.
   1=little or no success 5=a great deal of success n=no opinion

a. The four lectures on the history of Europe delineated major historical trends up to the present. How successful were they? (3.5)

b. The historical readings supplemented the lectures by providing additional details on these major trends. Did they? (2.8)

c. The next three lectures presented basic conceptual approaches to European integration. Did they? (3.8)

d. The readings on the next three lectures gave additional detailed information on these approaches. (2.8)

e. The discussion sections provided an opportunity to clarify material which was first presented in the lectures or readings. (2.8)

f. The discussion sections also provided an opportunity to integrate the readings and lectures. Have they? (2.4)

g. How successful was the midterm examination in testing what you knew? (2.5)

5. Approximately what percentage of the
   lectures have you attended? (91.8%)
   discussion sections have you attended? (64.1%)
   assigned readings have you read? (59.8%)

6. Assume that the course were to be given again next Fall. What parts of the course should be kept as they are and what parts should be changed? Please use the back of this sheet for your recommendation.

CIS 135: Final Questionnaire

You are asked to respond to the following questions in order to provide one measure of the success of CIS 135. Please answer all items.

Your Code Number_____Date_____

Instructions: Please use the five point scales for the following questions. "1" and"5" are always defined and "3" stands for the midpoint. For example, if CIS 135 is slightly below the midpoint in a given aspect, mark a "2". If you are not sure use an "n". Also, if you would like to make additional comments please do so on the back of the sheets.

A. Lecture Sessions

1. In general, the difficulty level of the lecture was such that the course faculty
   1=underestimated my abilities 5=overestimated my abilities (3.1)

2. How would you rate the scope of the lectures?
   1=too broad; superficial 5=too narrow (2.9)

3. To what extent were the lectures by outside "guest" lecturers consistent with the lectures by the course faculty?
   1=not at all 5=very consistent (3.4)

4. Were the faculty open to questions?
   1=very open 5=not open (1.7)

5. To what extent were the lectures since the Midterm compatible with the earlier lectures?
   1=not at all 5=very compatible (3.5)

6. In general, what effect did the lectures have on your interest in the topic of this course?
   1=decreased interest, were boring 5=stimulated great interest (3.4)

7. How many of the 14 lecture sessions have you attended? (12.1)

8. In the future, should the following be continued?
   1=yes, definitely 5=no, certainly not

   the format of a lecture followed by a question period? (2.1)
   adding occasional outside lecturers in the course? (1.7)
   using occasional discussion sections? (1.9)

9. Since the Midterm, which two lectures did you find the most valuable sessions and why?

   1._____Why?_____
   2._____Why?_____

10. In general, were the lecturers tolerant of student viewpoints?
    1=allowed no contradiction 5=welcomed differences (4.0)

11. Overall, how did you find the lectures?
    1=useless 5=very valuable (3.7)

12. How could the lectures be improved in this course?

B. General Readings

1. How would you rate the amount of reading required for the course?
   1=much too light 5=much too heavy (4.3)

2. How would you rate the scope of the readings?
   1=too broad, superficial 5=too narrow (2.9)

3. In general, how much overlap was there between the readings and the lectures?
   1=not enough overlap 5=too repetitive (2.8)

4. In general, what effect did the readings have on your interest in the topic of the course?
   1=decreased interest, boring 5=stimulated great interest (2.1)

5. Approximately what percentage of the assignments have you read to date? (58.3%)

6. Since the Midterm, which were the most valuable individual readings, and why?
   1._____Why?_____
   2._____Why?_____

7. Overall, how did you find the readings?
   1=useless 5=extremely valuable (2.7)

8. How can the readings in this course be improved?

C. Discussion Sections

1. Did the discussion leader seem knowledgeable?
   1=uninformed 5=knew content very well (4.3)

2. Was there ample opportunity to ask questions?
   1=no opportunity 5=ample chance (4.8)

3. Was the discussion leader willing to help students who had difficulty?
   1=seemed unwilling to help 5=interested in being helpful (4.5)

4. How interesting did you find the discussion sections?
   1=boring 5=very interesting (3.2)

5. How much did you learn from the discussion sections?
   1=nothing 5=a great deal

6. How many of the discussion sections have you attended? (2.6)

7. How can the discussion sections be improved?

D. Examinations

1. Did the Midterm adequately sample the important material in the course?
   1=not at all 5=reflected the important aspects of course (3.3)

2. Was the type of examination suitable for the purpose of the course?
   1=not at all 5=very suitable (3.3)

3. Was the grading of examinations fair?
   1=very unfair 5=very fair (3.7)

4. Was there adequate feedback as to what was expected on this course?
1=no answers or guidance 5=explanation of answers was provided (2.3)

5. Overall, how would you rate the examinations in this course?
1=very inadequate 5=very adequate (2.9)

6. How can the examination procedures be improved in this course?

E. Course Outcomes

1. As a result of your experiences in the course, how much do you feel you have learned about the following
1=very little 5=learned a great deal

A. Conditions in other countries (2.9)
B. Governmental policies outside the United States (3.4)
C. How political scientists analyze governmental policy (2.6)
D. How historians analyze European issues (3.4)
E. The relationships among the four above (2.8)
F. The interdisciplinary approach to the study of Europe (3.2)

2. As a result of your experiences in this course, how likely are you to take the following types of courses in the future?
1=quite unlikely 5=very likely

A. History (3.1)
B. Anthropology/Sociology/Psychology (2.3)
C. International Studies (3.2)
D. Political Science/Government (3.3)
E. Interdisciplinary courses or specific problem-oriented courses (2.9)

3. How many introductory courses in the social and behavioral sciences have you taken? (e.g., Psych. 101, Anthro. 101, 102). (4.5)

Compared with these other introductory courses, was CIS 135 more or less successful in the following areas
1=much more successful 5=much less successful

A. In providing a useful terminology for categorizing social and behavioral science phenomena (3.8)
B. Suggesting a useful framework for organizing information on how human beings behave? (3.0)
C. Giving a "feel" for how other people live and think (2.9)
D. Providing insights relevant to one's own life and concerns (3.7)
E. Are there any other courses at Cornell that you see as similar to CIS 135? If yes, list below.
Yes 16.7 No 83.3

4. Has CIS 135 affected your choice of a major?
Yes 13.4 No 86.7
If yes, please indicate what that effect was.

F. Teaching Goals

Various aspects of CIS 135 were designed to aid your learning. How successfully have they met these goals for you?
1=quite unsuccessful 5=very successful

A. In general the lectures described the major

1. Historical trends related to the concept of Europe (3.6)
2. Theoretical approaches to European integration (3.9)
3. Factors affecting European integration (4.1)
4. Cross national institutions (3.7)

B. The question and answer sessions after the lectures

1. Resolved the questions about lectures and readings (2.9)
2. Gave an opportunity to test and extend knowledge (2.8)

C. The discussion sections

1. Aided in integrating the readings and lectures (2.5)
2. Gave a separate opportunity to test knowledge (3.2)

D. In general, the readings provided detailed information on

1. The major historical trends presented in lecture (2.9)
2. The theoretical approaches to integration (3.1)
3. The factors that affect European integration (3.7)
4. The characteristics of major cross national institutions (3.5)

G. The Course as a Whole

1. How much independent thinking did the course demand?
1=no thinking 5=thinking always required (3.0)

2. Did the course fulfill your expectations in terms of what you wished to learn?
1=not at all 5=fully met expectations (2.6)

3. Did the teacher tell you what he expected you to learn?
1=didn't know what was expected 5=knew exactly (2.5)

4. The amount of effort I invested in this course was
1=much less than for most 5=much more than for most (2.6)

5. The amount of work required for this course in relation to other courses was
1=much less 5=much more (3.3)

6. The difficulty level of this course was
1=much easier than most 5=much harder (3.1)

7. The teaching skills of the teachers in this course, in comparison to others was
1=much poorer than the majority 5=much better (3.0)

8. My interest level in this course compared to others was
1=much lower 5=much greater (2.6)

9. The amount I learned in this course compared to others was
1=much less 5=much more (2.6)

10. The value of this course to my general education, compared to other courses was
1=much less 5=much more (2.7)

11. As a result of this course, are you interested in taking more courses in this field?
1=not at all 5=very definitely (2.7)

12. Overall, my opinion of this course is
1=very poor course 5=excellent course (2.8)

H. Course Redesign

Thank you for helping us evaluate CIS 135. We would appreciate any additional recommendations you might make about which parts of this course should be changed or kept as is if CIS 135 is given again. Please use the back of this sheet if you need more space.

I. Attitudes and Opinions

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?
1=strongly agree 5=strongly disagree

1. Europe is a state of mind and not a geographic entity (2.9)
2. Potentially, Europe could be the most important factor in the modern world (2.4)
3. The creation of a common European currency would require political integration (2.8)
4. Modernity is essentially a European phenomenon (2.1)
5. European power is predominantly industrial rather than political (2.9)
6. Cornell should offer more courses on modern Europe (2.0)

2. To what extent should the following be stressed in CIS 135?
1=little stress necessary 5=should be covered in detail

1. The history of Europe (3.0)
2. Modern European politics (4.5)
3. Problems of modernization (3.4)
4. European/American relations (3.7)
5. Analysis of the concept of the nation state (3.3)
6. The political and economic integration of Europe (4.1)
7. The sociological analysis of European cultures (3.4)
8. The analysis of cross national institutions (3.5)

3. What do you see as the five major cross-national issues affecting Europe today, and how do you expect these issues to affect the further political and economic integration of this area? (Use back of page if you wish.)