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Teaching Israel at American Universities: Growth, Placement, and Future Prospects

ABSTRACT

The teaching of Israel at American universities has grown dramatically in recent years and has become “normalized” in the curriculum. A census was conducted at 316 schools to assess 2011–2012 course offerings related to Israel in order to analyze growth over time, characteristics of courses, and institutional characteristics that contribute to growth. Results indicate a small increase in Israel-focused courses between 2008–09 and 2011–12, following a two-thirds increase from 2005–06 to 2008–09. Courses were offered under a variety of disciplinary auspices including Jewish studies, political science, history, Hebrew, and other fields. The number of courses offered remained strong particularly at more prestigious schools with large Jewish populations. External support from programs that place or train qualified faculty yield more courses about Israel at their respective institutions, but the effect cannot persist without the continued presence of those faculty. A key focus of further research is to understand the impact of Israel courses on students and discourse about Israel.

INTRODUCTION

In the past decade, a quasi-revolution has occurred in the teaching of Israel on college campuses in the United States. Israel—its history, culture, multiethnic society, and contemporary affairs—has been normalized in the curriculum and is taught as the focus of courses in hundreds of institutions. Perhaps most notably, courses about Israel are now part of
the curriculum of most selective universities. In some universities, the field has developed in parallel with ongoing contentiousness about Israel.1

A broad range of academics, university administrators, and funding institutions have helped to craft a field that extends far beyond consideration of Israel’s founding and conflicts with the Arab/Muslim world. Given the tenor and shape of discourse about Israel in the public square, what happens in the classroom is paramount. This article describes the growth of Israel studies and assesses a set of institutional and curricular factors associated with development of the field. In particular, we consider:

• Growth in Israel education over time on U.S. college and university campuses, as measured by the number and type of courses taught;
• Institutional characteristics associated with the growth of Israel studies;
• Whether the field has developed as an integrated interdisciplinary field or is multidisciplinary;
• The role of external forces in shaping the field, including Israel’s current political situation, funders, and their programs.

One goal of the present paper is to trace the growth of opportunities for serious discourse about Israel as represented by college and university courses about Israel. It is assumed that such courses provide at least the potential for discussion that rises above, for example, the number of mentions of Israel in a political debate.2 A second goal is to understand how theories of curricular change might inform or promote the future development of the study of Israel.

BACKGROUND

In 2005, a directory of courses about Israel was assembled by an Israel advocacy organization. Their commentary about the list of courses described “a troubling picture of a lack of opportunity for American students to study modern Israel.”3 Several years later, as academic researchers, we revisited the directory and updated it with data drawn from a survey done in 2008–09. Our 2009 study revealed a tremendous growth (+69%) in courses about Israel over the 2005–06 baseline period.4 The focus of that study was a sample of 316 colleges and universities selected based on size, ranking, and Jewish student population. Most (246), but not all, of the schools in the
sample overlapped with the 2005 study. Our study identified Israel-focused courses—those dealing specifically with Israel—and Israel-related courses defined more broadly.

**CURRICULAR CHANGE**

Although the present focus is specific to the growth in Israel studies courses, it needs to be contextualized in terms of how new fields are developed in the academy. The study of Israel reflects similar issues with other fields, but it is also unique. Area studies, such as Latin American studies, are typically geography based, addressing the history, geography, politics, and culture of a particular region, but they do not typically focus on a single country. Identity studies, such as African-American or Women’s studies, address the culture and history of a particular population. Israel, however, because it is a multiethnic and multicultural society, would be ill-served by focusing exclusively on one community or religious group. Nor does the study of Israel involve identity building or consciousness raising for members of a particular ethnic group. Problem-based fields such as environmental or sustainability studies address a particular problem of current interest through a political, social, historical, and scientific lens. Unlike these other fields, however, Israel studies retains a particular geographic and politically-bounded subject area, and it lacks an integrated interdisciplinary framework. Despite these differences, theories of curricular change may be helpful to understand how the field as emerged.

It is well-recognized that university curricula and program offerings in the United States have expanded subject to political and economic forces, social movements, and socio-demographic changes in the student body. The emergence of new programs in the academy, such as African-American and Women’s studies departments, has been explained in terms of factors internal to the academy, as well as the need to respond to external demands. The framework of organizational ecology posits that university curricula are market driven. Programs develop and thrive in particular forms and trajectories as a result of a particular institutional mission, bureaucratic structure, status, wealth, size, geographical location, faculty interests, and other characteristics. Schools utilize their course offerings in order to compete for market share of students, to differentiate themselves in terms of status, and to signal their academic mission.

Factors external to the university are a second reason for development of new university programs. For example, area studies developed during...
the Cold War in response to federal legislation and funding. Identity-based departments and programs in African-American studies and Women’s studies developed during the 1960s in response to the emergence of social movements, the support of outside funding sources, and the demand for coursework that both students and faculty found relevant and responsive to current moral and political issues. Social movement theory suggests, however, that “new fields, from the sciences to ethnic studies, depend on social movements to introduce new curricula. The most successful curricula . . . are curricula that continue to have close ties to their sponsors and patrons.”

It is also important to understand the place of Israel studies within the traditional disciplinary framework of colleges and universities. Traditional disciplines have distinct theories and methodologies and are supported by the university or college administrative structure. When the knowledge of individual disciplines is thought to be inadequate for complete understanding of a particular problem, such as a geographical area or social issue, an interdisciplinary approach may be used to synthesize and integrate multiple disciplines. An interdisciplinary approach requires the new field to achieve legitimization through the development of distinct theoretical and methodological bodies of knowledge, and this process has proven to be a challenge for new programs. As an alternative to the interdisciplinary approach, a multidisciplinary approach acknowledges the co-existing contributions of multiple disciplines without an attempt at synthesis. A multidisciplinary approach does not require a coordinated effort across departments, nor does it require changes to the institutional bureaucracy. It may be easier to introduce a topic through such an approach, but the lack of structure may make long-term institutionalization more challenging.

A new field of study faces an array of challenges. It requires an established institutional structure and is limited by institutional resource constraints. It is responsive to external forces such as funding and social movements. In addition, it must develop either an interdisciplinary theoretical framework or be incorporated as a multidisciplinary topic within the traditional disciplinary structure of knowledge in the academy. Although in some settings, Israel studies has become its own program, in most colleges and universities it is treated as a multidisciplinary topic and is therefore treated as such in this paper.

The present study is designed to describe the state of Israel studies—both Israel-focused and Israel-related courses—in 2011-12. The study tracks the growth in Israel courses on college and university campuses in the United States from 2005-06 through 2008-09 and 2011-12, examines...
the correlation of institutional characteristics such as size and prestige with Israel studies, reviews the disciplinary “homes” of courses and the central-ity of Israel’s geopolitical conflict to its presence in the curriculum, and explores the success of efforts to promote the study of Israel on campus as measured by course offerings.

METHODS

The 2008–09 directory and the present 2011–12 paper utilize a purposive sample of 316 schools, following the criteria shown in Table A-1. They include top U.S. News and World Report’s universities and colleges; public, private and sectarian institutions; universities with large Jewish student populations (as counted by Hillel) and some with no known Jewish students. We excluded junior colleges, conservatories, and art schools that had been included in the 2005–06 directory. Of the 316 institutions, 246 were included in the earlier study. All comparisons among the three time periods rely on those 246 institutions. Methodological differences between the 2005–6 and the latter two time periods are addressed below. Comparisons between 2008–09 and 2011–12 rely on the full 316 schools.

The 2008–09 and 2011–12 directories included courses from class schedules in the fall through summer of the academic year. Student research assistants were given a list of search words (Israel, Middle East, Jerusalem, Palestine, etc.) and criteria for inclusion. Only undergraduate classes or graduate courses open to undergraduates were included. Research assistants were instructed to disregard courses listed in catalogs that they could not find in course schedules.

All courses were classified as either “Israel-focused” or “Israel-related.” To be considered Israel-focused, a course had to deal exclusively with modern Israel. Courses on ancient Israel were excluded from the directory. Courses on the Middle East that may have had a unit on the Arab-Israeli conflict were considered Israel-related rather than Israel-focused. Research assistants used catalogs only to determine whether courses were Israel-focused on Israel-related.

This methodology has several limitations. Courses may have to be offered as “special topics” courses for several years before they become inte-grated as official parts of the curriculum. Special topics courses often have no descriptions and therefore may have been missed by the research team. As well, it is possible that some courses may have been listed and not offered due to failure to enroll adequate numbers of students. We assume that it
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is more likely that the former outnumber the latter and that more courses were missed than were included incorrectly. Categorization of courses as Israel-focused or Israel-related was based on titles and course descriptions. It is possible that some of these have been misclassified.

FINDINGS

After developing our directory of courses, we analyzed the characteristics of the current course offerings and compared them with the previous directories in order to address our primary research questions. The analysis includes the overall growth in Israel courses from 2005–06 through 2008–09 and 2011–12; the relationship of Israel courses with institutional characteristics, the disciplinary structure of the courses, and the effect of outside advocacy groups on the courses.

COURSE OFFERINGS ABOUT ISRAEL

In 2011–12, the 316 schools included in the study offered 625 courses specifically focused on Israel and 752 Israel-related courses. Approximately 190 of the Israel-focused courses were specifically about the conflict/dispute/peace process, or Israel’s relations with Arab countries, for example: *The Arab-Israeli Conflict, Israel’s Foreign Relations, Palestine and Israel: The Clash of Nationalism*, and *The Arab-Israeli Peace Process*. Others were about Israel more broadly, survey courses on the history of the State of Israel, Israeli politics, or Israeli society. Others dealt in more depth about particular issues
of Israeli culture, history, or society, for example: *The Arab in Israeli Literature*, *Digging for National Roots: The Politics of Israeli Archaeology*, *S.Y. Agnon and the Jewish Experience*, *The Israeli Kibbutz*, and *Women and Femininity in Jewish and Israeli Folk Narratives*.

The 752 Israel-related courses dealt with Israel in at least some context. Some of these, such as *Comparative Politics: Middle East*, a course including “historical foundations of the modern Middle East, competing strategies of state building, the Arab-Israeli conflict, the Gulf War, the rise of political Islam, and American policy toward the region” or *Modern Jewish History*, a course focusing on “the emancipation of the Jews of Germany to the immediate aftermath of the Second World War and the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948” may have significant content about modern Israel. Others may have had one or two lectures. *Embattled Media: Conflict and War Journalism* deals with “the World Wars, Vietnam War, Korean War, Gulf War, Afghanistan war, Iraq war, ‘The Troubles’ in Ireland and United Kingdom, Cold War, Arab-Israeli wars and conflict, Rwandan genocide, Baltic conflict, the Drug War, Latin American civil wars, conflict in the DR of Congo, etc.” It is unlikely that Israel occupied much of class time.

Likewise, *Religion, Politics, and Global Violence* “explores case studies that include attention to conflicts in Europe-Northern Ireland and Bosnia/Serbia; the Middle East-Israel-Palestine and Iraq; Southeast Asia-Indonesia; the Indian Subcontinent-India-Pakistan; Africa-the Sudan and Rwanda.” All of the courses in the “Israel-related” category had course descriptions that suggested Israel content, but it is possible that some devote very little time to Israel depending on the expertise and inclination of the instructor or other courses available in the university.\(^\text{17}\)

**CHANGE IN CLASSROOM EDUCATION ABOUT ISRAEL OVER TIME**

In 2011–12, during a period of economic recession and contraction across much of the academy,\(^\text{18}\) a more modest expansion (+4%) of Israel courses was evident compared to the 2005–06—2008–09 period. Of the 316 universities in which Israel courses were reflected in the 2008–09 and 2011–12 directories, 246 were part of the 2005–06 report. Figure 1 shows the increase in the number of Israel-focused courses at these 246 schools. The 2005–06 directory included some Israel-related courses such as *The History of the Modern Middle East*, *Jewish Thought and Culture II: From the Expulsion from Spain to the Present*, and *Politics of the Middle East* but primarily
listed Israel-focused courses and did not distinguish between the two. The 2008–09 and 2011–12 directories include both Israel-focused and Israel-related courses and distinguish between them. For purposes of this analysis, we count all courses in 2005–06 as Israel-focused and therefore probably overestimate the number of 2005–06 Israel-focused courses. If 2005–06 Israel-related courses could be deleted from this count, the increase from 2005–06 to 2008–09 would be even greater than that shown in Figure 1.

The trend in Israel-focused courses and Israel-related courses between 2008–09 and 2011–12 can be seen in Figure 2. From 2008–09 to 2011–12, among the full sample of 316 institutions, the number of Israel-focused courses increased (+8%) while the number of Israel-related courses decreased (-9%). This may reflect greater interest in Israel and/or recognition from faculty, administrators, and students that it deserves more study. The change may also be related to external funding available to support such courses, as well as community and foundation efforts to bring visiting Israeli professors to American campuses and to prepare existing faculty to teach about Israel.

Although the overall number of courses grew during this period, there was a dramatic shift in the percent of schools increasing and decreasing Israel-focused courses. Of the 246 schools in 2005–06, almost half (44%) increased their course offerings about Israel through 2011–12, 100 (41%) stayed the same, and 15% decreased the number of courses focused on Israel.
The rapid growth from 2005–06 to 2008–09 did not continue through 2011–12. The breakdown of the percent of schools increasing, staying the same, and decreasing their offerings is shown in Figure 3.

**INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS MOST ASSOCIATED WITH THE GROWTH OF ISRAEL COURSES SIZE OF SCHOOL**

One would expect that the number of Israel-focused and Israel-related courses would be related to the size of the school. Larger schools would be expected to have more resources and greater ability to add courses. Although larger schools have more potential, the size of the school appears to have little relationship to the number of Israel-focused course offerings. The size does, however, appear to have a relationship to whether or not the school offers any Israel-focused courses: 83% of the largest schools (enrollment of 20,000 or more) offered Israel-focused courses (see Figure 4) while only 39% of the smallest schools did so. For Israel-related courses, there is no difference in the number of courses based on school size for schools with fewer than 20,000 students. However, one third of the largest schools (over 20,000 students) have four or more Israel-related courses while less than a quarter of all other schools have as many (See Figure 5).
SIZE OF JEWISH POPULATION

In contrast to the size of the overall population, the percent of Jewish undergraduates and the absolute number of Jewish undergraduates each have a direct relationship to the number of Israel-focused courses (Figures 6 and 7). Among schools with 1500 or more Jewish undergraduate students, over half (56%) offer 4 or more Israel-focused courses. This may be due to Jewish student demand or the perception of such demand on the part of school faculty and administrators.

SCHOOL RANKING

University rankings are a crude measure, but are also related to likelihood of offering more Israel-focused courses (Figure 8). Across all school rankings, the proportion that offered 4 or more Israel-related courses was higher than for Israel-focused courses. However, higher ranked schools offered more Israel-focused and Israel-related courses than did lower ranked schools. Among the top 25 national universities, 70% offered four or more Israel-focused courses whereas only 15% of the lower ranked schools offered as many. For Israel-related courses the same relationship can be seen, with 81% of top ranked schools offering 4 or more courses compared to 15% of the lowest ranked schools. This relationship did not hold for the liberal arts schools included in the survey (Figure 9), and the difference between
Figure 4: Percent of Schools by Undergraduate Enrollment Offering Israel-Focused Courses 2011–12 (n=316)

Figure 5: Percent of Schools by Undergraduate Enrollment Offering Israel-Related Courses 2011–12 (n=316)
Figure 6: Percent of Schools with Israel-Focused Courses by Absolute Number of Jewish Undergraduates 2011–2012 (n=316)

Figure 7: Percent of Schools with Israel-Focused Courses by Percent Jewish Undergraduates 2011–2012 (n=316)
patterns of Israel-focused and Israel-related courses was much more pronounced. Only 8% of the top ranked liberal arts schools offered 4 or more Israel-focused courses, but 69% offered 4 or more Israel-related courses. When considering all ranked liberal arts colleges in the sample, only 5% offered 4 or more Israel-focused courses compared with 34% of all national universities in the sample.

School rankings come under a great deal of criticism and this is not the place to discuss their merits, but clearly the highly ranked universities offer more courses about Israel. That higher ranked schools offer more courses cannot be explained only by their larger Jewish populations. An analysis limited to schools with large Jewish populations demonstrated the same pattern of higher ranked schools offering more courses. Higher ranked institutions may be better able to afford to develop their curricula (financial resources is one of the criteria in the U.S. News rankings as it is one of the internal factors discussed in the literature of curricular change) and to respond to student demand for relevance—two measures of student retention also are part of the U.S. News rankings. As well, the American Israeli Cooperative Enterprise’s program to bring visiting Israeli professors to U.S. campuses has targeted the top national universities. In 2008–09, the year of the largest cohort of visiting Israeli professors, one third were hosted by national universities rated 1 through 25 and almost 60% were placed in the top 50 schools. This percentage slipped in 2011–12, however, when only slightly more than a third of the visiting professors were at top 50 institutions.

A MULTIDISCIPLINARY FRAMEWORK FOR THE STUDY OF ISRAEL

Perhaps more significant than the number of courses is the breadth and depth of courses and their locations within so many different departments. Israel-focused courses are distributed through a range of departments and subject areas. Over a third of the courses offered in 2011–12 are listed within Jewish studies (24%) or Hebrew language (13%) programs. Hebrew and Jewish studies programs offered a wealth of topics on contemporary Israel: the conflict, of course, but also *Topics in Culture, Art, and Literature in Israel; Land and Cultures of Israel; Hebrew Literature in Translation* as well as *Aspects of Israeli Society* taught as an advanced Hebrew course. History (20%) and political science (14%) were the next largest contributors to Israel-focused course offerings. Middle East studies and international
Figure 8: Percentage of National Universities with 4 or more Israel-focused or related courses (n=143)

Figure 9: Percentage of Liberal Arts Colleges with 4 or more Israel-focused or related courses (n=97)
relations comprised only 7%. The remainder (22%) were added together (see Figure 10). A breakdown of departmental homes for the 135 courses in the “other” group is instructive: comparative literature, fine arts, religious studies, anthropology, sociology, cinema, folklore, theater, music, education, and peace and conflict studies. Twelve schools offered Israel-focused courses in sociology departments, 19 offered courses in religion, 6 offered such courses in anthropology, and 24 in literature departments outside of Hebrew (English, comparative literature, Arabic, and French).

The diversity represented by the departmental classification does not, however, do justice to the range of course offerings and topics since so many courses in culture and society are in other departments. For example, 41 Israel-focused courses (6%) were on Israeli film even though only 4 were offered specifically in film or cinema studies programs, and 50 courses (8%) had ‘Israeli Society’ in their titles even though only 16 originated in sociology departments. Such courses may be offered in political science, such as Politics, Society and Culture in Israel, or in Judaic studies, Israeli Society. At one school, Israeli Society: Migration, Identity and Culture was listed in international affairs. Course titles, course descriptions, and syllabi reveal deep and broad interest in Israel. Courses such as Masculinities in Israeli Culture and Society; Israeli Media; Literary Tel-Aviv and Jerusalem;
Topics in Zionism: Israelis and Palestinians; Two Cultures in Conflict; Israel: African Refugee Rights; Public Administration and Policy in Israel; Religious Controversy in Israel; and Music of Modern Israel reveal the extent to which the subjects of Israeli culture, social policy, politics, and religion have penetrated the academy.

If the ongoing contentiousness about Israel’s political conflict is the primary driver behind the growth in Israel courses, it would be expected that most of the growth in Israel courses would be focused on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and these courses would be located in political science and international relations. But in fact, the dominance of the conflict in discussion of Israel in the public arena is not found in the classroom. Indeed, less than a third of the Israel-focused courses offered in 2011–12 were specifically about the geopolitical conflict Israel faces. The other two-thirds discussed Israeli literature, film, and art; internal politics and governance; challenges of a multicultural society; and the Israeli economy. Without further investigation, the degree to which the conflict permeates these “non-conflict” courses cannot be determined, although we assume it is dealt with to some extent.

The above discussion represents only those courses specifically focused on Israel. The course descriptions (and the occasional syllabus available on the web) suggest that Israel-related courses often present complex analyses of academic theories through the prism of Israel. A sample syllabus for a political science course, Military, Politics, and Society, spends a week on the IDF, using it to help understand “the tensions and relationship between civilian elites, military elites, and mass society in a variety of contexts.” A seminar, Reconciliation and Justice after Violent Conflict taught in a sociology department, exposes students to “peace-building efforts” and helps them “examine the tension between peace and social justice.” Israel-Palestine is one of the case studies used to explore these topics.

The distribution of courses by department speaks to the multidisciplinary approach—more the study of Israel than Israel studies. The individual courses, however, suggest a considerable attempt at drawing on a variety of disciplines within specific topics. This is an area for further study.

SUPPORT FOR THE STUDY OF ISRAEL

None of this could have happened without the support of universities—their administrations, faculty, and students—facilitated by philanthropic funding and the creation of a community of knowledgeable scholars. The
number of Israel-focused courses increased slightly (+8%) while the number of Israel-related courses decreased (-9%). This may reflect the popularity of Israel-focused courses on campus as well as community and foundation efforts to bring Israeli visiting professors to campus, to fund chairs and programs in Israel studies, and to develop a strong program of preparation for established faculty to teach about Israel. As was found for other new programs, continued external support, both organizational and financial, may be necessary to ensure their place in the academy.23

One effort to enlarge the pool of qualified instructors and develop the field of Israel Studies is Brandeis University’s Summer Institute for Israel Studies (SIIS). The program has prepared over 180 faculty members to teach about Israel.24 Colleges and universities with SIIS fellows doubled the number of courses they offered in 2005–06 through 2011–12. Most of the increase occurred between 2005–06 and 2008–09. As shown in Figure 11, the 56 schools in the study that had SIIS fellows in 2004–2011 cohorts increased their Israel focused courses from 89 in 2005–06 to 176 in 2008–09 (98%). From 2008–09 to 2011–12, they increased their Israel-focused courses from 176 to 186 (6%). In comparison, schools that did not participate in the program increased their Israel-focused courses by 57% in the first time period and by 3% in the second. This analysis underestimates the total impact of SIIS which has attracted fellows from schools outside the United States and many others from within the United States whose institutions are not included in this study.

Figure 11: Change in total Israel-focused at schools with and without SIIS fellows
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It is not possible to measure the increase in Israel-focused courses that can be attributed directly to such programs. Not all of the schools with SIIS fellows are included in the directory, and the number of courses offered about Israel at the SIIS schools in the directory exceeds the number offered by SIIS fellows because many of the fellows’ host schools have one or more other faculty members that offer Israel-focused courses.

CONCLUSIONS

This report provides evidence of the “normalization” of Israel in the curriculum, as indicated by its presence in Israel-focused courses at 194 campuses in 2011–12 across a wide variety of departments, and the success of efforts to institutionalize academic discussion of Israel on college and university campuses. The presence of so many courses focused on Israel beyond the conflict (Israeli society, politics, thought, and culture) attests to the dissemination of the study of Israel widely and deeply within a multidisciplinary framework. In addition, the presence of the study of Israel in the nation’s universities suggests that institutions consider Israel to be a subject for serious academic exploration and rational discourse.

This study finds a modest (8%) increase in Israel-focused courses between 2008–09 and 2011–12, following a two-thirds increase in Israel-focused courses from 2005–06 to 2008–09. The number of courses offered remained strong particularly at larger, more prestigious schools with large Jewish populations. The fact that higher-ranked institutions offer more Israel courses suggests that these schools recognize Israel courses as a means to enhance prestige and attract students. External support from programs that place or train qualified faculty yield more courses about Israel at their respective institutions, but the effect does not necessarily persist without the continued presence of those faculty.

The patterns of Israel course offerings documented in this report raise several questions about Israel education. What is the effect of courses about Israel upon the students who participate, and to what extent are Israel courses in the academy dependent on outside programs and financial support? Interviews and surveys of students, faculty, and administrators have shown that courses introduced within a multidisciplinary framework have attracted students and won the backing of university and college administrators, but they also suggest that any withdrawal of support for education about Israel in the academy could diminish the achievements documented here. Further, students report that Israel-focused courses help them develop
more nuanced views of Israel and greater appreciation of the complexity of issues the country faces. However, these findings are based upon evaluations of specific programs that train indigenous faculty to teach about Israel and bring Israeli visiting professors to campuses. More work needs to be done to integrate and extend this research through an exploration of the effects of Israel studies on students in settings without such programs.

Beyond the direct effect on students, it is important to understand the influence of serious academic discourse in the classroom on conversation about Israel in the public square. This remains an open research question. The absolute number of students involved in these courses remains small despite the growth in the number of courses offered. Measuring the impact of the courses on students’ Israel literacy and their ability to participate in discourse about Israel outside the classroom would be challenging, but would serve as a valuable step toward charting the direction of future approaches to Israel education in general and Israel courses in the academy more specifically.
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22. In 2005, Ian Lustick collected and analyzed syllabi from 34 courses with syllabi posted on the Internet. The courses had been offered over the previous five years. His study methodology (sample selection criteria and level of analysis) preclude a comparison with this analysis, nonetheless, he found that about half of the courses dealt primarily with the conflict. This report was submitted to the Association for Israel Studies Board. Lustick made a copy of a summary of the report available to the authors. Ian Lustick, “Report on teaching about Israel in the United States and Canada based on collection of available syllabi on the web” unpublished.
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