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PRESIDENT’S CORNER

FOSAP continues to be successful at organizing symposia at the national meetings. Paul Grebinger (Rochester Institute of Technology) and John Rhoades (St. John Fisher) organized and chaired an excellent invited session “Teaching in the Margins: Challenging the Anthropological Imagination” at the November 2001 meetings in Washington, DC; the papers appear in this issue. For the 2002 New Orleans meetings, John Rhoades has organized another session to be called, “Asserting Anthropology in the Liberal Arts Curriculum.” Robert Myers, the FOSAP co-president, is planning way ahead for the meetings in 2003 on the topic of teaching anthropology courses on American society. If you wish to know more about that session, contact Bob at myers@alfred.edu.

There are a few changes to report. Paul Grebinger has stepped down as co-president and is editing, along with John Rhoades, the FOSAP Newsletter you are now reading. Robert Myers of Alfred University is serving as co-president. Ann Hill has moved on to program chair of the General Anthropology Division, but is still active in FOSAP. John Gatewood has taken over as webmaster of the FOSAP site from Dan Moerman and will be relaunching the site. Many thanks to Dan for creating the original site.

Many of you responded to a mass mailing about listing your small program in the Guide to Departments. The Guide is useful to many people for locating colleagues and advising students about graduate programs. However, the cost (a minimum of $150 for the smallest listing) is a hardship for many, especially those in combined programs or those who support only minors in anthropology, because the amount represents a big hit on small departments. I am sending a final report to the AAA along with a request to reduce the cost for those who need only a minimal listing.

Under the heading of FOSAP’s future, there was some thought given this past year about merging with another GAD committee, the Committee on Teaching Anthropology. I am happy to report that FOSAP will remain a separate committee thanks to some new membership. But, we do need to know how the organization serves you and what needs you would like FOSAP to address. So please let us know your concerns. We also want to recruit new members; please talk to your colleagues in other small departments or independent scholars. We especially invite you to attend the annual business meeting held at the nationals. They are usually held on a Thursday or a Friday night. From those meetings, we generally get our ideas for next year’s symposia. Hope to see you there.

Cate Cameron, Cedar Crest College

MINUTES: FOSAP BUSINESS MEETING

Present: John Gatewood (Lehigh), Paul Grebinger (Rochester Institute of Technology), John Rhoades (St. John Fisher), Robin O’Brien (Elmira), Ann M. Hill (Dickinson), Clare Boulanger (Mesa State), Bob Myers (Alfred), Betsy Baird (USNH), John Lowe (cultural analyst), Cate Cameron (Cedar Crest)

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 PM. There was a brief discussion of the outcomes from last year’s annual business meeting and FOSAP representation on the board of the General Anthropology Division (GAD). The current co-president, Cate Cameron, brought up the perennial problem of low attendance at FOSAP business meetings and the larger issue of the invisibility in
AAA of anthropologists teaching in small programs. This group is particularly difficult to identify and contact, given current listing practices in the AAA’s Guide to Departments and the inadequacy of FOSAP’s dated membership lists.

The members’ concern with locating and involving anthropologists in small programs was communicated to the General Anthropology Division (GAD) board earlier in the day. Cate Cameron suggested that the Guide ought to make listings available to small programs for reduced rates, perhaps under $50. This might encourage anthropologists in this group to get listed in the Guide and come to the meetings. Ann Hill mentioned that the incoming GAD president, Karl Heider, would support a GAD initiative. Clare Boulanger raised the question of the advantages to people in small programs of a Guide listing. Cate Cameron responded that she uses her Guide for advising students about grad school. John Gatewood said that a listing gives people the feeling that they belong. He pointed out that other professional organizations offer cheaper listings in their guides.

Betsy Baird asked if the on-line AAA Guide is searchable. John Rhoades responded that he thought it can be searched by topic and ethnographic specialty. Clare Boulanger asked if we could use space in the GAD column in the Anthropology Newsletter to advertise our presence. The president noted that we have a certain amount of space in the GAD column.

Several members expressed concern about the FOSAP website. The current webmaster, Dan Moerman, would like to turn the job over to someone else. Various ideas about how to maintain the website were floated: hiring student workers, putting it on the AAA server, etc. John Gatewood agreed that he would take over the role of webmaster and would contact Dan Moerman for the passwords, in case the website would continue to be located on Dan Moerman’s server. Members applauded John Gatewood for his work on behalf of FOSAP.

Paul Grebinger, co-President of FOSAP, volunteered to publish the papers from the FOSAP session he and John Rhoades had organized for this year’s meetings, called “Teaching in the Margins: Challenging the Anthropological Imagination.” He will revive the FOSAP Newsletter for spring 2002 in order to provide a forum for the papers.

Cate Cameron, co-President, suggested that perhaps FOSAP should merge with the Committee on the Teaching of Anthropology (COTA) for more visibility and because COTA is concerned with teaching, also one of FOSAP’s areas of interest. Betsy Baird said, however, that FOSAP might want to stay separate since we were able to organize at least one session every meeting and have been able to put out newsletters that are useful to people teaching in small departments. Others felt that FOSAP’s constituency, anthropologists in small programs, has a rather unique set of interests and issues that went beyond teaching. John Rhoades indicated that FOSAP provided support for small programs which the parent organization, AAA, did not. He had personal experience with the inability of AAA headquarters to provide useful information to him when his program was threatened with being downsized. The group then discussed the problems of downsizing and the relative merits of a minor vs. a major in anthropology. Everyone agreed with John Gatewood that AAA should have “canned” materials to pass out to the membership about the value of anthropology to a liberal arts curriculum and about careers in anthropology. Robin O’Brien mentioned that she had contacted AAA headquarters for information on the anthropology undergraduate honor society, and they had none. The group felt that AAA was too focused on serving big programs rather than the membership in small programs.

There was further discussion of membership lists and their place on the FOSAP website. It was suggested that Paul Grebinger should ask for the membership lists of GAD to compare with FOSAP’s.

Two panels were proposed for next year: “Teaching Us: The Anthropology of American Cultures” (organizers Robin O’Brien and Bob Myers) and “Defending Anthropology in the Liberal Arts Curriculum.” (organizer John Rhoades). Betsy Baird will send out solicitations for papers for these panels if the organizers will provide her with brief descriptions.

Finally, by unanimous acclamation, Bob Myers and Cate Cameron were appointed as FOSAP co-Presidents for 2002. Paul Grebinger and John Rhoades will be FOSAP Newsletter co-editors, Betsy Baird will continue as membership chairperson, and Ann Hill will continue as executive secretary. The
meeting adjourned for dinner at 7:45 PM.  
Respectfully submitted,

Ann Hill, Dickinson College

INTRODUCTION

As Cate Cameron points out in her remarks in “President’s Corner,” ideas for FOSAP supported sessions at the national meetings often emerge from discussions among the membership attending the annual business meeting. These ideas may see light in a session the following year, or may require a longer gestation. Such was the case with “Teaching in the Margins: Challenging the Anthropological Imagination.” At the FOSAP business meeting in Philadelphia, Bonnie Lloyd generated the idea for a session on the special synergies and difficulties of teaching anthropology in small programs and interdisciplinary departments. Victoria Razak and I attempted to construe the idea in the form of a call for papers for the Chicago meetings under the title “Teaching Anthropology: A View from the Margins.” Response to our call was disappointing, and as a result we did not submit a session proposal.

At the Chicago meeting FOSAP sponsored a successful panel on “The Compleat Anthropologist: Strategies for Teaching the Four Fields.” Those papers were to be published and have appeared as Volume 8, Number 1, Spring 2000. The hope was that we could develop Volume 8, Number 2, fall 2000 around the special issues of teaching in small and interdisciplinary programs. John Rhoades agreed to join me in that effort. We reworked the call for participants into “Teaching in the Margins.” Among those who responded to the call was Dan Moerman, who suggested in late February 2001 that we consider submitting the proposal as an invited session at the annual meetings in Washington, D.C. As he pointed out, we were already running late for a fall 2000 issue of the FOSAP Newsletter. Although close to the deadline for submission, we already had the papers in hand and were successful in this effort. Mike McDonald also responded to our call for papers, but was unable to submit in time for the invited session deadline. His contribution is published here as an additional perspective on teaching anthropology.

The panel itself was scheduled in the margins (8 AM on Thursday), but did attract an attentive audience and generated spirited discussion. All of the presenters in the panel attended the FOSAP business meeting that evening, and each has made a commitment to active participation in FOSAP for the 2001-2002 year. The point of this brief biography of a FOSAP invited session is to remind the membership that we are a voluntary association in the purest sense of the term. Further, business meetings are an important context for creative interaction with like-minded fellow anthropologists and an opportunity for positive engagement with the American Anthropological Association. You need be liminal no longer!

Paul Grebinger, Rochester Institute of Technology

SESSION ABSTRACT

TEACHING IN THE MARGINS: CHALLENGING THE ANTHROPOLOGICAL IMAGINATION

Teaching anthropology in small programs and interdisciplinary contexts can be a liberating experience. Anthropological understanding and how we value anthropology as professionals is transformed in a feedback process that involves inputs from undergraduate students with diverse career interests and from colleagues in other academic disciplines. The challenge is to imagine an anthropology that is both relevant and exciting for students who approach it as consumers rather than devotees, and make it intellectually accessible to colleagues committed to other traditions of inquiry. Daily interaction with sociologists, social workers and colleagues from other disciplines is a catalyst for expanding everyone’s intellectual horizons. In such contexts the generalist is valued. Experiential approaches to teaching fundamental concepts are reinforced by colleagues and students alike. In effect, this is a call to reinvigorate anthropology as a unifying, integrating discipline for the behavioral and social sciences.
Teachable Moments: Anthropological Citizens and Cultural Consumers
Robin O'Brian (Elmira College, robrian@elmira.edu)

Consuming culture
Students in my classes approach most things as commodities and entertainments. Although many have not traveled much, particularly in the places most people still associate with anthropology, they have long been consuming the images, music, art, and language of other cultural groups as depicted on cable television and as used in commercials in a variety of media. My students, then, have some familiarity with other societies although they are apt to think about them in ways that make me uncomfortable. Most have an unreflective view of their own experiences and many suspect that most people in those “other” places are eager to adopt “modern” American ways.

Rather than encouraging “cultural consumption” and recognizing that professional anthropology will be a choice for a very few, I teach it as a way to comprehend a new and changing world. Most of my students will live in a world that is increasingly diverse, even in my own fairly homogeneous rural town. By suggesting to students that they share much with the “exotic others” whose images they consume, I encourage them to see human commonalities rather than bundles of unfamiliar identities. This does, I suppose, place me at odds with many trends in the discipline. But anthropology has always been messy and multivocal, and numerous constituencies have staked claims on its message.

My second goal is to encourage students to think of their own cultural experiences and to reflect on the culture they experience so unreflectively. While it is certainly true that some of my students aggressively promote their culture, most are more likely to ignore it or to think about it as “natural” if they think about it at all. I ask them to think about how their own experiences might shape their perceptions of their worlds and how these might be similar to what people elsewhere experience. In particular I ask students to consider things like appearance, hygiene, gender and cuisine as culturally mediated. While they start out superficially, over time they draw increasingly sophisticated parallels: for example patterns of body scarification seem less “exotic” when considered with tattooing and piercing. This seems like an obvious parallel, but I find that some students think they have a different sort of motivation, that what prompts some kinds of behavior is somehow more “authentic” when they do it. I ask students to question their assumptions in light of their new thinking about other peoples.

Deconstructing Western Culture
As a member of a liberal arts college faculty I also teach out of my discipline in my contributions to a series of history and civilization courses. Such courses are common in liberal arts colleges, and their mission is to ground students in the historical, social and intellectual development of Western thought and civilization. Rather than seeing this as contrary to the anthropological project, I try to contextualize the concerns of my own discipline within its larger place as one stream of western thought. This permits students, who might not otherwise have the opportunity to consider Darwinian thinking, to reflect on its influence on a wide range of western thinkers, its continuing contribution to the biological sciences, and how it colors contemporary American thinking. We explore the ideas of “evolution,” “improvement,” and “progress” critically, examining what they mean and in particular how they influence American assumptions of individualism and self-improvement. Many of my students are surprised to learn that evolutionary theory does not suggest an endlessly improving path toward some kind of perfection, but rather explains how populations become suited (through the mechanism of natural selection) to a given environment. When they understand this, they begin to track how our own cultural ideas of “progress” contribute to a wide range of Western ideas and beliefs. I thus teach this course at least in part as an exploration of how Western culture itself is constructed. Again, my students think about themselves as cultural beings who evaluate and understand their world through the lens of their own cultural assumptions.

As students become more comfortable with this approach they begin to make connections between what we discuss in class and what they experience in daily life. We compare different ways of theorizing economics and explore whether our own economic system is more immutably “right” than another. I want students to think critically about their world, but I also want them to think reflectively, to understand how multiple processes contribute to
what they experience. In this I draw on the theoretical assumptions of anthropology, exploring institutions like the economy holistically. Why is it that many Americans, my students among them, often think of economics in narrow financial terms? Is a gift an economic process? What about loaning someone your car? Anthropologists certainly treat these as economic interactions but this is often a new idea to students. In a recent discussion on Marx, we explored the meaning of commodity fetishism and value. When a student pointed out that requiring payment for a Christmas gift diminished its value we could unpack the meaning of “value,” the contrasting monetary and social values of things, and the socially constructed nature of money. I value the broad holistic approach I bring from anthropology, but I am also able to give concrete contemporary examples of societies that think differently than Americans.

Across the Disciplinary Divide

Because I have also taught in interdisciplinary programs (e.g., Latin American studies, women’s studies) I came to my current institution with the desire to work across disciplines. I sometimes find that working with scholars in other fields somehow makes the result larger than the sum of its parts. At present I try to combine my own academic interests and the needs of anthropology students with courses that could also serve other disciplinary constituencies. Both “Anthropology of Gender” and “Peoples of Latin America” are new courses on my campus that meet obvious multidisciplinary needs, but I also plan an “Anthropology of American Culture” course that I anticipate will provide an ethnographic and empirical look at modern U.S. culture. I expect American studies and history majors, more familiar with historical and literary approaches to American culture, to make up the greater portion of non-majors and I anticipate introducing them to both the ethnographic literature and brief fieldwork opportunities. Such a course would give these students the particular chance to see how our own (and I use “our” both deliberately and broadly) culture is shaped by our historical and literary traditions, and how at the same time changing cultural patterns in the U.S. (economic, demographic, technological) influence history. Interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary teaching allows me to integrate what students bring to the classroom with what I know and allow all of us to learn from each other. Because most students still pursue fairly narrow courses of study they often find interdisciplinary approaches liberating.

While I feel a strong professional identity as an anthropologist, I am also a broadly trained generalist, so being the only anthropologist on a faculty allows me to draw from a broad range of knowledge, from the biological to the cultural, in the courses I teach. Indeed, while professional training increasingly encourages finely-tuned specialization, institutions like my own value those trained in a “four-fields” approach. In my case I teach all cultural courses and the introductory physical anthropology course and I find that this grounding allows me to present a wider range of material than I might be able to do in a larger institution. In physical anthropology, while we study population genetics, fossil evidence and primate behavior, we also examine the social contexts of these fields. How for example does “race” come to be defined as a biological category? We sort through the genetics of human polymorphisms and explore how different physical traits might cluster together. Students also begin to see how these traits are not in fact interlinked. They can then see more clearly how historical and social factors played a far more important role than biology in defining racial categories.

I turn this approach on its head in “The Anthropology of Gender.” Here I include the old “man the hunter” model of human behavioral evolution, particularly because it still enjoys broad currency in popular conceptions of early humans. We explore the female role as gatherer not as a refutation but as an expansion of the earlier model. I further extend this by discussing recent research on menopause and partible paternity. Most students I teach still tend to regard biological reasons for things as somehow more “real” than social or cultural reasons; I present a range of examples and explanations in my courses to show how such reasons interact with each other. Biology is more plastic than students presume and the biological and social are strongly intertwined in the human species.

Because I can draw on the range of understandings that all of anthropology offers I present students in all my courses with a deeper and more nuanced understanding of what humans are about. Key to this understanding I think is holism,
the awareness that the human project, our institutions and experiences, are interrelated and embedded in specific historical contexts. Anthropology gives me a language to articulate this across disciplinary boundaries and the small college gives me a place to teach this language to all my students. Some choose to take up its study in more depth, but I hope to give each student ways to understand and discuss their worlds more thoughtfully.

**Anthropology In and From the Margins**

Robert Myers (Alfred University, myers@alfred.edu)

Despite the reflexive label "marginal natives" we learned for ourselves in graduate school, probably from Morris Freilich's 1970 book of that title, I bet most of us never expected to spend a career deep in the academic margins as a lone (and often professionally lonely) anthropologist in a department dominated by colleagues from other disciplines. I know I didn't. Yet most of my now quarter-century old academic life has been either as the only anthropologist on campus or, briefly, as the only reasonably sane anthropologist on campus. This experience has shaped my sense of the discipline and probably of myself as well. My comments concern my own experience and observations, but I suspect they are similar to the experiences of other lone anthropologists.

**Anthropology In the Margins**

Teaching as the only anthropologist in a social sciences division with sociologists and political scientists for the past thirteen years at Alfred University, a small regional university in western New York, has presented several of the opportunities, limitations, and problems which colleagues in similar situations may share.

Both within and without academe I am repeatedly reminded that most people have little idea what anthropologists are, or more to the point, what cultural anthropologists, do. When I say I am an anthropologist, the response is usually one of three types. The first fortunately remains isolated, but the other two are common. To my dismay, soon after I arrived, with degree in hand, on my first full-time job at a small, highly-rated liberal arts college, an earnest, respected, senior historian inquired whether there were actually graduate programs where one could get a doctorate in anthropology. More commonly, people respond with blank looks, unsure what to say next, or with the question, "Where do you dig?" or "Been on any interesting digs lately?" Anthropology still seems to be archaeology. Occasionally someone will then comment on an exotic custom or group of which they have heard. Cultural anthropology has little or no popular definition at all.

Anthropologists always seem very busy—like all other professionals I know—but the results of that busyness are not often conspicuous. We provide a lot of "service" courses to our institutions. We fill in gaps left by history, biology, and modern languages. We often bridge majors or schools with basic courses or electives. (Students from engineering, art, and the business school at Alfred register in my liberal arts courses.) We round out a liberal arts curriculum. On small campuses we may play a role in internationalizing the curriculum or the intellectual climate. These contributions are invaluable, but not enough in my view.

In addition to those broad roles in which we survey the human story or describe particular cultures or regions, we have been described as "scavengers" looking in the cracks between disciplines, at the margins of social life, or at the intersection of several fields. I see us, too, as beachcombers, picking up bits of interesting flotsam and jetsam washed up on the cultural shore or as gleaners of social grains missed or cast behind by other harvesters. We try to reassemble these pieces and to make sense of them, to connect and reconnect them to other related parts. As Peacock writes, “the ethnographer’s mind is not a bucket or a basket, but a searchlight” (1986:66). We have an important public opportunity and responsibility to use our unique fieldwork experiences, diverse readings and observations, and integrative perspectives to comment on contemporary events and patterns around us.

We are, in both large and small departments, teachers, often of large numbers of students. For those of us who practice alone, this is both a luxury and a liability. It is a luxury in that we can be generalizing without conforming to a large
department's theoretical orientation, but perhaps also without a professional validation of our lectures and discussions. The opportunities for interdisciplinary work and cross-fertilization of ideas are often more possible and highly rewarding when surrounded by non-anthropologist colleagues. I have learned a great deal from my associates in sociology, political science, and other disciplines. To compensate for the absence of an anthropology major at Alfred, we created a comparative cultures major, together with core faculty from sociology, art history, and religious studies. To cut across schools and boundaries, several of us established a health studies minor. To pursue an interest in the problem of violence, I created an interdisciplinary minor in violence studies. As coordinator of our small study abroad office for several years, I enjoyed contacts across the curriculum and with other international study program directors.

Solitary anthropological existence is a liability in that we become generalists, often responsible for a four or five field perspective and with the impossibility of keeping up with and representing a broad, complex field. Nearly all of my courses remain undergraduate introductory surveys of the field or one of its many parts. Well-meaning colleagues in other disciplines do not share our professional vocabulary or perspective and have not experienced the rite of passage of fieldwork. I'll wager lone anthropologists on the margins not only teach more hours, but also have more frequent and longer office hours for students than do those at larger universities. With a heavy teaching load, research time, indeed any time, is in short supply; with emphasis on teaching, conference travel money may be limited to those with papers to present. Another disadvantage for the only anthropologist in a multidisciplinary department is the burden of staying up-to-date in the diverse discipline we are assumed to represent. Professional connections take more effort from the margins.

Anthropology From the Margins

The struggle of anthropologists in small or single-person "departments" with professional invisibility seems to be par for the larger discipline as well. Where are the anthropologists with our global awareness and holistic sensibilities at the national level? Where are the rational commentaries on contemporary life informed by the broad perspectives on which we congratulate ourselves? Where are our contemporary voices with the boldness and public skills of Margaret Mead or the eloquence and wit of the late Ashley Montagu today? Who from the anthropological community has the ear of the educated public? Evolutionist and paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould, our most prolific popularizer, and UCLA medical school physiologist and Pulitzer Prize-winner Jared Diamond, incorrectly described as an anthropologist, both have that level of public engagement which we lack. Astronomer Carl Sagan often wrote and spoke from the Olympian perspective I long associated with our profession. We are missing in action, even as we remain extremely busy teaching, teaching, teaching, doing endless committee work, and occasionally researching and writing, mostly for each other, an audience which Anthropology News editor William C. Young has recently warned against over-indulging (2000:63) with esoterica and jargon.

The AAA has given lip-service to a public role for anthropologists for decades and the discipline has had occasional moments of public prominence. Nevertheless, it is difficult to see much evidence of institutionalized socialization (should I say enculturation?) within the profession resulting in a steady role for public anthropological contribution. Perhaps my complaints reflect merely my own myopia and frustration, but I suspect they are broadly true.

When the AAA sent out email notification in October of the workshop on Media Expertise at the annual meeting in November, I had mixed reactions. First, I thought, this is great! We need to develop these skills, we've needed this for a long time. Writing op-ed pieces for newspapers, and participating in press conferences at the National Press Club in Washington, DC, is something I've been doing for two years at my institution. It is an effort to reach a wider audience on important issues than we normally are able to. Second, I read, "This is a first for the Association and could prove extremely useful down the road." How could this be a first, I wondered. This is 2001; we've been talking about how we needed to work with the media for years and years. The Anthropology Newsletter has had a media monitor column for some time, but this dropped out last year in favor of a "policy monitor" section. What am I missing? Why don't we learn these things in
graduate school? Or, I had hoped that everyone was learning them and only I had slipped through without valuable skills long ago. But if everyone was learning this, we wouldn’t need a workshop….. Then, I saw that the training session was available for $125 for members and $150 for non-members. $125? How many of us have an extra $125 to invest in another workshop or event? Perhaps I misjudge this too. The skills I am familiar with seem very simple and able to be taught or acquired very differently than from an expensive “workshop.” If it is so potentially important to the profession, I wondered, why not offer the workshop for free, as a professional investment? (I wondered this in the email I sent back to the AAA.) Perhaps this is all part of the commodification of every aspect of modern professional (and personal) life, I wondered. [I look forward to hearing about the experience and views of others on this issue.] It seems to me that one of the several boats we have missed professionally is the one in which we are comfortable speaking to or writing for a broad audience, and that requires skills in engaging the popular media.

Today evolutionary psychologists glibly inform the public about the supposedly biologically-based, once-adaptive origins of many behaviors. These presumptive explanations of “human nature” were once widely known as sociobiology and given voice by the entomologist E. O. Wilson. Currently University of Maryland neurobiologist and psychologist Robert Provine brings word that most human laughter has much less to do with responses to jokes than with varied other social functions. Paul R. Ehrlich, professor of population studies and of biological sciences at Stanford, proclaims in his widely reviewed recent book Human Natures: Genes, Cultures, and the Human Prospect (2000) that we are biocultural creatures, not to be understood without a large emphasis on culture. Biological and psychological explanations for human behavior remain popular, even while in many respects the culture concept has arrived.

Ironically, our lack of success at having an important, publicly-sought voice is countered by tremendous success in conveying the concept of culture. Indeed, the idea of culture appears nearly everywhere. There are mass media references to the “culture of business” and the “culture of a sports organization.” Over the last fifteen years the subfields of “cultural sociology” and “cultural psychology” have emerged in those kindred disciplines. Several introductory sociology texts have a chapter on culture and reprint Miner’s “Body Ritual Among the Nacirema.” Historian Michael Kammen writes brilliantly about American Culture, American Tastes (1999). English departments everywhere have “cultural studies” programs, usually without anthropological input or participation and usually growing out of an intellectual tradition independent of our own. (This situation has drawn ample commentary elsewhere.) Anthropologists enjoy tackling popular culture abroad, but our contributions to the Popular Culture Association and the American Culture Association and their journals are scarce. Multiculturalism and diversity training often masquerade as substitutes for anthropological insight.

I am not hostile toward scholars reaching beyond the narrow training of their graduate specialties and disciplines, nor do I want to protect an anthropological turf populated with far-flung small-scale societies, or the culture concept itself. Sensitivities to diversity are, of course, highly desirable. The post-modern world after all is one of blurred genres and interdisciplinary perspectives. I am deeply frustrated, however. We have not fulfilled the idealized prospects on which I always thought anthropology was based: a holistic, comparative, global perspective, as engaged with complex modern society as with small-scale societies, or the culture concept itself. Having done so we have not followed this success with studies of the modern world that utilize our unique perspectives and fieldwork. We have rarely realized our integrative opportunities with respect to modern society. We remain as remote, as alien, and as marginalized as most of our famous traditional subjects.

Even as ethnographers of our own complex, fascinating, exotic society we seem to be largely absent. There are many important exceptions, of course, including William Arens’s work on the Nacirema, Conrad Kottak’s numerous excursions into modern American life, Daniel Miller’s A Theory of Shopping (1998), Michael Moffat’s Coming of Age in New Jersey (1989), and Peggy Reeves Sanday’s
Fraternity Gang-Rape (1990), to name only a few. Self-congratulatory anthropologists will continue the list with dozens of additional contributions of our colleagues. And indeed that would be correct, yet something is missing from the anthropological promise.

There is hope for our lack of visibility. The publication of volumes such as Forman's (1995), the calls by Borofsky for “public anthropology” (2000a, 2000b), and the efforts by Sanday (1998) to refocus at least some of us on contemporary issues through “public interest anthropology” are welcome, important, and overdue. But for the most part we still have little or no voice in contemporary social analyses or in public commentary. As Lee Drummond wrote in the Anthropology News last year, “When we set out to examine the public image of anthropologists we soon discover that it is practically non-existent” (2000:6). We still write mostly for members of our own small, self-absorbed clan rather than for the tribe.

I remain motivated by the belief that we have, in Peacock's words, “a grand vision, a critical edge” and, therefore, much to offer. Unfortunately, anthropology is, as he noted, “everywhere and nowhere” (1997:12, 10). We still need to do a much better job de-marginalizing ourselves, to one another, on campus, and to the society at large.
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Liminal No Longer: Collective Action at The Margins
Paul Grebinger (Rochester Institute of Technology, pfggss@rit.edu)

Several years ago my colleagues and I in a small department of sociology and anthropology were catalyzed into collective action. The proximate cause was an Institute wide program review that discriminated against departments that do not offer degrees. We offer service courses to students from diverse majors in a comprehensive university, Rochester Institute of Technology. With the exception of degree programs such as social work and criminal justice, the historical function of the College of Liberal Arts has been to offer service courses to students in technical majors. But it was inconvenient for the Institute Program Review Committee to create different criteria for the minority of departments in our circumstance. The bias in the review led to a poor outcome for us. We discovered a new dimension of marginality.

The program review was initiated in October of 1995 and the negative outcome reported by the following February. Academic programs and non-degree departments were evaluated in terms of four criteria: Centrality to the vision of the Institute (set out in its Strategic Plan); Financial viability through contribution to the long-run financial health of the Institute; Marketability in terms of student demand; and, Quality in terms of “verifiable evidence of . . . curricular and intellectual excellence.” From data inputs collected on this model, the Program Review Committee read and numerically rated each program and department in each category. The sociology and anthropology department appeared at the bottom of this list, nine in quality and eight of nine in overall rank, surpassing only our colleagues in
political science. It is always comforting to know that there is someone just a little more marginal than you are! Initial embarrassment gave way to anger about the injustice of being so rated in a methodologically flawed process.

We responded with a letter that I drafted and the department discussed and edited. It is quoted here at length: "From the outset it was obvious that the program review process did not provide measures that would be useful in evaluating departments. Most categories did not apply to our activities, many of the data were supplied by outside sources, and critical input from students who had taken our courses could not be collected in the truncated time frame within which the review was to be completed. But, among the various operations we were asked to perform, the creation of the 'vision statement' narrative represents the epitome of bogus data collection and evaluation. This highly subjective statement became the sole basis for an 'objective' measure of our quality as a department. The procedure for accomplishing this was akin to the well-known technique of content analysis. The statements were read by the Program Review Committee and given numerical ratings. Valid content analysis requires objectivity and system. Objectivity means that each step in the process 'must be carried out according to explicitly formulated rules and procedures,' and system requires that 'the inclusion or exclusion of content or categories is done according to consistently applied rules' (Ole R. Holsti, 1969 Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company).

We need to know whether these requirements were met. If not, then the analysis is not valid. More significant, however, is the apparent misuse of the technique itself. Content analysis is employed to generate quantitative data in the form of frequencies and contingency analysis (presence/absence), not ordinal rankings. The numbers that rate the quality of each department within the College of Liberal Arts are meaningless, as a process that was flawed from its inception produced them. THE PROBLEM IS THAT THESE NUMBERS NOW HAVE TAKEN ON A REALITY OF THEIR OWN."

Our desire for methodological purity was misplaced, an academic nicety. Our objections were ignored and we were instructed to press on nevertheless. I have been a token anthropologist in my department and college for many years, but suddenly my colleagues in sociology and I discovered a common bond in our liminal status. Like minorities we have studied, and about whom we teach, we were learning from first-hand experience how policy decisions on up the hierarchy can be both arbitrary and unfair. Like minorities before us we responded by reinventing ourselves and taking collective action that has been politically effective, and even intellectually stimulating.

An effective context for academics to contemplate collective action is a retreat, a setting in which one can focus, think, and exchange ideas. We decided (all five of us) to attend a conference on "Technology and the Rest of Culture" held at New School University in New York City in January 1997. While the Conference was valuable for the insight it provided and has been published (Social Research 64 (3), fall 1997), the real benefit of our trip as retreat was the bonding and sense of purposive action that it engendered in us. While traveling to and from by train, and over meals, we invented a thematic focus for our course offerings, that would become a minor in Work, Technology and Culture.

We agreed to incorporate issues of work and technology in all of the courses we offer in the minor. Further, we decided that the scope of our courses should be global. The theme provided impetus for the creation of new courses, for example Issues in Transfer of Technology, and Women, Work and Culture. When one of the original gang of five retired, we hired a sociologist who specializes in work. Further, we concluded that the theme would be of interest to a wider audience in Rochester and Monroe County where R.I.T. is located. Rochester is the most important manufacturing center in New York State, and Rochester products depend upon a global market. Therefore, we instituted an annual conference on work. The objective was to enlighten R.I.T. students about issues of the workplace, and the problems of global capitalism. Our students tend to be intensely focused on securing remunerative employment as an outcome of their highly technical training, but understand relatively little about the larger contexts in which corporations operate. Also, we wished to draw representatives of the Rochester corporate and labor communities into a dialog on issues of work and technology. By design, these conferences are not another context for academic
professionals to present papers to one another. They are organized on the model of a teach-in. We have presented four thus far, each more ambitious than the previous one.

In April 2000 we presented “Work and Globalization: Who Gets Ahead; Who is Left Behind?” The stated purpose was to “explore the local and international social consequences of globalization, including the impact on worker’s rights, grassroots developments such as microlending and microenterprise, and collective action by labor and other groups to democratize the expanding international economy.” The program brochure is quoted here in order to indicate the scope of the conference. We have begun these conferences with a morning plenary session that is an open panel. The hope is that free exchange of ideas will catalyze discussion throughout the day. The panel included Bill Johnson the mayor of Rochester, Barber Conable (former president of the World Bank) and Jon Garlock (representing the Rochester Labor Council) among others. We ended with a keynote address. David Hakken, an Anthropologist from SUNY Institute of Technology, Utica, New York, author of Cyborgs@Cyberspace? An Ethnographer Looks at the Future (1999, Routledge), spoke on “Work, Knowledge and Technology in a Globalizing Era.” The timing of the conference was fortuitous in its proximity to the protests in Seattle and subsequent activism on global trade. It gave us a public forum to discuss issues that all of us raise in our various courses in the minor Work, Technology and Culture. For me it was a chance to focus on grassroots development issues that I introduce, but do not have time to fully develop in my course on Cultural Change in Global Perspective. In other words, one outcome of collective action with my sociology colleagues has been to expand my understanding of critical development issues. I was able to organize a panel on “Grassroots Development: Microlending and Microenterprise” in which Ellen Kintz and Rose Marie Chierici from SUNY Geneseo talked about their work in Maya Mexico and Haiti, and in which Melissa Marquez, who is General Manager of the Progressive Neighborhood Federal Credit Union, discussed microlending in inner city Rochester. Student attendance and participation were encouraged and many attended more than one panel during the day. Further, since all panels of the conference were recorded on VHS tape, it is now possible to use segments in our courses.

Workers rights were a central theme of these conferences from the outset. By the time we had concluded the third, it was becoming obvious that impacts of globalization on human rights in general should be the subject of the fourth conference on April 19 2001. The morning plenary session was organized under the title “Globalization and Social Justice: Are They Compatible?” In this debate David Reid, who is Benjamin Forman Chair in International Business at R.I.T., provided the classic argument for the benefits of free trade. Rebuttal was provided by Richard Robbins, anthropologist at SUNY Plattsburgh (Global Problems and the Culture of Capitalism. 2nd Edition. 2002. Allyn and Bacon), William Tabb, an economist at Queens College CUNY, and Lance Compa, International Labor Relations, Cornell University. Panels treated topics such as “Globalization, Poverty and Human Rights” and “North American Trade Agreements and Social Justice.” The evening keynote address was delivered by Philip McMichael, a sociologist from Cornell University whose book Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective, 2nd Edition (2000, Pine Forge Press) is widely used in sociology courses on globalization.

Following our selection of the topic, and simultaneous with our efforts to organize the spring conference, an independent committee was deciding to make globalization, human rights and citizenship the focus of the Gannett Lecture Series and Senior Seminar. The lecture series (from September through May) is under the direction of the Caroline Werner Gannett Professor for the Humanities. Senior Seminar is a capstone course in the liberal arts required of all students at the Institute before they graduate. Students attend the lectures, and the seminars offer a context in which to discuss the lectures and other topics introduced by the faculty. Once the topic is chosen, a search follows for a candidate from outside the Institute to fill the chair. Robert D. Manning (Credit Card Nation: The Consequences of American Addiction to Credit, 2000, Basic Books) is the new Gannett Chair. Faculty from many disciplines volunteer to teach the senior seminars. This requires special preparation for some of them. Our spring conference was perfectly timed to provide workshops for faculty in globalization and human rights.
In effect, we had moved to the center of an important pedagogical and intellectual activity of the College of Liberal Arts. This has brought expressions of appreciation from the Dean of the College who has held us up as a model for other departments. Both the Provost and the President of the Institute have played roles introducing conference sessions and have expressed approval of our enterprise. We have been careful to be inclusive, soliciting participation from other members of the Liberal Arts College faculty, as well as from the College of Business and The College of Applied Science and Technology. As a consequence we have broadened the base of both student and faculty interest and attendance. While we have been successful in attracting participants from the Rochester and Monroe County business and labor communities, we have been less successful in attracting attendance from the general public. To date the conferences have been of greatest value as pedagogy, and as an spirit building collective enterprise that has lifted the fortunes of our department within the College of Liberal Arts and the Institute. We are liminal no longer.

TEACHING IN THE MARGINS: A CONCERNED VIEW
John Rhoades (St. John Fisher, rhoades@sjfc.edu)

I teach in what is currently a very small program—one full-time instructor and two adjunct instructors. There aren’t too many anthropology majors, and consequently we must offer ‘service’ courses, some of which are electives for other programs and others which simply satisfy a social science core in competition with courses in psychology, sociology, history, among others. Irrespective of their function in the college curriculum, these courses are what I would feel to be ‘in the margins’ because they are not designed to serve students who are advancing their competency in the discipline, but those who have no specific interest in anthropology (or, for that matter, any anthropological orientation to a holistic and comparative approach to understanding humanity). Students enroll for one or more of the following reasons: the course is at the right time, they need a social science or specific program elective, they have some recollection that Indiana Jones was an archaeologist, or, and this is what worries me, ‘the course sounds really neat’ or ‘it has a catchy title’.

The realities of FTE (Full Time Equivalencies—how many students per faculty member) means to administrators that the department realizes minimum enrollments for all courses. We cannot afford too many single digit enrolled courses—one or two might be made up by other courses with enrollments of 40 or more, but then there are questions about the continued viability of the low enrollment courses. I should add that the academic administrators at my college are not ‘bean-counters’ but are academics who struggle with budgets and knotty problems of resource allocation. They are willing to give second or even third looks at specific justifications for enrollment issues (experimental courses, courses at early or late hours, courses restricted to senior majors, etc.). Still, enrollment drives staffing and budgetary decisions. Therefore, courses need to be user-friendly, and attractive to students for whom anthropology is only an occasional curricular choice.

I understand that this is often exactly where anthropology needs to be. Our proselytizing mission as an academic discipline is to shake up a complacent world view with the challenge of cultural relativism and the intricacies and adaptive value of other sociocultural systems. A student may only take one anthropology course, but it has the potential for changing their life. We have gone into the margins and made a convert. There have been many contributions in the AA Newsletter and FOSAP Bulletin in which anthropologists describe the transformation in worldview that some of their students have experienced (e.g. Linder, 2000). This is a heady and immensely satisfying outcome, one that I have also experienced. So why do I feel like an advertising flack?

Anthropology certainly has the ability to produce courses that apparently (or even explicitly) offer an engrossing (even somewhat titillating) look at the exotic, and which would certainly appeal to a considerable number of students shopping for an elective, especially a fun one. In our case “Pyramids, Mummies and Mysteries” can do a lot better than “Civilizations of Ancient Egypt,” and, similarly, “Bones, Bodies and Detection” for “Forensic Anthropology,” “The human Animal” for “Introduction to Biological Anthropology,” “Understanding Others” for Principles
of Intercultural Communication,” and “Studying World Cultures” for “Ethnology,” and so on.

These are certainly relatively modest stratagems to increase enrollment in a competitive market. We compete with such other course titles as: “The Philosophy of Love,” “Word Up: Communicating in the 21st Century,” “Origins of the Future,” “Hitler and Hollywood,” “Sex Matters,” “Sex and the Body Politic,” “What Your Grammar Never Told You,” and my favorite “The Gangster and the Detective”—not to be confused with the two separate courses of “The Detective and the City” or “Crime and the City.”

In a sense anthropology courses with exotic titles may be justifiable sleight-of-hand, serving to entice intellectually receptive students who would enjoy a stimulating and productive course which they otherwise might have missed. However, the stimulation I am referring to here is one based on a fairly rigorous and critical examination of anthropology’s theoretical and methodological practices and achievements, not just exotic subject matter. But this stratagem becomes a problem when students feel that this is really the curricular equivalent of bait-and-switch. They feel justified in preferring what the course title in effect suggests, enjoyable exotica, not hard anthropology. This creates a disciplinary trap, where the conditions of the margin dominate and shape the course content. Faculty in other programs, as well as students looking for an engaging elective, may be puzzled about an instructor’s insistence to demand some competence in such anthropological details as Old Kingdom dynastic sequence, cranial indices, hominoid phylogeny, measures of intelligibility, and levels of sociocultural complexity. These can be referred to, of course, but only as extraneous things showing off the instructor’s mastery of arcane minutia rather than as necessary knowledge to be learned.

There is the temptation to adopt the students’ own experiences with “otherness” derived from media and the world wide web. I am sure that a course in “participant webservation” or “e-ethnography” (Varisco, 2000) would be quite popular. Or a course based in large part on episodes of the television show “Relic Hunter” (Weiss, 2000)—even granting that this was proposed to be used as an example of what not to do. I think that this would be even more popular than a course on webservation. I can also imagine using such media productions as “Survivor,” which I believe a cleverer anthropologist than myself could work into a course on “tribalism.” However, I think that these devices come with a price—that critical anthropological content is exchanged for entertainment. Or worse, exchanged for the anthropological heresy that the lifeways of others are held up for their voyeuristic appeal as weird or disgusting behaviors to be vicariously experienced as thrills (or done on a dare in order to vie for continued membership in a faux-tribal grouping, as was the case on a recent Survivor episode with the contestants drinking cow’s blood).

For the small department, where the majority of courses are in the margin, the issue is that there will be no refuge from selling the discipline—an anthropological home base to renew one’s conceptual sensibilities. Being able to teach a course in sociolinguistics and have the stimulation of working with a critical examination of the co-variation of social and linguistic variables is an intellectual and disciplinary refuge from a course in the margin on intercultural communication which can only present the idea that such variables exist and should be taken into consideration—somehow. But the sociolinguistics course has not been offered for some time now, due to low enrollment, while the intercultural communication course has good enrollments every year. And much to the instructor’s feared conceptual diminishment.

There is no question in my mind that anthropology should be in the margins providing a necessary broadening to students’ knowledge indispensable to citizenship in today’s world. In addition, it is good intellectual work to shape parts of anthropology for presentation in the margins. I do not subscribe to the attitude that popularization is necessarily a bad thing. At the same time small programs may not be able to provide sufficient opportunities for critical involvement in the state of anthropological work to ground and refresh our involvement with the discipline’s role as the science of humanity. I am afraid of going into the margins and becoming lost.
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Anthropology at the Margins
Aaron Podolefsky (University of Northern Iowa, podolefsky@uni.edu)

About a dozen years ago, while serving as the head of the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work at a Midwestern university, I was sitting at the department’s late registration table as students ran from place to place in the gymnasium looking for open courses to fill in their semester schedule. Late in that afternoon, a young man stopped at our table. He had that frenzied look of a student unable to find classes. As he slowly and under his breath sounded out A-N-T-H-R-O-P-O-L-O-G-Y he asked, “Is that the study of ants?”

Most people have a passing knowledge of what psychology is, what chemistry consists of, or what biology entails, but far fewer have any idea of the scope and nature of anthropology. Our poor frenzied student epitomizes, in some ways, the dilemma of anthropology in small departments—the puzzle, if you will, of doing anthropology at the margins. From this student, we may extrapolate reasons our field often goes unrecognized despite offering deep understandings critical for today’s world.

The papers in this collection express the angst and the anxiety on the one hand and the optimism on the other of teaching and researching in small anthropology programs. These feelings are expressed in the last lines of two of the papers. John Rhoades writes: “I am afraid of going into the margins and being lost,” while Paul Grebinger concludes that in his department: “We are liminal no longer.” In many ways anthropology plays a different role in small colleges and universities than in large anthropology departments with large numbers of undergraduate and graduate student majors. For faculty this creates what Robert Myers refers to as “opportunities, limitations and problems.”

There are four themes running through the papers in this collection: 1) a concern for professional identity; 2) challenges of teaching anthropology to non-majors; 3) issues teaching outside the discipline; and 4) university colleagues’ understanding and appreciating anthropology and the difficulties anthropologists face in their academic lives.

Professional Identity: Each of the authors resonates, to some degree, the idea of the lone and lonely anthropologist, further isolated by institutional and collegial dissonance. Becoming a generalist as a result of a steady diet of teaching assignments in a wide array of general courses is seen as a liability. The authors express personalized, internal dimensions of this circumstance. Robert Myers, for example, remarks that he feels his program is “dominated” by colleagues. I often had similar feelings when the vast majority of colleagues were from other disciplines. Yet I often sensed a high level of respect for what anthropologists do. Indeed, I sometimes felt that some of my colleagues were themselves envious of our field experiences and the broad sweep of our discipline.

Teaching non-majors: Compared to years past, students are increasingly vocationally oriented and have less tolerance for courses they do not perceive as directly related to their future career. Thus, most students who populate our lower division classes have little intrinsic interest in anthropology. Like other social sciences, we have sometimes tried to compete for students through sexy titles or watered down content. This competition over students is more frequently cited in the papers than are efforts to demonstrate the intrinsic value of anthropology.

But what is the value? At my own university there is an interesting contrast in two student surveys. The entering student survey finds that 95% of our incoming first-year students expect professors to challenge their most basic beliefs. Upon graduation approximately 70% say that they have no idea about the purpose of general education. Anthropology would certainly fit amongst those disciplines that challenge these students beliefs and values and provides important critical perspectives necessary for today’s undergraduates.

Each of the papers in this volume reflects a strong desire to bring the core messages and values of anthropology to non-major students. There is a deeply held confidence in the value of anthropology;
but our authors are not clear how well anthropology, locally or globally, has articulated these values to others, especially to potential students or the students in our classes.

Teaching Outside the Field: Paradoxically, teaching outside one's own field provides both opportunities and limitations. Clearly, teaching beyond the discipline moves one away from the profession. It becomes more difficult to focus on those narrow aspects of the discipline that are required for publication in nationally recognized peer review journals. At the same time, there is something intellectually exciting about interdisciplinary work, and teaching outside the field provides insights that can be brought back to anthropology to enliven our own discipline. At the same time, learning other fields allows us to bring anthropology to those fields and contexts.

My own experiences exemplify this circumstance. Following completion of my doctoral work on law in the New Guinea Highlands, I became involved with research on urban crime in America, working with sociologists, social psychologists, journalists, and others to produce several volumes on urban crime prevention. These were widely recognized in other areas, but none of my anthropological colleagues had read them. During that work, however, I brought the insights of anthropology to my colleagues in these other fields and at the same time learned greatly from them. When I took my first teaching position I was able to teach in the area of community crime prevention (sociology and criminology) and as well as graduate courses in what sociologists term qualitative methods. Familiarity with other fields made me a more valuable member of my academic department.

Colleague’s Understanding of Our Field: Anthropologists may experience a range of difficulties in presenting our field to students. In small departments, our colleagues are less likely to understand these situations. Let me mention just two. One is the anxiety created when teaching evolutionary theory. This may be among the most emotionally charged topics taught in the university these days. To shy away from teaching evolution in the classroom betrays our discipline, but to teach it often incurs the outrage of students, particularly in certain parts of the country, who perceive it to be an attack on their most basic beliefs. Anthropologists must engage students in a thoughtful dialogue about evolution while being sensitive to the values and beliefs of those who are offended by the concept and the conversation. A second example is the difficulty of maintaining a research program given the need to pursue field research—a consideration that differentiates us from many of our colleagues. Sociologists, our most frequent departmental colleagues, often do quantitative research, which can be completed with less disruption to the life cycle of a small institution not accustomed to faculty buying off research time or being away from campus for extended periods.

Myers laments the lack of strong representation by anthropologists at policy development levels or in ways that make it clear the importance of what we do. Paul Grebinger’s paper turns this on its head and shows how anthropologists can become important players at the policy level and demonstrates the usefulness of anthropology in the university. As a provost, I think this effort is exceptional and commendable. Grebinger’s paper describes how he and his colleagues first examined the local context?what would be called “the environment” in strategic planning. Second, they involved external constituencies in determining their strategic direction. Third, they involved others on campus. And fourth, through a collective effort they created a context in which others perceived the value of the department and its courses. The question is whether this new fire in the department is good for students and good for faculty. My estimation is that it is.

Anthropology will always be at the margins. It is a discipline that is particularly unique and individualistic. We choose, as anthropologists, to delve into the past through material remains or try to view the world from the perspective of people from cultures far different from our own. We choose as, individuals, to go to places foreign and far away? to the New Guinea Highlands, Amazon jungle, or Kalahari Desert. We take on these challenges as individuals where other disciplines are characterized by teams of scientists. Thus, we find ourselves personally and professionally isolated. We did not choose the popular path. Making a professional life in a small department compounds these circumstances.

I am frequently reminded of a passage in Herman Hesse’s book Steppenwolf in which the main character comes across a door on which is written “Not for Everybody.” This sign always comes to mind
when I think about places to live or things to do? "Not for Everybody." Somehow I gravitate to those sorts of places and people. Being an anthropologist is "Not for Everybody." But anthropological understanding, in contrast, is for everybody. The lessons of our discipline, from cultural relativism and diversity to the importance of ethnographic research methods, are critical to an undergraduate education and to applied and policy research.

If there is one thing I have to say from the perspective of a university provost, it is that I am glad that there are anthropologists teaching at the margins, doing the good work that provides students with those intellectual skills, abilities and insights that are among the qualities we most value in educated people.

The Perry Scheme for Teaching a Purposeful Anthropology
Mike McDonald (Florida Gulf Coast University, mmcdonal@fgcu.edu)

Recently public attention has been drawn to the consequences of anthropological research on informants (Tierney, 2000), yet many more people the world over study anthropology as a subject than are studied by anthropologists as objects. There is in my view a curious lack of attention paid to the discipline’s capacity to evoke personal and intellectual development among the students we expose to the esoterica of other people, other places, and other ways. William Perry’s scheme of moral and intellectual development (1979) is a promising framework in which ethnographic acuity may be used to read the outward signs of a mind growing through anthropology. Scholars working in what is commonly referred to as the Perry Scheme find that a college student may pass through up to nine fairly discrete positions of intellectual expression over the years in school. The scheme lumps the positions into four stages: dualism, multiplicity, relativism, and commitment in relativism, and charts, "students dealing more and more successfully with social and intellectual diversity, accruing a more and more coherent set of values and beliefs, and finally making commitments based on their values and beliefs and assuming responsibility to work to realize those commitments" (Burnham 1986: 153). Perry’s mileposts converge nicely with the ideals of anthropology and make our courses especially appropriate for tracking this kind of growth.

I am in the first phase of a longitudinal study of anthropology students at Florida Gulf Coast University (FGCU) employing the Measure of Intellectual Development (MID), a Perry based instrument that employs an open ended prompt to invite essay responses on the students "best class" (Mentkowski, et al, 1983; Moore, 1994). Findings from this type of study generally indicate that most college freshmen function at a dualistic level of thought (Baxter-Magolda, 1987; Kloss, 1994). Briefly, dualists perceive a binary structure in the world: there are right and wrong answers, there is an immutable truth in the world, and professors are authorities who know the right answers. The good professors teach the facts in a clear and interesting manner. Students at this level have little tolerance for admissions of uncertainty or hypothetical wanderings.

Over the past several years, the thirty or so students enrolled in my cultural anthropology sections at FGCU have typically been in their first year of school and each semester I hear in their questions the revealing voice of the dualist: "which one do you think is important," "what are we supposed to get out of this?", and my all time favorite, "which chapters, terms, facts do we need to know for the test?" Anticipating somewhat the findings of my study, I have been working on instructional and assessment strategies for the cultural course meant to disrupt the equilibrium of the dualistic mode of thought and to promote intellectual growth along the Perry Scheme. Repeated measurements over the coming years using the MID will allow me to evaluate this pedagogic strategy.

Just as group size and composition influence enculturation processes in ethnographic settings a factor that affects intellectual growth at the university level is the learning environment. I find that lecture halls with rows of theatre-style seating invite a certain distance from and passivity toward the subject. A "norm of non-questioning" (Tobin 2000:62) prevalent among college students and high reliance on the didactic style of teaching widely employed in colleges and universities further define this environment. While most of us have little
control over the size or venue of our courses, we can take aim at the other contributing factors by first reflecting on the things we do in the classroom. For instance, the manner in which we lecture or how much we lecture can subtly reinforce the dualists’ notions of authority or it can invite the students to question it. Rather than offer expository views, I invite and guide conversation on topics to deliberately diffuse ownership of the knowledge to include students. Following Tobin (2000), I require that these discussions, including all questions and answers, take place in complete sentences. Like Tobin, I believe this expectation counters the learning resistant norm of one-word replies (2000:62) and it fosters precision in thought and encourages students to find their own voice, activities which also invite intellectual change (Belenky et al., 1986).

Perry (1979) noted that the single most important factor for moving students out of dualism is diversity. This plays to the particular strength of anthropology where a wide array of images and descriptions of human physical and cultural variation are our stock in trade. I recognized the shock value of ethnographic films long before I understood how they could be used to stimulate intellectual growth. In the past they served primarily as substitutes or enhancements for lectures. When I show films now, I require students to conduct "vicarious research" by recording observations of material culture and behaviors, and to infer underlying values and beliefs from them. This allows students, including those in large lecture halls, to be active participants in the course. In follow-on discussions, I ask them to speculate on how these various parts of culture facilitate adaptation. Exercises such as this help provide a structured exposure to cultural diversity. I employ only a few cases over the course of the term and revisit them throughout so that dualistic thinkers do not get overwhelmed amid a mosaic of global diversity. In conjunction with the concepts of ethnocentrism and cultural relativism some students are able to use the metered encounters to construct views of other cultures as legitimate and reasonable alternatives to their own life experience, thereby increasing their capacity for diversity and ambiguity.

According to Perry, dualists also lack the ability to make generalizations or to argue them through relevant illustrations. Exercises like the one above provide practice in finding evidence to defend generalizations, and in coalescing this evidence into patterns to make generalizations. When students employ discursive and analytical tools it allows the instructor to both evaluate their level on the Perry scale and to place further instructional emphasis on areas that will promote growth. It may seem a truism, but students will not reveal their intellectual capacity if we do not challenge them to do so.

To get a sense of how students are evaluated in the discipline, I have collected thus far 76 syllabi for lower division cultural anthropology courses taught at institutions around the country. Of these roughly 65% employ "objective" tests that rest entirely or primarily on one or more of the following: multiple-choice, fill in the blank, matching and or true/false questions. Most of the others rely to a lesser degree on this assessment strategy that unwittingly confounds intellectual growth. Dualists love objective exams for the very reason I find them inappropriate. For one, this type of exam conveys the impression that the answer is already known, and they reward identification of the answer, not the use of the material or ideas to negotiate cultural difference or to create meaning.

Introductory level courses in all subjects are generally replete with vocabulary and while it may be common practice and expedient to employ single answer problems for evaluation, from the Perry perspective, such an approach will never impel students to move beyond dualistic thinking. In an effort to align assessment activities in my course with Perry goals and the best practices of cognitive anthropology, my exams include a section of unexpected pairs of concepts drawn from the review sheet. On the first exam this might include norms with participant observation. Students are tasked first with defining each concept and then constructing a relationship between them on the basis of several comparable, contrasting or overlapping aspects. This evaluative approach mirrors closely the various ethnographic methods employed to elicit folk taxonomies and other cultural domains (Berlin, et al., 1974; Boster and Johnson, 1989). I especially like it because it allows for the possibility of numerous correct answers?a point I belabor in feedback?and encourages the students to actively, if not extemporaneously, synthesize new content within existing beliefs and ideas. On a recent exam, several students defined the terms and then described how
participant observation would enable a researcher to perceive prevailing cultural norms. Another full credit response described participant observation as, "one of the norms of anthropological research," reminding me that anthropology may be perceived etically as a kind of culture and not just a discipline that studies it. Many students provided more dualistic type responses providing only definitions or definitions with examples of each of the paired terms.

To encourage comprehension of course concepts rather than their discrete and rote memorization, concept-mapping exercises are employed throughout the term. Following the section on political organization, I provide a page with a list of chapter concepts and ask students to construct a response to the essay type question, "What are the forms of political organization that occur cross-culturally?" Working in pairs or small groups, students are generally able to create linkages among several concepts. To advance the discussion we examine the nature of the relationships that join the various concepts. For instance, the chief has authority over the chiefdom or a paramount chief is a type of chief. These "propositional statements," sensu Novack (1991), structure the concepts into hierarchy, temporal sequence, or some other system of organization. By illustrating the process on the white board, students often volunteer connections they have made between concepts or cross-links among those already connected. Others see connections they had not considered and that multiple, possible solutions exist to answering the question. I believe that concept mapping helps students organize and structure knowledge, retain that knowledge for application and think about the subject matter as less monolithic, a necessary condition for growth along the Perry Scheme.

I pursue this purposeful, developmental approach to teaching because I feel that anthropology has more to offer than a mere assemblage of facts. I have come to recognize the need and the means to design courses that match the learner's developmental status and consciously prioritize intellectual development over content coverage. As the more formal evidence of this study emerges, I plan to report on the longitudinal assessment of the qualitative changes in anthropology student thinking at FGCU. In future articles I expect to present closer studies of techniques and results of anthropology courses matched to different Perry levels including multiplicity and relativism. I remain confident that the Perry framework is valuable for the pedagogy of anthropology primarily because it provides description of intellectual levels that corresponds to our informal perceptions of student ability and charts a mechanism for tuning and continuously refining our curriculum to match the modal abilities of our classes.
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