



Common Thread? The Role of Professional Orientation in U.S. and Non-U.S. Intelligence Studies Programs

Jonathan Smith 3496573

Coastal Carolina University, jonsmith@coastal.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jss>
pp. 118-142

Recommended Citation

Smith, Jonathan 3496573. "Common Thread? The Role of Professional Orientation in U.S. and Non-U.S. Intelligence Studies Programs." *Journal of Strategic Security* 10, no. 1 (2017): 118-142.

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5038/1944-0472.10.1.1541>

Available at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jss/vol10/iss1/8>

Common Thread? The Role of Professional Orientation in U.S. and Non-U.S. Intelligence Studies Programs

Author Biography

Dr. Jonathan Smith is the Director of Intelligence and National Security Studies at Coastal Carolina University. Graduating from college in 1989, he joined the United States Navy Reserve as an intelligence officer. In a 23-year career, he deployed in support of operations in Bosnia, Kosovo, Iraq and Afghanistan. His last assignment was as the commanding officer of Joint Intelligence Operations Center 0174 at the U.S. Southern Command in Miami, Florida. Dr. Smith received his Master of Arts in International Studies and his Doctorate in Political Science from the University of South Carolina. He also earned a certificate in the Joint Military Professional Education program of the U.S. Naval War College.

Abstract

As the field of intelligence studies continue to expand, knowledge of faculty and programs outside the United States remains limited. Beyond a few studies which consider the larger “Anglosphere”, there remains the question of whether programs in different countries are approaching this academic study from a comparable perspective. Utilizing a survey of individual faculty members, as well as interviews with program leadership, this study finds that there is a shared emphasis on practical application. From faculty background to program objectives, intelligence studies degree programs inside and outside of the United States appear to share this common focus.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the respondents of this study. Without their gracious support of their time and perspectives, this research would not have been possible.

Introduction

It is nearly axiomatic that the field of intelligence studies is focused on the English-speaking world—particularly, the United States (U.S.). From programs to conferences to publications, much of the work of intelligence studies hails from within the United States. As one scholar notes, “the United States has been at the forefront of this research, a function of its comparatively large set of academic intelligence programs.”¹ However, the expansion of intelligence education as a field of study is growing outside the United States as well. The question of this study is do these programs share a common emphasis towards intelligence practitioners?

In 2013, this author produced a study on the background and qualifications of faculty engaged in teaching courses in intelligence at civilian institutions in the United States. Using a survey research approach, the researcher concluded there was a statistically significant correlation between prior professional experience in intelligence and the faculty teaching in the field. That is, former, or in some cases current, practitioners were the primary teachers of intelligence.² The current research extended the prior work on faculty qualifications by exploring a trans-national sample. Was the prevalence of former practitioners in the classroom a trend that extended beyond the United States?

Additionally, this study examined the value of practical application at the programmatic level, looking beyond considering the presence of practitioners in the classroom and asking how much does an applied or professional perspective guide issues at the departmental level. By examining the degree objectives, professional collaboration, and faculty recruitment, the evidence suggested that the value placed on interacting with real-world intelligence practitioners is not only an American phenomenon.

The significance of this question—whether the focus on practitioners and practical application varies between U.S. and non-U.S. programs—is in what it may suggest for the development of the field of intelligence studies. Regardless of whether they emphasize practical application or not, if the

¹ Michael Landon-Murray, “Building an International and Comparative View of Academic Intelligence Education,” *American Intelligence Journal* 31:2 (2013): 12-23, available at: <http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=101486a8-bdb3-43db-ae5a-d3ab16cae571%40sessionmgr103&vid=0&hid=130>.

² Jonathan Smith, “Amateur Hour? Experience and Faculty Qualifications in U.S. Intelligence Courses,” *Journal of Strategic Security* 6:3 (2013): 25-39. doi:10.5038/1944-0472.6.3.3

respondents tend to approach the subject from a similar vantage point, it may be suggestive of a cohesive academic field of study. Shared values and priorities across national boundaries may serve as a basis for what the discipline may become.

What, Where, and Who....

As with most emerging academic disciplines, there is a degree of self-examination which runs through its scholarship. Intelligence studies is no exception. To date, that examination has largely been limited to the *Anglosphere*—specifically, the United States, the UK, Canada, and Australia. As Ella Ciuperca noted, “experts agree that the Anglo-American space is, qualitatively and quantitatively, the best represented.”³ Much of the research on intelligence education in colleges and universities has been descriptive in nature.⁴ These works have focused on broader questions of course content and the composition of the field.

Some research is also proscriptive. For instance, articles by 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.⁵ Similarly, in his study of intelligence training programs in American academic, industrial, and government settings, Gordon Middleton applied human resource theory to consider approaches to improve the quality of analysis. His maturity model contended that existing programs needed to give more emphasis to issues of culture, managing change, and adapting to dynamic circumstances.⁶ Even Spracher’s survey, which conducted a comparison between the course objectives of classes in intelligence with the competency directory produced

³ Ella Ciuperca, “A Comparative Analysis of Security and Intelligence Academic Studies in the Western Area and Romania,” *Review of the Air Force Academy* 9:2 (2012): 61-65, available at: http://www.afahc.ro/ro/revista/Nr_2_2012/Articol_Ciuperca.pdf.

⁴ Landon-Murray, “Building an International and Comparative View,” 12.

⁵ Michael Collier, “A Pragmatic Approach to Developing Intelligence Analysts,” *Defense Intelligence Journal* 14:2 (2005): 17-35; Michael Landon-Murray, “Social Science and Intelligence Analysis: The Role of Intelligence Education,” *Journal of Applied Security Research* 6 (2011): 491-528.

⁶ Gordon Middleton, “A Maturity Model for Intelligence Training and Education,” *American Intelligence Journal* 25:2 (Winter 2007/2008): 33, available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267561960_A_Maturity_Model_for_Intelligence_Training_and_Education.

by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), suggested a path forward.⁷

Beyond what is being taught, there is also the question of where it is being taught. Again, most of the scholarship is limited to the English-speaking world. In 2003, Paul Maddrell identified fourteen programs and thirty faculty members in the UK that provided instruction on intelligence issues. He specifically noted these programs are grounded in intelligence history.⁸ In the United States, Stephen Campbell reviewed government and civilian programs, as well as the substantive approaches and course materials used in this field of study.⁹ Martin Rudner provided a similar review of the field while discussing civilian academic programs in the United States, the UK, Australia, and Canada.¹⁰

Systematic reviews of intelligence courses and programs at civilian institutions are limited. The Association of Former Intelligence Officers produces a pamphlet that includes a listing of schools where classes in intelligence are offered.¹¹ More recently, Coulthart and Crosston mapped the contemporary market for civilian intelligence education programs in the United States. These researchers identified seventeen undergraduate and graduate-level institutions that offer degrees in this field with most of the institutions developing intelligence programs over the last decade.¹²

Studies focusing outside the United States are less common. Landon-Murray explored a variety of non-western academic programs that relate to the study of intelligence. In his review of the program goals and curricular objectives in countries such as Indonesia, South Africa, and Israel, he noted that they are

⁷ William Spracher, *National Security Intelligence Professional Education: A Map of U.S. Civilian University Programs and Competencies* (Washington: National Defense Intelligence College, 2009).

⁸ Paul Maddrell, "Intelligence Studies at UK Universities—An Expanding Subject," Aberystwyth University—Centre for Intelligence and International Security Studies, available at: <http://users.aber.ac.uk/rbh/iss/uk.htm>.

⁹ Stephen Campbell, "A Survey of the United States Market for Intelligence Education," *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* 24:2 (2011): 307-337. doi:10.1080/08850607.2011.548207.

¹⁰ Martin Rudner, "Intelligence Studies in Higher Education: Capacity-Building to Meet Societal Demand," *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* 22:1 (2009): 121. doi:10.1080/08850600802486960.

¹¹ 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, available at: https://www.afio.com/publications/AFIO_2013_Careers_Booklet.pdf.

¹² Stephen Coulthart and Matthew Crosston, "Terra Incognita: Mapping American Intelligence Education Curriculum," *Journal of Strategic Security* 8:3 (2015): 46-68. doi:10.5038/1944-0472.8.3.1459

not all exclusively focused on the study of intelligence. Indeed, one of his conclusions noted a correlation between the role of intelligence in the program and the variety of approaches (e.g, functional, historical, politico-policymaking, and structural-organizational) that are addressed by the program.¹³

Another question that has drawn some attention in this area is the background and qualifications of the faculty who are teaching in this field. As with any emerging field, academic programs that develop appropriate faculty do not exist at the beginning, and the reliance on practitioners is common. This author noted this tendency towards practitioners in a survey of U.S. intelligence education programs, particularly for contingent/adjunct faculty.¹⁴ However, educational programs are not staffed exclusively in this regard. Indeed, other studies note the need for balance between traditional academic research and prior practical experience. For instance, in her comparison of intelligence studies programs in the United States, the UK, and Romania, Ella Ciuperca states, “(the) teaching staff is generally mixed as the practitioners...and the theoreticians...are equally involved.”¹⁵ However, whether that balance is a matter of choice or necessity is not clear.

A Two-Level Sample

To explore the role of practical influences in intelligence studies programs, this research considered two separate, but related, issues. One examined the attributes of individual faculty members. The other assessed the programs that administer graduate-level degrees in the field.

The sampling strategy reflected this duality. The first element was a sample of individual faculty members who taught courses in intelligence. Those faculty members completed an online survey with mostly fixed response options. Data collection occurred in two phases: Phase one (2013) solicited participation from members of the International Association for Intelligence Education (IAFIE) and phase two (2016) requested the faculty in the academic programs that were selected for the second part of the study. The combination of these two requests to individual faculty members yielded

¹³ Stafford T. Thomas, “Assessing Current Intelligence Studies,” *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* 2:2 (1988): 239.

doi:10.1080/08850608808435061; Landon-Murray, “Building an International and Comparative,” 21.

¹⁴ Smith, “Amateur Hour,” 36.

¹⁵ Ciuperca, “A Comparative Analysis,” 64.

sixty-two responses to the online survey. A copy of the survey instrument is located in appendix 1 at the end of this article.

This sampling strategy has two substantial methodological limitations. First, the universe of intelligence studies faculty at the university-level—within the United States or elsewhere—is unknown. While IAFIE is one of the most well-known and established organizations within the community, it is understood that its membership does not reflect all intelligence studies faculty which could skew results. However, how and whether this skews the sample is unknown given the limitations in what we know about the population under study. Second, the faculty included in the second iteration of the sample are only from the programs identified for the program-level survey. Hence, while the sampling strategy is not entirely random (it is more akin to a purposive sampling strategy), the analysis drawn from this sample can be suggestive of trends for further research in this area.

Beyond examining individual faculty, this study also compared six programs offering relevant degrees at civilian educational institutions. Interviews (using open-ended response options) were conducted with the program directors at these schools. The interview questions are located in Appendix 2. The case selection strategy of focusing on civilian higher education institutions eliminated government-run educational and training institutions, such as the U.S. National Intelligence University. Additionally, each of the programs offers a masters-level degree with the word *intelligence* in the degree title.

As Seawright and Gerring assert, “case selection is the primordial task of the case study researcher.”¹⁶ The known universe of intelligence studies programs, particularly outside of the Anglosphere, is quite small. The selection criteria used for the case selection identified programs that were common in most respects, excluding geographic location. This *most similar* case selection approach allowed the researcher to explore the question of whether the location of the intelligence study program influenced its view on the role of practical experience and application.¹⁷ To be sure, the case selection strategy may be too conservative, as some relevant programs may not have the precise wording to be included in the sample. However, this

¹⁶ Jason Seawright and John Gerring, “Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research,” *Political Research Quarterly* 61:2 (2008): 294.
doi:10.1177/1065912907313077.

¹⁷ Seawright and Gerring, “Case Selection Techniques,” 304.

sampling approach ensured valid insights regarding the research questions, even if it is less than comprehensive.

Even using narrow sampling criteria, there were complications. Most notably, the universe of academic programs in intelligence studies remains uncatalogued. While there have been some recent efforts to identify such programs within the United States, there is no comprehensive listing of intelligence studies programs outside of the United States.¹⁸ Indeed, of the six programs reviewed in this study, only the United States-based program was an institutional member of any association related to intelligence education. Without a complete listing of intelligence studies programs, any attempt to conduct a comprehensive survey on this topic is limited.

Indeed, the lack of awareness seems to be a problem for both researchers and the programs, themselves. In her comparative analysis of intelligence education programs, Ciuperca notes, “the biggest problem for Romania is the lack of international visibility of these programs of study.” She concluded that this hinders faculty quality and the value of the education.¹⁹

Given the lack of a comprehensive listing of intelligence studies programs in existence, an online academic search engine (findamasters.com) was used to identify active institutions offering graduate-level degrees. The sample is not systematic. Its focus was two-fold. First, the sample sought to include a representative sample of programs from within the “Anglosphere”. Past that, the second focus of the researcher was to incorporate as many non-Anglosphere programs that met the sampling criteria previously described.

Unfortunately, the internet is a fallible source of information. Some inactive programs were mistakenly listed as active. For instance, Sogang University in South Korea advertises a Master of Arts in International Affairs with a National Intelligence and Security track.²⁰ However, the director, Professor Jae Chun Kim, indicated that the program no longer offered intelligence-related classes. The reason was low student enrollment in these courses.²¹ To be sure, the decline of programs is not the focus of this research. That said, as the field of intelligence studies matures, there will likely be other programs that do not thrive. The issue of what factors contribute to or facilitate such a decline will be an important question for a future study to address.

¹⁸ Coulthart and Crosston, “Terra Incognita,” 47.

¹⁹ Ciuperca, “A Comparative Analysis,” 65.

²⁰ See website: <http://hompi.sogang.ac.kr/gsis/>.

²¹ Jaechun Kim, e-mail message to author May 8, 2016.

On the other side of the programmatic life cycle, there is Sharda University. Located in Uttar Pradesh, India, this private university established its program in 2009. Per the website htcampus.com, the university started a master's program in Security and Counterintelligence in 2011.²² However, a review of the Sharda University website not only fails to reveal this master's program, it also fails to show the School of Investigation, Intelligence, and Security—the school that houses the program. According to the Sharda University admissions office, the program is still in the planning stage.²³

To be sure, communications across languages can stifle the research process. For instance, initial contact confirmed the operation of the Masters of Strategic Intelligence program at the University of Indonesia. However, the author was not able to contact the departmental leadership. Repeated calls to the university were unproductive due to the inability to speak Indonesian. These complications aside, this study used the following six programs:

1. Brunel University is a public research university located in the Uxbridge section of London. Founded in 1966, the university has approximately 14,000 students, of which, 30 percent are in graduate-level programs. The Master of Arts program in Intelligence and Security Studies was founded in 2005. Embedded in the Department of Politics, History, and the Brunel Law School, the intelligence program is staffed by four full-time faculty members and four honorary fellows who assist with teaching.²⁴
2. The University of Glasgow is also a public research university located in the UK. Established in 1451, the university is the fourth oldest university in the English-speaking world and has approximately 27,000 students enrolled. The university started offering courses in intelligence in 2012 as a part of the Global Security Degree. The intelligence-related course offerings are expanding with the Master of Science degree in International Security, Intelligence, and Strategic Studies. This new degree takes a novel approach, as the curriculum is serviced via an international consortium of universities. Beyond Glasgow, the program utilizes courses at Charles University Prague

²² "School of Studies of Investigation, Intelligence and Security, Sharda University," available at: <http://www.htcampus.com/college/school-studies-investigation-intelligence-and-security-sharda-university/>.

²³ Sharda University Admissions Office (91-120-312-1001), Interview with Jonathan Smith, Telephone, May 3, 2016.

²⁴ Dr. Kristian Gustafson, Interview with Jonathan Smith, Telephone, May 5, 2016.

and *Ostbayerische Technische Hochschule* (OTH) Regensburg. The Glasgow program's limited focus on intelligence is reflected in the fact that only one of the ten faculty members in the security program teaches coursework in intelligence.

3. Novena University is a private university that was established in 2005. Located in Delta State in southern Nigeria, the university is organized into four colleges.²⁵ The Intelligence and Security degree is located in a separate department within the College of Management and Social Sciences with nine full-time faculty members.²⁶ When the program was founded in 2006, it was an undergraduate level program, but it has expanded its offerings for a Master of Science degree recently. Novena University sees itself as a pioneer in this field of study in Africa.²⁷
4. Link Campus University was previously the Italian branch of the University of Malta. A for-profit institution located in Rome, it became a separate university in 1999 and joined the Italian University system in 2011. The Master of Arts program in Intelligence and Security was created in 2006 and is intended to train professionals in the analysis and expertise in the field of public and private security.²⁸ There are approximately eighteen teachers in the program with about half of them teaching classes in intelligence. According to the program director, many of these faculty are retired practitioners or dual-employed.²⁹
5. Charles Sturt University is a public university in Australia that was established in 1989 from the merger of several existing separately administered institutions. Known as Australia's largest regional university with a student population of approximately 21,000, it is the country's leading provider of distance education. The university is

²⁵ Novena University, available at: <http://www.novenauniversity.edu.ng/page/59>.

²⁶ The total faculty of the university is 132. See "Novena University", Classbase.com. Accessed at: <http://www.classbase.com/countries/Nigeria/Universities/Novena-University-23523>.

²⁷ Dayo Adesulu, "Novena University Boosts Security Intelligence, signs MOU with Nigeria Police," *Vanguard*, June 9, 2014, available at: <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2014/01/novena-university-boosts-security-intelligence-signs-mou-nigeria-police/>.

²⁸ Link University Campus, available at: <http://intelligence.unilink.it/index.php/master-intelligence-obiettivi-formativi-e-sbocchi-occupazionali/>.

²⁹ Dr. Marco Mayer, Interview with Jonathan Smith, Telephone, May 18, 2016.

organized into four colleges—Arts, Business, Education, and Science.³⁰ The Criminal Intelligence program was established in 1999, but was restructured as an intelligence analysis program in 2011 in order to broaden the appeal to students in the national security and business sectors. The curriculum for the Master of Arts in Intelligence Analysis is completely online. Its faculty represent a small proportion of the Policing and Security Department, with the intelligence courses being offered by only two of the twenty-four full-time faculty members.³¹

6. The Citadel is the single U.S.-based program in this study. While the school itself was established in 1842, the Master of Arts program in Intelligence Analysis was established in 2016. This on-line graduate program builds off a graduate certificate program that had been offered at the school in recent years. Currently two full-time faculty support this program in the Department of Criminal Justice.

Analysis

The key purpose of this research was to compare the intelligence studies faculty and programs across national boundaries. As an organizing concept, the study grouped respondents of the faculty survey into ‘U.S.’ and ‘non-U.S.’ categories. It tabulated these responses in to averages across a variety of demographic and professional traits within each category. The hypothesis tested was whether the variable of location—U.S. or non-U.S.—appeared to influence the type of faculty who are engaged in this field.

The program-level analysis presented a qualitative test for the hypothesis of whether location influences the areas of program purpose, collaboration with government organizations, and faculty recruiting. Analysis of the data indicated a substantial degree of commonality across faculty and programs irrespective of location. This suggests that research on U.S. intelligence education programs and faculty may be a good starting point for future studies that consider these issues in a different national or international context.

³⁰ “25 Year Anniversary: Charles Sturt University,” available at: <http://www.csu.edu.au/25-years/25-years>.

³¹ Dr. Patrick Walsh, Interview with Jonathan Smith, Telephone, May 5, 2016.

Faculty are all the same...

As a first step in comparing intelligence education programs across nations, a simple review of the background of the faculty is useful. As noted in a previous study, “by dint of their implementation of intelligence courses. . . they have the ability to substantially influence the ‘facts on the ground’ of the field.”³² Beyond normative questions of faculty qualifications and their benefits to the goals of a program, the actual make-up is more instructive of how the discipline may be actually evolving.

The online survey initiated in 2013 and redeployed in 2016 captured 62 faculty who taught intelligence-related courses at civilian higher education institutions. The survey revealed a striking similarity between U.S. and non-U.S. faculty attributes.

Table 1. Averages of U.S. and Non-U.S. Faculty Attributes

	U.S. Faculty (N=49)	Non-U.S. Faculty (N=13)
Age	49.8 years	49.6 years
Years of Teaching Experience	6.02 years	7.6 years
Doctoral Degree	55.1 percent	61.5 percent
Prior Professional Experience	69.4 percent	69.2 percent
Years of Prior Experience	15.7 years	11.9 years
Class Ratio	3 out of 4 (72.9 percent)	4 out of 5 (79.1 percent)
Exclusively INTEL Courses	46.9 percent	53.8 percent
On-Line Instruction	55.1 percent	38.5 percent

Source: On-line Survey Conducted by Author

Indeed, with regard to the question of experience, the sample groups were effectively identical. Nearly 70 percent of the teachers came to the classroom with some level of prior professional experience in the intelligence field. For this survey, experience was broadly defined as work in any phase of intelligence production. That is, instead of focusing exclusively on the area of analysis, which would likely be the area of practical experience that would be most congruent with university-level teaching, the operational definitional

³² Smith, “Amateur Hour,” 28.

definition also included other areas such as production, collection, and dissemination of intelligence information.

This tendency of intelligence studies faculty to have prior work experience is certainly consistent with the conventional wisdom within the field. As one contributor to an International Association for Intelligence Education (IAFIE) listserv conversation noted, “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.”³³ This preference for faculty with prior professional experience was also a common theme in the program director interviews.

The value of prior professional experience is, on the one hand the reflection of an emerging field, and on the other hand an unproved assumption. To be sure, as intelligence studies programs came into being, there was a lack a trained faculty in the area. This is a dilemma that has been experienced by other professions such as law, medicine, and journalism. Currently, there is only one doctoral program in intelligence studies in the United States—Henley Putnam University. As institutions sought to develop programs in this field of study, there was a limited number of faculty with the common credential for university teaching—an earned doctorate. Hence, the value of former practitioners is partly born of necessity.

At the same time, the value of former practitioners is an understudied assumption. It is assumed practitioners have a substantive knowledge base and can provide a real world perspective that a traditionally-trained academic faculty member might lack. It may also be assumed that they can provide contacts for students and programs to exploit. This is consistent with a pre-professional program focus, vice a more traditional academic approach to the study of a given subject. However, while these assumed benefits may be valid, they are assertions that remain unsubstantiated by the research.

³³ Stephen Marrin, “Intelligence Studies Centers: Making Scholarship on Intelligence Analysis Useful,” *Intelligence and National Security* 27:3 (2012): 403.

Table 2. Attributes of U.S. and Non-U.S. Faculty with Prior Experience

	U.S. Faculty (N=34)	Non-U.S. Faculty (N=9)
Average Age	51.4 years	50.8 years
Average Years of Teaching Experience	5.3 years	7.1 years
Doctoral Degree	47 percent	44 percent
Pedagogy Training	53 percent	33 percent
Prior Teaching Experience	71 percent	78 percent

Source: On-line Survey Conducted by Author

It is also unclear whether former practitioners are actually adept in classroom instruction. It is not an absolute requirement to have pedagogical training or experience to be an intelligence officer. In the current sample, only 49 percent of the respondents who indicated that they had prior work experience in the field of intelligence had any formal instructional training from their experience. Interestingly, as Table 2 depicts, U.S. faculty with prior experience in the sample were 20 percent more likely to have such training. Additionally, only 72 percent of all respondents with prior experience brought any actual teaching experience from their time in the profession.

Variations between the United States and non-U.S. faculty member samples are minor but reflect a more traditional academic profile in the non-U.S. group. Faculty outside of the United States tended to be more likely to have a doctoral degree and more years of teaching experience. However, among former practitioners, U.S. faculty are slightly more likely to possess an earned doctorate (see table 2).

As table 1 illustrates, there was a notable difference between the two groups with regard to on-line teaching. The United States was 16 percent more likely to use that instructional delivery method. Still, the similarities between the two groups are striking. Based on this sample, the faculty who teach classes on intelligence at civilian institutions of higher education appear to be largely the same regardless of the country in which they reside.

Program Raison d'Être

An organization's purpose should be an important driver of its activities and outcomes. The study assumed this general principle would be operable in this comparison of civilian higher education programs that focus on intelligence.

The missions of the programs in this study revealed a strong bent towards professional objectives. For instance, the underlying philosophy of the program at Novena University is to equip students “with the tools that will enable them to make meaningful contributions to the security needs of Nigeria.”³⁴ Based on the interviews with the program directors, the primary purposes of these programs relate more to helping students gain entry into the profession or to assist current practitioners to advance. To be sure, general academic objectives were present, but the professional emphasis was notable.

Creating access to the profession was an objective that was noted in almost all (five of the six) of the programs in this study. The interviews and promotional materials used phrases like ‘training a new generation’, ‘a pathway to a career change’, or ‘employability enhancement’. Indeed, the one exception – Novena University – did not explicitly state this but the implication from the promotional materials and director interview were consistent with this trend. The literature has long noted that the growth in the analytic and security sectors of the country has led to increased interests and related educational programs in the United States³⁵ These interviews suggest that this phenomenon is not limited to the United States.

The question of whether acquiring this type of degree actually improves the chances that a student will gain entry into the profession is an important topic. It is reasonable to assume that the growing student interest that fuels these programs is premised on that idea. Unfortunately, there is a dearth of systematic evidence and scholarship to answer that question at this time.

A second common objective that was commonly noted was to assist current practitioners to advance within their field by earning an appropriate advanced degree. Four of the six programs in this study explicitly referenced the idea of ‘professionalizing’ students who were already working in the field. In essence, these students needed a relevant academic credential for promotion. Indeed, the program at Brunel University was open to students without their first degree (i.e., a Bachelors-level degree) if they had five years of relevant professional experience. The Director of the Strategic Intelligence program at Link University estimated that approximately 80 percent of the program’s

³⁴ Adesulu, “Novena University Boosts.”

³⁵ See Stephen Marrin, “Training and Educating U.S. Intelligence Analysts,” *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence* 22:1 (Spring 2009): 131-146. Also, Landon-Murray, “Social Science and Intelligence Analysis,” 491-528.

students were in this category of current practitioners looking to earn a degree for career advancement.³⁶

Ultimately, the practical orientation of the faculty and programs were viewed as important components in allowing these programs to meet these objectives. For instance, the Director of the Master of Arts program at Brunel University stated, “the program here has been successful because it focuses on either enhancing someone’s professional experience or preparing them for the professional working environment.”³⁷

Government Collaboration

Most of the programs in this study had some degree of collaboration with the host country’s security services, typically in a training role. Given the discussion in the literature on the value of intelligence education and analytic training to enhance workforce capability, this is unremarkable. The training collaboration takes a variety of forms, but there seems to be no real cross-national distinction. It seems that intelligence education programs and government organizations see the potential for mutually beneficial relationships.

Some institutions develop education and training programs specifically for government use. For instance, Dr. Patrick Walsh, the Course Director for the Intelligence Analysis program at Charles Sturt University noted that the school has had a long history of providing short, intensive, tailor-made analytic courses for both industry and government. One prominent venue for this support to government and industry by Charles Sturt is the National Strategic Intelligence Course (NSIC). Faculty teach this two-week intensive course jointly with practitioners from relevant agencies, such as the Australian Security Intelligence Organization and the Australian Crime Commission. As noted in its promotional materials, the NSIC aims to provide participants with a practical knowledge of strategic intelligence, research methods, program management, data collection, analysis, and intelligence. In addition, while the program is only available to those currently employed in the field, those students can apply the NSIC to one of their intelligence analysis degree programs at CSU.³⁸ This appears to be a novel way to blend the training collaboration of the program with the purpose of providing those

³⁶ Mayer Interview, 18 May 2016.

³⁷ Gustafson Interview, May 5, 2016.

³⁸ “National Strategic Intelligence Course: Charles Sturt University,” available at https://www.csu.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/543540/F3168-AGSPS-NSIC-flyer_WEB.pdf.

already employed in the field with a path to earning a degree to advance their career.

The NSIC has been offered frequently but is currently being revised. The course had been offered on a regular basis (typically three times per year) in Canberra for the last 15 years. It had also been offered on an ad hoc basis to international partners in such places as Singapore, Hong Kong, and Washington. However, the NSIC is currently “in abeyance” due to some collaboration issues. That said, the program director at Charles Sturt University believes the pedagogical model is still sound and expects the class to restart after the issues are addressed.³⁹

This approach of tailored training seems to be gaining currency in recent years. For instance, Novena University in Nigeria entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Nigeria Police in 2014. Dr. Ngboawaji Nte, the Department Chair for Intelligence and Security Studies noted that their program has been an active training partner not just with law enforcement, but also with the Army and Air Force of Nigeria.⁴⁰ As the first civilian institution providing intelligence-related education and training in Nigeria, it was a natural partner for a government looking to improve the quality of its workforce in this field. As the Assistant Inspector General, Solomon Arase noted, the partnership with Novena University helps “train and sharpen the intellect of police officers who will become grounded in the fine art of the profession to achieve the finest tradition of intelligence gathering.”⁴¹

Link Campus University also seems to be in the initial stages of this type of collaboration with the Italian government. Dr. Marco Meyer, the Director of the program, noted that the Italian government had passed a law in 2007 to foster improved research and training relationships between government and academia on intelligence studies.⁴² Indeed, in January 2016, an agreement for scientific collaboration, teaching, and training for the Italian Department of Information Security of the Council of Ministers (DIS) was reached.⁴³

³⁹ Walsh Interview, May 5, 2016.

⁴⁰ Dr. Ngboawaji Nte, Interview with Jonathan Smith, E-Mail, May 15, 2016.

⁴¹ Adesulu, “Novena University Boosts.”

⁴² Mayer Interview, May 18, 2016.

⁴³ “Cooperation Agreement Between DIS and Link Campus University,” February 16, 2016, Link University Website, available at: <http://intelligence.unilink.it/index.php/accordo-di-collaborazione-tra-dis-e-link-campus-university/>.

Some institutions maintain a more diffuse and informal relationship with government institutions, but the relationship is still evident. Brunel University in London does not have any formal MOUs with the British government, but frequently assists the professional intelligence organizations on array training and standards issues. For instance, the Center for Intelligence and Security Studies at Brunel regularly supports the Professional Head of Intelligence Analysis on issues related to professional standards in the analytic community.

The Center at Brunel also collaborates with government organizations on its Brunel Analytical Simulation Exercise (BASE), “the jewel in the MA/ISS crown.” The simulation is designed to emulate the interdepartmental assessment methods of the British Joint Intelligence Committee and give students a chance to apply hands-on analytical principles in a real world context.⁴⁴ Recently, the Defense Intelligence-Futures in Analytic Methodology (DI FAM) hosted such a simulation at the Ministry of Defense Main Building. There is also an academic outreach agreement that is run by the PHIA and DI FAM to utilize civilian academic programs in the UK to improve the analytic workforce, but to date, the programs at Brunel University and Kings College have been the primary participants.⁴⁵

The program at the Citadel does not have training arrangements with the United States government. Still, it too, sought opportunities to formally connect its program with government activities. Professor Carl Jensen, the director of the intelligence analysis program at the Citadel, noted the school previously worked with members of the intelligence community on producing open-source intelligence products.⁴⁶

The one outlier to this collaboration trend is likely due to the primary purpose and unique organization of the program. The International Security, Intelligence, and Security Studies program at the University of Glasgow did not have any known collaborations with security services of the U.K. This is understandable given the focus of the program is not driven by the study of intelligence. According to the Convener of the Security Studies program, this is something the program is looking to develop, but intelligence issues are not

⁴⁴ “M.A. Intelligence and Security Studies,” Mastersportal.eu website, available at: <http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:A3l4FDuCsdeJ:www.mastersportal.eu/studies/6067/intelligence-and-security-studies.html+&cd=5&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us>.

⁴⁵ Gustafson Interview, May 5, 2016.

⁴⁶ Dr. Carl Jensen, Interview with Jonathan Smith, Personal, Conway, S.C., June 13, 2016.

the primary focus of the current degree.⁴⁷ In addition, the primary location for the intelligence-focused course work is resident at a different university outside of the country. The Master of Science program at Glasgow is structured as a consortium agreement with partner institutions in Germany and the Czech Republic. As a result, OTH Regensburg offers most of the technical knowledge and practical experience related to intelligence analysis.⁴⁸ Hence, given the limited focus on intelligence education that is currently resident at the University of Glasgow, the lack of collaboration with UK security services is understandable.

Based on this research, it appears intelligence programs seek a connection to current practitioners of intelligence analysis—in this case, five of the six programs studied. The United States case—the Citadel—had less of a training role to support practitioners in the field and more of a production support role. Given the number of other U.S. programs that are not included in this study, this may be a spurious result. Certainly, there are some connections between the United States intelligence community and academia.⁴⁹ That said it might also be suggestive that countries with smaller intelligence bureaucracies may rely on academia to augment their foundational training needs.

Since government is by far the largest entity involved in security-related intelligence, the desire by academic programs for collaboration is unsurprising. Moreover, government entities have recognized the value that such institutions can provide in fostering rigor in the area of analytic method. Still, having former practitioners in an academic program can be helpful in establishing trust and building relationships in this academic-government connection. As one person noted, it is “a bit like the Free Masons—you have to know the secret handshake.”⁵⁰ However, as with the general snapshot of faculty backgrounds, there does not appear to be a significant difference

⁴⁷ Dr. Eamonn Butler, Interview with Jonathan Smith, E-Mail, May 25, 2016.

⁴⁸ “International Security, Intelligence and Security Studies MSc,” University of Glasgow, available at: <http://www.gla.ac.uk/postgraduate/taught/internationalsecurity/#/whythisprogramme,thepartners>.

⁴⁹ One recent study noted 12 graduate level programs in intelligence within the United States (not counting the Citadel). Coulthart and Crosston, “Terra Incognita,” 52-53; Daniel Drezner, “Will I Ever Advise the United States Intelligence Community Again,” *The Washington Post*, December 15, 2014, available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2014/12/15/will-i-ever-advise-the-u-s-intelligence-community-again/?utm_term=.94be8fcb5e40.

⁵⁰ Walsh Interview, May 5, 2016.

between U.S. and non-U.S. programs in their desire to collaborate with government (or industry) partners.

A separate, but related trend is the international collaboration between academic programs in the field of intelligence education. Several of the programs reviewed in this study had teaching or cooperative relationships with scholars and programs from different countries. Many utilized faculty and programs in the United States. Given the consensus on the knowledge base of the United States intelligence education community, this seems logical. However, the collaboration is certainly not limited to participating with only education programs in the United States, or the Anglosphere more broadly. As noted in the University of Glasgow program, OTH Regensburg provides most (but not all) of the instruction of their intelligence-related courses.⁵¹ While this program may be more accurately classified as a security studies endeavor, these types of arrangements may hold promise. They could advance the view that intelligence education is more akin to a traditional academic discipline that fosters a free exchange of ideas. This would be at odds with some of the field's initial tendencies that primarily viewed itself as a jobs pipeline to a given country's security establishment.

Recruiting Faculty – Good Help is Hard to Find

Still, the prevalence of teaching classes in intelligence utilizing prior practitioners is a common thread to most of the programs in this study. While some programs emphasized the need for some degree of balance, all of the programs in this study utilized current or former practitioners to deliver at least some of their educational program. At Link University, the program director estimated that eighty percent of the faculty was in this category. Even the program at the University of Glasgow, which is the least intelligence-centric program that was included in this study, noted that its program offered students “access to a range of...non-academic personnel from industry and business, the military, the intelligence community, government and non-governmental organizations.”⁵²

This leads to complications on two key fronts. On the one hand, there is the issue of finding and keeping former practitioners who are interested in teaching. These individuals are widely viewed as having a credibility that

⁵¹ “International Students Spending the Summer at OTH Regensburg,” OTH Regensburg Website, March 21, 2016, available at: <https://www.oth-regensburg.de/weiterbildung/nachrichten/einzelansicht/news/von-glasgow-nach-regensburg-und-weiter-nach-prag.html>.

⁵² Butler E-Mail Interview, May 25, 2016.

traditional academics would lack. However, recruiting such people can present a challenge. Martin Rudner identified this as a possible issue in the slow development of intelligence education programs. He noted, “A chronic scarcity of available, qualified faculty remains an imposing constraint on the development of Intelligence Studies programs almost everywhere.”⁵³ The director at Brunel University echoed this sentiment when he noted, “it has been hard to find people who have a practical bent.”⁵⁴ It can also be a challenge to keep these practitioners. As one program director noted, some faculty have returned to the profession of intelligence due to their dissatisfaction with the culture and processes in academia.

In addition, as noted earlier in the article, the focus on prior work experience in the field assumes that these faculty are disposed to the craft of teaching. While briefing policymakers is a common requirement for intelligence analysts, it is not a universal requirement. As Mark Lowenthal noted in a previous study, “skilled practitioners might not be scholars and (therefore, might not) be able to teach.”⁵⁵

Beyond this challenge of finding former practitioners to teach, programs frequently face challenges from the university administration in employing practitioners. Most academic disciplines do not require or value prior work experience on the same level that they value having the appropriate educational degree and scholarly publication record. In the U.S. system, this is one factor that pushes former practitioners without an earned doctorate into part-time and adjunct positions.⁵⁶

One area where this institutional resistance might manifest itself is in the area of academic accreditation. A former practitioner with the appropriate terminal degree (e.g., an earned doctorate in the field) is certainly possible, but if there is one and not the other, the academic degree is typically the more important attribute with regard to academic accreditation. For instance, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in the United States identifies the proportion of faculty who hold the appropriate terminal degree as one of their standards for evaluating a given university.⁵⁷ There is no comparable requirement for professional experience. The director of one program noted

⁵³ Rudner, “Intelligence Studies in Higher Education,” 116.

⁵⁴ Gustafson Interview, 5 May 2016.

⁵⁵ Spracher, *National Security Intelligence Professional Education*, 113.

⁵⁶ Smith, “Amateur Hour?,” 36-7.

⁵⁷ Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, *The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*, 2012:36, available at: <http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/2012PrinciplesOfAcacreditation.pdf>.

their institution's concern with the country's Research Excellence Framework. This framework is a UK-wide measure of institutional quality that focuses on the research output of faculty members. As a result, there can be a concern that the institution may prefer to hire faculty with the best publication record as opposed to the best subject matter expertise.

Conclusion

There is movement outside the Anglosphere. While previous research suggests that much of the growth in intelligence studies is largely an Anglo phenomenon, programs outside of this area are emerging. Where new intelligence studies programs are arising (and where they are not) is an important future research question for understanding the forces that are important in the development of the field.

Based on the current study, intelligence studies programs outside the United States benefit from the same forces in the educational marketplace that precipitated the growth within the United States. Faculty attributes and program focus are similar. For instance, Professor Nte of Novena University noted that support for such programs has grown as awareness of intelligence and security issues has grown within Nigerian society.⁵⁸ That statement is comparable to a number of scholars who have noted the role that the 9/11 attacks had on spurring the growth of U.S. intelligence education programs.⁵⁹

This research is not intended to be a comprehensive review of all programs worldwide. Instead, it is intended to be suggestive of likely trends and hopefully to provoke additional research in this area. Based on the survey and the interviews, it appears there are challenges influencing the field generally. There will certainly be differences and nuances that will emerge as the field matures.

That said, particularly as it relates to the value of experience as an asset for this field of study, national boundaries appear to make little difference. If this common thread is borne out by subsequent research, it may be a driver as the field of intelligence studies develops. The focus on practical experience and application is not necessary an inherent good. However, it may be an expression of how the field will evolve.

⁵⁸ Nte E-Mail Interview, May 15, 2016.

⁵⁹ Spracher, *National Security Intelligence Professional Education*, 1; Coulthart and Crosston, "Terra Incognita," 49.

To be sure, there may be other priorities that develop beyond practical art. This study was a test of only one of the possibilities. Still, this research suggests that practical application is a shared priority of programs, whether the programs are in the United States or not.

Appendix 1 – Faculty Member Survey Questionnaire

1. In the past 5 years, have you taught a course that has the word “intelligence” in the course title?

- Yes

- No

Current Teaching Position and Education

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

- Part-time

- 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.)

- Master’s Degree

- Bachelor’s Degree

- Other

6. What is the subject area/field of study of this highest-level academic degree?

7. Was this highest-level degree earned while you were simultaneously employed with a non-academic organization engaged in intelligence-related activities?

- Yes

- No

8. In addition to your teaching position, 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

Courses Offered in Current Position

9. 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?

10. Of the courses listed in the previous question, how many were offered with a majority of the instruction delivered via on-line (as opposed to a traditional, in-class) instruction?

11. For the typical course that you offer, how many contact hours per week do you have with the students?

12. How many different course titles (please DO NOT count multiple sections of the same course) do you teach per year?

13. Of the courses listed in the previous question, how many of these were predominantly concerned with the study of intelligence issues?

Prior Work Experience

14. 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

15. If you answered 'yes' in the previous question, how many years did you hold that position?

16. 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?

17. 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)?

18. 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

19. In all of your non-academic intelligence related work experiences, did you ever lead intelligence training instruction in a classroom-type experience?

- Yes

- No

20. 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

Appendix 2 – Program Director Questionnaire

1. What year did your program begin offering classes in intelligence?
2. What is the mission or general purpose of your program? (What will the students be able to achieve?)
3. Does your program have any active collaborations with the security services of the country that you reside in? If so, please describe.
4. Does your program offer intelligence classes at the undergraduate level, graduate level, or both?
5. How would you characterize your typical student in the intelligence program? For instance, Traditional Full-Time, Working while in School, Mid-Career Retraining, etc.
6. Does your program offer any of these intelligence courses in an on-line format?
7. How many full-time faculty members do you have in your department?
8. In this study, I am operationalizing the ‘faculty’ variable as those who teach a class with the word ‘intelligence’ in the course title. How many of the faculty teach a course with the word ‘intelligence’ in the course title?
9. Of these, how many would you describe as full-time employees (likely their sole occupation) of the institution? How many would you describe as part-time/adjunct faculty?
10. The next part of my research is to seek the assistance of individual faculty members. I have a 25 question on-line survey that I would like them to complete. It should take less than 15 minutes for the faculty members to complete.

Would you be willing to provide me with the e-mail contact information for your faculty teaching courses in intelligence?

Alternatively, would you be willing to forward my survey request to your relevant faculty?

11. Does your program maintain any institutional memberships with intelligence-related professional associations (e.g., International Association for Intelligence Education)? If so, who?

12. With regard to the hiring and retention of faculty for courses in intelligence, have you had any challenges that are unique to this subject area? That is, is it easier or harder to find faculty in this area compared to other academic specialties?

13. Lastly, is there anything else that you think would be important for this research regarding your program?