With the blessing of GAD, FOSAP organized two sessions for the AAA '99 meetings. The first was The Compleat Anthropologist: Strategies for Teaching the Four Fields organized by Ann Maxwell Hill of Dickinson College. The session was extremely well attended and generated much discussion. The second was an electronic poster session: Course Web Sites, Web Connectivity and Internet Assisted Teaching organized by Manuel Carlos of CA State, Monterey Bay. Despite technical glitches, it too added much to the meetings landscape.

Things are in the planning stage for next year's meetings in San Francisco. Look for this session on Distance Learning at the AAA Meetings in San Francisco:

Internet Dreaming: Information Technology and the Restructuring of Post-Secondary Education. Organized by Wesley Shumar (Drexel) and Catherine Cameron (Cedar Crest)

What is Distance Education? Potentially, it can come in many guises from Web-assisted courses to an asynchronous fully automated format. This symposium describes some of the kinds of courses that have been developed for distance learners and the issues that have emerged from this relatively new mode of delivery. On the heels of the rapid diffusion of Internet and Web technology, not to mention the broader range of information technologies, there has been a scramble to develop distance courses in the service of bottom-line visions. These are the dreams of the new university administrator, the business-oriented technocrats reshaping faculty into a flexible workforce deployed in the service of cost effectiveness and the profit of the university. The flexible workforce it is imagined will produce the new digital knowledge, a form of knowledge that can be packaged in bits and delivered globally to a potentially ever-expanding market of consumers. Beyond the administrator as commodity fetishist, other scholars are genuinely excited about the pedagogical possibilities opened up by information technology including the ways the Internet opens up new avenues for student inquiry. The papers in this panel will explore a variety of themes: the client group that is best served and least served by distance delivery, the kind of dynamic that develops between the technology and the providers and consumers who interact through it, the impact on student education and student life, the increasingly instrumental nature of education, and how the newest technology is trying to address the limitations of mediated learning. Two issues appear in many of the papers. The first is how has information technology redefined the boundaries of university community. The second is the issue of control as faculty, administrations, as other invested parties struggle to define what learning and knowledge are and who is authorized to legitimate knowledge and the learning process. Several papers will also demonstrate distance courses that are currently being run.
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Presented the membership list which she is putting into a database (Excel).
The snail mail list contains 349 names and addresses and the E-mail list contains 95 names and addresses. Question was raised whether the entries on the list are all active members of AAA. Betsy indicated that about one-third did not check against the AAA list. Betsy will pursue her efforts to update the list. Also, she would like information on professional interests of the membership.

5. Ann Hill called for volunteers to edit the FOSAP Newsletter for the coming year. She has assumed that responsibility for the past two years and is unable to continue. FOSAP publishes two issues, one in the spring, which includes the papers delivered in sessions at the national meetings, the other in the fall which contains announcements of the upcoming AAA meeting, book reviews and other items of interest to the membership. Following discussion Sally McBeth and Jim Wanner, of the University of Northern Colorado, agreed to take responsibility for the spring 2000 Newsletter. Paul Grebinger agreed to work on the fall 2000 issue.

New Business

6. Session proposals for the 2000 annual meeting in San Francisco were discussed:
   a) Cate Cameron proposed a panel on the pros and cons of on-line learning and web-assisted teaching. This proposal was discussed at length and with considerable approval.
   b) Ann Hill suggested a follow-up on the Mad About Methods panel in which faculty and students would present outcomes of their field projects.
   c) Cate Cameron also suggested that we should consider a panel on Anthropology in the K-12 curriculum, or teaching teachers how to teach anthropology. This would provide an opportunity for interdisciplinary connections with other programs at our colleges, such as Education, and would be a good topic for cooperation with the Committee on Teaching Anthropology (COTA).
   d) It was reported that Manuel Carlos has
also suggested a possible panel on discussion groups/chat rooms and their value in classroom teaching/pedagogy.

7. Officers of FOSAP for 1999-200 were elected as follows:
   Cate Cameron and Paul Brebinger  Co-chairs
   Ann Hill  Secretary/Treasurer
   Dan Moerman  is serving as Web Master
   Betsy Baird will continue as Membership Chair.

Respectfully submitted
Paul Grebinger
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EXPERIENCING ARCHAEOLOGY 101: RUDIMENTS FOR A LIBERAL STUDIES EDUCATION

Michael McDonald  
Florida Gulf Coast University

When I tell people that I teach anthropology and archaeology I usually get responses like, “Oh, how cool, that would be a fun job” or “I took anthropology or archaeology in college, and it was my favorite class.” Often the reminiscence includes a recitation of details from a course assigned ethnography, interpretations of “bizarre” lifeways as seen on a recent TV special or questions about where I dig or what I have discovered. I have mixed feelings about these conversations. As an anthropologist, I’m glad that many people took and continue to take elective courses in anthropology and archaeology. I am also pleased that the experiences and the profession have made lasting impressions on them. On the other hand, as an educator, I am disappointed that the sustaining impact of our discipline appears to be a mosaic of exotica, almost a cartoon image of anthropology rather than the habits of mind that distinguish a liberally educated person.

Is it fair to expect or even want so much? When I reflect on my own experiences in that first archaeology course, I remember it as a vocabulary and facts event. It was clearly meant to provide future anthropologists with the “keys to the kingdom” necessary for continued study and success in the discipline and profession. I remember a little from it now and then, and I certainly saw no connection between archaeology and my subsequent academic endeavors. Fast forward in time to the professional circumstances in which I now find myself, and the very same gap between the Archeology 101 and the goals of a liberal studies degree defines one of my own challenges to becoming a COMPLEAT ANTHROPOLOGIST:

The Challenges

Many of the papers on this panel present the difficulties of attaining and sustaining a complete professional practice in small and understaffed departments. Without wishing to engage in a competition of hardships, my current circumstances present an acute case of a common challenge -- maximizing the impact of the discipline on an ephemeral student population. Florida Gulf Coast University (FGCU) is a new public institution that began operations in the fall of 1997. The College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), is responsible for the general education curriculum and thus serves our own students and acts as a conduit to the other colleges: health professions, business and education. Our CAS is noteworthy in that we offer a single undergraduate degree in liberal studies rather than multiple majors, and we operate without departmental structures or department chairs.

Anthropology represents a quarter share of an interdisciplinary social science program. We offer three introductory level anthropology courses, including Introduction to Archaeology. Students interested in pursuing further anthropological study take four upper division courses in a disciplinary track. The balance of their credits is distributed across required interdisciplinary social science courses, electives and the college-wide required liberal studies core.

In the university’s brief two and a half-year history, a pattern within the college has begun to emerge. Students are drawn to anthropology and the other introductory level electives
in their first or second year, but only occasionally continue in the social sciences program, opting for other programs in the college or elsewhere in the university. I would hazard a guess that many of us face this situation - - where most students who take an anthropology course, take only one, just as I did as an undergraduate. In my own case, this trend is curiously coupled with very high student evaluations of my instruction and course content.

This is a common challenge throughout the college. Many academic disciplines have a single faculty member and have few students in their programs. An aggressive effort to recruit anthropology students would pit me against these colleagues, whose collaboration I relish and on whose cooperation I depend. My response has been an ongoing effort to make Introduction to Archaeology and other anthropology courses relevant to the many programs found throughout the college, the university and their professional expressions beyond.

My reflection on the attributes that denote competence and distinction in the profession has had a powerful revitalizing effect on my own sense of anthropology and I have consequently reoriented my teaching toward these laurels. A bonus, in this approach is that irrespective of discipline, educators value certain qualities. We value clear and effective communication. We also esteem the capacity for reasoned thought or analysis. With these common qualities in mind, I designed the introductory archeology course as a place where students learn archaeology neither as an end to itself nor as a beginning unique to an anthropological career, but as a vehicle for acquiring communication skills, an ecological perspective and a generic analytical ability. This rudimentary intellectual tool kit will serve them in a myriad of academic and life pursuits. My paper today highlights my efforts to define and transmit a widely applicable heuristic for analysis through deliberately crafted experiences in an introductory archeology course.

In his Experience and Education (1938), John Dewey distinguished between what he called traditional education- -the transmission of static, finished knowledge and new education--the process of learning from experience. Given the physicality of fieldwork and the romantic, if not imaginary, possibilities associated with discovery, archaeology is especially well- positioned among anthropological sub-fields to facilitate learning through experience. Echoing Dewey, Lauren Resnick identified significant contrasts in dichotomous learning venues. Schools she writes, are recent institutions where students learn about the application of theories and principles without the actual manipulation or application they might learn in day to day life (Resnick,1989: 9). I have come to regard archaeology as well suited to join the book learnin’ we do in school and the real world learning by fostering the development of an analytical capacity. The student who learns to recognize and gather evidence, examine its characteristics, and derive meaning from them has, at the very least, a means to assimilate new knowledge in a systematic way. Moreover, s/he has an experience-based insight on the theories and principles that are built logically from a delimited evidence set.

Consider the concept of chronology. This organizing principle is central to the discipline and must be understood very early on if more abstract ideas are to be grasped. I have a vivid recollection of giving a lecture on chronology when I was a visiting professor in Ireland. When I spoke, students lapsed into the court stenographer mode, frantically recording my words, and rarely asking questions. Consequently, little of their mental effort went toward processing the ideas about chronology, and they did not examine what they understood about it until they sat down to prepare for the midterm.

By contrast, one of the first activities I now employ in the archaeology course at FGCU has the students learn about chronology through a seriation experience. Following readings about dating techniques in general, and seriation in particular, students are assigned to work in teams of three to four to examine a collection of objects: for example, points, shell tools or gravestones. They are instructed to sort them into categories based on attributes of their choosing and then to create a developmental seriation scheme based on change in those attributes. This is by no measure a cutting edge technique in archaeology (Rouse 1967,Barber 1994) and its limited value in determining real dates is widely acknowledged by archaeologists. However, seri-
ation exercises can play a role in cultivating analytical capacity, a facet that might be under-appreciated or overlooked if our aim is to promote the discipline alone.

For many students, handling artifacts or replicas is often a novel experience, and they become overly concerned about breaking or damaging the artifacts, thus limiting what they are open to perceive. Once they overcome their reticence, the students are encouraged to employ senses other than vision to discover and perceive patterns. By broadening their intuitive sense of what constitutes an observation, they often record attributes that may have gone undetected by them or others in written descriptions or data tables. Positive feedback from the instructor about these efforts reinforces this exploratory daring. Furthermore, as they are working in separate groups, they are likely to vary in their solutions to the problem, which causes some anxiety about what the right answer is.

The follow-up discussion of the experience provides focus on a concrete, common experience that affirms multiple interpretations to a problem and introduces the scientific method for evaluating competing claims. The experience, vivid and communal, can also be referenced throughout the course as interpretations of new cases or higher levels of analysis are pursued.

Not a trivial concern in acquiring analytical capacity is the learning climate. The seriation activity also allows students to experience learning as social activity, where consultation with peers is not cheating but actually encouraged. Subsequent experiences in the course rely on effective group interaction and creating the norm for this unfamiliar way to learn is an essential early step.

For another more opportunistic reason, experiential learning is the approach of choice at FGCU. While it is true that we don’t have a department or a major in anthropology, we do have something remarkable, two prehistoric sites on the campus grounds. Situated near the coast at the head of Estero Bay watershed, the university sits in the center of what was once the domain of the Calusa, an indigenous, complex, maritime chiefdom well known from contact period records and by their elaborate coastal shell mound villages (Marquardt, 1987). By contrast, the campus sites are dirt mound structures, possibly seasonal exploitation sites, situated in elevated hardwood hammocks. Because so little is known about the sites, we are able to present the students with an authentic problem solving scenario in which they learn the content of southwest Florida archaeology while engaged in field experiences meant to develop their analytical capacity.

Thus far, students have worked in various activities including topographic mapping, vegetative surveying and soil sampling. These data are compiled and used in a number of course activities. For instance, an environmental reconstruction activity asks students to consider, study and synthesize various data such as elevation and landform, soil chemistry, and extant vegetation. They use this information to make comparisons to other interior sites known in the region and to form hypotheses about what human activity might have taken place in the campus hammock 2-3000 years ago. In the same assignment, they are asked to refer to the documented evidence from better known coastal sites to speculate on what resources might have drawn people from the coast into the interior. From these and other course activities, students gain practice in a four-tiered, and portable, heuristic for analysis that includes: observation, discernment of pattern, inference making, and synthesis. Feedback from the instructor is aimed at improving or affirming their analyses rather than promoting their archaeological expertise.

The Effects

Our brief history as an institution and the limited number of students I have worked with prevents me from giving you conclusive evidence of the effectiveness of this approach for developing analytical ability. I can report that my colleagues at FGCU who find in it a means and reason for collaboration within the social science program and beyond have warmly embraced the approach. The learning experiences in Introduction to Archeology are meant to develop recognition of logical, discernable structure in the world around us from careful study of the same world others occupied in the past. Employing the heuristic for analysis, students are led to confront the
archaeological record in the form of patterns and inconsistencies across different types of evidence within a site and across numerous sites within a region. Through assessment activities, students are pushed further to deduce common principles that unify the practice of the discipline and the cultural practices of the past. The heuristic for analysis constitutes a framework of active procedures that can be applied to an ever-changing database academic discipline or subject matter. I myself can recognize my own use of routinized procedures as I learn new computer programs, or figure out directions in a new city—all information far removed from the study of the past but clearly a derivative of years of anthropological praxis. We live in an era of rapid social, technological and informational change and work, paradoxically, in the institution of higher education, one of the greatest conservators of tradition, especially as it relates to curriculum. As anthropologists working in professional settings other than large graduate research programs, we have a better opportunity to respond nimbly to these challenges, to make anthropology meaningful to all intellectual growth and to provide a legacy to our students that is more meaningful than the minutia recited at cocktail parties.
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**NACIREMA FIELDWORK:**

**Experiential Learning in a Four-Field Introductory Course**

**John M. Coggshall**
Clemson University

All of us, whether we are teachers or students, know how difficult it is to write, and yet we all know how vital effective writing is for future careers. Many of us as teachers further recognize how crucial fieldwork opportunities are for learning, and yet hesitate to assign them to students for a multitude of reasons. This paper describes effective ways to combine experiential learning and effective writing in undergraduate assignments, at the same time integrating these projects with lecture and discussion information. Two examples of class projects are presented, along with student findings and my assessment criteria. The paper concludes with suggestions for additional experiential learning projects.

The first of these two projects involves a direct analysis of an “archaeological site.” For the past four semesters, I have assigned this project to approximately 45 undergraduates per semester in their first Anthropology class. About two-fifths of the way into the semester, students are given lectures on archaeological field methods. I carefully explain the general idea behind archaeology: that, rather than being “treasure hunters,” archaeologists observe the consequences of human activity (features and artifacts), infer cultural behaviors from those consequences, and in turn infer the cultural rules generating those behaviors. Students also write an in-class essay about William Rathje’s “garbage project,” and we discuss what the analysis of trash can tell about contemporary human behavior. Suitably prepared, the students then receive their First Project.

Students must locate a contemporary

human occupation area (identified by the trash at the site), map and describe the site, describe the features and artifacts in detail, and then interpret the human behaviors suggested by the artifact and feature distribution. I also ask the students to speculate about what the site might look like three months into the future and what it may have looked like fifty years ago. Each student surveys her own site. I typically allow two weeks for the project's completion, with late projects losing a minimum of 50%. Virtually all projects arrive on time.

While the directions may seem fairly obvious, I have discovered that I need to be rather specific at times in order to avoid common student errors. I need to mention that the site must be outside and that artifacts and features differ from natural objects. It also helps to specify that the reason for describing the general artifact distribution is to see whether that suggests anything about human behavior. Question 4 has a "health warning," and I have added the temporal phrases for the two parts of Question 6, because a few students have described their site three months and then fifty years into the future.

The most common student question is "can you give us some examples?" My reply is always negative, in part to avoid reading twenty projects from exactly the same type of site, but more importantly to stimulate student creativity. After thinking about the project for several days, almost all students develop a viable project idea; they also have the option of talking with me in order to make certain they have an appropriate site. Since the Fall Semester project typically occurs during football season, weekend party refuse is a very popular and obvious topic. Campus rest areas provide evidence for student breaks, while community places like parks or construction sites offer students additional ideas. Without a suggestion from me about a "good" possibility, students have displayed amazing creativity in site selection.

Student site analysis can also be refreshingly creative. One woman analyzed tailgate party refuse, arguing for a small group of people, "because I only found two cups and one bag of napkins and wrappers" from a fast-food restaurant. Fifty years ago, she concluded, "artifacts... would have included wax paper (for wrapping sandwiches), glass soda bottles, and brown paper bags... fast food restaurants did not exist." Another woman analyzed car-repair materials from an old garage. Fifty years ago, she noted, fewer wire fragments would have been found because "modern cars have more electrical circuits." To another student, artifacts such as cigarettes, chewing tobacco, soft drink and beer cans indicated leisurely activities near a lake's boat ramp. Fifty years ago, she concluded, the cigarettes would have been unfiltered and the lake was not there, since "the road ends into the lake" and then continues on the other shore. Another woman analyzed candy wrappers and balloon fragments found at a public park, indicating a child's birthday party. The party must have lasted only a few hours, she felt, because otherwise "there would have been evidence of a meal having been eaten." Trash at a campus picnic area, another woman observed, tended to be located under a streetlight, indicating nocturnal activity. Beer cans also suggested this, since (she argued) "students don't normally walk around with alcoholic beverages in the daytime." Fifty years ago, she concluded, Clemson (then a military school) would not have allowed alcohol at all.

Evaluation of student writing is challenging, but I have discovered that the more specific I am about the criteria, the less "bargaining" for grades occurs. Thus, I indicate exactly how many points are awarded for each question, with a plurality of points for artifact description and site analysis; since typically few features are identified, fewer points are given there. Maximum points are awarded for the most detailed descriptions: worn areas in grass; brands of cigarettes (including lipstick, if present); "born-on" dates on beer labels; dates on coins; tooth marks on pens or straws; and insects on food items. Then, maximum points are given for outstanding analysis: cornerstone dates for buildings; artifacts clustered in shaded areas, under street lights, or on the south side of buildings; and differing beer or cigarette brands indicating group diversity. Finally, for future or past analysis, maximum points are awarded for "insight": seasonal influences (such as exams) on cigarette consumption; changes in brands or packaging materials; and variation in gender behavior (e.g., more
women smoking). Overall, most students are reasonably good at interpretation and a few are remarkably intuitive.

The second of the two projects involves the direct observation and interpretation of cultural behavior. For the past ten years, I have assigned this project to approximately 45 undergraduates per semester, also in their first Anthropology class. About three fifths of the way into the semester, students have read, written on, and discussed in class such essays as Horace Miner’s “Body Ritual Among the Nacirema” and Conrad Kottak’s “Swimming in Cross-Cultural Currents.” They have also heard several lectures on the discovery of “cultural rules” from observations. Then, students are given their Second Project.

Students are expected to select a group or place where typical people gather to do typical activities. Once again, each student interprets her own data. Students observe behaviors and record as many of the relevant observations as necessary: non-verbal communication, the cultural use of space, and gender or age differences, for example. Then, students analyze these behaviors and formulate the cultural rules which underlie the behaviors they have observed. Note the caveat about ethical behavior. I have never had any problems, but it is important to state these cautions nevertheless, primarily to illustrate what appropriate anthropological observations entail. I typically allow two weeks for this project’s completion as well, with late projects again losing a minimum of 50%. As with the first project, virtually all arrive on time.

Why not have students conduct interviews? First of all, I also teach Cultural Anthropology, where students are taught field methods and ethics and then practice interviewing selected international student volunteers from ESL classes. I also teach a Qualitative Methods class, where we examine and put into practice field methods for an entire semester. Because of the sensitivity of interview information, and because of the time commitments for both interviewer and respondent, I feel that sending 45 differentially motivated undergraduates out into the community unnecessarily strains the goodwill of informants and taxes the skill level of some students. Consequently, I prefer unobtrusive observations for my uninitiated Introductory students.

As in the First Project, I have developed rather detailed directions in order to eliminate as many inappropriate projects as possible. Some students immediately try to think of the strangest, most unusual group they might study, despite having heard in class that anthropologists study typical people, not always “exotic others.” I also remind students that active interaction is easier to describe and interpret than passive activity such as television viewing. I have also found that some students, focusing on a small group, sometimes analyze personalities or interpret motivations rather than describe shared cultural behaviors. Finally, while parties sometimes provide excellent observation possibilities, weaker students concentrate on the cultural importance of getting drunk. For obvious reasons, those papers tend to be poor, and thus I also caution against observations of illegal activities.

Once again, students frequently ask for suggestions, and once again I offer my services as critic but not as director. And, not surprisingly, most students become quite creative in their selections for places to conduct their observations. Fall semesters frequently bring tailgating parties or family Sunday dinners, while Spring semesters often yield elaborately detailed descriptions of sunbathers on our campus “front lawn.” Library and cafeteria groups are popular topics, as are studies of downtown coffee houses, bars with dance floors, and the regional shopping malls.

Student analysis often becomes quite insightful. For example, for a family Sunday dinner a woman observed that “women . . . take care of . . . food preparation and cleanup,” while “the eldest female . . . prepares most of the food,” simultaneously, the men watch television. She even included photographs to illustrate her points. In a study of the informal joking behavior of female secretaries in a male dean’s office, a student worker could tell “just by their nature and demeanor” whether the dean was in or not. In a Waffle King study, the observer concluded that several customers “appeared to be regulars because they conversed with the workers as well as with each other.” In an obser-
vation of her sorority mixer, a woman noted that "although females did not stroke or rub other females [as males often did], they had longer touching periods than males touching other males." A woman's study of spring flirting noted that female sunbathers "wisely distributed themselves in small groups [rather than large ones] because they were there to be observed;" by means of such surreptitious behaviors, she concluded that females "obtain their desired mates, seemingly by chance, while still remaining feminine and non-aggressive." In a study that thoroughly enlightened my female TA, a male spent thirty minutes standing in a men's restroom, where he concluded that males desire "privacy when in need of the facilities." To support this conclusion, he noted that urinal users never look at each other, conversation ceases upon entering the bathroom, and personal opinions are registered only in the privacy of stalls, not in public conversation.

Evaluation criteria for these projects have also been refined over a dozen semesters. Generally, D-range papers missed the mark somehow: they narrate a sequence of activities over a weekend, perhaps, or describe the rules of sports. Papers in the C range cover observations of activities, but conclusions tend to be too general: often these projects analyze motivations of individuals or their personalities. Higher-quality papers have solid observations and conclusions linked directly to those observations, but perhaps are a bit brief or lack "insight." Excellent papers contain brilliant observations.

I wish I could report that students register overwhelming support for these projects and immediately recognize their pedagogical strength, but I cannot report this. On the teaching evaluations after the semester has ended, some students actually mention that they enjoyed doing the projects and learned a lot from them. On the other hand, a few complain that they had invested a large amount of time and effort only to see that effort unfairly acknowledged by a low grade. Most students make no mention of the projects on their evaluations, but from conversations I have had with former students, they all remember doing them. This makes the projects, and thus the class, a memorable learning experience.

One of my disappointments is that students rarely combine their first and second projects into a truly superlative investigation. For example, students have sometimes described artifacts surrounding benches upon which people took class breaks; no one has then used their second project to verify their conclusions from their first one, as a sort of undergraduate ethnoarchaeology. Another disappointment is that, especially in larger lecture halls, most students hesitate to discuss their findings in class. With better course integration, the projects might become an even more valuable learning experience.

Of course, teachers might conceive of numerous other types of projects. When I taught Cultural Anthropology at other universities, I assigned a project which investigated the cultural rules and social obligations of an economic transaction; students provided detailed discussions of the complexities of female roommate clothing exchanges or neighborhood task sharing. A second project asked students to investigate kinship, and in the countrysides of southwestern Virginia or southern Illinois, students enjoyed obtaining the cultural rules and social obligations of kin. Likewise, linguists might ask students to listen to conversations of friends and analyze the cultural rules of pauses or gender-based differences in interruptions. Physical projects might explore the social construction of race by asking students to sort friends or classmates by eye or hair color and then discuss the nature of stereotypes, or collect somatic measurements for in-class statistical analysis.

There are unlimited opportunities for instructors to implement a diversity of anthropological field projects, tuned specifically to the appropriate class and level. Teachers will quickly discover that experiential projects engage students in active learning opportunities and create experiences which students long remember. As students write up their results, they develop analytic and communication skills. Ultimately, opportunities to actually "do" anthropology provide the greatest pedagogical reward for these projects. Given a chance, students can be creative and insightful; these projects offer them that chance.
COPS, COUNSELORS, AND ANTHROPOLOGISTS: INCORPORATING THE FOUR FIELD APPROACH IN A NON-ANTHROPOLOGY CURRICULUM

Chad E. Litton
Oklahoma State University

Introduction

Let me first make it clear that I consider myself an anthropologist. This is a critical statement. I am a firm believer in the four-field approach to the discipline. I have no desire to live exclusively in any one of the sub-fields. While a majority of the work I do is in the sub-field of cultural anthropology, I use information, methods, theories, and ideas from all areas of the discipline. It is this desire to learn, live, and teach in all four areas that draws me to small institutions. I received my undergraduate education in anthropology at the University of Minnesota-Morris. We had a combined Soc/Anth department with two and a half anthropologists. It was in this environment that I learned what it is to be an anthropologist. At graduate school I was taught the words and ideas, but I learned the emotion of the field as an undergraduate. I told myself that I would return to that setting as a teacher and give another generation of students the same feelings about humanity that I received. I pursued (am pursuing) a PhD from a department with a four-field approach, with the expressed purpose of getting a job at a small institution (Litton 1997).

I succeeded. Southeastern Oklahoma State University (whose most famous exports may be Dennis Rodman and Reba McIntire) is a small regional university. Our overall enrollment is just under 4000. I am the only anthropologist on campus, therefore, the only focus is four-field. I work in the Sociology Department. We offer three majors (one a major/minor): Sociology (SOC), Social Gerontology (SGER), and Criminal Justice (CJ). Interestingly, there is only one full time member of the Sociology faculty: Me. Everyone else splits between SGER and CJ. We serve the second largest number of majors on our campus with only seven full-time faculty. The curriculum of our department has two primary foci. The first is the development of individuals with goals of working in the criminal justice system. The second is the development of social service workers. Anthropology only appears in the elective curriculum. I offer two of the six or seven sections of Principles of Sociology (discussed below). I also rotate through the following elective courses: Cultural Anthropology; Physical Anthropology; Native American Cultures; Comparative Cultures; Comparative Religion; Stratification and Inequality; Race, Gender, and Ethnic Relations; Collective Behavior and Social Movements; and the occasional seminar (this Spring: Visual Anthropology).

While this seems like a good number of courses to expose students to the field of anthropology, with the specific exception of Physical Anthropology, they all focus on cultural ideas. So, I asked myself how do I get the four-fields into these courses? And more importantly, how do I get these cops and counsellors interested enough to take courses in anthropology?

Part of the answer is my teaching style. I have advocated elsewhere that part of what must be done in the contemporary classroom is interest and activate your students (Jipson and Litton 1996 & 1998). I also have developed a good reputation on campus for being helpful and understanding. It does not hurt that these courses have good, juicy subject matter so as to attract students from other parts of campus. But I truly believe that one of the greatest assets my courses have is the anthropological perspective that I bring to all of these topics.

At the 1996 Midwest Sociological Society conference in Chicago I presented a paper entitled “The Incorporation of Culture into Culture Studies: The Use of Anthropology and Sociology in (Post)Modern Academia.” In that paper I argued for the importance of three basic elements to the anthropological perspective.

The first of these important elements is...attention to detail.” The search for patterns, which is critical to the ways in which we learn phenomena, is not the most useful data involved
in anthropology or sociology. The patterns are nice, but it is what does not fit that is the most interesting. Details are the important aspects of the human condition which make a people distinct. By focusing on the minute and tracing over the whole, we create a style of thought and attention that allows people to be more aware of the world around them. Attention to detail also allows individuals to become more appreciative of the intricacies of the human condition.

This awareness opens up the next important element, relativism. I believe that the ability to step away from ones biases (or at least to recognize them) is a particularly important tool taught by anthropologist and sociologists. Looking at people within the framework of their own particular circumstances allows one to be able to see the whys and hows of what it is humans do.

Along with relativism come the notions of reflexivity and holism. Being aware of yourself and your own world helps you to understand others. The holistic view of life provides for a more generalized view of humanity.

Finally, anthropology and sociology encourage and hone critical awareness. Having the ability to see others in terms of their own thoughts, allows one to take a particular view of the human construction of life. If one can see the importance of the practices and beliefs of others in the construction of their reality, he/she can begin to understand what it is that makes us who we are. (Litton 1996:7-8)

These are the basic approaches that I teach my students. I incorporate many aspects of all four-fields into my courses. As the only anthropologist on campus it is also important to present the anthropological perspective on issues of multiculturalism, curriculum, general education, and the social atmosphere of the campus overall.

Anthropology in Principles of Sociology

At Southeastern we teach several sections of Principles of Sociology. Four separate faculty teach one or two sections each per semester. We all use the same book, but I assure you that the similarity of these courses blurs at that point. Sociology as a discipline is moving toward a more inclusive approach to culture, ethnicity, and gender in introductory texts (Macioris 1999, Kornblum 1998, Stark 1998, and Tischler 1999).

I use this inclusion to focus a true multi-Culturalism into the course.

Using examples from throughout the world, I introduce the basic components of Sociology to students who have little exposure to the world outside of Southeastern Oklahoma. A majority of our students are first or second generation college students. Our average student age hovers just under 30. Our greatest cultural diversity is a historical artifact of Oklahoma as Indian Territory. Durant is the tribal headquarters of the Choctaw Nation. We have (depending on how you ask the question) 400-1000 Native American students on campus. We have less than 100 foreign students, and less than 150 African American students. So one of the goals of the intro Soc course is to expose students to humanity from throughout the world.

By taking information about cultural and social constructions from around the world, I can give these students a greater appreciation of what is means to be human. I use ethnographic and ethnologic data from the traditional Anthro hot spots: Sub-Saharan Africa, Mesoamerica, Native North America, and Polynesia. I also use information from the archaeological record to show the extreme diversity of social and cultural constructions. Needless to say, my students get a course from a traditional sociological focus. However, this is not a Cultural Anthropology course. I simply use anthropological ideas and data to illustrate the basic concepts of sociology (stratification, deviance, institutions, change, demography, etc.).

For example, to help illustrate the complex nature of politics and social control, I use both the progression of violence and village separation and migration among the Yanomamo (Chagnon 1997) as well as the authority and independence of the Bedouin (Abu-Lughod 1986). When discussing the effect of environment on social constructions, examples come from the Aztecs (Coe 1994) and Cahokia (Fowler 1969, 1971, & 1975). Family relationships and marriage take on new dimensions with the introduction of kinship studies. And a read of any introductory Sociology text would make most anthropologists shudder at the treatment of the concept of culture.
Anthropology in Race, Gender, and Ethnic Relations

This is a course designed to introduce students to the issues surrounding minority relations. I find this course to be the most challenging course I teach at Southeastern. I am dealing with a fairly white, poor, and isolated population of students. Granted, those who are most likely to have difficulties with the material in this course are not likely to take this course. However, when we spend the first section of the course dismissing the physical/biological notion of race and continue through to discussions of ritualized homosexuality, I find students to be hostile to some of the ideas presented. One other thing to keep in mind is the fact that this is an extremely religious social environment. The superintendent of the Durant School System cancelled participation in the viewing of the construction of the mandala by a group of visiting Buddhist monks because several ministers complained that the monks might try to convert the local school children. Needless to say, issues of the evolution of the human race in relatively isolated breeding populations that are differentiated by response to local environments receives little support from a majority of the students.

But my first goal in this course is to dispel the myth of the importance of physical differences. One of the best tools I have found recently has been the GAD teaching module on clines (Lieberman and Rice 1997). Using this, I am able to show how environment affects populations, how these populations may have migrated throughout the world, and how they are beginning to reintegrate on the basis of archaeological, linguistic, and physical anthropological evidence. I am also able to use the current race debates from both the American Anthropologist and Anthropology News. The more recent evidence that is reported, redated, or reinterpreted helps my students to understand the fluid nature of the biological definition of humanity, even if they never grasp the genetics behind it. Using a reading list that draws heavily from the presentations of physical and archaeological data allows me to illustrate the notion of the emerging conception of racial differences (Leiberman & Jackson 1995, Gould 1994, Keita & Kittles 1997, and Marks 1994).

The primary focus of the rest of the course is the social construction of race and gender. I emphasize the process and effect of cultural construction. We look at issues of presentation and linguistic construction and the effect these have on the perception of social realities (Page 1997, Hartigan 1997, and Castile 1996). I also focus on the cultural construction of inequality. Using ethnographic and ethnotopic examples from the same areas discussed above, I illustrate the effect of cultural focus on constructing issues of value based on certain physical characteristics. Lastly, I use the issue of discrimination on a global scale to illustrate the effect of this culturally constructed inequality on specific social structures (Bodley 1994). I find that these students are more willing to look at the 'exotic' first and then apply the models that are generated from that to their own culture.

Anthropological Concepts in a Criminal Justice Curriculum

There are some basic anthropological ideas that help in the development of a Criminal Justice curriculum. The notion of the cultural construction of crime and the law are two of the most important. In each of these instances, I am working with the department in the development of issues of cultural construction into the CJ curriculum. We are including issues from the ethnographic and archaeological records concerning the situational development of norms and deviance as well as the development of social controls and justice distribution systems (Lindenbaum 1972, Terrill 1999, and Hoebel 1954).

It is also important to note that the State of Oklahoma has developed a system that allows for the certification of law enforcement officers after the completion of certain elements of the University curricula. This has brought an influx of students to our program whose primary focus is employment in local law enforcement. These are individuals who until recently would have enrolled in the state police academy having only had a high school diploma or GED. Our department now has the opportunity to develop a higher caliber, more educated, more critically
skilled police officer for the state of Oklahoma. Several of these students also have a drive for federal law enforcement. Last year we sent two students through a highly selective internship process with the US Marshals Service. These two individuals, I believe, will be better at their job because they have a background in law enforcement and other criminal justice issues that includes a significantly improved breadth of information as well as education in the critical evaluation of issues, ideas, and situations.

Anthropological Concepts in a Social Service Curriculum

The other major focus (while not directly reflected in our curricular offerings) is the development of individuals whose goals are to work in social service areas. The greatest benefit our department offers these individuals, outside of the traditional issues of social work, is the exposure of a true multi-Culture-alism. We work issues of minority relations, cultural differences, and the cultural construction of poverty into the curriculum. This aspect of our curriculum is the weakest in its application of the four-field approach. However, there may be ways that the methods and theories of linguistics and archaeology will be helpful (Cone 1969, Wilson 1987, Bon-villain 1993, Turkle 1995, and Shanks & Tilley 1987). We do incorporate mortuary analysis, medical anthropology, and conceptions of social and spiritual healing into the curriculum. However, I believe that this aspect of our curriculum shows the greatest potential for growth.

As I mentioned above, one of our majors is social gerontology. As the issues of the aging population become more predominant in our society, the culture of age and the cultural construction of ageism will allow our students a greater appreciation of potential solutions.

Conclusion

The focus of the Sociology Department at Southeastern is primarily on the development of social service and criminal justice employees. However, the curricular development of the inclusion of a four-field approach to anthropology has and will improve the quality of the graduate from our program. As the American Anthropological Association states in its online document concerning careers in anthropology:

"Careful record-keeping, attention to details, analytical reading, and clear thinking are taught by anthropological courses. Social ease in strange situations, critical thinking, and strong skills in oral and written expression are cultivated by anthropological training. Using a range of social, behavioral, biological and other scientific research methods, anthropology majors learn to supplement statistical findings with descriptive data gathered through participant observation, interviewing, and ethnographic study. An anthropologist is a trained observer who knows the importance of collecting data, in listening and watching what others are doing, in reflecting on what has actually as well as apparently occurred, in researching the context, in applying various explanatory models, and in adopting a broad perspective for framing an understanding. Whatever the topic of research, anthropologists share a particular holistic vision that requires using a repertoire of methods in order to forge a deeper understanding of situations. This holism characterizes the best anthropology and imparts the perspective for which the profession is valued." http://www.aaanet.org/careers.htm

This statement addresses the goals I have for incorporating the issues of anthropology into not only the Sociology curriculum but also the overall curriculum at Southeastern. While I believe that this creates better employees, I also believe that these ideas create better citizens of the world. More importantly, however, may be the simple fact that the eyes of students with little or no exposure to world are opened. I state several times in my courses: "You never have to agree with the position I am presenting, but you have to be able to argue and support the position you take on an issue." I offer the use of the four-field approach to anthropology as the best curricular addition any university can make to the development of quality education.

NOTE: This bibliography may not con-
tain the best informational material on the subjects discussed in the text. However, I have found them the most useful in teaching the material to my students. So, if you have better sources that you are more comfortable with, by all means, use them. If you are not sure where to start, try these.
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Challenges to Creativity:
Teaching the Four Sub-Fields in a One-Person Department

Fran Mascia-Lees
Simon's Rock College of Bard

Introduction

Teaching a full anthropology curriculum in a small department is often daunting. It is
not surprising, then, that teaching the four sub-fields in a one-person department might seem
nearly impossible, especially if the courses the lone anthropologist offers must be interdiscipli-
nary in order to attract students from a number of fields. But this is what I have been asked to do
for the last 17 years at Simon's Rock College of Bard, a small, highly selective liberal arts college.

Simon's Rock does not offer traditional majors. Instead, students must complete two
interdisciplinary concentrations, each requiring between 16 and 24 credits. One of my first obli-
gations is to contribute substantially to at least two of these, one in Cross-Cultural Relations and
another in Cultural Studies. However, because there are only 32 full-time faculty members at the
college, and 36 concentrations, it is also imperative that each of us develops courses that con-
tribute to as wide a range of concentrations as possible. I, for example, contribute to over half of
the 36 concentrations, and have courses included in concentrations ranging from "Modern Stud-
ies" to "Movement Studies" to "Politics, Law, and Society."

At the same time, it is necessary to pro-
vide students interested in going on in anthro-
pology with a firm foundation in the discipline
that will be able to compete successfully with
other students applying for admission to gradu-
ate school. This requires that, at minimum, they
be exposed to the basic ideas in the four sub-
fields of the discipline.

Since it is not possible to meet these some-
what conflicting demands by teaching a tradi-
tional sequence of anthropology courses, I have
devised an approach that can. It is an approach
that has turned out to be quite popular with stu-
dents and which has allowed me to think about
anthropology in new ways, keeping my ideas
fresh and my courses ever-evolving. Indeed, I
often feel I am at my most creative when I put
together the kinds of courses such an approach
requires, juxtaposing seemingly unrelated topics,
and thinking hard about how to facilitate the
production of new knowledge in the classroom.
The ten or so courses that I now teach on
a regular basis are designed to balance tradi-
tional knowledge with innovative ideas and
approaches, ones that entice and challenge stu-
dents to think creatively.
Before I detail my approach, let me briefly outline some other factors that have affected how I have conceptualized the complement of courses I offer, especially my philosophical and ethical commitments.

**Philosophical Tenets: Contextualizing Ideas and Enabling Critical/Ethical Thinking**

One of my primary concerns in teaching any course is to place cultural processes and ideas within a historical framework to provide students with an understanding of the intimate relationship between ideas and culture. I want students, first and foremost, to think critically and to be aware of the influences and constraints placed on ideas by particular socio-political contexts. Helping them do so involves encouraging them to think contextually about the ideas of others and self-reflexively about their own. Thus, I rarely discuss an idea as though it is "true," but instead present it as a concept tied to a particular historical moment or theoretical orientation. For example, one student recently asked me what the term "ideology" meant, and rather than responding with any one definition, we discussed the term as it was, and continues to be, used and conceptualized by, for example, European philosophers, Marxists, feminists, and Lacanians. Whether I am introducing students to the concept of "culture," "race," "sexual selection," "tribe," or "prehistory," to the conceptualization of non-Western societies as "primitives," "pre-industrial," "simple," or "breeding populations," or to the construction of specific groups as "Native American," "Middle Eastern" or "!Kung," I want them to see such ideas as heuristic categories that have often been reified with profound consequences.

Let me expand on this by describing the way in which I introduce students to the idea of "culture." After making it clear just how important the culture concept has been to anthropology through tracing the history of the field and role of the concept in it, I tell students that culture does not exist. I show them how it is a cultural construct employed to provide explanations for a remarkably large range of behaviors, beliefs, expressions, phenomena, and occurrences. We discuss how culture is not an entity that can be seen, touched, or bounded, even though we are often led to believe that it can, because anthropologists (and others) have treated "culture" as an object with a concrete or material existence that is "out there," and, thus, as something that is observable. It is usually not long before a student asks: "But if culture is not real, then what do we make of all those accounts of other "cultures"? Why study anthropology, or any other social science for that matter, if they reify social categories and treat them as real, actual, and true, when they are not?"

In response, I encourage students to change what they think anthropologists and others are doing when they study and write accounts of other "cultures" and to think about the value of the enterprise in new ways. Within this framework, anthropologists' depictions in traditional ethnographies, for example, are understood not as descriptions of stable entities, but as texts that provide a story of a process of interaction between people in one group with those of another. This shifts the emphasis away from the idea that ethnographies are accurate portraits about "them," written by "us," to the recognition that what is being depicted is a process of cultural interaction. This helps students focus on anthropology as a process and to understand cultural encounter--of whatever variety--as a complex process, each one with a long history of traditions of interpretation and representation that have facilitated and hindered cross-cultural understanding.

Accepting ideas and concepts as constructed fictions necessarily undermines the view of knowledge as something external to students, something they merely imbibe through a process of education. If students understand all ideas as uncertain, they are in a better position to reconceptualize their own process of learning. I try to encourage students to replace the classic and revered image of the lone scholar in search of "Truth" with one that envisions learning and thinking as a complex collaborative negotiation capable of generating new ideas and knowledge.

One of my goals in using this approach to ideas is to encourage students to acknowledge the grave responsibility attached to how people think and act and to recognize the role ideas and
actions play in the world. The recent post-colonial critique of anthropology has certainly taught us the importance of that. This self-knowledge can be immensely empowering to them. Knowing that their ideas count so much encourages them not only to take their own ideas very seriously, but also those of others. It helps them see that understanding, exploring, dissecting, scrutinizing, contesting, reformulating, experiencing, getting inside of, and playing with ideas is at the heart of being active participants in the world they inhabit. Such an understanding, I hope, will better enable students to think complexly about the contemporary world, and make ethical choices about their relationships with people from differing traditions, however those traditions have been, or will be, conceptualized or defined.

At the Intersection of Anthropology and Cultural Studies

Since I must offer courses that will attract and serve students with a wide-range of interests, my courses are by necessity interdisciplinary. They draw on contemporary theory from across the disciplines and use reading materials from many different fields. In particular, I have chosen to locate many of my courses at the intersection of anthropology and cultural studies. Many anthropologists in recent years have bemoaned the rise of cultural studies, seeing it as an encroachment on anthropologists' territory. Unfortunately, too many anthropologists have been willing to accept the view of cultural studies promulgated by the popular press: that it is little more than programmatic, ideologically-based analysis, interested more in power relations than critical assessment.

But cultural studies has appealed to me, and to a large number of scholars in a variety of disciplines, because it makes questions of value visible, encouraging students to explore the bases of political judgements and aesthetic evaluation, especially those of Western culture. Cultural studies asks us to think about evaluation and why it matters, a form of analysis that can only strengthen students' abilities to analyze their own cultural context. In this way, cultural studies can act as an important complement to anthropology's strategy of defamiliarizing the familiar to allow critical self-reflection.

The Importance of Language

It is probably clear from this discussion that I have been immensely influenced by what has often been called the "Linguistic Turn" in anthropology. While a few of my courses have segments especially devoted to traditional anthropological linguistics, a focus on the relationship of language to ideas and thinking is a crucial aspect of all my courses. Using theoretical models drawn from post-structuralism as a framing device for many of my courses allows students to grasp on multiple levels the central insight of anthropological linguistics: that language and culture are so intimately intertwined that we can not understand one in isolation from the other.

Geographical Areas

Although I teach no traditional area course, each of my courses focuses on several traditional and contemporary anthropological populations. Students interested in learning about societies from geographic regions that I don't cover can take courses from my colleagues in other fields focused on East and Southeast Asia, Africa, African-America, Native-America, Latin America, and the Middle-East. This provides students with an important interdisciplinary understanding of non-Western societies, one that will become increasingly necessary in the complex, interconnected world of the 21st century.

Interdisciplinary, Topical Courses

While I teach a popular four-field "Introduction to Anthropology" course, I offer no other course that might specifically be called a cultural anthropology, biological anthropology, linguistics, or archaeology course. Instead I have developed a number of topical courses, each of which includes attention to the four-fields in one way or another. The courses fit together in a kind of lock-step way so that when students have taken a number of these courses, they have sufficient background to continue studying anthropology.
at the graduate level, as a number have successfully done.

The handout provides a schematic representation of the way this works. I should point out as you glance at the handout that I have only put a few of my course offerings on it, just enough to give you an idea of my approach. But even with just these few, you can see that after taking several of them, a student will have covered a number of topics in each of the sub-disciplines. Thus, for example, after taking “Introduction to Anthropology,” “Anthropology Goes to the Movies,” “Cultural Encounters,” “Cultural Stories,” and “Voices Against the Chorus,” a student will have been introduced to the following topics of interest to biological anthropologists: the history of ideas in biological anthropology, including those of Darwin; microevolutionary processes; primate evolution; primate behavior; a critique of primatology; hominid evolution, human variation, race, and some contemporary debates. One problem with this schematic representation is that it can obscure the connections among the various isolated topics. To make that clearer, I have also provided you with course descriptions.

Conclusions

Let me end with an important caveat. I am trained as a cultural anthropologist and this is certainly reflected in the content of my course. Therefore, as you can see, I often spend more time on cultural anthropology topics than on others and I certainly do not cover all the topics my colleagues in the other three sub-disciplines might like to see. Nonetheless, I have struggled to offer a solid foundation to students in anthropology even as I have been pulled away from that task by multiple and, often conflicting, demands. I am all too aware of the strength and weaknesses of my solution. We in small departments—whether of one or two or three—are, after all, trying to make the best out of what is obviously a less than desirable situation. If it were easy, we wouldn’t be here today.

Course Descriptions:

Popular Film

Conventionally, both the standard ethnographic method of participant-observation and filmic technologies have been seen as objective instruments capable of capturing reality in text or on film. Only more recently have these been analyzed as constructs that interpret, rather than simply reflect, reality. This course brings these two approaches to “viewing” the world together, exploring the role of film in ethnographic representation and of ethnographic representation in popular film.

The first part of this course focuses on the modernist foundations of ethnography and on issues of central importance to ethnographic representation today. The second part concentrates on popular films, especially those that draw on anthropological topics for their story lines and that employ an ethnographic aesthetic in their representations. We will analyze a range of ethnographic, independent and Hollywood films to uncover ways of reading film as cultural documents, exploring the relationship of anthropology to the construction of popular film and of film to the construction of culture.

Cultural Encounters

Individuals’ experiences of foreign cultures are shaped by often-unrecognized assumptions and traditions of interpretation, which develop out of the history of contact between the culture of the traveler and the destination. Such interactions, while various, fall into types associated with particular genres of representation. This seminar explores some of the primary ways in which people from the West have encountered non-Western peoples, and the relationship of these encounters to their representation in language and image. The experiences of colonialists, adventurers, tourists, immigrants, and anthropologists are analyzed in terms of their relationship to conventional forms of cultural representation such as travel writing, short story, film, and ethnography.

Cultural Stories

All cultures instruct members on how to think and act in the world, addressing such ques-
tions as these: Who are we? Where did we come from? and What does it mean to be human, a woman or a man? Americans tend to think of non-Western peoples as finding answers to such questions through creating stories or myths, while we find truths through science. This course exposes this claim itself as an American cultural story, investigating the nature of cultural stories in general, and exploring the interaction of science, history, and social science with popular culture in creating narratives about who we, as Americans, are and should be. Specifically, we will 1) explore human evolutionary accounts as narratives and analyze their relationship to contemporary ideas about human origins, human nature, and gender behavior, 2) investigate historical and contemporary myths about Native Americans, focusing on the significance of the transformation of images of Native Americans from savages to New Age gurus, and 3) examine the recent psychologization and therapeutization of American Culture, uncovering the significance of stories about self-help, suffering, and victimization in a culture in which notions of good and evil no longer seem viable.

Voices Against the Chorus

This seminar explores the development of some of the ideas that have come to be central to our definition of the modern world. Its focus is on how nineteenth and early twentieth century thinkers in various disciplines confronted what was the accepted order of things, how they proceeded to challenge accepted ideas and categories, and how, finally, they constructed radically different conceptions of the world around them. This section links 19th century ideas to contemporary ones, especially those of importance to anthropology and cultural studies.

Teaching the Anthropology of Music:
How Musical is the Web?

Catherine M. Cameron
Cedar Crest College
I am grateful for the help I received from Megan Velte, Tiffany Adams, John Gate-wood, Michael Bender, and Matthew Kyle.

Site available at:
<www.cedarcrest.edu/academic/soc/ccameron/soc215>

In this presentation, I will be reporting on what for me was an experiment in teaching one of my courses using the Internet. I had taught the course, the Anthropology of Music, many times before in the traditional manner. I wanted to know whether the Web would augment the teaching and learning experience. I was also curious about how musical the Web was, that is, whether I would find much coverage of ethnomusicological programs, interesting links on musical cultures, non-western instruments and performers, audio clips of the music, and video clips of performances.

Game Plan

The experiment began about a year ago with an invitation from the Vice President of Technology to the faculty for proposals that would incorporate more of the Internet into their teaching. Two carrots were dangled: one that faculty could get either a course release or a stipend for signing on and, two, that an educational technology assistant would be hired to assist faculty. While the first carrot was very appealing to me (we normally teach four courses a semester), the second was absolutely critical. I had successfully avoided the Internet except for some minor surfing and buying books from Amazon.com.

I submitted a proposal for the spring ’99 semester. My plan was to include a substantial Web component into the course, specifically a course Web site and Web assignments. In addition to the usual course information for the site - the syllabus, assignments, a news group, and links to outside sources - I wanted to include student-built modules on musical culture areas. The modules were to feature their electronic papers, as well as a multi-media dimension of visual images and sound clips of the music from the areas they studied. The students were to work in teams and post the results of their research over the semester. My hope was that by making the students’ research “public” they would produce
higher quality work than if it were for my eyes only.

I began the spring semester enthusiastically. A number of candidates for the technology position were brought in. The FLITE technology people were part of the interview process. Over the course of two months, many people interviewed, but none were hired. The Vice president, however, appeared confident and offered us his help and that of some of the computer-savvy students. Although things seemed to be going smoothly, I was getting nervous that I would not be able to accomplish what I set out to do. By the end of February 1999, not only was no technical support person in place, but eventually the Vice President of Technology, himself left the college. I can say without too much exaggeration that there was general panic among us.

How Did It Turn Out?

I had been assigned a student assistant to help me design the Web site. Like many of our students today, she was thoroughly comfortable with the Internet and had previous experience designing Web sites. I think some of these students have a micro-chip planted in the back of their heads. When working with her, I can remember reflecting about Margaret Mead’s prophecy that there would come a time when the young would teach the old. The student was a great help in the actual design of the site. The main drawback with working with her was that, while she was good at doing Web work, she clicked so quickly I had trouble following her.

Usefulness of the Internet

Here, I report on the development of the site and usefulness of the Internet for teaching the Anthropology of Music.

The course mainly deals with topics in the field known as ethnomusicology and with non-western musical cultures. Our two and a half hour weekly meeting were held in a computer lab. Generally, I began with a topic - for example, a discussion of musical categories such as folk, classical, popular or the functions that music can have in societies. Then, I shifted to a large musical culture area - examples of traditional music from sub-Saharan Africa, Native North America, India, or the Caribbean. I played examples of the music and had students write up stylistic descriptions. I also gave coverage to what is called world music or global pop; this is non-Western music that has been influenced by the popular music forms from North America, Europe, and the Caribbean.

Each week, we did Web work assignments. These varied. One of the first was to evaluate Web sites. While students seem to be completely comfortable surfing the Internet, they do not appear to be very critical about content. Often, they are wowed by the bells and whistles aspect. Some of these critical measures I used to evaluate sites included the authority of the author (a credible institution, for example), the last update, the number of dead links, a working e-mail, and the apparent veracity of the information. I found several interesting sites to illustrate this; one of them called “The Neandertal Flute” looked credible on the face of it, but flunked the test when a more critical eye was cast.

The main assignment for the course was a series of linked papers on a musical culture area. Most of the students (there were 15 in the class) worked in groups of 2 or 3 and divided their labor for each part. The first assignment was to do a description of the culture area they picked; the second to cover traditional musical forms, instruments, and performance styles; the third to cover the emergence of new, popular music. The students were required to use both print and Internet sources. They were given time in class to search the Web for information on their musical cultures. These were subsequently incorporated into the Web site.

Except for providing addresses of sites, the students did not participate in the creation of the site. Had I been more experienced, I would have had them make decisions about the layout, structure, and content.

This time out, the course Web site was not used by the students as well as I might have wanted. Principally, they seemed to use it for information on the culture area they picked and musical instruments. Judging by their papers, most groups found relatively good sites on their own. On the other hand, it is clear to me that students have become so reliant on the Internet
that they don’t bother to hone their library search skills. To correct this, I had a librarian demonstrate an electronic data base called First Search and First Search Plus in class. However, that exercise didn’t have any noticeable effect in their next paper submission.

One of the last assignments involved presenting the results of the groups’ research to the rest of the class. Several groups were rather low tech in their presentation - mainly reading from prepared notes. One group amplified their presentation with clips from a CD. Another group went to some Web sites they had used to show pictures of the instruments and brief audio clips. The most electronically skilled student presented her research using Power Point, the program of choice for doing presentations. She imported very effective visuals of instruments and performances from the Web.

The very last assignment asked students to consolidate the pieces they had done for each paper and edit these into one big paper - this was the original module idea. They were asked to copy them to a floppy. But, the problem that soon became apparent was that the image files (jpg or gif) took up too much space. Nonetheless, with the help of the student assistant, we managed to upload them to the server. These have only recently been edited and one group’s is now on the site. I don’t know if the public posting of the papers had any effect in this case, so my hypothesis remains unconfirmed. I hear from other faculty that it has not had the desired effect.

With technical support and a lot of time, the Web site was finished -- if you can ever say that about a site -- shortly before the AAA meetings of 1999 and just in time for my participation in a session on Web assisted teaching. The time investment in creating a site cannot be underestimated. It is staggering how many hours fly by for so little return. But, it is ready as a resource for the next teaching of the course.

The most apparent value of the Internet for the teaching of this course is the ease of access for students. In a surfing session, they can readily find all manner of information, in this case on ethnographic areas, music, and musical instruments. The ethnographic content appears to be quite reliable, mainly because it has been posted by academic institutions. The quality of the musical content, on the other hand, is variable. Once again, university, museum, and archive sites on musical cultures tend to be good. Commercial and individual sites are quite uneven. Those record labels that pride themselves on being "serious," for example, Music in the World and Rounder provide pretty good information on the musical culture on their sites. They also usually feature audio clips from their CDs. Sites put up by individuals tend to be eclectic and are often esoteric to the author. They contain many dead links because they are not maintained. Some of the large university music schools -- Indiana, University of Washington, and UC Santa Barbara have informative sites. I found one exceptional site put up by the Director of African Music at Berkeley which has very good coverage of the traditional music of the Ewe people of West Africa. It also has audio and streaming video to illustrate performance styles.

One of the most difficult things for both student and faculty users is to recognize what is reliable and useful. The Web, of course, is everybody’s game and none of the usual critical gate keeping goes on. I continue to promote the use of print sources to students, but I’m afraid this has become a losing battle. Perhaps the greatest service we can provide for students is to show them the best ways to evaluate and use sites.

For those of us who have only begun to use the Internet, this represents a substantial investment of time.

To return to my other question, how musical is the Internet, I have to say that it is amazingly musical. Any serious search of a musical culture area will yield full and complete results. It is possible to get information on the culture, musical styles, instruments, and performance practice of most ethnic groups. There has obviously been a lot of effort on the part of institutions, businesses, and individuals to make the Web a good musical resource.

Site Design

(Visit <www.cedarcrest.edu/academic/soc/ccameron/soc215> for the site)

In the construction of the site, I had to make a decision early on about what kind of pages were needed for the course. I decided to
include six: a home page that introduced the site, syllabus page, resources page which links to five additional pages (anthropology, ethnomusicology, non-western music, world beat, and references), assignment page that outlined the short assignments and the three-part research paper, the student research that presented the cumulative work of one of the groups (they did Cuban music), and musical examples page. The syllabus and assignments were also handed out hard copy.

The resources page was meant to be educational, a resource for students who wanted both online, print and video material. Instead of hot linking names of sites on the Web, I linked the URLs on the advice of a consultant. He said that sometimes when the full link goes dead, the searcher can try the partial address which may go to an updated link.

Initially, I did not give much thought to backgrounds and borders; I was happy to use a simple design with a flat mustard background. I discovered that tech-types put a lot of emphasis on the visual side of Web sites and we were able to compromise on something with texture. In retrospect, aesthetics do make sense since the Internet is highly visual.

I was disappointed to discover how hard it is to borrow audio or video clips from any copyrighted source. Two of my six requests were turned down. JVS, whose parent corporation is SONY has produced excellent recordings and a multi-part video series on world music and dance. They courteously refused my request, as did several other labels, based on their concern about possible misrepresentation of their material. Those permissions I got limited the audio clips to 45 seconds. One of our technical support people thinks permissions are going to get harder to obtain rather than easier for the next few years.

The next time I design a site, I would change some things for the course:

1. I would include a discussion group on the site. It is often said that the shy students will contribute if the exercise is written.

2. I would require them to develop their own Web pages based on their research and attach these to site.

3. I would require students to do more Web evaluation and search exercises to make them into more critical users of the Internet.

4. I would include more discussion of copyright issues. The fair use ideas that guide academic use of articles is becoming much more stringent for images and audio as it is used in the electronic medium.

5. I would include more critical discussion on the topic of the utility of Web based delivery and on-line courses asking the question of what advantages electronic instruction has over traditional instruction.

On this last point, we will find more pressure to build technology into our courses. There is definitely a slippery slope between Web assisted teaching and online courses. In many institutions, administrators are pressuring for online distance learning. While the technology is expensive in the early stages, the official perception is that online is cheaper than traditional instruction in the long run. Among faculty, there is growing concern that fully automated courses will staffed by adjuncts and teaching assistants rather than full-time people. There is also the issue of intellectual property and compensation. The most recent issue of Academe (Vol. 85, Number 5, Sept/Oct. 1999) is devoted to educational technology and reports on institutions where there has been conflict between faculty and administrators on the ownership of online courses.

The question that is difficult to answer is whether online provides a better quality educational experience for students. There has been little empirical demonstration one way or the other because this mode of delivery is new. Clearly, online works for the busy, highly motivated part-time student who needs the asynchronous quality of such a course. It probably does not work as well for traditional students. Initial reports indicate a high drop rate among this group. We, the users of the technology on any part of the slippery slope, can help answer the question of quality by developing some outcome measures of our own. We need to maintain a critical eye and find out what works and what
doesn't, as well as what groups it works best for.

The Politics of Anthropology in Academia: A Sad Story

Mary Cameron

The story of how the program in anthropology at Auburn University was threatened with elimination in the fall quarter of 1998 begins with caprice, develops into disciplinary partisanship and animosity, and ends in a victory for anthropology. This is not a story of heartless administrators, though the whole saga originates in what was apparently a misstatement by the University's president reported in the local newspapers. Rather, it is a tale of departmental politics at its worst. That three anthropology faculty prevailed against twelve colleagues in sociology, criminology and social work attests to our strength in all three facets of Auburn's mission research, teaching and outreach - and the need to have strong alliances with other campus programs and regional anthropology programs.

For the few years prior to the crisis, our department had been discussing the ways in which our smaller programs, particularly anthropology and sociology, could shield themselves against the inevitable 'restructuring' that the board of trustees (governor appointees) was compelling the president to do. If the president did not develop the strategy to implement budget cuts, then the board would do it. So the president established committees to develop priorities and goals, and a strategy was put forth by which all colleges would cut up to 20% of their budgets. Deans were authorized to submit restructuring recommendations, with varying degrees of input from their faculty. Unfortunately, our department had settled into a dangerous complacency in which we believed we were safe from any drastic changes. Still, because we recognized that dropping below ACHE (Alabama Commission on Higher Education) standards of viability might occur for either sociology or anthropology in certain years, we had informally agreed in department meetings that we would merge the programs and jointly count the majors. The degree would continue to read either anthropology or sociology, depending on the students' concentration. There was never any discussion about one program being merged into the other as a concentration. In fact, anthropology had to be persuaded of the final merged arrangement because we had more majors, and unlike sociology, had never had a problem meeting ACHE standards.

After a year of consulting with faculty, our dean proposed several program changes to the provost. In our department, the social work program would be canceled, and the programs in anthropology and sociology would be merged, allegedly in the form that we had agreed upon earlier. After much lobbying, the social work program was retained. The president reported to the trustees the university-wide restructuring proposals. These were reported in the newspaper the following Saturday, only I read with some surprise that anthropology would be merged with sociology, and would become only a concentration. Given that this was never discussed with us by either our department chair or the dean, nor among the faculty during departmental meetings, I was certain that this was an error. What followed was a flurry of email messages that I initiated, inquiring about the apparent error in reporting. The chair and the dean replied that indeed, there was no error and that anthropology as a major would be discontinued and would be offered only as a concentration. No one admitted to the error, and no one stepped forward to correct it. Quite incredibly, the mistake soon turned into policy, anthropology being reassured all along that the decision was not final and would be reviewed by the APRC (Academic Program Review Committee). Initially enraged by the unfairness, the lines began to be drawn in very distinct ways among the disciplines in our department.

Realizing that the APRC's review of programs targeted for termination (or what the administration called "low priority programs") would be critical to our case, the faculty senate chair quickly appointed our program coordinator to the APRC, and she promptly recused herself from the discussion of anthropology. We then rallied our friends and colleagues throughout the university and in other Alabama anthropology
programs to submit letters supporting the retention of anthropology as a major, which they did. We contacted FOSAP and Catherine Cameron and Ann Hill wrote letters on our behalf. Our archaeologist, a native son, contacted the many influential people he knows throughout the state and asked for letters of support. AAA provided critical data on the increase in anthropology degrees nationally. On the other side, the other program coordinators were asked to canvas their faculty and write letters to the APRC expressing their views on the merger. The department chair indicated that he would not be writing a letter, and that only one program coordinator had done so. Only later did he inform us that he had written a letter in support of the merger, with anthropology becoming only a concentration. We also learned that all the program coordinators, without fully representing their faculty, had written similar letters. So there we were, fighting a local uphill battle.

But sometimes faculty governance prevails. We submitted a full report of our program to the APRC, emphasizing our strengths in furthering the university’s mission. In the process we discovered that we three faculty had brought in the vast majority of grants and awards to the department. News of this leaked out to the student newspaper reporters who did a feature article on anthropology and all of our accomplishments. This further angered our colleagues, since it did not show them in a good light. I was on sabbatical during the quarter when we were to present our case to the APRC, and I spent many hours discussing with the chair how much more beneficial it was to everyone in the department if the programs in anthropology and sociology remained separate. Slowly, he became convinced, and when the day arrived to present to the APRC, he reversed his earlier position and said that he felt a compromise had been reached and that the programs should remain separate. The dean was there, and he admitted that in fact the meager savings (a grand total of $70,000!) from such a merger could be found in other ways. The APRC voted to retain the anthropology major, suggesting that we invite the faculty at AUM (Auburn University at Montgomery) to participate in our program in order to meet what were (and still are) faculty needs. The recommendation was presented to the trustees who accepted and voted to retain anthropology.