ASSOCIATION FOR INTEGRATIVE STUDIES
AIS NEWSLETTER

Volume 31, Number 1 (March 2009) ISSN 1081-647X William H. Newell, Editor

Inside

The *AIS Newsletter* is published quarterly by the Association for Integrative Studies, Western College Program, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 45056.
Phone: 513-529-2659 or 513-529-2213
Fax: 513-529-5849
E-mail: Phyllis Cox at coxpa@muohio.edu or Bill Newell at newellwh@muohio.edu

Submissions are welcome!

Visit our Web site: www.muohio.edu/ais/
Username: issues
Password: INTERDIS (all caps)

International Political Economy:

How interdisciplinary is Ray Miller's new textbook?

Review of *International Political Economy: Contrasting World Views*. Raymond C. Miller. Routledge, 2008. 296 pp. ISBN 978-0-415-38409-4 paperback. $44.95.

Reviewed by Parakh Hoon, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, and affiliate faculty for the Alliance of Social, Political, Ethical, and Cultural Thought (ASPECT) at Virginia Polytechnic and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

Overview of *International Political Economy*

International Political Economy: Contrasting World Views is an introduction to the field of international political economy (IPE). It builds on some of the key pre-disciplinary foundational ideas of classical political economy and attempts to present an interdisciplinary perspective to the field. However, it only partially succeeds in its integrative efforts. This review substantiates why this is the case by situating the perspectives discussed in *International Political Economy: Contrasting World Views* in the larger historical context of the evolution of Modern IPE and examining them in light of the conceptual distinctions between multidisciplinarity, interdisciplinarity, and transdisciplinarity.

Historically, the field today known as IPE originates in the pre-disciplinary field of study that is now known as classical political economy. With disciplinary specialization, the ideas proposed by Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Karl Marx, and those who followed them, came to constitute the modern academic disciplines of economics, political science, and sociology. This specialization in the subject matter by the creation of academic disciplines, with little cross-fertilization of ideas, however, was redressed in the 1980s in response to evidence of thickening relations and growing interdependence in the economies of different countries. In the sub-discipline of international relations (IR) in political science, the dominant Realist approach with its mechanistic logic and focus on security issues could not explain these developments and changes in the world economy. Modern IPE emerged in the United States as a subfield of IR countering Realism and creating space for the study of political economy as a domain distinct from security issues.[1]

Those involved in constructing the "new" field of IPE relied on and adopted the ontological methodological individualism of neoclassical economics to produce new insights on cooperation and conflict in the international system. Epistemologically, the American school used the scientific method of positivism, and its scholarship was aimed at mid-range theorizing geared toward identifying empirical patterns by using "sophisticated" statistical and econometric methods. This perspective has been countered by continental approaches, in particular the "British School," which rejects the methodological individualistic assumptions and eschews the scientific method over broader ethical and normative questions. While both these schools are taken into consideration when referring to IPE, American IPE is dominant or has become hegemonic in scope. According to

(continued on page 2)

[1] Various scholars have been attributed with the founding of IPE and who most influenced the construction of the field in the early years as a subfield of IR. According to Cohen (2008) these "magnificent seven" were from English-speaking nations on both sides of the Atlantic, though Americans outnumbered the rest: Robert Cox, Robert Gilpin, Peter Katzenstein, Robert Keohane, Charles Kindleberger, Stephen Krasner, and Susan Strange.

Miller's IPE text ...

(continued from page 1)

Lake (2006), "IPE should be seen as a substantive topic of inquiry, rather than a methodology in which economic models are applied to political phenomena—*although scholars are in fact drawn to such methods* [my emphasis]." However, critics of the American School see it as theoretically exclusionary since it draws mostly on neoclassical economics and is driven by the dictates of positivism which privileges rigorous quantitative analysis over other ways of knowing.[2] Indeed, IPE as an academic field of study has also recently been called a "true interdiscipline" (Lake, 2006). By this, students of IPE indicate that while IPE began as an interdisciplinary field, integrating insights from political science and economics, in recent years it has become like a discipline—developing its own perspectives, journals, and professional associations. To remedy this, Cohen (2008, p. 2), suggests that in "the construction of IPE, it is not enough to build bridges between economics and politics. Bridges must be built between the field's disparate schools too."

International Political Economy: Contrasting World Views

Raymond Miller attempts to do just that in *International Political Economy: Contrasting World Views*. Miller, an emeritus professor at San Francisco State University and past president of the Association of Integrative Studies (AIS) proposes an integrative approach to IPE for building bridges within different schools of IPE and between different social sciences. Miller defines IPE as an "interdisciplinary social science field of study that investigates, analyzes, and proposes changes in the processes of economic flows and political governance that cross over and/or transcend national boundaries" (p. 2).

IPE: Contrasting World Views is organized around three contending perspectives: free market, multi-centric organizational (MCO), and Marxism. Each perspective or "world view" and its model are discussed in two linked chapters: The first articulates the assumptions and elements of the model, while the second illustrates how the model has been or can be applied to contemporary global events and problems (p. 13).

The first chapter outlines the scope of the field, which the author considers as a "central component of the interdisciplinary field of International Studies" (p. 1). Miller indicates that a new field of knowledge, which came to be known as classical political economy, emerged from those who were writing in response to changes that were taking place in industrializing societies in Europe. Adam Smith is associated with the market model of neoclassical economics, David Ricardo with the organizational power model of institutional political economy, and Karl Marx with his critical model of capitalism and subsequent elaborations. (Miller utilizes these as a starting point for each of the three competing world views.) In Miller's treatment of the field, IPE does not remain limited nor is it seen as one of the subfields of International Relations; instead it returns to pre-disciplinary perspectives to try to reconstruct an interdisciplinary IPE.

The three perspectives generate insights into some of the foundational issues in IPE: whether markets are on balance productive and an efficient decision-making system; whether this decision-making system is efficient, especially when left unregulated (to its own devices—or that of greedy and unethical profit-oriented market actors); or that essential markets are a tool for exploitation and engender greater inequalities within and among societies. Miller does not take a position on these issues. Instead, these positions emerge in the discussion and application of the three world views.[3]

While *IPE: Contrasting World Views* is attempting to be an interdisciplinary text, are there also multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary aspects? One of the tasks of this essay is to examine this question using insights from interdisciplinary studies. As Repko (2008) has indicated, often there is confusion in the use of the terms "interdisciplinary" and "multidisciplinary" as they tend to be used synonymously. Or, interdisciplinary efforts are actually multidisciplinary.

I propose that Miller's "market model" typifies hegemonic multidisciplinarity or at most weak interdisciplinarity; the MCO model is an example of pragmatic and conceptual interdisciplinarity; and the Marxist model is transdisciplinary. However, taken as a whole, *IPE Contrasting World Views* is multidisciplinary and not truly interdisciplinary.

Is *IPE: Contrasting World Views* (in its constituent parts or taken as a whole) interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary or transdisciplinary?

(continued on page 6)

[2] According to Lake (2006), IPE is informed by two sets of questions. First, how, when, and why do states choose to open themselves to transborder flow of goods and services, capital, and people? In other words, what are the political determinants of what we call globalization? Second, how does state integration fit (or not) into the international economy as the independent variable. (pp. 2-3)

[3] The market model provides not only insight into how a market economy ideally works but also guidelines for setting up an actual market society (p 15). In this perspective government is seen as a problem and has a limited role. The MCO model and proponents of this model believe that actual trading practices are neither free nor mutually beneficial. Outcomes are determined not by market efficiency but by the power of a few players who benefit disproportionately (p. 112). Classical Marxism provides one of the most comprehensive and systematic theoretical critiques of capitalism. From this perspective, reforming capitalism is an illusory pursuit and needs to be replaced by a socialist system (p 166). Members of the MCO school of thought are reformers, not revolutionaries. They believe that the problems of the current system can be rectified through democratic processes and the ability of democratically elected governments to act on behalf of the public interest (p. 154).

Transdisciplinary team science:

Breaking new ground or reinventing the wheel?

Review of: "The Science of Team Science: Assessing the Value of Transdisciplinary Research." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 35,* 2S: S77-249, 2008.

Reviewed by Angus McMurtry, LLB, PhD, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Introduction

Interdisciplinary collaboration, or "team science," is now a hot topic in health science circles. Many crucial discoveries, such as the identification of the coronavirus that triggered the SARS epidemic a few years ago, were made possible not by "lone geniuses" but by collaboration among groups of people with diverse sorts of disciplinary expertise (Surowiecki, 2004, p. 160). Not surprisingly, therefore, organizations like the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Cancer Institute (NCI) have decided to dedicate significant resources to such team science initiatives.

Important questions have arisen, however, in relation to this new interdisciplinary field of "team science"—questions that will likely be familiar to many AIS members. These include how to define the boundaries of the field, what theoretical frameworks to use, how best to support interdisciplinary collaboration, and how to measure success (both in research terms and in practical policy outcomes).

The goal of this "Science of Team Science" supplement is to begin answering these questions and provide the field with "the conceptual coherence of a more established and widely recognized scientific paradigm" (p. 80). On the whole, it offers a very thoughtful and enlightened attempt to come to terms with the complexities of both human health and interdisciplinary collaboration.

However, the supplement is not without its problems. One is the assumption (manifested in the preceding quote) that interdisciplinary teamwork can be explained and evaluated in purely scientific terms. Another major problem is its failure to take advantage of pertinent literature from communities such as the AIS and interprofessional health care practitioners. Finally, many of the articles manifest a political naivety that stands in sharp contrast to their scientific sophistication.

In what follows, I will describe and critique the supplement's various authors' ideas in relation to three topics close to the hearts of most interdisciplinary researchers and educators: 1) systems perspectives, 2) the conditions for effective collaboration, and 3) issues of methodology, measurement, and evaluation.

A Brief Word on Definitions

Before doing that, however, I would like to quickly clarify some definitions. The primary focus of the supplement is what the authors call "transdisciplinary research," which they describe as the development of "shared conceptual and methodological frameworks that not only integrate but transcend their respective disciplinary perspectives" (p. 79).

This definition is in fact quite compatible with "interdisciplinary" research, at least as it is defined in AIS publications and many other sources.[1] For the remainder of the article, therefore, I will use the terms interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary interchangeably.

The term "team science" also merits some clarification. In this supplement, it refers to large (50-200 person), multi-year, collaborative science initiatives that in most cases are geographically and institutionally dispersed (p. 78). Furthermore, only *health* science initiatives are discussed in these articles. Since human health is an enormously complex, multi-dimensional phenomenon—which draws upon disciplines as diverse as pharmacology, microbiology, medicine, nutrition, psychology, social work, epidemiology, ecology, and physical, occupational and recreation therapy—this narrowing

(continued on page 4)

[1] Virtually all of the authors adhere to Rosenfield's (1992) definitions of *multidisciplinary* (disciplines coming together for a broader perspective), *interdisciplinary* (the above plus some integration of the disciplinary perspectives), and *transdisciplinary* (the development of "shared conceptual and methodological frameworks that not only integrate but transcend their respective disciplinary perspectives" (p. 79).

This delineation of terms differs somewhat from those found in AIS publications and many other sources. More commonly, the term *interdisciplinary* encompasses both integration and the emergence of transcendent perspectives. The term *transdisciplinary*, on the other hand, is typically used (by Europeans) to refer either to "a principle for a unity of knowledge beyond disciplines" or interdisciplinary approaches to "real world" problems involving multiple stakeholders, which require not only intellectual integration but also the political negotiation of conflicting interests (Newell, AIS Listserve communication, April 13, 2008; Wikipedia, 2008, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transdisciplinarity).

Transdisciplinary team science...

(continued from page 3)

of focus does not in any way limit the importance and relevance of the supplement.

Systems Perspectives

Systems perspectives, and more recently *complex* systems perspectives, are becoming influential in many interdisciplinary fields. Health science research is no exception. A number of authors in the current supplement write about the importance of viewing individuals' health issues from wider, more complex and ecological perspectives.

In "The Social Determinants of Cancer," for instance, Hiatt and Breen highlight the need for a transdisciplinary, multi-level approach to cancer research and care—one that addresses not only the biological nature of cancer and clinical interventions, but also crucial behavioral, social and environmental factors.

This "socioecologic" or "cells-to-society" approach (p. 141) is shared by Marbry et al. who describe current research directions at the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research (OBSSR). Some of their quite interesting illustrations include graphical models of the causes, diagnoses and treatments of diabetes and the manner in which social and psychological stresses influence the microenvironment of tumors.

More explicitly oriented by complexity science, Leischow et al. depict both diseases and health care systems' responses to them (including team science initiatives) as complex, dynamic, multifactoral, non-linear systems. Traditional scientific disciplines' knowledge "silos" are useful, they write; but to truly address these complex issues, one must take a transdisciplinary approach that sees the silos as part of a larger system (p. 197).

Unfortunately, these authors make very little use of existing literature linking interdisciplinarity with systems thinking and complexity science. Both the AIS's *Issues in Integrative Studies*—most notably the 2001 issue devoted to complexity—and health care-related publications connected to the Plexus Institute (www.plexusinstitute.org) have been theorizing this link for many years. As a result of this omission, the authors are forced to "re-invent the wheel," theoretically speaking, and their speculations in this area are relatively tentative and limited.

Conditions for Effective Collaboration

Getting people to work together synergistically is always difficult. Interdisciplinary collaboration presents additional hurdles, in the form of the epistemological and political tensions that often exist between disciplines and disciplinarians. A number of authors in the supplement take on the topic of how to support inter- and transdisciplinary collaboration, as well as related questions such as the special challenges of leadership in these contexts.

Kessel and Rosenfield's article, "Toward Transdisciplinary Research: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives," begins with a brief and interesting history of transdisciplinary team health science. The authors then identify factors that either facilitate or constrain collaboration, based on lessons learned from successful programs in the developed and developing world. Factors that facilitate collaboration include having complex problems to work on, a common language, trust and respect, institutional support, and adequate communication technologies. Constraining factors include power differences, limited resources, and the lack of integrative research frameworks and practical "how-to" models (p. 230).

Few previous studies have been done on collaboration within the specific area of transdisciplinary team science. Stokols et al. therefore draw upon research from management, social psychology, and several other related areas in order to propose an ecological "typology" of influences on transdisciplinary collaboration. This typology embraces a variety of levels: *intrapersonal*, *interpersonal*, *organizational*, *technological*, *sociopolitical,* and *physical environment*. Interpersonal factors, to provide one concrete illustration, include team members' diversity of views and flexibility as well as the need for regular communication and the development of shared goals (p. 109).

Gray's article, "Enhancing Transdisciplinary Research Through Collaborative Leadership," focuses on how leadership can enable team science and the special challenges leaders face in transdisciplinary research. Based mostly on a review of leadership literature, the author identifies three crucial types of leadership tasks: *cognitive tasks* (related to vision, building conceptual bridges, and so on), *structural tasks* (including the need for information exchange, conflict management, and making sure that everyone is heard), and *processual tasks* (for example, building trust and establishing ground rules) (pp. 125-127).

While these and several other articles contribute to discussion surrounding the issue of nurturing trans- and interdisciplinary collaboration, they too, I submit, fail to recognize significant bodies of literature that have addressed these issues before. The personal and interpersonal characteristics associated with successful collaboration have been a frequently discussed topic in theoretical literature on interdisciplinarity ever since Petrie's (1976) classic article "Do You See What I See? The Epistemology of Interdisciplinary Enquiry." Guidelines offered in AIS-linked publications for drawing upon and integrating disciplinary perspectives—often referred to as "steps in the interdisciplinary process"—also address this issue, for example, through processes such as role negotiation and finding common ground.

In the health care field specifically, *The Journal of Interprofessional Care* publishes many insightful articles every year concerning the conditions for successful collaboration. Not surprisingly, these articles stress many of the same things, including trust, respect, regular communication, the negotiation of conflicts, institutional support, and the importance of integrative frameworks.

No doubt large scale transdisciplinary team science initiatives have some unique characteristics. But that did not stop some of the authors from borrowing heavily, for example, from management literature. Once again, therefore, the supplement claims to be exploring "new territory" that is neither as new nor as unoccupied as the authors assume.

Issues of Methodology, Evaluation and Measurement

Team health science research is doubly complex. In the first place, it studies dynamic, multidimensional health-related systems (from "cells to societies") with innumerable variables. In the second, its large-scale, transdisciplinary teams are faced with the necessity of negotiating among multiple paradigmatic perspectives and varied measures of success. Issues of methodology, evaluation and measurement therefore merit careful consideration.

The authors in this supplement do indeed give this topic careful and detailed consideration. However, they do so primarily from a quantitative and modernist perspective. There seems to be a pervasive assumption that the study of interdisciplinary teamwork is a science—in the traditional sense—and that teams of researchers and their products can be understood and supportively engineered with the same sort of predictability, precision, and generalizability of other phenomena studied by natural and health scientists (chemical reactions, molecular structures, and so on). Perhaps this approach reflects the disciplinary background of the authors.

The concluding article, for instance, stresses the importance of building "a strong science base that can be synthesized and generalized" (p. 249). Similarly, In "Measuring Collaboration and Transdisciplinary Integration in Team Science," Masse et al. discuss their development of "psychometrically valid" evaluations for teamwork. This includes three scales to assess *collaborative processes* (satisfaction with the collaboration, impact of collaboration, trust and respect) and one scale to assess *transdisciplinary integration*.

Hall et al.'s article also addresses the complexities of collaboration and integration. They introduce and test new scale-based measures for assessing both *collaborative readiness* and near term markers of *collaborative process*. The former focuses, for example, on team members' prior collaborative experience and their perceptions of available resources. The latter is more concerned with factors such as equality, trust, and regular communication.

Holmes et al. shift the focus from the complexity of team collaboration to the complexity of the health systems these teams study. Based on research conducted by the Centers for Population Health and Health Disparities (CPHHD) program, the authors highlight the challenges involved in researching and measuring multifaceted topics like health disparities (that is, gaps in the quality of health and health care across economic, social, racial, and cultural groups).

These challenges include collecting and comparing data from many different sites, methods for dealing with interactions between multiple levels, and the need for explanatory theoretical frameworks (pp. 186-190). Optimistically, they note that "[e]ach of these challenges represents an opportunity for transdisciplinary science to evolve" (p. 191).

The AIS's own Julie Klein, not surprisingly, takes a less modernist, less narrowly scientific approach than many of the above authors. In "Evaluation of Interdisciplinary and Transdisciplinary Research: A Literature Review," she suggests "seven generic principles of evaluation" for team science. These principles emphasize variability of goals, methodological pluralism, the negotiation of epistemic differences, the difficulty of separating cognitive, social, and contextual aspects of collaboration, and the need to adjust evaluative criteria as research evolves and unpredictable outcomes emerge.

In effect, Klein uses transdisciplinary science researchers' own literature to complicate and challenge the idea of any sort of linear, simple or settled evaluation procedure:

> …interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research process and evaluation are grounded in the philosophy of constructivism. Appropriate evaluation is made, not given. It evolves through a dialogue of conventional and expanded indicators of quality…a single-best or universal method… would be antithetical to the multidimensionality and context-specific nature of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary work. (pp. 122-123)

The other authors' aspirations for strong scientific foundations, general agreement, and universally applicable methods for the field of transdisciplinary team science may therefore be difficult or impossible to achieve.

Final Thoughts

This supplement clearly offers a

(continued on page 6)

Transdisciplinary team science...

(continued from page 5)

compendious and intelligent attempt to address the wide range of complex issues associated with transdisciplinary team science research. Indeed, a few very interesting articles have not yet been discussed in this review.

These include Nash's article on transdisciplinary training for individual scientists and Hesse's technology-oriented article on the mutually supportive relationship between "cyber-infrastructures," systems perspectives and team science. Another fascinating article is Emmons et al.'s discussion of the role of transdisciplinary teams in creating highly effective health communication programs—thus facilitating the dissemination and translation of health care research. The most compelling of these programs were two award-winning websites, "Your Disease Risk" (http://www.yourdiseaserisk.wustl.edu) and "Cancer Control PLANET" (http://cancercontrolplanet.cancer.gov).

As we have seen, though, the supplement is not without its problems. These include the assumption that interdisciplinary teamwork can be exhaustively understood in traditional scientific terms and a failure to take into account relevant literature from communities such as the AIS and interprofessional health care practitioners.

To these I will add one final criticism. The authors' impressive scientific sophistication seems in many cases to be counterbalanced by a political naivety—or at least a failure to take into account the wider political ramifications of their research. Tensions between departments and disciplines are acknowledged in the supplement, but the potential of inter- and transdisciplinary research to threaten the political status quo is not.

For instance, several of the authors assert that socioeconomic factors like income disparities have deep health consequences and that national policymakers ought to take this into account. This assertion is not politically innocuous or "neutral"; it leads one inescapably towards discussions of wealth redistribution. And any suggestions along those lines would face more than just academic opposition. Indeed, they would almost certainly draw the ire of entrenched economic interests—not to mention accusations of socialism. The authors' omission of such political issues may point to a need to make the study of team science even more transdisciplinary and include *social* scientists in future conversations.

References

Petrie, H. (1976). Do you see what I see? The epistemology of interdisciplinary inquiry, *Educational Researcher, 5*(2), 9-15.

Rosenfield, P. (1992). The potential of transdisciplinary research for sustaining and extending linkages between the health and social sciences. *Social Science Medicine, 35*, 1343–1357.

Surowiecki, J. (2004). *The wisdom of crowds*. New York: Doubleday. ■■■

Humanities & Family Conference in Chicago

The Humanities and the Family Conference will be presented by the Institute for the Humanities at the University of Illinois at Chicago March 13-14, 2009.

The conference will explore the contributions of the disciplines of the Humanities to debating and constructing ideas and representations of the family. Based on the premise that conceptions of the family are wide-ranging and continually transforming, the conference will ask what constitutes a family, examining this question from the perspective of history, literature, law, and ethics. Topics considered will include inheritance, marriage, work, religious and utopian communities, violence, children, the relation of the family to the community, the nation, and the state, and changing conceptions of genders and sexualities.

The conference is free and open to the public, but registration is required. For more information, go to http://www.uic.edu/depts/huminst/conferences.shtml or contact Linda Vavra Associate Director, Institute for the Humanities, 701 South Morgan, MC 206, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL 60607-7040; 312-996-6354 or lvavra@uic.edu.

Miller's IPE text ...

(continued from page 2)

Repko (2008) points out that both multidisciplinarity and interdisciplinarity seek to overcome disciplinary monism, but in different ways. Multidisciplinarity limits its activity to appreciating different disciplinary perspectives, applying perspectives from different disciplines to complex problems. They do not take a further step of "integrating and synthesizing" the insights of each discipline to create a new way of thinking about the complex problem that *also* takes into account the other perspective(s). Simply put, a multidisciplinary approach does not undertake the task of integration. An interdisciplinary study also examines the contested terrain—problems or questions that are the focus of several disciplines. More importantly, in addition to focusing on the contested space between two or more disciplines or bodies of specialized knowledge, an interdisciplinarian reconciles disciplinary perspectives through the process of integration to produce specific insights about a multi-faceted or complex problem. I quote here the definition of interdisciplinary research by the National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, and the Institute of Medicine (2005), which is cited by Repko:

Miller's IPE text ...

(continued from page 6)

> Interdisciplinary research (IDR) is a mode of research by teams or individuals that *integrates* information, data, techniques, tools, perspectives, concepts, and/or theories *from two or more disciplines or bodies of specialized knowledge* to advance fundamental understanding or to solve problems whose solutions are beyond the scope of a single discipline or area of research practice. (p. 39)

Thus, both multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary studies focus on the contested space between different disciplines or fields of study. However, interdisciplinarity breaks from disciplinary theories, concepts, and methods by selecting those that are appropriate to a problem and *integrates* perspectives from different disciplines and fields of study to produce new *insights*. Finally, transdisciplinarity has been defined in Repko (2008, p. 15) as, "the application of theories, concepts, or methods across disciplines and sectors of society by including stakeholders in the public and private domains *with the intent of developing an overarching synthesis* [my emphasis]."

Interdisciplinary, Multidisciplinary, or Transdisciplinary? Contrasting Free Market, Multi-centric Organizational (MCO), and Marxism

Miller begins by fleshing out the "market model" as a simplified construction derived from neoclassical economics. Within IPE, this perspective is associated with the American School and as earlier indicated has generated much debate about its disproportionate influence on the field. From the perspective of critics, the "politics" in IPE has been co-opted by a narrow utilitarian perspective of neoclassical economics. Thus one could argue that the market model indicates hegemonic cross-disciplinarity—the co-optation of one disciplinary perspective (neoclassical economics) over another.

The MCO perspective integrates two schools of thought—institutionalism and neo-Ricardianism and serves as a counterpoint to the Market Model. This model is Miller's innovation, a way to synthesize the insights of various scholars (for example, Ricardo, Sraffa, Polanyi, Veblen, and in particular inspired by John Kenneth Galbraith) into a holistic framework (or world view) that generates new insights on how things work in the political economy (which in this case is a capitalist political economy). The MCO model meets all the integrationist criteria of interdisciplinarity, converting the "fruit salad into a smoothie" (quoted in Repko, 2008).

In the classical Marxist model Miller discusses Marx's scholarship, which is pre-disciplinary and foundational for social science disciplines. But as Miller notes, "the scope of his [Marx's] work went far beyond the boundaries of today's specialized academic disciplines. Marx's transcendent analyses and theoretical frameworks are applicable to many fields, certainly to all of the social sciences, but even to the arts and sciences" (p. 174). Here, we see that Miller considers Marx and the Marxist model to be "transdisciplinary." Lattuca, cited by Repko, states that transdisciplinarity is "the application of theories and concepts or methods across disciplines with the intent of developing an overarching synthesis" (Lattuca, 2001, p. 83, quoted in Repko, p. 15). In other words, Miller's Marxist model is transdisciplinary because its theories, concepts, and methods are not borrowed from one or more disciplines (since classical Marxism is pre-disciplinary) and applied to a specific problem, but rather applies principles of historical or dialectical materialism and a labor theory of value to critique industrial capitalism.[4]

Taken as a whole, *IPE: Contrasting World Views* utilizes different perspectives, concepts, and theories to understand a complex problem (the market economy) and an intellectual question (how to make sense of capitalist markets). Each model is first outlined conceptually and applied in specific domains to outline and solve problems. From our understanding of the distinctions between interdisciplinarity and multidisciplinarity, *IPE: Contrasting World Views* is more "multidisciplinary" than "interdisciplinary." In the concluding chapter, Miller restates and summarizes the assumptions of the models and leaves the task of integration unfinished. The three perspectives are applied to different problem areas, but not *integrated* to generate new insights that otherwise are not possible. *IPE: Contrasting World Views* thus proposes an integrative approach to IPE, but it does not fully succeed in making the text truly interdisciplinary.

Miller has left these tasks of integration for faculty and students, allowing *IPE: Contrasting World Views* to be an optic through which to explore and test their own world views on political economy. They can select the market model and be disciplinary, juxtapose the three models and be multidisciplinary, or attempt to be interdisciplinary by synthesizing the insights from all three models to propose a new way of understanding how the political economy works.

[4] One of shortcomings of the textbook is its emphasis on dated theories of classical Liberalism and classical Marxism. The framework would be topical and of greater interest to future generations of students who would be interested in critical and problem-solving theories if it had included more recent innovations in Neoliberal Institutional theories and Neo-Marxist critical theories.

References

Cohen, B.J. (2008). *International political economy: An intellectual history*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lake, D. (2006). International political economy: A maturing discipline, In Weingast & Wittman, (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political economy.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Repko, A.F. (2008). *Interdisciplinary research: process and theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. ■■■

CALL FOR PROPOSALS

31st Annual Association for Integrative Studies Conference

October 8-11, 2009

Hosted by the University of Alabama

Creativity and Play Across the Disciplines

"Creativity and Play Across the Disciplines" is the theme of the 31st annual conference of the Association for Integrative Studies, which will be hosted by the University of Alabama October 8-11, 2009, in Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

Proposals are welcome for presentations in multiple formats, including, but not limited to, roundtable discussions, integrated panels, single papers, and performances that address issues such as:

- Creativity as Core Educational Value – creativity as assessment outcome; arts participation and general education; creative capacity as distinct intelligence; creativity and empathy; creativity as introduction to diversity; creativity and the integrative learning process; creativity and interdisciplinarity; leadership and the arts; the arts in the non-arts classroom; creativity and professionalism.
- Creativity and Collaboration – building innovative campus collaborations amongst artists and engineers, scientists, designers, and others; creativity as a paradigm to bridge the "divisions" of humanities, natural and social sciences; interdisciplinary research on creativity; creativity, entrepreneurship and career development; invention, innovation, and economic growth.
- Creativity as a Means of Integrating Campus and Community Economies – community/campus arts partnerships; confronting deficiencies in K-12 arts education; supporting students as arts entrepreneurs; creativity and community renewal; creativity and the knowledge economy; culture as an economic base.

Proposals (250 words) should be sent to AISconference@bama.ua.edu by March 15, 2009, and the conference committee expects to respond to proposal writers by May 15, 2009.

Association for Integrative Studies
Western College Program
Miami University
Oxford, OH 45056