



# Amateur Hour? Experience and Faculty Qualifications in U.S. Intelligence Courses

Jonathan Smith  
*Coastal Carolina University, jonsmith@coastal.edu*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jss>  
pp. 25-39

## Recommended Citation

Smith, Jonathan. "Amateur Hour? Experience and Faculty Qualifications in U.S. Intelligence Courses." *Journal of Strategic Security* 6, no. 3 (2013): : 25-39.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5038/1944-0472.6.3.3>

Available at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jss/vol6/iss3/3>

---

## Amateur Hour? Experience and Faculty Qualifications in U.S. Intelligence Courses

### **Author Biography**

Dr. Jonathan Smith is an Associate Professor of Politics and serves as the Director of Intelligence and National Security Studies at Coastal Carolina University. He teaches course on intelligence analysis, national security decision making, and U.S. security policy. Dr. Smith also served as an intelligence officer in the U.S. Navy Reserve. In his 23-year career, he has mobilized in support of Operations JOINT ENDEAVOR, IRAQI FREEDOM, and ENDURING FREEDOM. His last assignment was as Commanding Officer of NR Joint Intelligence Operations Center 0174 based at the U.S. Southern Command in Miami, Florida.

### **Abstract**

As intelligence studies programs and courses continue to grow in the United States, the demand for qualified faculty to service these activities also continues to grow. However, the paucity of graduate programs in the field and the specialized nature of the instruction has the potential to lead to staffing challenges. This article reviews the findings of an empirical survey of intelligence faculty at U.S. civilian colleges and universities. It is found that most faculty who teach courses in intelligence have prior work experience in the field of intelligence. Indeed, many come with a substantial background in the craft, as well as some pedagogical training. However, a large proportion of these faculty are employed in an adjunct capacity, raising questions about the development of such programs in the future.

## Introduction

### What Does It Take To Teach Intelligence?

This study is an empirical survey of faculty who teach courses on intelligence in U.S. civilian colleges and universities. As the number of courses on intelligence in U.S. educational institutions expands, a natural question arises regarding how such courses are staffed. Are the faculty qualified to teach the subject? What does it mean to be ‘qualified’ to teach courses in intelligence? After reviewing the contemporary context of such courses and the literature on the instruction of intelligence studies, this study analyzes a survey of forty-eight faculty members who are engaged in the instruction of courses in intelligence in the United States. Particular attention is given to variations associated with prior work experience and level of education. Is professional competence in the classroom defined more by prior work experience in the field of intelligence or by the level of education?

What is found is that a large majority of faculty teaching courses in intelligence come with some level of prior work experience in the field. However, many of these faculty do not come with the requisite terminal degree (typically, the doctor of philosophy) common for tenure-track faculty. As a result, the departments offering courses in intelligence tend to have an above average proportion of adjunct faculty relative to other academic disciplines. This has important implications for the development of the field, as adjunct faculty tend to have limited powers in university governance structures.

### A Rapidly Expanding Field

In the Intelligence Studies section of the *International Studies Association Compendium*, Dr. William Spracher noted, “. . . the growth of more specialized intelligence studies, departments and programs, especially since September 11, 2001, is rapid and undeniable.”<sup>1</sup> Indeed, beyond Spracher’s evaluation, many observers have noted that the instruction of intelligence-related subjects has undergone substantial growth in recent years.<sup>2</sup> In 2006, Amy Zegart noted that only four universities in the *U.S. News and World Report*’s top twenty-five universities in the United States offered courses on intelligence agencies or issues.<sup>3</sup> Today, utilizing the Association of Former Intelligence Officers’ (AFIO) 2013 listing of U.S. academic programs that offer courses in intelligence, over half of the top-25 institutions in the *U.S. News and World Report* listing offer such courses or programs.<sup>4</sup>

The growth trend is not limited to these top schools. The need for intelligence professionals is rooted in the notion that this profession is a “new cornerstone” of government being used equally

---

<sup>1</sup> William Spracher, “Intelligence Studies,” *International Studies Association Compendium* (2012).

<sup>2</sup> Stephen Marrin, “Training and Educating U.S. Intelligence Analysts,” *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* 22:1 (Spring 2009): 131-146; see also, Michael Landon-Murray, “Social Science and Intelligence Analysis: The Role of Intelligence Education,” *Journal of Applied Security Research* 6 (2011): 491-528.

<sup>3</sup> Amy Zegart, “Universities Must Not Ignore Intelligence Research,” *Chronicle of Higher Education* 53: 45 (13 July 2007): 9.

<sup>4</sup> *Intelligence as a Career: Is It Right For You and Are You Right For It?* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Former Intelligence Officers, January 2013), 42-48. Thirteen of the top twenty-five programs are listed in this publication.

as a tool of offensive war-making and defensive national security planning.<sup>5</sup> It also is increasingly utilized in other career fields such as law enforcement and business. As a result, there has been a large-scale growth in the teaching of intelligence as reflected in the growth of new courses and programs, as well as enrollments in such programs. For instance, in comparing the 2011 and 2013 editions of the AFIO publication *Intelligence as a Career*, the number of institutions listed as offering courses in intelligence grew from 130 institutions to 270 institutions. While it is possible that there was a surge of existing schools seeking to advertise in this publication, the most likely explanation is that there has indeed been substantial growth in the number of schools offering such courses.<sup>6</sup>

However, this growth has raised several questions, including whether departments have adequate resources and staff to support such offerings. Some scholars have even questioned whether academic institutions, in their rush to exploit the high student demand for intelligence courses, have resorted to employing ‘amateurs’ as course instructors.<sup>7</sup> Mark Lowenthal echoes this concern when he noted, “. . . with so many instructors out there with little or no experience, there is a risk of amateurism.”<sup>8</sup> But this, itself, raises a significant question – what does it mean to be an ‘amateur’? Is it more important to have prior work experience or a higher-level academic degree in order to avoid the undesirable label of ‘amateur’?

## What Schools Are Looking For

Recent job announcements reinforce the impression that prior work experience in the ‘profession’ of intelligence is more valuable than the educational degree when it comes to faculty qualifications in intelligence courses. In a posting for a tenure-track position in National Security and Intelligence at Fairmont State University, one of the stated requirements of the applicant was “10 years or more of US Federal Government or US Military experience in the National Security field.”<sup>9</sup> Similarly, Tiffin University sought an Assistant Professor of Intelligence and Security Studies for a Spring 2013 start. For qualifications, they required “this person will have a Master’s Degree in Intelligence Analysis, Security Studies, or a related field *with significant work experience in the intelligence community*” (emphasis added).<sup>10</sup> Finally, James Madison University sought two new faculty members to teach in the Intelligence Analysis program at the Assistant or Associate Professor level. They noted, “the ideal candidate(s) will have substantial experience as all-source intelligence analysts.”<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Michael Goodson, “Studying and Teaching About intelligence: The Approach in the United Kingdom,” *Studies in Intelligence* 50: 2 (2006), available at: [https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/csi-studies/studies/vol50no2/html\\_files/Studying\\_Teaching\\_6.htm](https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/csi-studies/studies/vol50no2/html_files/Studying_Teaching_6.htm).

<sup>6</sup> *Intelligence as a Career* (2013): 42-48.

<sup>7</sup> Martin Rudner, “Intelligence Studies in Higher Education: Capacity-Building to Meet Societal Demand,” *International Journal of Intelligence and Counter-Intelligence* 22:1 (Spring 2009): 110.

<sup>8</sup> Spracher, William, *National Security Intelligence Professional Education: A Map of U.S. Civilian University Programs and Competencies* (Washington, D.C.: National Defense Intelligence College, 2009), 114.

<sup>9</sup> “Assistant Professor of National Security and Intelligence,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 2013, available at: <http://www.chronicle.com/jobs/0000763522-01>.

<sup>10</sup> “Assistant Professor of Intelligence and Security Studies,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 7, 2012, A98.

<sup>11</sup> E-mail to the International Association for Intelligence Education Listserv (November 28, 2012).

Indeed, these three job announcements have additional ‘common threads’ that are instructive. All of these positions were at least primarily geared towards the instruction of undergraduate students. Also, while all three institutions advertised their positions at the Assistant or Associate Professor level, none required a doctorate of philosophy (Ph.D.). Each of the position announcements indicated that, while an earned doctorate was preferred, the minimum acceptable criterion was a Master’s degree in a relevant field. However, the requirement for previous work experience was not negotiable based on these advertisements. In essence, for typical academic rank in the full-time teaching of intelligence, education was desirable but practical work experience was essential.

This dynamic is at odds with common practice in U.S. colleges and universities. Most traditional academic subjects do not require work experience as a central job qualification. However, possessing the ‘terminal degree’ – for most academic disciplines, this is the Ph.D. – is a requirement for full-time employment. Deviations from this standard are not typical, and are most commonly found in specialized instruction and technically-driven disciplines such as accounting, engineering and nursing.<sup>12</sup> Within academia as a whole, faculty without a terminal degree are more commonly found in adjunct (part-time) positions where they are responsible for undergraduate, entry-level courses.<sup>13</sup>

This study seeks to discover to what extent practical work experience is utilized as a professional qualification for college and university faculty in the United States who teach courses on intelligence. Is practical work experience an effective substitute for a doctoral degree in full-time faculty positions? While there have been broader debates about such topics as whether intelligence studies should be a separate academic discipline or the appropriate mixture of education and training in an intelligence studies program, there have been no studies that examine the faculty who are currently developing curricula and teaching courses in the field.<sup>14</sup> The most relevant work to date would be Spracher’s survey of intelligence programs in the United States. After interviewing several academic and non-academic leaders in the field of intelligence studies, he recommended that the optimal faculty member should embrace a scholar-practitioner model.<sup>15</sup>

Recent scholarship on the connection between academia and the world of intelligence has focused largely on the curriculum. For instance, Collier and Landon-Murray both highlight the need for academic programs to provide greater emphasis on research, methodology and modeling as a way to improve the potential of future intelligence analysts.<sup>16</sup> Also, Spracher’s

---

<sup>12</sup> Patricia Mounce, “The Importance of Relevant Practical Experience among Accounting Faculty,” *Issues in Accounting Education* 19:4 (November 2004): 399-411; see also, P. Goonatilake, “The Significance of Academic’s Practical Experience For Engineering Education in Developing Countries,” *International Review of Education* 30 (1984): 85-90.

<sup>13</sup> William Wickun and Rock Stanley, “The Role of Adjunct Faculty in Higher Education,” *The Montana Professor* 10:1 (Winter 2000), available at: <http://mtprof.msun.edu/Win2000/Wickun.html>.

<sup>14</sup> For a current discourse on these broader issues, see Loch Johnson and Allison Shelton, “Thoughts on the State of Intelligence Studies: A Survey Report,” *Intelligence and National Security* 28:1 (2013): 109-120.

<sup>15</sup> Spracher, *National Security Intelligence Professional Education*, 190.

<sup>16</sup> Michael Collier, “A Pragmatic Approach to Developing Intelligence Analysts,” *Defense Intelligence Journal* 14:2 (2005): 17-35; see also, Landon-Murray, “Social Science and Intelligence Analysis,” 491-528.

survey conducted a ‘cross-walk’ between the course objectives of classes in intelligence with the competency directory produced by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI).<sup>17</sup>

But what does the average intelligence studies faculty member actually look like? What variations exist within this group? These faculty represent a critical component to the development of this academic field. While professional organization such as the International Association for Intelligence Education deliberate on the scope and content of courses in intelligence, faculty members in the classroom are actually defining it for themselves. By dint of their implementation of intelligence courses around the country, they have the ability to substantially influence the ‘facts on the ground’ of the field. Hence, who they are and where they come from matters.

## Sample, Survey, and Method

This study relies on the experiences of forty-eight faculty members at U.S. civilian colleges and universities who were contacted in February and March of 2013. These faculty members represent a group of twenty-six institutions. The mix of institutions represents a balanced collection of institutional types. For instance, fifty-four percent (14 of 26) of the sample institutions are privately-funded organizations. More than half of the 26 sample institutions offered graduate-level courses in intelligence. Three quarters of the sample institutions offered some type of academic program in intelligence – a Master of Arts degree, an undergraduate minor program, a certificate program, etc., while the remaining twenty-five percent only offered intelligence-related classes as a part of a different academic program.

The institutional sample for this study was constructed by applying a systematic sampling technique to the listing of schools that are included in the 2011 edition of *Intelligence as a Career*, a document that is produced by the Association of Former Intelligence Officers (AFIO). Institutions were listed in alphabetical order; the first case selected was number three on the alphabetized list and every third case was selected thereafter. While this listing is appropriately caveated with the statement that it is not definitive given the changing curricula at the listed institutions, it does provide the best available snapshot of institutions that offer classes in intelligence.<sup>18</sup> Hence, while not perfect, this document provided the best alternative for attempting to achieve a representative sample of the population.

Utilizing the systematic sampling strategy, an initial grouping of forty-three institutions were selected from the AFIO listing. However, since this study is limited to a study of U.S. civilian institutions, programs in Canada or affiliated with the U.S. government or industry were excluded. Also, utilizing an operational definition for intelligence courses that stipulated that it must be a security-related class with the word ‘intelligence’ in the course title, each institution’s catalog was reviewed to ensure that relevant courses were being offered. Institutions which did not have such classes were also excluded from the sample. The remaining thirty-four institutions constitute the sample of institutions where faculty were invited to participate in this project. Of these thirty-four institutions, faculty from twenty-six agreed to participate in the survey.

---

<sup>17</sup> This directory is included in Intelligence Community Directive 610, Annex B. See Spracher, *National Security Intelligence Professional Education*, 134-182.

<sup>18</sup> *Intelligence as a Career: Is It Right For You and Are You Right For It?* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Former Intelligence Officers, May 2011), 29.

The department chairs were essential to the administration of this survey. For instance – identifying faculty (both full and part-time) who are teaching courses in intelligence is problematic from the outside. Schools vary widely regarding the availability of course information and instructor contact information. As a result, this research utilized the department chairmen of the identified institutions to contact relevant faculty members. Chairmen were contacted via telephone and e-mail. The e-mail requested that the chairmen pass along the e-mail to relevant faculty members – that is, faculty who taught at least one class in intelligence. The message described the purpose of the project and provided a link to the on-line survey.<sup>19</sup> A copy of the survey is included as Appendix 1. This approach helped to improve the representative character of the sample by ensuring that all relevant faculty at the target institutions had an equal opportunity to participate in the sample.

As noted earlier, the definition of ‘intelligence course’ was operationalized to security-related areas where the word ‘intelligence’ was incorporated in the course title. Clearly, this is a simplistic criteria that would likely miss some courses – for instance, if a class title used the word ‘espionage’ (but not ‘intelligence’) it would be omitted. Also, classes outside of the security sphere that used the word ‘intelligence’ – artificial intelligence, emotional intelligence, psychological intelligence, competitive intelligence, etc. – were also omitted. While this screening criteria is fairly conservative, it ensures that the sample is composed of faculty who are teaching classes in the appropriate areas.

Beyond a general review of the overall findings, this study is primarily geared towards exploring the variations within the collected sample. That is, how is the subset of the faculty members with prior intelligence experience different than the subset of faculty members without experience? However, in order to see if the variations in education and experience that occur in the sample have any larger significance, a chi square test was applied to see if there was a strong probability that the association found in this group of forty-eight teachers is likely to be found in the larger population of intelligence studies faculty.

## The Overall Snapshot

As can be seen in Table 1, the sample reflects a wide diversity in positions, education, and experience levels. The average faculty member was 49.5 years old which is slightly above the average age of all college and university faculty (48 years).<sup>20</sup> The faculty teaching classes on intelligence also had an average of 5.7 years of teaching experience. They were evenly split between full-time and part-time employment. Only 29 percent of the respondents were in full-time tenure track positions, whereas nearly half (49 percent) were adjunct faculty. By way of comparison, the National Center for Education Statistics indicates that at four-year institutions in the United States, 37.5 percent of the faculty were in tenure track positions whereas 42.5 percent were adjunct faculty.<sup>21</sup> Hence, the faculty who teach courses in intelligence are under-represented on the tenure track and over-represented in the adjunct community.

<sup>19</sup> A similar survey was advertised on the IAFIE e-mail list. However, that data was not utilized in this paper.

<sup>20</sup> *The Condition of Education 2013*. National Center for Educational Statistics, available at: <http://nces.ed.gov/>.

<sup>21</sup> Stephen Perez and Andrew Litt, “The Work of the University: The Adjunct Phenomenon,” available at: [http://www.academia.edu/2100902/The\\_Work\\_of\\_the\\_University\\_The\\_Adjunct\\_Phenomenon](http://www.academia.edu/2100902/The_Work_of_the_University_The_Adjunct_Phenomenon); Wickun and Stanley, <http://mtprof.msun.edu/Win2000/Wickun.html>.

On average, members of this sample taught four different courses (topics – this number does not account for the teaching of multiple sections of the same course) in a given year. Of these courses, only 63 percent were related to the study of intelligence. However, it is important to note that almost half (46 percent) of the respondents only taught courses related to the study of intelligence. There was also a substantial employment of on-line learning with more than half (56 percent) of the respondents indicating that at least part of their teaching utilized on-line formats.

**Table 1. Overall Sample Attributes**

	<b>Overall (N=48)</b>
Average Age (years)	49.5
Teaching Experience (years)	5.7
Tenure-Track, Full-Time Position	29%
Non-Tenure-Track, Full-Time Position	22%
Per Course (Adjunct)	49%
Doctorate of Philosophy	51%
Other Doctorate Degree	6%
Master's Level Degree	43%
Total Course Titles	4.0
Intelligence Course Titles	2.5
Course Ratio	63%
Course Ratio 100%	46%
On-Line Course Instruction	56%
Intelligence Work Experience	69%

The impact of professional experience appears to have a stronger impact on teaching credentials at the college/university level than education. While over two-thirds (69 percent) of the respondents had some type of professional experience in the craft of intelligence, only half (51 percent) of the respondents had a doctorate of philosophy. Faculty teaching with a Master's degree was at 43 percent. The remaining cases were doctoral degrees in something other than philosophy – two in law (J.D.) and one in education.

The subject area specialization for the educational credential of the teaching professional spanned a gamut of fields with a strong concentration in the social sciences. Nearly half (48 percent) of the respondents were in the areas of political science, international relations and national security studies. Given that scholars typically have earned the same or similar degree to the department in which they teach, this is consistent with the findings that intelligence studies is widely viewed as most consistent with the discipline of political science. Therefore, courses in intelligence are most likely to find a home in such departments.<sup>22</sup> Beyond this, there were

<sup>22</sup> Spracher, *National Security Intelligence Professional Education*, 41.

historians, economists, lawyers, psychologists, and others. Indeed, the only areas that appear to have been omitted were disciplines in the science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields. Only ten percent of the respondents indicated that their highest educational degree was in the area of intelligence, and none of these were at the doctoral level. At first glance, this seems counter-intuitive. Typically, faculty possess degrees in the same subject area that they are teaching. However, given the recent growth in such courses, perhaps this deficit is a natural reflection of an emerging discipline.

The faculty who had previous work experience in intelligence had a deep exposure to the craft. The average amount of experience was 16 years, with more than half of the group having twenty years' experience or more. As can be seen in Table 2, most (67 percent) spent their entire professional career in the intelligence trade, whereas the remainder split their career experiences with other policy sectors. The Department of Defense has a strong influence on the experiences of this group with 64 percent having worked at least a portion of their career in military intelligence. Interestingly, more than a quarter (27 percent) of the respondents were still working in intelligence *while* they were teaching courses on intelligence at a civilian college or university.

**Table 2: Attributes of Faculty with Intelligence Experience**

	Overall (N=33)
Years of Work Experience	16 yrs
Military Work Experience	64%
Constant Full-Time Status	67%
Currently Employed in Intelligence Work	27%
Pedagogical Training During Intelligence Work Experience	52%
Teaching Experience During Intelligence Work Experience	70%

## The Impact of Experience

The question of experience is commonly presumed to be a defining trait of an intelligence studies faculty member. Indeed, absent that background, many have questioned the ability to teach the subject matter effectively. A statement on the International Association for Intelligence Education (IAFIE) listserv is instructive on this point. A contributor to a conversation on the site highlighted a common conception that “practical experience in intelligence was the key criterion for being considered an ‘intelligence expert’”. Indeed, it was further stated that academic research and critique without experience was not an adequate substitute, and that such people were essentially “back seat drivers.”<sup>23</sup> Obviously, a combination of both would be the ideal background.<sup>24</sup> But what is the actual dynamic at play in the current environment?

<sup>23</sup> Stephen Marrin, *Improving Intelligence Analysis: Bridging the Gap between Scholarship and Practice* (London: Routledge, 2012), 403.

<sup>24</sup> Spracher, “Intelligence Studies.”

Certainly, the literature on intelligence studies would lead to the conclusion that prior experience in the craft of intelligence is critical. Much of the literature has historically been applied in nature, relying on the experiences of practitioners who became academics (or vice versa). The lack of focus on theory has been one of the central weaknesses of the intelligence studies literature.<sup>25</sup>

Within the sample, there is evidence of a divide between education and experience in the qualifications of intelligence faculty. Comparing the averages of the two subsets (experience v. non-experience) to the overall average in Table 3, one can immediately see that the average faculty member with prior intelligence experience is older, but has less teaching experience than their counterparts who lacked a practical background. Given that the average amount of work experience for those respondents who worked in intelligence was sixteen years, this suggests that many faculty with intelligence experience may have retired from the profession and have come to teaching as a second career.

There is also a significant divide over the job position and academic degree within the sample. Among faculty with prior work experience, only a third of the group worked in a full-time position. The director of the intelligence program at Notre Dame College illustrates this point when he noted that all of the intelligence-related faculty at his institution were adjuncts who were current or retired intelligence analysts.<sup>26</sup> The subset for tenure-track, full-time faculty was only eighteen percent of the faculty with work experience. This is in marked contrast to the faculty without experience, where tenure-track faculty represented fifty-three percent of the group. With respect to academic degree, while faculty with experience were nearly evenly split between the doctoral and master's level degrees, faculty without experience were much more likely to possess a Ph.D.<sup>27</sup> Interestingly, there was little difference among the groups on the question of course ratios (total course titles to intelligence-specific course titles) and on-line instruction, suggesting that in spite of the differences in job titles and degrees, there was little difference in their actual application in the classroom.

**Table 3: Variations Based on Experience.**

	<b>Overall (N=48)</b>	<b>Work Experience in Intelligence (N=33)</b>	<b>No Work Experience in Intelligence (N=15)</b>
Average Age (years)	49.5	51.0	46.0
Teaching Experience (years)	5.7	4.8	7.7
Tenure-Track, Full-Time Position	29%	18%	53%

<sup>25</sup> Marrin, *Improving Intelligence Analysis*, 402.

<sup>26</sup> Spracher, *National Security Intelligence Professional Education*, 155.

<sup>27</sup> Of the faculty who did not have experience, seventy-three percent had a Ph.D. as their highest academic credential. Master's degrees made up the balance. Though a very small grouping (N=3), all non-Ph.D. doctorates possessed previous intelligence work experience.

Non-Tenure-Track, Full-Time Position	22%	15%	33%
Per Course (Adjunct)	49%	67%	13%
Doctorate of Philosophy	51%	39%	73%
Other Doctorate Degree	6%	9%	0%
Master's Level Degree	43%	52%	27%
Total Course Titles	4.0	3.6	4.9
Intelligence Course Titles	2.5	2.3	2.9
Course Ratio	63%	64%	59%
On-Line Course Instruction	56%	58%	53%
Institution with 100 miles of DC	25%	24%	27%
Program Offers Graduate Courses	65%	67%	60%
Program in Intelligence	81%	76%	93%
Undergraduate Program in Intelligence	60%	55%	73%
Graduate Program in Intelligence	38%	30%	53%
Privately-Funded Institution	46%	36%	67%

The type of institution has some curious results. While it might be expected that faculty with prior experience might be in closer proximity to the Washington, D.C. area, table 3 demonstrates there was essentially no difference between the groups. The same could be said about whether the institution offered graduate-level courses in intelligence – faculty with or without experience were present in comparable numbers.<sup>28</sup> However, per Table 3's results, faculty without prior experience were more likely to be a part of a school that offered a program in intelligence – graduate or undergraduate. Also, faculty without experience were more likely to be teaching at a private institution than a public one.

However, which of these variations is likely to be relevant beyond the current sample? Utilizing a chi square test to examine which associations are statistically significant, academic job type is the stronger association with experience than degree type. As can be seen in Table 4, the presence of experience was more likely to be related to the job than the degree type. Whether consolidating all full-time (tenure track and non-tenure track) positions or considering them separately in relation to part-time faculty, there is a statistically significant correlation to the 0.005 level ( $P = 0.003$ ). This means there is a 99.5 percent chance that this relationship is valid in a normally-distributed population. And the association was negative, meaning that experience was more likely to be present in part-time than full-time positions. Degree-level was also

<sup>28</sup> Note that this indicator demonstrates whether the faculty member worked at an institution that offered graduate-level courses, not that the faculty member was the actual instructor of graduate level courses.

associated with prior experience, suggesting that prior experience was more likely at the master's degree level. However, this association was only significant at the 0.1 level ( $P = 0.074$ ), but that is below the accepted statistical standard of significance at the 0.05 level.

**Table 4: Probabilities of Association with Experience**

	$X^2$	D.F.	P
Academic Job Type	11.872	2	0.003
Degree Level	5.195	2	0.074
Institution within 100 miles of D.C	0.32	1	0.857
Program at Institution	2.091	1	0.148
Graduate Courses at Institution	0.200	1	0.654
Undergraduate Courses at Institution	0.203	1	0.652
Publicly or Privately Funded Institution	3.814	1	0.050
Online Instruction	0.075	1	0.784

One common concern is that former practitioners, while having a wealth of subject matter expertise, may have limited experience in pedagogy.<sup>29</sup> In discussing a balance of practical experience and academic training as the optimal background for an intelligence studies faculty, Mark Lowenthal noted that “skilled practitioners might not be scholars and [therefore, not] be able to teach.”<sup>30</sup> However, it is significant to note that intelligence professionals have to be trained and that the personnel conducting the training commonly get some training in how to effectively deliver courses of instruction. As can be seen in Table 2, of the faculty members with intelligence experience who were surveyed, more than half (52 percent) indicated that they had received some form of pedagogical training during their career outside of academia. Regardless of whether they received formal instruction in training, many intelligence professionals also found themselves pressed into the service of training other intelligence professionals. In the current survey, seventy percent indicated that their practical job experience involved delivering classroom instruction in the service of training other intelligence personnel. In this respect, the dynamic is similar to a critique of graduate programs and their pedagogical training of their doctoral candidates. Oftentimes, there is limited formal training in classroom instruction with the expectation that service as a teaching assistant or actual classroom teaching is adequate for training new faculty to teach.

## The Impact of Education Level

The impact of education level offers little in the way of surprising findings. As can be seen in Table 5, the average age and teaching experience of faculty with a doctorate was higher than faculty with only a master's degree. Two-thirds of the faculty with doctorates were in full-time positions; seventy-one percent of the faculty with master's degrees were in part-time positions. Both groups had a majority of teachers with prior intelligence experience, but master's faculty had a more substantial proportion (eight-one percent) than faculty who possessed a doctoral degree (fifty-nine percent). Doctoral faculty were likely to teach a wider array of courses in a given year, but the proportion of total course titles to intelligence-specific titles had little variation between the groups.

<sup>29</sup> Wickun and Stanley, available at: <http://mtprof.msun.edu/Win2000/Wickun.html>.

<sup>30</sup> Spracher, *National Security Professional Education*, 113.

**Table 5: Variations Based on Education.**

	<b>Overall (N=48)</b>	<b>Doctorate (N=27)</b>	<b>Masters (N=21)</b>
Average Age (years)	49.5	50.6	48.0
Teaching Experience (years)	5.7	6.2	5.0
Tenure-Track, Full-Time Position	29%	48%	5%
Non-Tenure-Track, Full-Time Position	22%	19%	24%
Per Course (Adjunct)	49%	33%	71%
Total Course Titles	4.0	4.8	3.0
Intelligence Course Titles	2.5	2.8	2.0
Course Ratio	63%	58%	67%
On-Line Course Instruction	56%	63%	48%
Intelligence Work Experience	69%	59%	81%
Institution with 100 miles of DC	25%	30%	19%
Program Offers Graduate Courses	65%	63%	67%
Program in Intelligence	81%	78%	86%
Undergraduate Program in Intelligence	60%	52%	71%
Graduate Program in Intelligence	38%	37%	38%
Privately-Funded Institution	46%	37%	57%

With regard to education and the type of institution, there was little difference regarding proximity to the nation's capital, the availability of graduate-level courses or a graduate degree program at the institution. Master's level faculty were more likely to be at an institution that offered an undergraduate degree program, as well as more likely to be teaching at a private institution. This last point – when combined with the findings from the last section – raise a new question. If qualifications for effective instruction in intelligence are driven by experience and/or education, the negative relationship of both of these traits with private institutions raises a provocative question about what underlies this relationship and whether it has a demonstrable impact on the quality of instruction.

**Table 6: Probabilities of Association with Education Level.**

	$X^2$	D.F.	P
Academic Job Type	17.449	4	0.002
Intelligence Work Experience	11.872	2	0.003
Institution within 100 miles of D.C	1.213	2	0.545

Program at Institution	1.457	2	0.483
Graduate Courses at Institution	11.208	2	0.004
Undergraduate Courses at Institution	4.646	2	0.098
Publicly or Privately Funded Institution	1.578	2	0.454
Online Instruction	1.459	2	0.482

As can be seen in Table 6, teachers with a doctoral degree are more likely to be found in full-time tenure track slots and graduate programs than their non-doctoral counterparts. The association between education level and academic job status is statistically significant at the 0.001 level ( $P = 0.002$ ), meaning that there is a 99.9 percent chance that this relationship exists in the population of college and university intelligence studies faculty. Doctors are more likely to be staffed in full-time teaching positions; teachers with master's degrees are more likely to be part-time faculty. Doctoral faculty were also more likely to be utilized at institutions offering graduate-level courses in intelligence ( $P = 0.004$ ).

Table 6 also demonstrates that prior work experience is strongly associated education level. There was a statistically significant association ( $P = 0.003$ ) between education level and prior intelligence work experience. This may suggest that practical experience is viewed as a partial substitute for a doctoral degree in some institutions of higher learning.

## Conclusion

Martin Rudner asked how schools would meet the increased demand for courses on intelligence. The answer seems to come to two words – Experienced Adjuncts. Prior work experience is a critical element that defines most faculty who teach intelligence at U.S. civilian colleges and universities. Nearly seven-in-ten faculty members come to the classroom with some type of intelligence work experience. However, while practitioners were prominent at all levels, experience was more likely to be found in the adjunct/part-time community.

This finding has a particular relevance to the development of intelligence programs within institutions. If faculty who teach courses intelligence are over-represented in the adjunct community, that means they are under-represented in the governance of the university. Adjunct faculty typically do not have committee assignments since their function is to teach classes. Indeed, full-time faculty sometimes cite how 'lucky' adjunct faculty are to avoid such duties.<sup>31</sup> However, it is in those committee assignments that programs are approved and resources (e.g., requests for additional faculty) are allocated. As the discipline of intelligence studies develops, the over-reliance of colleges and universities on adjuncts may prove to have unexpected consequences.

There are at least three potential paths for future research in this domain. First, the current survey examines U.S. civilian higher education institutions as a monolithic unit. The background and utilization of faculty might have important variations between research-oriented and non-research oriented institutions. On a related point, a second research avenue could explore how

<sup>31</sup> A. Cassebaum, "Adjuncts with an Attitude? Attitudes Encountered in the Struggle for Fair Play and Job Security for Adjunct Faculty (Report No. JC 880 318)," Dekalb College, available at: <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED385853.pdf>.

experience actually is exploited in the classroom. That is, presuming that most faculty who teach courses in intelligence come with some level of practical experience, how does that influence their course design and instruction? The present study addresses an important initial question: how much is experience a factor in the qualifications of faculty who teach these courses? The logical extension is, now that experience can be validated as a significant criteria for many faculty, how does it impact what they do in the classroom?

“The awakening of public concern with intelligence offers our universities and colleges an opportunity and a challenge – the opportunity to take advantage of a rising interest and to meet a clear need, and the challenge to meet it effectively and thereby ultimately contribute to improving U.S. intelligence doctrine and competence.”<sup>32</sup>

While these words were penned in 1960, they are equally valid today. How the need for effectiveness is being met is a complicated question which involves both issues of course objectives and instructional methods.

A third area of future research would be to extend this discussion beyond the boundaries of the United States. The U.S.-centric nature of the intelligence studies literature is widely recognized. How have intelligence classes and programs in other countries been staffed? For instance, Goodson notes how courses in the United Kingdom typically have more of a focus on intelligence history, while U.S. programs are more likely to emphasize intelligence process.<sup>33</sup> Does this impact faculty credentials, particularly with regard to the utilization of former practitioners in the classroom?

The findings from the present study affirm that experience is a prominent criteria in the qualifications of faculty that teach intelligence studies courses. The variation between the full-time and part-time (and to a lesser-extent, tenure v. non-tenure track) status raise some important implications about how contemporary colleges and universities attempt to accommodate a new academic area where many of the prospective faculty lack the traditional academic criteria for full-time positions. Whether the arrangement is appropriate or equitable will need to be resolved over time. Regardless of the outcome, the evidence in this study suggests that most faculty involved in intelligence studies courses do not qualify as ‘amateurs.’

---

<sup>32</sup> P.J. Dorondo, “For College Courses in Intelligence,” *Studies in Intelligence* 4:3 (Summer 1960): 15-19.

<sup>33</sup> Goodson, “Studying and Teaching About Intelligence.”

## **Appendix 1 – Survey Questionnaire**

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Please answer as many questions as possible. If you have any questions or would like to provide additional information, please feel free to contact me at [jonsmith@coastal.edu](mailto:jonsmith@coastal.edu).

1. What is the name of the academic institution where you are currently employed?
2. How many years have you taught at your current institution?
3. What is the type of academic position that you are currently employed in?
  - Full-time, Tenure Track
  - Full-time, Non-Tenure Track
  - Per Course Contract
  - Other
4. What is your age?
5. What is your highest-level academic degree that you have been awarded?
  - Doctorate of Philosophy (Ph.D.)
  - Other Doctoral Degree (e.g., J.D., Ed.D, etc.)
  - Master's Degree
  - Bachelor's Degree
  - Other
6. What is the field of study of this highest-level academic degree?
7. How many separate degrees do you have at this level?
8. Was this highest-level degree earned while you were simultaneously employed with a non-academic organization engaged in intelligence-related activities?
  - Yes
  - No
9. Are you currently a member of any professional association connected to intelligence study or practice (e.g., Association of Former Intelligence Officers, International Association for Intelligence Education)?
  - Yes
  - No
  - I don't know
10. What is the total number of courses (please count multiple sections of the same course in your total) that you teach per year at your current institution?
11. Of the courses listed in the previous question, how many were offered via on-line instruction?

12. What is the approximate number of contact hours with students per course?
13. How many different course titles (please DO NOT count multiple sections of the same course) do you teach per year?
14. Of the courses listed in the previous question, how many of these were predominantly concerned with the study of intelligence issues?
15. In your entire working career, have you ever held a job outside of academia that was primarily related to the production, collection, analysis, or dissemination of intelligence information?
  - Yes
  - No
16. If you answered 'yes' in the previous question, how many years did you hold that position?
17. Of the years identified in the previous question, how many of those years were spent in a part-time status or in a full-time status where the intelligence function was not your primary job responsibility?
18. Of the years identified in Question 16, how many of these years were spent in a military organization (in either a civilian or military capacity)?
19. Are you currently employed in a job outside of academia that is primarily related to the production, collection, analysis, or dissemination of intelligence information?
  - Yes
  - No
20. In all of your non-academic intelligence-related work experiences, were you ever given any training in teaching intelligence-related subjects to other intelligence personnel (i.e., this would not include briefing decision-makers)?
  - Yes
  - No
21. In all of your non-academic intelligence related work experiences, did you ever lead intelligence training instruction in a classroom-type experience?
  - Yes
  - No