INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Unmasking Identity:
The Construction of the 'Anthropologist'

By

Laura Susan Cohen, B.A.

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

May 29, 1997

© copyright

1997, Laura Susan Cohen

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-26907-8

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis

**Unmasking Identity:
The Construction of the 'Anthropologist'**

submitted by Laura Susan Cohen, B.A.
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Bruce Cox, Co-supervisor

John Cove, Co-supervisor

Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University

June 11, 1997

Abstract

This thesis investigates the construction and reproduction of anthropological identity. In doing so, it identifies fieldwork and the Ph.D. as dimensions that facilitate, maintain, and legitimize anthropological identity. Women informants introduce gender as an added dimension of professional identity. The data collected for this thesis is based on interviews with university-based anthropologists in Canadian universities. The general findings point to a consensus on the criteria used to define the anthropologist. It also examines how group membership results from these shared definitions. Introductory anthropology texts are surveyed to show how they complement the views and perceptions expressed by informants. They also construct the external definitions that may serve to reproduce the anthropological world view and perspective in students of anthropology. Finally this thesis, because it deals with academic anthropologists, also suggests the complexities of the dual-natured role of professor-anthropologist within a university structure.

Acknowledgments

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my committee members, John Cove, Bruce Cox, and Flo Kellner for their ongoing support and interest in my work. I am thankful to John Cove for his openness in accepting and engaging my ideas, logical or bizarre, and always having something to add to them. Thank you to Bruce Cox for his continued support of this thesis, and for giving me hope that this really was an interesting area of inquiry. Finally, thank you to Flo Kellner for teaching me that methods really can be taught!

I am extremely grateful to my informants who gave generously of their time and themselves through their honesty, and willingness to be interviewed. I had a wonderful opportunity to meet many interesting and creative anthropologists through this research.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this thesis to my late grandfather, Joe Shapiro, who never understood why I chose to study "monkeys" when I could have been a dental hygienist!

Table of Contents

	Page
Chapter I: Introduction	1
Chapter II: Methodology: The Research Process	
2.0 Introduction.....	7
2.1 Theoretical Framework.....	10
2.2 The Research Setting.....	15
2.3 Method of Data Collection.....	17
2.4 The Sample.....	19
2.5 Data Measurement and Analysis.....	22
2.6 Limitations of Research.....	24
2.7 Influence of the Researcher on Data Collection...	26
Chapter III: Group Membership and Collective Identity	
3.0 Introduction.....	31
3.1 Conceptualizing Identity.....	32
3.2 Encountering Perspectives: Anthropology as Presented in Introductory Texts.....	36
3.3 Attributing Qualities to Self: Anthropology and Anthropologists as Expressed by Informants...	39
3.4 Fieldwork as a Rite of Passage.....	42
3.5 (Re)defining the Field.....	50
3.6 Promoting/Defending Perspectives: Anthropology as Unique?.....	54
Chapter IV: Women and Gender Identity	
4.0 Introduction.....	62
4.1 Women's Identity as Anthropologist-Spouse.....	64
4.2 Women's Identity as Academic Anthropologist.....	69
4.3 Women's Identity as Teacher.....	75
Chapter V: Reproducing Anthropology	
5.0 Introduction.....	81
5.1 Rationale for Examining Reproduction.....	83
5.2 Reproduction as Identity Maintenance.....	85
5.3 Promoting Perspectives to Others: Reproducing the Anthropological "World View".....	86
5.4 Selectivity in Conveying Self to Others: Reproducing (My)Self?.....	93
5.4.1 (My)Self as Ego?.....	95
5.4.2 (My)Self as Anthropologist?.....	95
5.4.3 Unconscious Reproduction.....	97
5.5. "Lived Experience" as Identity Maintenance.....	99

Chapter VI: Conclusion: Final Thoughts	104
Appendix A1 Electronic Message (CASCA)	117
Appendix A2 Electronic Message (General)	118
Appendix B Letter of Consent	119
Appendix C Interview Questions	120
Appendix D Breakdown of Informants by Fields	121
Appendix E Introductory Anthropology Texts	122
Bibliography	124

Chapter I

Introduction

This thesis is derived from an ongoing investigation of anthropology as a discipline. In the early stages of my research, I became interested in how anthropologists are trained. Specifically, I wanted to investigate the type of training that goes into constructing an academic anthropologist and a practicing anthropologist. I was working from the premise that the physical and conceptual locations of these anthropologists had distinctive ethical and professional implications. I found that those anthropologists who work within a practicing/applied context appeared removed from the foundations of academia. Based on this idea, I found myself asking what impact that disengagement might have on the ethics and career decisions of an anthropologist. I also became interested in exploring whether this disengagement highlighted something more fundamental: a possible disconnection between theory and practice.

My early research showed me that these issues were more complex and required further analysis. The problematic was not necessarily as clearly defined and obvious as a disjunction

between theory and practice, as I initially thought. Moreover, it also seemed beneficial to examine academia's role and function within this scenario. I wanted to know how social reproduction occurs through curricula choices in anthropology departments. My research interest then shifted toward examining the milieux wherein the anthropologist was partially produced - the university. How to understand the transfer and communication of anthropological skills and expertise? Let us examine the discipline and its academic roots, because that's precisely where anthropologists are produced. Concomitant with this, the construction of group and self identities among anthropologists also became an area of interest. Specifically, does identity have an impact on the way anthropologists transfer anthropological information and skills to students? In the early stages, this interest in the communication and transfer of knowledge was central to my investigation.

To address these issues, it was essential to examine the unstated assumptions about being an anthropologist and focus on the related and relevant issues. However, in the course of my data collection, it appeared too large a task to take on for a Master's thesis. Those questions of identity were themselves complex and interwoven and warranted a separate discussion. Therefore, my focus shifted from examining

pedagogical practices and curricula, to examining the dimensions that may construct a professional identity 'anthropologist'. It is my intention to spend the next five chapters tracing that process. I will also introduce gender as an obstacle and challenge to the ongoing continuity of the professional identity 'anthropologist'.

Chapter II presents an overview of the methodology and research issues involved in collecting and analyzing data for this thesis. The chapter will begin by examining the theoretical framework to be employed. The theoretical perspectives that guide this research are symbolic interactionism and grounded theory. Symbolic interactionism offers a basis for examining identity and the objects that become central to identity itself. I will then go on to examine the research process that will include the setting, method of data collection, and sampling. Finally, this chapter will also discuss the role of the researcher in the process. I assert that the researcher and research process are connected. Because of this, the position of researcher within this process directly affects and influences the findings presented in this thesis.

Chapter III examines how anthropologists forge membership and group identity, focussing on the symbolic meaning that

fieldwork and the Ph.D. had for the informants interviewed. This chapter aims to investigate whether the university-based anthropologists I interviewed, could identify a collective identity called 'anthropologist'. This chapter works to illustrate how consensual agreement on professional identity is established and how legitimacy is attained.

Chapter IV introduces the complexity of gender into the process of defining the professional identity 'anthropologist'. This chapter underlines the significant discrepancies between how men and women viewed themselves as anthropologists. While there was agreement on what people felt was important to be an anthropologist, women exposed another dimension that men had not raised. Therefore, the 'generic' process of anthropological enculturation becomes disrupted when configuring the impact of gender on identity. While all the informants made the same transition from student to anthropologist by doing fieldwork and a Ph.D., women's ongoing membership and participation in the larger world of anthropology becomes marginalized. This chapter examines how women informants viewed the construction of themselves as teachers, colleagues and anthropologists.

Chapter V focusses on, and examines reproduction. I will investigate how introductory anthropology texts may be used to

concretize the discipline, and in many cases the 'anthropologist'. This chapter also investigates the ways in which identity maintenance is achieved by reproducing the anthropological world view and perspective in students. This chapter attempts to explain how reproductive strategies such as texts, teaching, and personal experiences communicate an external definition of anthropology to outsiders. This may serve to maintain legitimacy and identity within a university structure.

Chapter VI concludes this thesis by discussing the complexities of the dual role of professor and anthropologist. This section will attempt to summarize the main issues raised throughout my investigation. The movement between the anthropologist as understood in traditional terms, as the 'field worker' and the anthropologist as professor will be explicated. Here, I only intend to suggest some of the complexities of professional identity for people whose identity is derived from two different experiences and essentially two different occupations. This thesis does not aim to prove that there is such a thing as an 'anthropological identity'. Often informants denied that there was an anthropological identity. Yet, they illustrated throughout my interviews the dimensions of the identity whose existence they

denied. Rather, this thesis aims to highlight the complexities of the anthropological identity, and to explore the culture of anthropology within a university structure.

Chapter II

Methodology: The Research Process

2.0 Introduction

As I stated in the introduction, my primary research objective was to explore how anthropologists viewed themselves with respect to issues of professional identity. What elements construct the professional identity of 'anthropologist'? My experience as an anthropology student and my contact with anthropologists within a university, directly influenced my desire to explore identity construction. The challenge was to investigate whether anthropologists themselves could identify elements of an anthropological identity.

I began the process of defining interview questions by conducting five preliminary interviews. These pretest interviews revealed that while there was a consensus on certain aspects of anthropological identity, there were also notable differences. This heightened my curiosity and led me to investigate where ideas and perceptions meet, where they diverge, and to explore possible reasons behind these different positions. The data presented here come from twenty-seven interviews. Twelve of the informants were women, and

fifteen were men. Of the twenty-seven interviews, twenty-two were done in person, and five electronically via electronic mail (E-mail). The only criterion used to select informants was that they teach anthropology. Initially I had conceptualized studying two very distinct groups of anthropologists: 'practicing' anthropologists who have no institutional affiliation, and 'academic' anthropologists. However after reading *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*, it became clear to me that unless there were shared commonalities between the groups, constructing categories for comparative analysis would be quite difficult (Glaser and Strauss 1967). Rather, "comparing as many differences and similarities in data as possible tends to force the analyst to generate categories, their properties and their interpretations (Glaser and Strauss 1967:55)." Therefore, I decided that by focussing on anthropologists who teach, there would still be ample room for comparison, although this is ostensibly one group. While I hoped that some of my informants would identify themselves as practicing or applied anthropologists in some contexts, I restricted my sample to those who had university teaching experience. Using this criterion proved to be quite helpful, because it encouraged me to investigate where academics draw their professional status. Had I continued to pursue the

professionalization and training of anthropologists as my sole source of professional identity, I might have missed this issue.

Early in my fieldwork, I became aware that my questions were changing, and became concerned that these changes might 'taint' my data and threaten the consistency of my findings. However because the research process is a 'work-in-process', change can be viewed as a positive development. The principles of grounded theory stress that concepts are generated throughout the research process, and are based on evidence (data) from which the category emerged (Glaser and Strauss 1967:23). It is this grounded theoretical position that guided the methodological process under which my research developed.

This chapter focuses on that process and the concomitant elements of it. I begin by presenting a detailed explication of my theoretical framework to map the identity issues raised within this thesis. I then go on to describe the settings where the data were collected. Following this, I discuss the methods used to collect data and some weaknesses and difficulties encountered. This chapter details how the interviews were organized and recorded. I will also describe the sample and the process of data measurement and analysis. I conclude this methodology chapter by examining some

obstacles and problems that arose throughout the process. In keeping with the principles of reflexivity, I discuss the importance of my role as researcher throughout this process.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

Symbolic interactionism provides a map for investigating components of group membership. In using symbolic interactionism as a guide, it is possible to examine how both internal definitions (anthropologists as a group) and external definitions (anthropologists and others) may emerge. Symbolic interactionism emphasizes individuals' 'world of objects', as a means to understand their actions. This is a helpful way to explore the meaning/s that certain components of anthropology may have for its members (Blumer 1969:11). According to Blumer, the use of the word, 'world' as opposed to 'environment' is essential for understanding the actions and meanings of people. For Blumer, world denotes, "the setting, the surroundings, and the texture of things that confront them (Blumer 1969:11)." What may comprise the anthropological world, and how do anthropologists then communicate that world? The world of objects discussed in this thesis consists of the social objects that are meaningful to the anthropologists interviewed. "Symbols are social objects. We create and use symbols to communicate and represent something to others and

to our self (Charon 1985:39)." The meaning of symbols is based on whatever people, (in this case anthropologists) agree these symbols represent (Charon 1985:39). In symbolic interactionism, these meanings are a result of an interpretive process, and the social interactions between individuals (Blumer 1969:2). For these social objects to develop meaning, they have to be based on some form of agreement by the group whose interactions occur around them. By examining how social objects become transformed into symbolic objects, it is possible to analyze the potential identity pegs that may exist within anthropology that create meaning for its membership. Wengle's, *Ethnographers in the Field*, refers to 'identity pegs' as the process that explains "how or through what...student-initiates identify with the symbol of anthropology (Wengle 1988:13)." This thesis aims to expose those identity pegs or 'markers' for anthropologists, that become internally incorporated into an anthropological identity and then externally communicated. A more detailed discussion of this process will be explicated in Chapter III.

A further issue I will raise in the following chapters is how group membership and consensus operate through the various objects and symbols a group adopts. In order to look at group membership, attention must be directed at the significance of

social identity and group identity. The work of Goffman and Rosenberg are extremely helpful for this analysis. The issue of group consensus is given much attention in Goffman's, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959). Goffman's emphasis on how the individual projects a definition based on a 'team'¹ definition is valuable for investigating the process by which anthropological identity may be constructed. Rosenberg's book, *Conceiving the Self* (1979), analyzes and suggests the ways in which membership groups are formed, and how that influences self-concept.

Rosenberg, focusses on self-concept, as object rather than as subject. He defines self concept as the "totality of the individual's thoughts and feelings having reference to [him/herself] as an object (Rosenberg 1979:7)." Self-concept complements symbolic interactionism in the sense that "we form our objects of ourselves through the way in which others' see

¹ Goffman's use of the terms 'team' and 'performance teams' relates to "any set of individual's who co-operate in staging a single routine" (1959:79). For this thesis I am drawing on Goffman's notion of team to denote the group membership of anthropologist, precisely because there appears to be single routines that all individuals are expected to do, such as fieldwork and completing a Ph.D. Furthermore, Goffman's work is valuable in investigating the process by which team consensus is established and maintained.

or define us (Blumer 1969:13)." Rosenberg emphasizes that self-concept is not the 'real self', but rather the picture of the self (Rosenberg 1979:7). It is precisely this notion of the picture of self that is explored in the following chapters. Throughout my fieldwork distinguishing between the 'real self' (informant) and the 'picture of the self' (anthropologist) was difficult. This is relevant to the construction of the anthropological self because it suggests that part of becoming an anthropologist may be a result of what others define an anthropologist to be.

The self-concept...is an object of perception and reflection, including the emotional responses to that perception and reflection. It is a product of "self-objectification," requiring the individual to stand outside [him/herself] and to react to [him/herself] as a detached object of observation (Rosenberg 1979:8).

This notion of self-concept, that is the focus of Chapter V, was particularly evident when I questioned informants as to how they reproduced themselves. This question, evoked impassioned responses in people, whose boundaries between self and anthropologist appeared to be blurred. This is directly in line with Rosenberg's assertions on how group membership occurs. According to Rosenberg, a membership group occurs as "societies grow larger, they subdivide into groups based on voluntary association... these membership groups are socially

recognized bases of classification and constitute important elements of social identity (Rosenberg 1979:10)." For Rosenberg, these elements that are socially defined are part of self-concept, and sometimes may constitute the core.

Finally in examining such concepts as social objects, and group consensus, I hope to begin to illustrate the ways in which identity may be formed and maintained. Also, I hope to show how this establishes professional legitimacy for anthropologists both within the academy and outside in the larger domain of the social sciences. There are two possibilities for approaching this issue and it may be necessary to draw on both these concepts in order to construct a feasible picture of anthropological identity. The first idea is that of 'boundary maintenance', which according to Wengle is "a device that separates anthropology from its "compatriot" sciences (1988:96)." The second idea is that of the 'identity peg' which has already been briefly touched upon (Wengle 1988:13). By relying on both notions of boundary maintenance and identity pegs, they may reveal the internal and external construction of professional legitimacy.

My rationale for mapping out the theoretical concepts in this chapter is twofold: First, these concepts are applicable to both issues of collective identity and group membership and

reproduction. Presenting these dimensions in tidy theoretical packages is not feasible or perhaps even possible. Identity, indeed identities, are a highly complex web of factors and meanings that are interlinked and co-dependent. Therefore, trying to explain identity in a narrow context undermines the entire process that I am trying to construct and analyze. Secondly, I hope to show how professional identity may be constructed. Examining the social objects that anthropologists interpret and use to form the actions that we recognize and understand as anthropology will do this. Finally, I examine how consensus is used to draw boundary lines around what anthropology is, and what it is not. In essence, I am attempting to answer the underlying question of this thesis: what is an anthropologist?

2.2 The Research Setting

My interviews primarily took place in two settings. The first set of interviews took place at Brock University, during the 1996 *Learned Conference*. The *Canadian Anthropology Society* (CASCA) held its annual meeting at the same time, and that made this an ideal setting. In my view, this provided an interesting opportunity to 'observe' anthropologists outside their departments and among their professional colleagues. This venue also provided an opportunity to hear about the work

of other anthropologists whom I later contacted. I also had the opportunity to discuss my research with people who had received my electronic message (see Appendix A1). This turned out to be quite useful when I contacted people personally. Many people responded by saying that they had either received my first message, or heard about it from someone who had attended CASCA. Furthermore, it is important to note that at people were quite relaxed at CASCA. Perhaps being away from the demands and responsibilities of academe, made them more relaxed and willing to spend time with me.

The next sets of interviews were held in the offices of professors in their university surroundings. Being able to interview anthropologists within the boundaries of the university, was valuable. As university professors, a segment of their cultural milieu is the university. The offices of my informants were filled with the cultural objects that identify the other side of their professional (anthropological) lives. This was illustrated primarily by art, photographs of them in the field, and other field-based nostalgia. In terms, of reproduction, I tried to imagine the effect that these cultural items would have on students impressions of anthropology and anthropologists. It was my sense that these items, particularly photographs from the field would peak

students curiosity and interest in the discipline.

2.3 Method of Data Collection

The next stage of the research process involved selecting methods of data collection. Based on the focus of my research and the theoretical frameworks guiding my work, qualitative-based methods were the preferred and appropriate method. I then developed a series of questions, which I used in several semi-structured interviews and a Letter of Consent (see Appendices B and C). As previously stated, there were five pretest interviews; as a result new questions evolved, while others were omitted. Further by allowing questions to change and new ones to emerge, this enables the researcher to "... [compare] where the facts are similar, or different, [and]...generate properties of categories that increase the categories' generality and explanatory power (Glaser and Strauss 1967:24)." This then sets up a distinction between accuracy vs., "establishing the structural boundaries of a fact (Glaser and Strauss 1967:24)."

This process is very important. It underlines the problematic of objectivity in research. It also highlights the fact that the researcher is central to the research process, particularly in identifying concepts and categories that inform the direction of the research. I also paid attention to

some principles of feminist research, particularly the importance of a reciprocal process by which information is shared and exchanges encouraged. Often, informants asked me questions specifically, about what motivated me to pursue this research. It was my sense that when I positioned myself within the interview, the atmosphere was more congenial and more honest. It appeared that there was more trust in that my objectives and motives were clearly laid out. In other cases, when informants drifted, and I was unsuccessful at bringing them back to my questions, I went with the issues they were raising. Overall, I found these digressions to be extremely valuable and fascinating for later reflection. Moreover, being able to tolerate digression and change within the interview is a strength of using qualitative methods.

I also employed both the Internet and E-mail. The Internet was used to investigate the topic, particularly to find out whether this type of research had been done. After a fairly thorough search, I did not identify any research being done of this kind in anthropology. I also used the Internet to 'visit' university web sites to get a sense of the work being done by different university-based anthropologists. This was particularly beneficial when I contacted them for an interview.

Being 'familiar' with their work gave me a good 'in'.

E-mail was used to contact individuals to arrange interviews and furthermore, I conducted some interviews electronically (see Appendix A2). There were drawbacks and advantages to using electronic mail for interviewing. One drawback was the absence of a reciprocal and engaged exchange. While going back to my informants and asking for elaboration was possible, many valuable nuances present in face-to-face interviews were absent in the electronic interviewing process. On the other hand, I found that because people were required to sit and write their responses, the interviews were concise and direct, and less self-indulgent. As for logistics, E-mail enabled me to interview people whom I would not have interviewed because of distances, and/or people's schedules. Interestingly, people raised questions of anonymity and confidentiality more frequently, regarding electronic interviewing. I had the sense that people felt a printed interview could potentially be even more 'public' than a recorded interview.

2.4 The Sample

When I began to organize the fieldwork portion of my thesis, I was committed to trying to collect a representative sample of anthropologists from Canadian universities. I wanted

to present the thoughts and perceptions of a sizable number of university-based anthropologists, particularly as I was attempting to identify a construction of a professional identity. Further, I had hoped that my informants would represent the four fields of anthropology: physical anthropology, archaeology, linguistic anthropology, and sociocultural anthropology (see Appendix D for breakdown of informants). There was a reasonably good balance between the four fields, although the sample is slightly weighted in terms of social/cultural anthropologists. A representative group was needed to guard against sampling bias, particularly because I was doing 'insider research'.

Both insiders and outsiders...must guard against the unwarranted generalizations to an entire group the views expressed by a few favourite informants. But insiders have the unique problem of guarding against the projection of their views onto others of their community, of assuming that their orientation is more share or representative than it is (Messerschmidt 1981:23).

Because of financial constraints, it was clear that reaching a large group would be quite difficult on a face-to-face basis. This is why I decided to begin the interview process at CASCA 1996. This was my first attempt at using electronic mail as a method. It consisted of a message forwarded to all the participants and presenters on the CASCA

electronic mail list. While there was a good response to the message, in the end, I actually interviewed only a few people.

However, the responses themselves were quite helpful, even though they did not all result in interviews. There were those who were enthusiastic about the idea of anthropologists being studied; to those who were suspicious about my motives in examining these issues. Suspicion may have arisen from the fact that my own message was vague, and could have been interpreted as an attempt to critique anthropology. The vagueness stemmed from the fact that I was still in the preliminary stages of my investigation. I wanted to leave room for questions to develop, rather than restricting myself. This was my first indication that there could be a potential dilemma to gaining access to informants. When I realized this, I encouraged people's questions regarding my topic, and that became a very interesting component of the interview process.

Because I was successful in interviewing only five people at CASCA, I sent electronic messages to the anthropologists who had access to E-mail. I then began contacting these individuals directly to arrange interviews that began in May 1996, and were completed October 1996. My informants represented faculty members from nine universities in Canada. These universities were as follows: University of

British Columbia, University of Calgary, Carleton, Concordia, McGill, University of Toronto, University of Victoria, Western, and York University. A tape recorder was used in all the face-to-face interviews. These were later transcribed.

2.5 Data Measurement and Analysis

When I began my fieldwork, I attempted to conceptualize what I intended to measure. How was I going to measure informants' attitudes and perceptions of anthropologists' identity (Singleton et.al. 1993:101)? To do this, I designed questions that I thought would elicit some of those perceptions and attitudes. The main concepts I hoped to work with were identity, self, consensus, legitimacy and social reproduction. I define each of those concepts in the following chapters. As I stated in section 2.1, I relied on grounded theory throughout the research process. As a result, the question that I continually asked was, "what concept does this interview or discourse reflect?" To do this, I transcribed interviews immediately. This enabled me to make sense of the data, and to identify concepts that the data seemed to reflect (Jackson 1995:330). By constantly trying to identify and refine emerging concepts, I attempted to identify trends or patterns within the data that allowed for a generation of concepts (Glaser and Strauss 1967).

A concept may be generated from one fact, which then becomes merely one of a universe of many possible diverse indicators for, and data on, the concept. These indicators are then sought for the comparative analysis (Glaser and Strauss 1967:23).

I began the process of data analysis by trying to identify themes and concepts that emerged from the interviews. To do this, I placed all the data that were similar into categories. Each of these 'categories of meaning', highlighted some aspect of the concepts I intended to measure and analyse (Singleton et.al. 1993:103). For example, the responses that defined the role of "anthropologist" were categorized under the title 'self definition' (see chapter III). I used the same method for all the 'categories of meaning'.

This method also led me to abandon themes that I had expected to be relevant. I had intended to measure differences in professional identity among different generations of anthropologists. As my fieldwork progressed, generational boundaries seemed irrelevant, except perhaps in the case of tenure. I decided to abandon this concept as the data did not reflect it as an issue for the informants.

As for data analysis, my purpose was to build some kind of theoretical explanation for the ideas, symbols, and trends that emerged. By trying to analyse the phenomena that I felt were being described, I attempted to define identity as it

pertains to anthropologists. In doing that, I paid close attention to how these dimensions of identity were expressed, and to the variations that emerged within each dimension. Chapter IV, on gender is an example of this. By paying attention to the variations, I could identify a dimension of professional identity, namely gender, that only women expressed. Because of the overwhelming attention given to this issue, I felt it warranted a separate discussion. I believe that this is the strength of using a grounded approach. Because grounded theory recognizes the need for identifying and refining concepts as observations take place, theoretical explanations work with the data instead of against it. Had I approached my work with a solid conceptual and theoretical framework in place, gender as a phenomenon of identity, might have caused havoc on what I was trying to 'prove'.

2.6 Limitations of the Research

As with all research, there are limitations to this research which need to be acknowledged. First, this thesis is in essence, a case study of twenty-seven anthropologists. The data and analysis presented here, do not purport to generalize the perceptions and attitudes of all anthropologists. Rather, it is my intention to present the views of my informants and to attempt to analyse the greater significance that these

issues may have for anthropological identity. However, it is my sense, that it would be possible to identify recurring themes, and commonalities if this research and sample were expanded.

Secondly, it may also be the case that the identity issues and constructions presented are indeed experienced by other occupational groups, and disciplines. The degree to which this is true cannot be measured because this is not a comparative study.

Moreover, the introductory texts presented in Chapters III and V, are primarily written from the perspective of cultural anthropology. While some of the texts do discuss the other three fields, they are generally directed at introducing cultural anthropology. This may reveal an inherent bias in my research because I was primarily interested in examining how the anthropological world view and methods are presented to new students. Physical anthropology texts did not generally deal with these issues, and were more directed at examining the 'scientific' aspects of anthropology.

Finally, while my informants did represent the four fields of anthropology, they generally tended to highlight the issues related to cultural anthropology. It is my sense that this occurred for two reasons. First, my questions were

specifically directed at examining how anthropologists viewed their own transition from student to anthropologist and the role that fieldwork and the Ph.D. played in that process. Secondly, because I was attempting to identify a professional identity, the nature of the questions were more personal than professional which could have dissuaded people from discussing their own anthropological interests. Had I continued to pursue training and pedagogy, discussions regarding the four field approach, and individual interests would likely have been central in the data.

2.7 Influence of the Researcher on Data Collection

There were several dynamics at play during my fieldwork. The most significant dynamic in my opinion, was the fact that I am in anthropology, and was studying anthropologists. Because I was studying anthropologists, a certain dynamic surfaced that might not have occurred had I studied a different group. I believe, that this dynamic significantly influenced the data and the general findings of my work. In a typical fieldwork experience:

The novice-anthropologist is recruited into and trained by a group with a particular formal and informal ideology which to a greater or lesser extent, [s/he] absorbs and carries... into the field (Messerschmidt 1981:25).

For this research, what might the implications be of a

'novice-anthropologist' who uses her anthropological knowledge to study those that helped in developing those skills? As a student of anthropology, it was also often difficult to negotiate my role as a researcher. This was particularly evident when conducting interviews within university departments. That is, I felt that I had gone from being a capable researcher to a student. There were several instances where I felt very much like a student who had come to discuss a paper or a grade during office hours. Did the fact that I was in anthropology have anything to do with it? Additionally, I found it more difficult than I had imagined drifting into universities, finding departments, and presenting myself. I was very much aware of the fact that I was 'studying up', which requires a more formal and professional approach than I think I had been prepared for. Moreover, the fact that I was 'studying up' may have had much to do with the power imbalances I often experienced.

Another key issue as I have stated, was that some people I contacted were hesitant to be interviewed. I viewed this as suspicion of my 'motives', of what my goal was in studying anthropologists. There was a certain element of protectiveness or 'loyalty' to the discipline and some resistance to what were perceived to be my research objectives. For me, this was

one of the more interesting aspects of doing this study. It not only fine-tuned my focus, but also enabled valuable exchange between me and my informants. This issue also highlighted for me the possibility of secrecy around talking about, and sharing personal views of anthropology. I would assume however that this would be the case for any group that was being studied, particularly if there was any doubt as to the researcher's objectives. Because of this, I began to speculate about the kinds of membership codes that exist within the discipline, and on what they might be based.

Another dynamic that played itself out was related to gender. In my view, gender had a significant impact on rapport between my informants and I. It was through E-mail that I felt I maintained the most balance as a researcher and as a woman, because the interaction was one-sided. Through my electronic messages, I could be more creative, and challenging. Additionally, the fact that I am a young(er) woman had minimal bearing on these exchanges. I had the sense that my interactions were somewhat genderless to the extent that gender neither greatly affected nor influenced the data I was collecting electronically. As for gender, I had fundamentally different face-to-face experiences with women than I did with men. My position within the interview process was also

different with men and women. With women I tended to share some of my own views on anthropology, some background as to why I had chosen the topic and more information about myself. Because of this exchange with women and the information they shared with me, a chapter specifically on their views was added to this thesis. For the most part my interviews with men were more 'structured' in the sense that I asked questions, they answered, and there was very little exchange. Although there were interviews with men that were more informal, I failed to collect much relevant data. This is partially because they took me out to lunch where conducting this made the interview more difficult, but also because I wasn't in a position to ask many questions.

It surprised me that my informants did not talk about the things that I had come to understand as 'intricate' aspects of anthropology. I am referring specifically, to the stories that I had heard as an undergraduate pertaining to the difficulties and hardships of fieldwork, and the idea that fieldwork was a rite of passage. Because of this, I became interested in devoting a chapter to examining text as reproductive strategy to compare and contrast it with the actual data I collected.

Finally, through this process I learned a lot about myself, and in many ways I changed as a result. I feel that my

research was successful in terms of the original goal which was that the research be reflexive, both in terms of reflexivity of the discipline and of the self. This acknowledges that the findings presented in the following chapters are very much influenced by and interpreted through my lens.

Chapter III

Group Membership and Collective Identity

3.0 Introduction

This chapter explores the ways in which anthropologists construct a collective identity. I begin by examining the process by which identities are constructed and identity claims presented. In order to examine this process, I investigate whether there is a collective definition of anthropology. Based on the interviews and anthropology texts, it seems that such a definition does exist. The next step is to examine whether there is agreement on what an anthropologist is within this context. Moreover, I will examine how the Ph.D. and fieldwork are used as social objects that assist in building consensus among anthropologists. This chapter also investigates the main themes that informants highlighted, concerning fieldwork and the Ph.D.

The first theme they identified is the role of the Ph.D. and fieldwork play as an entrée to the group. Fieldwork is often acknowledged as a 'rite of passage', key to anthropological enculturation and self-definition. The second theme identified as central, is the claim that fieldwork

distinguishes anthropology from the other social sciences. A final theme discussed is that of redefining the field of anthropology and the possible reasons for this redefinition. As I have suggested, anthropology is asserted to be different from other social science disciplines. This is primarily because of its interest in holism, its cross-cultural focus and methods, such as fieldwork. However, this status has been challenged on two fronts: First, it is not the only discipline studying Others, and secondly, it has become politically challenged by those Others that have typically been the focus of anthropological investigation. The implications that this may have for anthropological identity and legitimacy will be raised, as I believe that they are key to identity maintenance.

3.1 Conceptualizing Identity

As stated in Chapter II, symbolic interactionism provides a useful map for exploring how anthropologists construct identity. Nevertheless, Denzin's emphasis placed on studying oppressed and marginalized peoples (Denzin 1989:20) suggests a problem: According to Denzin:

Interpretive interactionism should only be used when the researcher wants to examine the relationship between personal troubles ...and public institutions that have been created to address those personal problems (Denzin 1989:10).

If this is the priority for symbolic interactionists, then focussing on university professors may be theoretically problematic and inappropriate. However, I believe that symbolic interactionism does emphasize the social process under which identity occurs, and the "sequence or phases that persons go through as they move from one stage to another (Denzin 1978:13)." Considering this, symbolic interactionism can provide a valuable and usable framework for analyzing the identity issues explored here. Finally, it is important to note that symbolic interactionism's emphasis is also on the investigation of the 'hows', and not specifically the 'whys'. How for example, "is a given strip of experience structured, lived, and given meaning (Denzin 1992:24)?" These are precisely the questions that are of interest to me regarding anthropological identity. How might anthropologists construct anthropological identity, and how have the Ph.D. and fieldwork been incorporated into that identity? Symbolic interactionism is an effective theoretical tool precisely because it does focus on the construction of self which is central to this thesis.

Identity can be best defined for the purposes of this thesis as: "[the] meaning that a self acquires when 'situated' - that is, cast in the shape of a social object by

...participation or membership in social relations (Weigert et.al. 1986: 14)." Further, one can interpret identity as the social construction of an individual.

As socially constructed, the definition of the individual makes use of culturally available meanings and distributes them according to rules of interaction and patterns of stratification. The meaning of an individual, then, derives from these socially constructed definitions - that is, his or her identities (Weigert et.al. 1986:34).

Using these definitions, how is it then possible to work toward understanding identity construction? In looking at identity, recent symbolic interactionists have emphasized the value and usefulness of 'process-oriented sociology'. Process-oriented sociology is the shift to examining "the how (rather than the why) of group life...[and] the necessity of grounding these notions in the ongoing experiences of people doing group life (Prus 1996:148)." These 'generic social processes' which according to Prus, address "the emerging, sequencing, unfolding, ongoing features of group life (Prus 1996:148)." For Prus, approaching identity this way succeeds in incorporating the participants' perspectives "and their tendencies to develop and act upon particularistic relations with others (Prus 1996:148)." Using the model outlined by Prus, it may be possible to better analyze the group life of anthropologists within an interactionist perspective. This is

done by drawing specifically on a generic process, whereby the concepts in each of these processes can be generically applied and grounded in a variety of data.

Prus outlines several processes, two of which are of particular value to this analysis: *Achieving Identity* and *Acquiring Perspectives*. Within each process, there are a variety of subprocesses that emerge out of these categories. These subprocesses will be used in this chapter, and chapter V on social reproduction. They are as follows:

Achieving Identity (Prus 1996:152)

- Encountering definitions of self from others.
- Attributing qualities to self (self-definitions).
- Comparing incoming and self-assigned definition of self.
- Selectivity conveying information about self to others.

Acquiring Perspectives (Prus 1996:151-52)

- Encountering perspectives (definitions of reality) from others.
- Promoting (and defending) perspectives to others.

Examining these subprocesses allows for an examination of the process by which anthropologists "contend with the cultural content they encounter (Prus 1996:151)."

Prus' idea that is also helpful for this analysis is of 'identity work'. Identity work reflects ongoing assessments and negotiations, as the parties involved jointly endeavor to work out their relationships (Prus 1996:112).

Identity work is contingent on people's capacity for "self reflectivity"; it requires that one begin to take oneself into account in developing lines of action or that one become "an object unto oneself." Reflecting the perspectives one has on the world, people's identities or self-other definitions are not only situated within those realities, but also are influenced by the ongoing shifts in perspectives that people normally undergo over time and across situations. However, in contrast to the more generalized quality of perspectives, identities have a more immediate and personalized ("you and I") focus. Additionally, to the extent people associate identities with the treatment they receive, they tend to be concentrated about maintaining acceptable images ... As products of interaction, peoples identities are also fundamentally linked to the identities of their associates (Prus 1996:152).

The following section begins to investigate this identity of anthropologist, drawing on some of the subprocesses outlined above.

3.2 Encountering Perspectives: Anthropology as presented in Introductory Texts

I decided to do a literature review of introductory anthropology texts in order to examine definitions of anthropology . How do these texts define anthropology? Are there general similarities between the definitions?(See appendix E.) Surveying introductory texts shows how anthropologists define themselves as well as how they define anthropology for the 'neophyte' in his/her first anthropology course. Furthermore, these texts reflect the 'packaging' of

anthropology, much of which I assert has been incorporated into the collective identity - anthropology. Like my informants, these texts placed great emphasis on fieldwork as an assertion of anthropology's unique position within the social sciences, thus maintaining legitimacy within the wider domain of the social sciences. These same texts will be used again in Chapter V, in order to illustrate the ways in which 'neophytes' become attracted to anthropology. These texts may also promote anthropology to others (Prus 1996:151-52). The common themes in these introductory texts are divided between defining anthropology and defining anthropologists. The majority of the texts consulted would define anthropology in a manner similar to these quotations from two popular texts.

We have described anthropology as being broader in scope, both historically and geographically, and more holistic in approach than other disciplines concerned with human beings...But this statement again implies that anthropology is the all-inclusive human science. How, then is anthropology really different from these other disciplines? ...Anthropology defines itself as a discipline of infinite curiosity ... we suggest that anthropology's distinctiveness may lie principally in the kind of curiosity it arouses (emphasis mine) (Ember and Ember 1990:2).

Anthropology teaches us about other peoples, and in the process it teaches us about ourselves. The anthropologist's method is different from that of other social scientist, and this influences the nature of the discipline - its theories, concepts, and procedures (emphasis mine). Anthropological research involves a

journey, a journey in space, a journey through time, a psychological journey into an alien world. It resembles Alice's trip through the looking glass into another universe where the "rules" may be turned on their heads and people may behave in very different ways (Rosman and Rubel 1995:1).

If we return to these quotations, it is possible to see the construction of self in opposition to the Other. Anthropology is what the other social sciences are not. The question that they ask is, how does anthropology differ from the other disciplines? The answer? Anthropology is an infinitely curious discipline, not only about its own intellectual quest but also in the curiosity it arouses in outsiders. Secondly, these quotations point to how we explore and satisfy anthropological curiosity. It is my sense that searching out the 'curious' is best satisfied by fieldwork. The second quotation reaffirms that anthropology is different from other disciplines. In this excerpt they tell us that it is not just the curiosity of anthropology/anthropologists but also, the theories, concepts and procedures.

If we return to the second excerpt, there are several noteworthy points made. First there is emphasis on the journey: "anthropological research involves a journey, a journey in space, a journey through time, a psychological journey into an alien world." This emphasis on the 'alien

world' may serve to explain why throughout the interviews, the 'field' was often narrowly defined. Only a few informants raised the issue of a need to broaden and redefine the conceptual space of the field. Secondly, the analogy of 'Alice in Wonderland' is worthy of some discussion. If we recall the story, Alice is in many ways an anthropologist. Finding herself thrown into an 'alien' world, she experiences profound 'culture shock' in the world of Others who are fundamentally different from her. She also discovers that "the 'rules' may be turned on their heads and people may behave in very different ways." Based on my interviews, this experience has been well integrated into the world of anthropology, and a fundamental component to defining the anthropologist. A question to be asked is, do these definitions influence how anthropologists come to perceive themselves within the larger domain of anthropology? It is my assertion that they do, namely in the importance placed on doing fieldwork and the status placed on completing a Ph.D. What I hope to illustrate is that both fieldwork and the Ph.D. work in unison to construct identity.

3.3 Attributing Qualities to Self: Anthropology and Anthropologists as expressed by Informants

In my interviews, I asked the question: "When you think

of anthropology, what comes up for you?" By asking this question, I was hoping to elicit self-definitions and perceptions of anthropology. The images and themes described by informants were quite similar to the description of 'Alice in Wonderland'. Parallel to 'Alice in Wonderland' as text, is the well-known Gary Larsen cartoon, of the natives running from their huts with their televisions, as the anthropologist approaches the field site. The informants' descriptions illustrate the subject of anthropology -- the natives. In defining anthropology, my informants identified the subject of anthropological investigation in this way:

My first thought as the Gary Larsen cartoon with the "natives" hustling the T.V.'s and lamps out of their hut, shouting the "Anthropologists! Anthropologists!" (Interview 19).

...What else can you think of but the Far Side cartoon -- "anthropologist, anthropologist"... the natives are cleaning out their television sets, "the anthropologists are coming" so I couldn't help thinking that would color my response to that question (Interview 16).

Personal images, sitting with a Kamba man, who gave me a big wooden spoon, in Olduvai Gorge... sitting with him and talking about humanity and the evolution of humanity... (Interview 20).

Another informant, identified what I would define as fairly 'popular' stereotypes of anthropologists and fieldwork.

Bearded fellow with glasses or a lady with sensible

shoes, chatty opinionated and (politely) iconoclastic... Fieldwork? Dust and heat and diarrhea (the down side - and the ecstasy of "making sense" and being taken seriously in a wild and exotic place. Pounding headaches from communicating all day long in a new language, and the growing sense of identification with the people (Interview 11).

Finally, an informant identified the notion of "journey" and how that played into his life as an anthropologist.

Wow - free association - fieldwork. Nothing specific - a warm fuzzy feeling. I associate with fieldwork and theory, both of which I like. I associate with travel - fun, adventure, doing something worthwhile (Interview 5).

What do these responses say about anthropology? I believe that they reinforce how anthropology is externally defined. Finally, recall Alice's journey. The last informant's response reinforces the idea that anthropology is a journey. For one informant, anthropology is "natives, old connection but broadest and simplest most predictable connection, foreign cultures, native societies and populations (Interview 9)." These subjects cannot be found in the halls of a university: one must journey outside to find them. How do these images and definitions become incorporated into an anthropological definition? We have seen that anthropology and anthropologists are defined in a very distinct way. I am not sure that conjuring the same images of other professionals would be possible. Does this distinct 'nature' of anthropology have an

impact on the identity anthropologists adopt? It may and it may also highlight the importance of fieldwork in constructing this identity and in being incorporated into the group.

3.4 Fieldwork as a Rite of Passage

That fieldwork has been continuously viewed as an anthropological rite of passage is evident in the role that it has played in molding the anthropologist (Wengle 1989, Stocking 1992). In Stocking's essay, "The Ethnographer's Magic: Fieldwork in British Anthropology from Tylor to Malinowski", he calls himself a 'noninitiate' precisely because he has not done fieldwork which he views as "virtually a *sine qua non* (emphasis his), for full status as an anthropologist (Stocking 1992:13)."

During the early years of my membership in the Chicago Department of Anthropology, colleagues on several occasions urged me to undertake ethnographic fieldwork. I took this as both a compliment and critique: on the one hand, as an encouragement to legitimate my membership in the community by participation in its initiation ritual; on the other hand, as a suggestion that without such an initiation, I could never really understand what anthropology was all about (Stocking 1992:12).

While in my interviews only three people specifically labeled fieldwork as a 'rite of passage', there was no mistaking the importance that fieldwork has for anthropologists. The following excerpts are in response to the question: "Can you describe a transition from student to anthropologist?"

You become an anthropologist when you do fieldwork, "rite of passage", fundamental to becoming an anthropologist as defined by the community and by me (Interview 9).

...I personally think anthropology will wither and die, if the "rite" of lengthy fieldwork in a foreign language and in a new society dies out (Interview 11).

That occurs at least for - at least until recent generations, that occurred inevitably during the fieldwork process. Doing fieldwork is very much a rite of passage and has been recognized as such going all the way back to Malinowski (Interview 10).

The above excerpts clearly outline two essential issues with respect to fieldwork. First, they underline the importance of fieldwork as an initiation rite for joining the collectivity - anthropologists. Once having completed this rite, you become an anthropologist. Secondly, they serve to illustrate the historical process that has solidified fieldwork as a 'rite of passage'. These issues also underline how this initiation rite has played directly into notions of what symbolic interactionists refer to as 'category membership'. Category membership implies that the identities people are endowed with are based on meanings given to the individual, such as gender, and marital status. These meanings, like fieldwork then become "culturally significant pieces of biography (Schwalbe 1993:334)."

The question here, may be, how does fieldwork become positioned as a criterion for group membership?

By returning to the excerpts above we can begin to see how this process takes place. Tracing fieldwork back to Malinowski exemplifies how category membership may occur. It also illustrates how fieldwork has become the central element of an interpretive process for anthropologists. Fieldwork facilitates the ongoing historical continuity of the discipline. This is key to understanding how anthropologists form this identity. By tracing fieldwork back to Malinowski, meaning becomes passed on through the generations of anthropologists. By using Malinowski as a 'mirror', a construction of a self is facilitated. Here, it is Malinowski who becomes the connector, that solidifies fieldwork as something you must do to be an anthropologist. Note that fieldwork is not a stated 'prerequisite' for accreditation, although there are universities where this is a requirement. A novice anthropologist (student) is not, at least officially, required to do X number of hours in the field in order to become a recognized anthropologist. This differentiates anthropology from other professions where such professional accreditation exists. Despite that, in many ways fieldwork has become a 'quasi' anthropological license, usually an unwritten

condition that has been at the core of anthropology for several decades. It is true that conceptions and definitions of the field have changed. However, even with these emerging redefinitions of the field, there was agreement by all the informants on the importance of fieldwork. As with all data, one informant took quite a different position and was resistant to what he called the ritualization of fieldwork.

Fieldwork is important - it's hands on. My problem is that its been ritualized - its absurd. You need to do a lot of it. Rapport is extremely important. Identity - Anthropologist - Fieldwork is problematic, look at someone like Lévi-Strauss. Fieldwork is a means - not an end in itself (Interview 8).

This quotation raises some thoughtful questions. What do you do if you are an anthropologist who does not value or hold fieldwork in the same esteemed regard as other colleagues and anthropologists? This informant's choice of Lévi-Strauss as an example is significant. Juxtaposing Lévi-Strauss with an anthropologist like Malinowski, may raise some tensions that exist for anthropologists around fieldwork, and its status in anthropology. Lévi-Strauss is often acknowledged as one of the most influential anthropological theorists (Bohannon and Glazer 1988:423:), but simultaneously, is criticized for his lack of emphasis on fieldwork. He himself, downplayed the importance of fieldwork. In *Tristes Tropiques*, he states that

he found more value in the "patient and piecemeal process of distillation... than the day-to-day observation(Lévi-Strauss 1974:47)." I have often wondered if the reason that Lévi-Strauss was labeled an armchair anthropologist is precisely that he did not value deeply the one thing that has come to define and sustain anthropology. This position could be threatening or disagreeable to some anthropologists who view fieldwork as the one thing that separates them from other social scientists. While fieldwork may hold esteemed status in anthropology, theoretical contributions in the long run gain one more academic prestige. Further, there is an unstated assumption that to be a 'real' anthropologist you must do, and perhaps even enjoy fieldwork. Indeed, several informants alluded to the problematic of anthropologists who do not do fieldwork.

Although I grant that there may be some anthropologists who are theorists and not field workers, I have always found that those who haven't done fieldwork or who work in their own society don't have a clue about the subtleties of culture and society...(Interview 11).

The profession itself will tell you over and over in various ways, "you're not an anthropologist, till you're Ph.D. or doing Ph.D. work", till you're doing anthropology in the field, you're not an anthropologist... That's why a lot of us look askance at people who take Ph.D.'s in anthropology, and don't go into the field, because the fieldwork process in an alien culture, particularly, is transformative to the

personality and I to this day hold that there's no way of causing this to happen until the person has lived intensely in another culture for a long enough time that the adaptive processes of consciousness produce whatever it is - that makes an ethnologist different than other people (Interview 10).

One informant, when asked about the importance of fieldwork in his own career, had this to say.

Oh yes, I couldn't have done what I've done without it. And I see that there are some countries where people can become an anthropologist without doing fieldwork... there is one person who wasn't able to do fieldwork because he was in a wheelchair from birth. He's produced brilliant work in the domains which interest me, but at the same ... there are whole parts when you say..."Yeh, that could have been written only by an armchair anthropologist," this over-theorizing...(Interview 22).

Clearly, based on these responses, it would be uncomfortable to be an anthropologist who did not place the same value or importance on fieldwork. This highlights Goffman's notion of 'self-presentation', which can be best described as the process by which "individuals seek to satisfy impulses by making identity claims; that is, they make use of their sign values...to evoke desired response in others (Schwalbe 1993:334)." It is important to note, that this 'presentation of self', is a "presentation of signs in a way that function - by eliciting useful responses from other - to preserve both the self as organized psychic process and the body as an

organism (Schwalbe 1993:334).” This is key to understanding how individuals reach consensus. For there to be self-presentation, there must be some group agreement on what signs will be presented. I contend that fieldwork is one symbolic sign used to define the anthropologist.

This returns to the earlier discussion of Malinowski as a historical marker or identity peg. Approaching self-presentation as a group process, it may be possible to view identity as less of an individual construction than a group construction. I am suggesting that anthropologists have formed and maintained identity through a historical process, under which new initiates simply carry on the traditions which sustain the ‘anthropological identity’. The process here is that of fieldwork which, can be traced back to our ‘ancestral’ anthropologists. For anyone to belong to this group, they must, like those before them, do the initiation ritual. Informants raised the issue of not liking fieldwork but having to do it. What may be significant is that the informants were careful to point out that it was not them who did not like fieldwork but rather that they knew of colleagues who did not like fieldwork.

I spent considerable time thinking about this, it was strange to me that in twenty-seven interviews, not one person

stated that they had not enjoyed fieldwork. At first, I had thought that perhaps there was some kind of 'heroic' anthropologist persona being presented in order to be interpreted as 'real' anthropologists. On the other hand, I had imagined that the fact that I was a student of anthropology, would encourage them to share what these experiences (negative or positive), were really like. Based on the surfeit of literature on ethnographic personal accounts for example, Golde 1986, Messerschmidt 1981, Lawless 1983, Fowler and Hardesty 1994, Wengle 1989, it seems that there is a need to talk about fieldwork experiences. Further, I had anticipated that people would discuss the pressure placed on people to do fieldwork. The following are some responses that did deal with the tensions of doing fieldwork.

I think there is a lot of personality specific issues involved that many of us do not want to talk about because fieldwork is such a "hallmark" of anthropology that those of us who are not good at fieldwork, who are afraid of fieldwork would not want to talk about it (Interview 13).

I know people who don't particularly like the field but that's what they have to do to be an anthropologist which they really like to be -- like to work at (Interview 24).

For me, it may be an unjust evaluation but people who felt that they didn't like their fieldwork, I do consider as failures as anthropologists. I feel that they should do something else which will make them happier in life.

As I said maybe unjust and there's no doubt that there are ... By enjoyment I don't mean having a good time, I mean there are some people who have a terrible time, and it was entirely appropriate that they had a terrible time but they got something out of it (Interview 22).

The notion of self-presentation is key particularly with regards to the idea of situated identities. According to Schwalbe:

To understand how situated identities are created, he (Goffman) directs our attention away from the individual to the social world in which the individual can accomplish nothing without a rule book, equipment, and other players who are willing to frame a self-presentation in a particular way (Schwalbe 1993:336).

Until this point I have tried to illustrate, using my informants' words, the way in which fieldwork has become viewed as a requirement for being an anthropologist. It is evident based on the data that there was consensus on the importance of fieldwork for anthropologists, although perceptions operated on a continuum. This was illustrated by the informant who felt that fieldwork had become too ritualized, and others who definitively called it a rite of passage.

3.5 (Re)defining the Field

What we begin to see is that while there is consensus on the importance of doing fieldwork there are contrasting opinions as to what defines the field. This contrast may pose

the greatest challenge to sustaining an anthropological identity, particularly if new definitions of the field are not allowed to emerge. One possible reason behind the new definition of the 'field' may be that many anthropologists like Lévi-Strauss, do not necessarily find the same value in traditional fieldwork as their colleagues. By redefining the field, these anthropologists are still operating within the group structure, while branching out into new domains that better reflect their own research interests. The following excerpts illustrate some attempts being made to redefine the conceptual space - 'field'.

The field for me is a particular way of living which is not to say that I have lived in all my field sites. I mean the field for me is harbor front in Toronto, and the field is also islands in _____... lots of interviewing, perhaps some archival work, a lot of planning... you know it's a different way of operating...(Interview 16).

Let's talk about those that won't do fieldwork - fieldwork, what is it? Need to define the field - fieldwork is a different setting, community - the Other is everywhere... fieldwork is anything outside of this office (Interview 8).

Those boundaries broke for me a long - not that long ago, but long enough that I'm not at all comfortable... saying "the field is over there", it's not. First of all, ... I have visitors coming from "there" to my house or to Toronto. Does that mean, not that I'm constantly the anthropologist and they're members of the field site? There's no such thing in this world anymore and nor would I define that field site as the only representation of what I understand anthropology to be... You realize that number one, the field site, if you view a field site

that's sort of foreign or "other" "out there", it doesn't remain "out there", it enters into your world here, not only that your life world here is also always a field site. There are no boundaries. I don't see the boundaries (Interview 21).

These informants contrast with others, who still view the field in traditional terms.

One of the things I've often thought about in the field... here I was in that completely different world discussing something both highly exotic and highly everyday. So it's a very defining thing (Interview 22).

Another informant when asked about his transition from student to anthropologist responded this way.

I think it was something that happened on the journey by ship back from my first fieldwork... I would always recommend a "transition" by ship rather than by plane... you recede slowly from the "other" and the effect is quite transformative. (Interview 11).

A final issue that must be raised with respect to anthropological identity and fieldwork, is the challenge to anthropological access to the exotic Other. Therefore, anthropologists have found themselves scrambling for new field possibilities. This point was well illustrated by one informant who shared the following thoughts regarding the changing field.

So, I can be an anthropologist in downtown Ottawa as I can in central Brazil. I guess the field for me is more

a conceptual thing now, it's not so much a geographic thing but it means that I'm going to spend time with people to learn about another world view if you will, and another set of conditions and the way people think and live within those life conditions. Anthropology has had to change especially in the last twenty years. One of the reasons is that the traditional stomping ground is drying up - not only funding but people are fed up with the taking and not leaving anything behind. Getting into a traditional setting is more difficult - this is good. ...Traditionally anthropology meant going to do fieldwork in exotic places, and that's interesting and that's fine but I think that we have skills and as social scientists that enables us to do work in our culture as well. I think this is all for the good, we don't necessarily have anthropologists running off in all directions, having their way with tribal cultures and exotic places anymore, maybe we have fewer people running off which is probably good because there's so much bad anthropology (Interview 5).

The first section of this chapter has been dedicated to looking at how definitions of anthropology have been incorporated into anthropologists' definitions of self. The objective was to begin looking at how anthropologists construct identity through a process of consensus building, by which identity claims are established using a specific set of signs or symbols that the group agrees upon. I have suggested thus far, that fieldwork is such a symbol for anthropological group identity. I have also illustrated that conceptions of the field have challenged traditional notions of fieldwork, which by default, have perhaps also challenged the group definition of anthropologists. These challenges to the field,

plus the increased visibility of fieldwork in other disciplines, (sociology, geography, and social work) could threaten anthropological identity. Is anthropology still unique?

3.6 Promoting/Defending Perspectives: Anthropology as Unique?

To return to the definitions extracted from the introductory texts, anthropology was distinguished from the other social science disciplines, in that: *"anthropology defines itself as a discipline of infinite curiosity... [and] that anthropology's distinctiveness may lie principally in the kind of curiosity it arouses (Ember and Ember 1990:2)."* The texts also stressed that the anthropologist's method was *"different from that of other social scientists, and this influences the nature of the discipline - its' theories, concepts, and procedures (emphasis mine)" (Ember and Ember 1990:2)."* The informants presented in this chapter also reinforce the importance of these anthropological methods, and how successfully they have been incorporated into the anthropological definition of self. While consensus is paramount to a cohesive identity, legitimacy also plays a key role in maintaining an identity. The anthropologists interviewed also saw fieldwork as that element of anthropology that made them distinct from other social sciences.

I think that one of the things that distinguishes anthropology from other disciplines whether in the social sciences or humanities is that we really tend to get our feet dirty if you will. ...You go and live with another people and another culture, or that is to say maybe people in your own culture but another group of people... doing anthropology (Interview 5).

It's extremely important to see that shift from the old guard who believed that fieldwork has to distinguish what we do from sociology, it has to be non-urban North America, to see that shift... it's a point-of-view, it's an assemblage of methods and it's a style of fieldwork and a style of analysis that sometimes isn't any different than sociology but it has a very important place in the contemporary world (Interview 16).

I fear that anthropology, as opposed to archaeology, is rapidly losing its unique data base and becoming a side branch of sociology (Interview 19).

If other social sciences are now encouraging fieldwork, the "hallmark of anthropology (Interview 13)," can anthropologists maintain their legitimacy as social scientists? In analyzing my data, I repeatedly returned to responses that suggested that not only was fieldwork essential to becoming an anthropologist, but also completing a Ph.D. I found it perplexing that a Ph.D. was viewed a fundamental component of being an anthropologist, especially given that many informants, and several texts emphasize that their graduate studies had not prepared them for the field. If this is the case, how is a Ph.D. essential to becoming an anthropologist?

This is a complex question, and one for which I do not have a definitive answer. However, I would suggest that the Ph.D. gives an anthropologist the academic prestige that they need to maintain their status within the social sciences, particularly within the physical space of the 'university'. Fieldwork alone could not accomplish that: therefore the Ph.D. becomes the second identity peg that secures status and prestige within the academic world. The following are some responses from informants about the importance of completing a Ph.D. Interestingly, not one of the informants felt that teaching was essential to being an anthropologist, yet all agreed, some more aggressively than others, that the Ph.D. was crucial.

It's at the Ph.D. level - that's the "passage", critical because it's where you establish yourself. You become an anthropologist when you defend - professors become colleagues. Fieldwork and completing the Ph.D. - they are linked (Interview 7).

This may be an elitist idea but it reflects at least some kind of commitment to being enculturated into the doing of anthropology. Obviously there were and are people...doing anthropology through the data they record. But I think that in as far as it does still have some unity, I've expressed my faith that it does, it also requires enough exposure to the culture of anthropology so that we share a belief. So you can make contributions to anthropology while not being an anthropologist (Interview 23).

I felt like an anthropologist because I was doing applied

work. I didn't yet have academic credentials, when I got my Ph.D., I felt like a real anthropologist (Interview 5).

Another issue that directly relates to the Ph.D. and the way it may legitimize anthropologists, is the emphasis made by some informants on their ability as anthropologists to negotiate and communicate the concrete, and the abstract. The concrete I came to understand as fieldwork, and the abstract, as theory, which I think can be further broken down to represent academe. Returning to Lévi-Strauss, I suggested that one of the things that may have gained him esteemed status as a theoretical anthropologist, was that he might have placed more value on theoretical abstractions, rather than the "day-to-day observations" of fieldwork (Lévi-Strauss 1974:47). Fieldwork alone may not be enough to gain academic status or legitimacy within the confines of the ivory tower. One informant expressed that the only time his anthropological identity surfaces, is when people write off anthropology as 'fluff'.

My identifications manifest themselves in a strong way when they're affected... Now come to anthropology, no, I have never had a very strong sense of identity, except when it's threatened, "a lot of crap", and I can present some pretty good arguments. But I've never really felt a strong identification with a unit, a concept which you can collectively call -- anthropology (Interview 26).

Therefore, anthropological identity may also hinge on

anthropologists' ability to communicate their work in the appropriate and accepted discourse of the university. Several informants suggested this:

In a sense, an anthropologist is an anthropologist not by what s/he "experiences" in the field, but how s/he turns these scraps of data and experiences into a coherent narrative. Though as I've said, fieldwork is very important, one "becomes" an anthropologist by the way in which one transforms the field data into text (Interview 11).

I personally feel very strongly that the strength of an anthropologist, the way that I've identified myself is precisely in the fact that I can breach the extraction with the concrete... If I only pick up on other peoples theoretical work and go on from there, I am not doing anthropology. To me my contribution is precisely to take this body of theory, or conceptual ideas to the field look at the kinds things I can see and try to conceptualize whether the existing ideas reflect what is happening on the ground, and if not, then why not - and that is my contribution, to breach the abstract with the concrete. I don't believe that the role of anthropologists is purely descriptive ethnography, the thick description is very valuable, but that thick description could be put to better use than just a body of data sitting there because it's precisely the way I see anthropology and I see myself and that is the breach between the two (Interview 13).

I'm fascinated by theory... I think it's one of the easiest ways to keep yourself excited about the ethnographic material you're doing. It's always been the case that I've read an article...and it sparks my inquiries so that what I'm always looking for is that one little spark...[or] one little hook...that brings all the stuff together. Sometimes that happens when I'm in the field. I run into things, the puzzles that just don't make sense, on the other hand there's the stuff you're doing through library reading, it's when the two come

together that you really get interesting stuff (Interview 12).

This relationship between the concrete and abstract that anthropology offers, could precisely be the one way of protecting the anthropological identity outside of the anthropological domain.

According to Schwalbe, while self cannot disappear, identities can. This means that certain mechanisms may be in place by the discipline and its membership to ensure that this identity is not threatened. One of the mechanisms may be the act of re-conceptualizing and redefining the field, in order to become more 'localized', which has typically been sociology's terrain. Another mechanism may be the breach between theory and application. According to Schwalbe, the way in which an identity ceases to exist occurs when:

...the signs that give meaning to a person lose their signifying force... Likewise, if the group from which a collective identity derives ceases to exist, the identity may disappear with it. Thus, identities can change or disappear, or come into being, as quickly as any kind of sign (Schwalbe 1993:335).

I am not suggesting that this is an overt strategy by anthropologists to protect anthropological identity, it is only a possibility that may or may not exist. However, if this is feasible, it may be tacit in its construction. It may occur

'naturally' in the same way as fieldwork became established as a 'hallmark' of anthropology. Just as fieldwork became an identity peg for anthropology and anthropologists, the necessity to move between the concrete and abstract worlds those academic anthropologists occupy may have as well. "Social arrangements may demand flexibility in making identity claims, and the making of such claims may depend on cultural images and codes borrowed from elsewhere (Schwalbe 1993:339)." Anthropologists run the risk of marginalization if their legitimacy as academics is threatened. This may be the impetus for the redefinitions and academic expansion I have tried to highlight in this chapter.

To conclude, using Prus' model of the subprocesses of achieving identity, and acquiring perspectives, I have tried to illustrate the following subprocesses: Encountering definitions and perspectives from others, attributing qualities of self (self-definition), and promoting and defending perspectives. By examining these subprocesses I have attempted to highlight how these elements of identity establish consensus between anthropologists and legitimize that identity within the larger domain of academe.

Chapter IV details professional identity within the university but focuses specifically on the impact of gender.

While there was agreement by all informants on certain criteria to 'become' an anthropologist, women informants expressed gender as having a significant influence on their professional identity. They felt that while they had followed the same career path as men, they encountered obstacles that were rooted in gender that men did not. The fact that these issues were not raised by men, may indicate that for men being an academic is taken for granted, whereas women may need to fight harder to attain and maintain that status.

Chapter VI

Women and Gender Identity

4.0 Introduction

Dear Sirs:

My attention has been drawn to the entry of my name in Who's Who Vol.XV as Mrs. Herbert Parsons and to my demise in 1928. As I am generally known as Elsie Clews Parsons and as I have been quite active in my profession, anthropology, since 1928 being this current year, President of the American Anthropological Association, I suggest you send me a blank form to fill out which, if you see fit, you can use in your next publication (Zumwalt 1992:328).

The excerpt above is one of the more poignant examples of women's blurred identities of anthropologist-woman. Parsons, one of the most prolific writers in the profession "published almost thirty articles in the American Anthropologist between 1916 and 1945 (Parezo 1995:21)." Historians of anthropology however, rarely mention her beyond her role as the wealthy benefactor of the Boasian anthropologists (Stocking 1992). It is this experience of women's professional marginalization that forms the basis of this chapter.

In this chapter I explore how gender influences and impacts anthropological identity. My objective is to illustrate that one cannot discuss anthropological identity,

and anthropology without examining women's positioning within these areas. To do this, it is necessary to isolate women's expressions in order to (re)incorporate women into a more general discussion on the dimensions of identity. It was not my original intention to examine gender as a separate issue of identity. However, it became increasingly apparent throughout my fieldwork that gender was indeed a fundamental component. By providing my women informants the space to engage these issues of gender, they unravelled the complex relationship between women and anthropology.

During my fieldwork, I did not ask women specifically about their experiences as women. I asked the same questions to both men and women. However, throughout the interviews with women, gender as an identity issue surfaced repeatedly. This led me to reexamine my initial assumption of a collective identity called 'anthropologist'. In short, women were describing different expressions of identity than men. Unlike men, women spoke about the need for 'different hats', not of identity, but of identities, all shaped around gender: academic, professional (professor), and anthropologist. The following themes, women as anthropologist-spouses; women as academics; and women as teachers exemplify the issues of gender in this thesis. Moreover, these multiple identities

underline an experience of marginality for the women in these roles. This experience of marginality becomes key to the construction of any identity. This is particularly important if we understand marginality as the experience of an individual who "lives in two different worlds simultaneously, one of which is, by prevailing standards, regarded as superior to the other (Klein [1974] in Parezo 1995:336)." This chapter examines the different 'worlds' that women anthropologists occupy and gives voice to those experiences.

4.1 Women's Identity as Anthropologist-Spouse

I am most grateful to my wife, Ruth M. Lewis, for her assistance in the organization and editing of my original interviews with the children of Sanchez which form the basis of this volume (Lewis 1969:Acknowledgement).

One of the more prevalent issues raised in texts on women's relationship to, and identity in anthropology is the role that women have historically assumed as spouse-assistant anthropologist. Barbara Tedlock (1995), compares the incorporation of women into their husband's careers within bureaucratic and corporate structures, to the role that women have played as assistant anthropologists and data gatherers for their husbands' work. Consider the famous anthropological couples such as Rosemary and Raymond Firth, Edith and Victor Turner, and Ruth and Oscar Lewis. They illustrate what Tedlock

calls the "two-person single career (Tedlock 1995:269)²." My women informants also raised aspects of their husband-wife relationships.

My process in education was different from other peoples because I started out with the fieldwork, and then in a university where I had a husband on staff and then into a job so in a way it's been a process of establishing my own identity as opposed to being part of this couple identity (Interview 16).

Cohen: I've interviewed a lot of women who talked about that, how they came into anthropology. In some cases, the women are now divorced now but they've remained at the universities where their careers began as "spouse." There have been a lot of interesting stories around that but you describe something that sounds a bit nicer than most of what I've heard.

One of the things that helped was a really good marriage - we've managed to sort it out. Another thing is that we've worked, we've done a lot of fieldwork in the same place together but we teach at different places (Interview 16).

This notion of 'two-person single career' suggests the potential tensions for women who attempt to construct an academic identity within an 'anthropological marriage'. The issues raised by my informants illustrate some difficulties

² For a discussion on this issue of women's roles as spouse within ethnographic fieldwork, see Barbara Tedlock's essay, "Works and Wives: On the Sexual Division of Textual Labour" in *Women Writing Culture*, Behar and Gordon eds., 1995 (267-86).

that women can face who came into anthropology as a spouse, or through their spouse's fieldwork. Perhaps the most complex issue that faces these women is the problematic of (re)constructing their own identity of anthropologist outside the identity 'wife'. The previous informant, for example, left her husband's university to teach elsewhere. That suggests that the separation from their 'couple identity' involved a physical disengagement. In leaving the university, her own professional identity could emerge.

The same informant quoted above shared these thoughts about her initial experience in the field: "I was a spouse really, I was essentially in the development parlance -- a 'non-working spouse' who needed something to do to keep busy (Interview 16)." When asked what made her own fieldwork for her Ph.D. different, she responds, "In the second time it was my own project (Interview 16)." When questioned about why she decided to go to graduate school, she traced it back to a frustration with being home after having been involved in her husband's fieldwork. However, the department required her to "pass a number of tests" because as a faculty wife accepting her was "a risky thing for them to take on (Interview 16)." By looking at this informant we can analyse several layers of identity until this point. The first theme, which has been

discussed, is her pursuit of anthropology as a means of occupying her time, not as a professional quest. The second theme, is that her decision to go to graduate school is still tied to a 'spousal identity'; she is still a "faculty wife". This reinforces the notion of a wife's incorporation into her husband's anthropological career. In this instance she already had anthropological field experience before going into graduate school, yet is still required to take tests because she is a faculty wife. Another informant, looking back at twenty-seven year career in anthropology, recalled her first teaching position as a spouse. They hired her as a teaching assistant because her husband was a member of the faculty and this gave "her something to do with her time (Interview 7)." When asked if she could describe a transition from student to anthropologist, she responded, "No, I became an anthropologist because I married one and went to graduate school (Interview 7)."

Another key issue relating to the idea of 'two-person single career' is that of incorporation and collaboration. Tedlock observes:

Just how often incorporation takes place we cannot actually know, since many of the affected women are not only muted, in that their work is subsumed into corporate body and identity of their husbands, but their presence in the field is often unacknowledged (Tedlock 1995: 270).

We can broaden this notion of two-person single career to include and scrutinize the collaborative relationship between anthropologists and native informants. By comparing these two sets of relationships, many interesting parallels can be drawn. Similar to spouses, native informants have often functioned as assistant anthropologists, yet their collaborative participation goes unacknowledged.

In the same spirit that Boas encouraged natives to become anthropologists, he also encouraged women because they could collect information on female behaviour more easily than a male anthropologist. This attitude strongly implied that native and female anthropologists are seen as potential "tools" to be used to provide information to the "real" white male anthropologist (Jones [1970] as quoted in Medicine 1987:284).

For Medicine, being a Sioux and an anthropologist has created tensions in her professional identity because "colleagues persist in using her as an informant (Medicine 1987:282)." What we can extract from both these collaborative relationships is the undermining of the valuable anthropological contributions of women and native informants who have performed anthropological duties. Examining the similarities in these relationships points to what Gottlieb calls the problematic of anthropological collaboration. Like Tedlock, Gottlieb makes the following observation.

Despite the recent glut of fieldwork memoirs, the fact that we often work in tandem with others [such as, spouses, domestic partners, collaborations with colleagues, whether or not we and/or they are "native"] has been all but ignored (Gottlieb 1995:21).

The impact that this partially invisible and under acknowledged collaboration has on women's professional identity and success is paramount. Finally, in our discipline, women have always had a strong presence. What Gottlieb terms the 'macho ethos' has frequently nevertheless undermined women's contributions. As Gottlieb notes, this macho ethos pervades "the intellectual orientations of many anthropologists, both male and female (Gottlieb 1995:22)." Further, Ruddick has argued a presence of what she coins 'maternal thinking'. In essence, this implies an "orientation toward group cooperation rather than individual competition is socialized in women but not men in Western societies (Gottlieb 1995:22)." Using Ruddick's assertion, Gottlieb suggests that this may explain, how "the masculine orientation of the theoretical foundations of our discipline may likewise be at least partly responsible for the polite ignoring of our professional and personal collaborations (Gottlieb 1995:22)."

4.2 Women's Identity as Academic Anthropologist

While all professionals face challenges and must pass rites of passage as they progress on their career paths,

women encounter additional obstruction not met by men (Parezo 1993:335).

Historically, women have had a very ambivalent presence in the academy. The tensions underlining the obstructions that women anthropologists face in their careers are diverse. Indeed, I would suggest that this is not only symptomatic of anthropology, rather that it is characteristic of most disciplines. However anthropology as a discipline reveals a surfeit of contradictions that may not be present in other disciplines. On one level, there is a rich history of women in the field, which suggests that anthropology has been receptive to women's participation. It is true that anthropology realized the importance of women as field workers who could gain access to places that were off-limits to men. The ethnographic work of the husband-wife teams illustrates this. However, on another level, there is a glaring contradiction when we examine historical texts on anthropology. These texts generally discuss only women such as Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead, although other women have made valuable contributions to the discipline³ (Warren 1988:21). Women as

³ See Hidden Scholars: Women Anthropologists and the Native American Southwest, Nancy J. Parezo, (ed), 1993 for a discussion of the academic exclusion of women in anthropology.

scholars, are frequently placed outside of the dominant anthropological discourse and important sites of debate. Moreover, rationalization as to why anthropology has often excluded feminist scholarship is well illustrated by the now 'infamous' introduction to *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Clifford and Marcus 1986).

Planning the seminar, we were confronted by what seemed to us an obvious - important and regrettable - fact. Feminism had not contributed much to the theoretical analysis of ethnographies as texts. Where women had made textual innovations...they had not done so on feminist grounds (Clifford and Marcus:20).

I acknowledge that this may be an extreme example. However, I think it is key to understanding the position and status of women anthropologists, particularly those within universities, where they produce such 'theoretical analysis'. My thesis supervisor pointed out to me that in my data, there was no discussion by women informants with respect to theory versus ethnography. This is a significant silence. In returning to Clifford and Marcus' comments, if it is true that women have not made equal contributions to theoretical analysis, examining why that might be is important. As a student of anthropology, I have come to understand that women's intellectual work in anthropology has, quoting Clifford again, been devalued "as rewriting the masculinist canon... and/or

setting the record straight about women or on revising anthropological categories, for example, the nature/culture opposition (Clifford 1986:20-21)." This is clearly an oversimplification of women's contribution to anthropology. In fact most of the women I interviewed did not do 'feminist motivated research', yet we hear and learn little about the other types of theoretical contributions made by women. This 'slotting' of women anthropologists in this way, has constructed the notion that women are 'repairing' traditional assumptions and gender myths, whereas men are paving new theoretical roads. Because women informants did not raise this, I can only speculate as to this occurrence. It may be just as Gottlieb suggests, that the masculine orientation of the theoretical foundations of the discipline have built a wall which has been difficult for women to break through.

Finally women as academics have struggled to gain professional entrance into universities. While "women enter anthropology in almost equal numbers to men, they were less likely to get jobs in academic departments (Warren 1988:11)." Given all these obstructions, it is not surprising that the women I interviewed had very powerful feelings about their identities as anthropologists, academics, and teachers.

The following informants shared their experiences as women in anthropology departments.

Although there are a significant number of women in this department, we are still very much a minority. The discourse is a male discourse, and the type of behaviour is still a male type of behaviour. You have to come up with different identities and you cannot manage your academic life with only one identity that is of being an anthropologist, or that is being an academic - you have to fight as a woman (Interview 25).

I had a very difficult first year at ____ from men, much worse than I had experienced in my entire life. Here it was an institutionalized abuse of women... That first year was a nightmare, an absolute nightmare -- I decided to do fieldwork with social groups rather than lab work because the [original research] had cost me personally so much. At the time when I joined, we were I think three females. It was an exceedingly difficult time (Interview 20).

The informants identified two prevalent roles in anthropology that women play. The first, as a field worker/anthropologist, and secondly, as a member of a primarily male dominated academy. This domination can be seen through the scarcity of women in anthropology departments. It is also seen in through the ongoing struggles of women (and some men) in anthropology departments to hire more women. Women reiterated this issue repeatedly throughout the interviews.

When I see gender bias, when I see the fight that we had in this department to get other women. When I came here, there was one other woman, an archaeologist and I was the first anthropologist. A fight to get courses on women

approved, a fight to get somebody who would be a specialist in gender studies, these people are anthropologists. I would expect that from maybe another discipline but not this one (Interview 25)!

When these issues began to surface, I attempted to put them into a historical context. I approached my research with the assumption that women who had graduated in the late 1950s or early 1960s would most likely have experienced sexism and exclusion. I believed that within the context of those times, this type of marginalization while uncomfortable, would not be surprising. This was the common experience shared by women in and out of anthropology. As my research progressed and the generational boundaries blurred, I came to understand that isolating a period in which gender bias was more or less prevalent was not possible. On the contrary, the experience of many of the women (despite their ages) attests to the assertion that gender bias knows no time - it is timeless and ongoing. An informant whom in fact had completed her Ph.D. in the late 1980s reinforced this point.

There was a comment made recently in my own department which is 50%, actually more than 50% female now . . . We have a very good ratio here in terms of faculty but even still there was something about...an increase in the number of female students. The assumption was "oh my god," this is by a colleague here in the department. The feeling was "oh my god. There are too many women coming into anthropology, not enough men. What does that mean?" My response was, "does that imply the "stupidification"

of anthropology, are we becoming a more stupid discipline, is it a problem that more women are coming into this, you know are we becoming less of a true discipline because there are more women or is it becoming somehow softer, even less relevant than it already is in the scope of things?" It made me angry as you can tell, and it made me angry the assumption that because there are more women, it's a less valued site. Offensive, thoroughly offensive(Interview 21)!

The informant's perceptions that somehow the increased numbers of women in anthropology make it a 'less valued sight', raise some thoughtful issues. While women have been well represented as students in anthropology, the same can not be said for their professional presence. Equating women's increased academic visibility with a 'stupidification' of the discipline may highlight the possibility that as women become more professionally visible, anthropology becomes less 'attractive'. I would suggest that this is not specific to anthropology and could be identified in any discipline where there is an increase in women's membership. This suggests that gender may have a profound role in how disciplines and professions are viewed.

4.3 Women's Identity as Teacher

The final identity to be examined is that of women's roles as teachers in the conceptual space 'classroom'. To my surprise, particularly in the late twentieth-century,

informants raised the issue of dress and how it either reinforces or challenges their authority as teachers. Many of them identified what could be called a 'tacit dress code' that women follow. The following respondent commented on how the way she dressed influenced her position in the classroom. She also suggested that she garners more respect from (male) students by presenting herself in a "conservative" way. Her comment suggests that there is in fact a tacit dress code specifically directed at women.

I see how a male colleague dresses and I couldn't. I don't walk into class in jeans, I would never do it, not because I'm a conservative dresser... I mean, I wear jeans all the time at home but...I come into the university, it sounds silly but part of how you present yourself is so much of what's going on. You can always tell by how I'm dressed whether I'm teaching or not that day. Women are very conscious, not because they're women but because they're very conscious of having to look like professionals on the days that they're teaching -- the men just -- don't care (Interview 21)

My interviews revealed that continue to be incredible pressures placed on women to fit into a male world of anthropology. What stood out in particular was the issue of how women academics adopt a professional identity when teaching.

At no age do you garner the kind of respect that you do as a male academic ... there's a tremendous bias against female academics period (Interview 21)!

The question of identity becomes important here, specifically the notion of an anthropological identity. Is it easier for men to construct that identity, than for women, precisely because women are so aware of the tremendous bias against them? On the other hand, is a woman who is more conscious of issues of gender likely to approach the classroom in a different way? I asked that question of several women, one of whom answered this way.

You wear various hats ...in the classroom you have to behave in a certain way. In the class, I'm not very authoritative but you see, the students don't know how to handle this so sometimes you come back to more "professor types" of conventional stereotypes -- as the prof imposing solutions(Interview 25).

This excerpt underlines the problem several woman informants discussed. That there are implications to being too non-authoritative with students. Namely that if students become too familiar with you, this can jeopardize your credibility as a professor. Is it then a question of students not knowing how to react overall to non-authoritative teaching, or when a woman is doing it? It is my sense that students may need the constructions of professor-student as guides to appropriate behaviour. However, it may only become problematic when it is done by a woman. It has been my experience as a teaching assistant and a student, that

students do behave differently to male and female non-authoritative teaching styles. Men whose teaching styles are more casual often become the favourite teachers because they are 'cool' and can 'relate' to their students. On the other hand, students often discredit women who approach the class in this way, as if somehow their 'friendliness' makes them less professional, less knowledgeable. If women do not garner the same kind of respect as men in the classroom, then relaxing those boundaries may increase the likelihood of disrespect simply based on gender.

I have to walk in and be a professional. You know in the same way I don't mind being called by my first name but I find it shocking that a first year undergraduate student would even think to call a professor by their first name...I can't imagine, maybe they do, but I can't imagine so casually calling male professors by their first names, I just don't see it (Interview 21).

These issues clearly point to a need to develop a professional persona when dealing with students, not because of an apparent lack of respect for professors, but for women who are professors. Interestingly, in my interviews, no men mentioned the need to develop a professional identity when dealing with students, or as an academic. Some of them did however, discuss the less than enjoyable aspects of academe, such as marking papers and teaching required courses. However,

none of them seemed to feel the need or the pressure to be something else in order to do their job as an anthropologist, academic, or teacher.

I have attempted throughout this chapter to give voice to the complex gender issues that come into play when examining professional identity. While the experiences of women are diverse and cannot be generalized, they do serve to explain why a collective identity of anthropologist may be difficult to identify. That women were able to identify some common issues of identity shared by men, underlines that there is somewhat of a shared identity between men and women as was illustrated in the previous chapter. However, there exists an entire space which only women identified. I believe that this space is significant and should not be ignored. The professional lives and careers of women anthropologists are vastly different from those of men. While there is a range of experiences that operate outside of gender boundaries, there is a consistency in the voices of women whom I interviewed for this thesis.

Given what I have discussed in this chapter and chapter III, it is necessary to examine how anthropologists communicate these experiences, identities, and definitions to their students and the problem of reproduction. The degree to

which they reproduce these identity issues in students is difficult to gauge, but I contend that there is process of reproduction which occurs. In my view, this reproduction takes place through promoting and defending anthropological perspective to others. The importance of the Ph.D. in maintaining academic legitimacy has been investigated but this continues as anthropologists selectively convey information about themselves as anthropologists to others. Further, as we have seen in this chapter, some of these issues, such as gender, are well anchored within the discipline and the practitioners to the point that it is likely that they are reproduced as well.

Chapter V

Reproducing Anthropology

5.0 Introduction

This chapter investigates the possibility of reproductive strategies that communicate and maintain anthropological identity and the legitimacy of the discipline. I believe that this is primarily done through introductory anthropology courses and more generally, teaching within the university.

Introductory courses are fundamental in my view to this process of social reproduction or what we could alternately understand as identity maintenance. In many ways, introductory courses are a broad narrative. Through this narrative, anthropologists expose the 'children' of the next generation to their work, and lives and work of anthropological forbearers (Interview 8). Perhaps a reproductive strategy functions to attract new members to the discipline, and more important, to maintain the unique character of anthropology within the university structure. The definitions of anthropology by both the texts surveyed and informants, illustrated one such strategy for doing this. Both these sets of texts emphasized the importance of the anthropological

perspective, primarily because of its distinct character and scope that distinguishes it from other social sciences. If we briefly return to Chapter III, we began to look at the historical process that has connected anthropologists to their 'ancestors' through fieldwork. The frequent references to Malinowski are a case in point. This occurrence which one informant identified as the 'rhetoric of continuity' suggests the importance of historical continuity:

I think there is this idea of 'rhetoric of continuity', that is we all say, that this is something upon which one builds, that has a history, and although we surely do not do some of the things that our predecessors did, you also do, do some of what they did, a sort of clearing the way for investigating the same matters now - so in that sense there is continuity (Interview 27).

However, this is only one dimension of a process of identity construction and maintenance. This chapter intends to focus on one question: how can anthropologists reproduce the notion of anthropologist, (and anthropology) through teaching anthropology?

This chapter examines three approaches to reproduction: the introductory level course, the question of reproducing 'self', and of how the anthropologist uses the 'lived experience' to teach students. This reproductive process has a direct impact on anthropological identity. To maintain this

identity, it must be communicated to others and understood by them. Therefore, the reproduction of anthropology becomes connected to anthropologists themselves. Several informants emphasized that their own fieldwork does become part of their course curriculum. They use their own experiences to communicate anthropology to their students. This is what I will refer to as 'lived experience'.

An objective of this chapter is to present reproduction as part of the ongoing process of maintaining the anthropological identity. This idea of identity maintenance is crucial to what Weigert calls 'identity continuity'. The question that identity poses is, "what structures and processes sustain a sense of self sameness (Weigert et.al 1986:60)?" This chapter will attempt to examine these structures and processes above.

5.1 Rationale for Examining Reproduction

Originally this research was directed at investigating how anthropologists train students in anthropology. As my research progressed, the focus shifted toward examining how anthropologists construct and communicate their identity. It became clear to me that one avenue for communicating anthropology was the conceptual space 'classroom'.

I think we're very lucky in anthropology as university

instructors, it's very easy to sell the material. It's so much easier to be able to catch students imagination by showing them slides of the places you've been, conditions you've worked under and trying to relate it to their experiences and so on...Once you get students in the class of course. I think there's not a great deal of knowledge about anthropology outside in the general public but I think once we get our students in and get them occupied and enthusiastic and I think we've found that most of our majors had no intention of becoming anthropologists but they take the course and they suddenly see the light, and they come to you saying things like, "I really want to do anthropology but how can I convince my father that there's any sense in doing it (Interview 12)?

It is in this space where anthropologists introduce students to the narrative called 'anthropology' and to the actors such Malinowski, Boas and Mead who form this narrative. I can recall my own introductory course where the adventure of anthropology contributed immensely to my own decision to pursue anthropology. I believe that we can view this narrative as a parallel metaphor to the traditional Western 'creation myths'. Like 'creation myths', the anthropological narrative begins with, "In the beginning..." Using my own experience, I wanted to investigate how anthropologists felt about this idea of reproduction.

A comment made to me in a private conversation, aided me in gathering data on personal views of reproduction. This comment, "I train to reproduce myself, insofar as I want to

communicate my particular biases, ideologies and so on", evoked strong responses in the informants. Moreover it revealed a divide between those that felt that they did reproduce themselves in their students, and those that opposed any notion of reproduction. These responses revealed two components of identity. First, there is a suggestion that depending on situations, there may be multiple identities that are available. Secondly, 'self' can be expressed in different ways depending on what identity is triggered. Schwalbe notes that, "the reality of the self is thus evident when we are affected emotionally by the signs of selfhood that are used in an encounter (Schwalbe 1995:338)." For some, the 'self' triggered by the quotation was the notion of a Freudian 'ego-self', while others interpreted the 'self' as the anthropologist.

5.2 Reproduction as Identity Maintenance

I suggested in Chapter III, that consensus and legitimacy are essential for the construction of an anthropological identity. I attempted to show that fieldwork and the Ph.D. work to define the unique scope of anthropology. I also suggested that the Ph.D. legitimizes anthropology within the greater social sciences, which gives anthropologists access to a larger intellectual membership group. How then is

anthropology as a discipline secured within the university? Until this point I have attempted to illustrate an individual process of enculturation that works to create a more cohesive collective group category. I would suggest that we can conceptually interchange this idea of construction with notions of production. That is, if fieldwork and the Ph.D. produce/construct the anthropologist, how is this production maintained? Investigating actions of, and strategies for identity maintenance may best illustrate this. To maintain the anthropological identity, anthropologists must also legitimize the discipline. This may explain the role that introductory level courses play in safeguarding anthropology as a legitimate and 'popular' social science.

5.3 Promoting Perspectives to Others: Reproducing the Anthropological "World View"

Introductory level courses provide the first glimpse into the world of anthropology, recall the 'Alice in Wonderland' metaphor discussed in chapter II. One informant when asked about introductory courses, responded:

...What I see myself doing in these courses is a little bit of a missionary thing . . . spreading the word . . . I think with undergraduates it's really more spreading seeds out there and trying give people some initial thought and direction with which they can do whatever they end up doing (Interview 2).

Introductory texts and courses do appear to plant the seeds of anthropology. They also give students an idea of what it means to do anthropology, its importance and how anthropology can be used. In chapter III, I illustrated that for many anthropologists, their own definition of anthropology complemented those definitions presented in introductory texts. I also investigated the question of academic legitimacy that I felt was illustrated by drawing distinctions between what anthropology is, and what other social sciences are not. For this chapter, I attempted to draw out different information from these texts and instructors' manuals to begin to investigate the notion of reproductive strategies.

While all the texts surveyed here are similar, the manuals that accompany the texts reveal something different. In essence they reveal suggestions for communicating anthropology. They urge instructors to illustrate in their courses that anthropology goes beyond the adventure into the unknown, and is valid and essential for understanding the world. The following is a poignant example of what I view as a reproductive strategy.

Cultural Anthropology... has been designed with the idea that even though the majority of students in the course will not go on to major in anthropology, they will find it a fascinating and useful subject... Students understanding... will lead to their increasing awareness

about themselves and the world they live in, about the past and the present, and about the unity and diversity that characterizes the human species... With an anthropological perspective, students can begin to "make sense" of the behaviour of peoples unlike themselves as well as gain greater insight about their own behaviour and society... For both the liberal-arts and pre professional student, particularly those who will enter human service careers, anthropology is an essential intellectual, scientific, humanistic, and practical foundation (Nanda Preface:1980).

In summarizing these texts, I asked myself, "What is it then, that anthropologists as professors can reproduce?" I would suggest that on one level an anthropologist can reproduce the importance of fieldwork, anthropological holism, the 'romantic', 'wild' and 'curious' adventure called anthropology. On another level, which is indeed relevant to the identity issues being explored here, a world view of anthropology is reproduced through texts and a professor's own personal anthropological experiences. That is, that anthropology is not only a discipline but a way of approaching the world, and those that do anthropology will likely share this world view. This has broad implications for the kind of identity attached to anthropology and the identity that is reproduced through these courses. I am not suggesting that reproduction is necessarily a conscious strategy used to recruit new anthropologists. Clearly an introductory level

course cannot do that. Texts and personal experiences can however, reproduce the anthropological world view which is an important component in maintaining a group identity.

I think most people drift into anthropology by taking a course in university as undergraduates, because they want an elective and it sounds vaguely entertaining, and they find out that really did not want to be doctors and lawyers or whatever their parents had in mind, and that they really do like this stuff, and the people who do it, and then suddenly you look around one day and realize that you cannot do anything else. I don't think many people decide abstractly to be an anthropologist, and then go study to become one. It's more a question of exploring a way of how to think outside the mainstream and to be comfortable with that. And then it follows (Interview 27).

As I suggested, these reproductive strategies most likely operate on an unconscious level. The anthropologists themselves may not even be aware of the influence of their experiences on students. Whether or not this is a conscious or unconscious activity may be less important than the actual effect that these "texts" have on maintaining an anthropological identity. According to Weigert, identity maintenance is key for ensuring identity continuity. This could possibly underline the necessity to externally communicate identity through students.

Since identity is a socially constructed and symbolically sustained meaning, there must also be sociological psychological realities that guarantee the continuity of

these meanings and allow us to construct and experience that crucial intimate meaning: that of my self as a continuous identity through all the changes which mark my life (Weigert et.al.1986:60).

For many of the anthropologists interviewed, being an anthropologist is much more than a career choice. In fact, for many of them it is a fundamental component of who they are - in and out of the field. This may support the importance of the anthropological world view that is being communicated. If who you are is so intimately connected to what you do, then it is highly probable that will influence how students approach, and come to interpret anthropology. This was highlighted by an informant who shared that her 'lived experience' as an anthropologist is directly tied to her own personal identity.

Closely related to my "lived experience"? Yes, in that it grows out of, who I am, is who I am I guess and my identity as anthropologist is all tied up with my identity as a person...(Interview 16).

Other informants identified the symbolic and personal meaning that the anthropological perspective had on their lives and career choice. Those informants described the personal significance of seeing the world through the anthropological lens. Further, some of the informants shared what I interpreted as anthropological epiphanies. The impact that these 'awakenings' had on their decision to pursue

anthropology also reinforce my assertion that anthropological texts can be viewed as reproductive strategies.

A friend of mine brought me a book one day and it was called "The Forest People"... so I started reading it... and it changed my life because, here before my eyes I'd never read any anthropological, any ethnography before but had taken an intro course several years before that and here before my eyes was unalienated human being... I changed completely to anthropology, completed my degree, aced it and then I went on to graduate school (Interview 10).

I read Clyde Klockhohn, "Mirror for Man" in high school... signed up as an anthropology major on first day as undergraduate (Interview 11).

I was in the Andes - 16,000 feet. I had gone there for a few weeks, personal interest. I was already registered in the faculty of Law. I was fascinated by the work, a "flash" came to me, I was going to be an anthropologist (Interview 9)

I did a lot of travelling and because of my travelling (mostly Africa), I went into anthropology. Took courses and got hooked. I wanted questions answered that I saw in my travels - particularly around tourism (Interview 6).

Another important anthropological perspective communicated was the idea that anthropology is located outside of the mainstream. This in itself could have reproductive influence especially for students who resist the sometimes conventional and traditional boundaries of higher learning. One informant suggested 'anomie' as a reason behind her identity as an anthropologist.

I wasn't in the process of becoming an anthropologist, I have always been outside of the mainstream. I have always been a foreigner and a refugee - always! I have always suffered from anomie, what else makes an anthropologist (Interview 20)?

Coupled with this intimate and personal connection to anthropology, and the introductory texts, I asked informants what they thought they brought to their students.

We teach them to think and be involved in the world and they end up doing all kinds of things, and they may not have the disciplinary labels of any kind... It's a manner of seeing the world. And I think that we must insist that one who simply takes the position outside the mainstream, is absolutely crucial to that notion of living in the world well... And I think that's why anthropology draws so many students (Interview 27).

The question that needs to be asked is how are these texts and these personal/professional roots in anthropology reproduced in students? Clearly, if one believes that being outside of the mainstream is "crucial to that notion of living in the world well (Interview 27)", this will be communicated to students. This could have reproductive implications for reinforcing and validating anthropology. This is the rationale behind asking anthropologists how much of themselves they felt they took into the classroom, and whether they themselves viewed that as reproduction. The responses were unexpected and surprising. I had assumed, given informants perceptions of the

importance and value of anthropology, that they would, if not accept this idea of reproduction, at least acknowledge it as a possibility. It then occurred to me upon analysing these responses, as I have suggested that the 'self' that was being prompted was interpreted differently by informants.

5.4 Selectivity Conveying Self to Others: Reproducing (My)Self?

In identity theories, there are many ways of defining the 'self'. Identity theorists tend to move away from examining the self in 'Freudian ego' terms and look towards a self that is socially and culturally constituted (Hollan 1992:284). Approaching the self as a socially and culturally constituted construction enables us to view it as, "an evolving, self-aware production of a series of interactional relationships that lead to the development of the sense of individuality over the life course (Weigert et.al 1986:40)." How then, does this idea of self become connected to identity? Identity is only one expressed dimension of self. "An individual has one self that becomes situationally typified through a variety of identities (Weigert et.al. 1986:40)." One informant in particular illustrated this notion of 'self' as expressed through identities when responding to the question of reproduction.

No, I would think that I'm a teacher and the job of the teacher is to challenge and be open. And so if people disagree with me... what I used to do when I was a high school teacher and I still do it in a university class - If I take different positions, I step to different parts of the room. If I take my own position... I make it very clear that this is my opinion, what's more you need not follow it (Interview 3).

This act of taking different positions reinforces Weigert's notion of self. This informant evokes different identities as she positions her(self) in different roles. This 'social self', which has also been referred to as the 'performed self' (Goffman 1959) is "that self that is presented to others in the social actions of everyday life (Weigert et.al.1986:40).

Identity can be further subdivided into "personal" identity, based on characteristics presumably unique to the individual...and "social" identity, based on broad social categories having general social acceptance. Putting these elements together, we see that identity is a system based on one's reflective view of self, perceptions of the expectations or response of others (reflected images), and subsequent reactions to shared reality or "validation" (Weigert et.al, 1986:40-41).

In discussing the notion of 'reproducing self' with informants, my own unstated assumption was that the 'self' being investigated was the 'social self', rather than the 'personal self'. Based on the diverse reactions to the statement on reproduction I read to informants, it became clear to me that self had different meanings for different

informants. These can best be seen as 'self as ego' and 'self as anthropologist'.

5.4.1 (My)Self as Ego?

For many of the informants the notion of reproducing self was taken literally to mean the reproduction of their 'personal selves' as individuals, not as anthropologists.

I hope it isn't what I do. This statement seems to be a theological one, with an implication that "I" am somehow a being worthy of being emulated. I'm concerned with data, not with my own ego. If I'm aware of my biases and ideologies, I warn my students that they are about receive biased information (Interview 7).

I have no intention of 'reproducing myself'. I would rather view teaching as imparting what I have learned, but the students need to improve on that and make it their own. Maybe the difference is anthropology prof as rabbi (teacher) rather than as guru (Interview 2).

I don't train to reproduce myself. I don't agree with that, it sounds too egotistical. I like the idea of sharing knowledge, experience and skills (Interview 13).

...If you're merely reproducing yourself, you're also reproducing your own flaws and all. It's only, only if you can say I am perfect that you can be totally happy with this linear reproduction and to me that is very narrow, because we know things do change, new ideas do come up... No, I'm not reproducing myself -- in my own shape and size, no - that would be frightening (Interview 6).

5.4.2. (My)Self as Anthropologist?

The next set of responses suggested that (my)self, was being understood as the anthropological self. For these informants, disagreement or discomfort with this idea of

reproduction was grounded in epistemological concerns.

I think it's true - it happens all the time. I don't know how you escape it - hopefully you can be reflexive. There is reproduction going on, that doesn't mean you can't teach other perspectives along with it (Interview 1).

I totally disagree with this view - to teach to reproduce self. It's like incest - wanting them to be like us was so in Malinowski's time - the "masters". This view goes counter to intellectual progress. It goes against epistemology, prohibits new ways of knowing (Interview 8).

I say it's "bosh", I do have biases and they're not ideological particularly, they are theoretical, and hopefully empirical, but I don't demand that students accept this bias... It's just a point of view so why promulgate a point of view when the object is to understand the transcendental (Interview 15)?

It's an approach - I disagree with it. Old fashioned way of teaching. I'd rather see dialogue, students thinking. Particularly at the graduate level ought to be encouraging, questioning and dialoguing, thinking. Hate to think - "it's my way, or the highway". God knows there are innumerable ways to do anthropology (Interview 4).

I find the sentiment disagreeable. You CAN teach methods and techniques and help sensitize students to critical thinking, but I'm not so cocksure about my views that I would presume to "reproduce" them in students (Interview 5).

The distinctions between these two positions of self are great, but they share an assertion that reproduction does not take place for them as teachers. There seemed to be no

acknowledgment of the possibility of the inevitability of unconscious reproduction, despite attempts to safeguard against it.

5.4.3. Unconscious Reproduction

Throughout the interviews, it became clear to me that the intellectual resistance of the informants to reproduction might be equated with 'producing a carbon copy' of oneself. However, there was a another dimension to reproduction that most informants seemed unwilling to examine. That is, the idea that there is an unconscious process of reproduction that occurs which is not the idea of the 'carbon copy' but rather the choices you make with regards to course texts, content and theoretical positions. I suggest that reproduction is more subtle and therefore, is worthy of further investigation. The nuances of reproduction can occur simply through what is taught, and what is bypassed. Certainly this can be seen by the marginalized status that feminist and applied anthropology have within many departments researched for this thesis.

Specifically, if we look at the gender issues expressed in the previous chapter, it is highly probable that those ideas, concerns and biases are passed on to students. Clearly, curriculum if viewed in this way, could suggest a type of reproductive strategy that reinforces certain areas in

anthropology and ignores others. One informant suggested some of the political issues connected to knowledge which he identified as the agenda of knowledge. The points he raises typify a reproductive strategy that may operate and be communicated at an unconscious level.

Well I think all knowledge has an agenda. I'm old fashioned at one level and I think that there is better knowledge and more adequate knowledge and there is worse knowledge, propaganda and lies. These are real distinctions. The university has to uphold some standards for better knowledge. So I think it's my responsibility to teach not simply my biases, or my own political values but certainly that the knowledge that I try to circulate in teaching is knowledge that will serve some political goals better than others. Not because the knowledge itself is less adequate or is deliberately partial but simply because I'm interested in issues such as equality, dependency, development, alternatives out of those conditions, political processes that lead out of those conditions. My interest in those things means that the kind of knowledge that I focus on is more likely to be relevant to that than it is to other political issues or other agendas. So, I feel that the two are always present, I think certainly that one of the tasks of humanities and social sciences in general is to present knowledge that inevitably has a moral complexion as social, ethical implications. It would be forced and artificial division to try to separate the political and the ethical from the objectivity of a particular body of knowledge (Interview 24).

The excerpt above outlines the choices that are made within a teaching context. Those choices will have a profound impact on how students in the class come to identify with anthropology. Only a few informants were willing to discuss this issue of

'choice' as a potential reproductive strategy. These informants moved beyond the notion of reproducing the 'self' as me, to shed light on how particular perspectives and theoretical positions may be reproduced.

I guess the most important word of that quote is... "I train", you can go many ways with a text like that... I want to concentrate on that word "train", if it means this is where "professionalization" takes place, then I would tend to agree that statistically this is what happens. You are reproducing something almost unconsciously because you're not as you say "reflecting" on your own use of sources, text or the way you read something (Interview 8).

I think what I try to pass on is a way... I mean I would love to think, maybe this sounds... when I'm long gone, my students are teaching either in the academy or in whatever they're doing working with people that they will use some of the ways of approaching teaching people that I have used - That they will try to get to the heart of what someone is trying to say - to rephrase it so they say "oh that's what this means (Interview 16).

There are many things I don't teach because I don't think they're important, why? From my point of view... I think the difference is someone who's reflexive and someone who's not - someone who's trying to present it as truth (Interview 1).

5.5 "Lived Experience" as Identity Maintenance

In an attempt to get informants to focus on this idea of reproduction, I posed the question of how relevant the 'lived experience' of the anthropologist is to teaching? It was my intention to investigate the extent to which the 'self' enters

the classroom and to analyse the potential reproductive effect that may have on students. By looking at reproduction from different angles, it may be that reproduction operates on a continuum. This was illustrated by the original comment on reproduction: "I train to reproduce myself, insofar as I want to communicate my particular biases, ideologies and so on (private conversation)", to the more subtle notion of reproduction which was expressed by the previous quotations. This is where professors' lived experience may become key for identity maintenance. Students are taught specific anthropological perspectives through their professors and their work. Professors who bring their fieldwork into the classroom may unconsciously be reproducing their perspectives and areas of interest, simply by not teaching fields of inquiry that don't interest or concern them. This was evident by those informants who acknowledged the potential unconscious reproduction that takes place simply by choosing to teach one perspective over the other.

The following responses suggest that indeed there is the possibility for reproduction simply by bringing the anthropologist into the classroom and moving beyond the 'abstract' perspectives of anthropology to the more 'concrete' real world experiences of anthropologists. Furthermore, these

excerpts are another example of the way in which fieldwork is used to legitimize the discipline. By using personal fieldwork experiences as part of the curricula, the importance of fieldwork as an anthropological tool is reinforced.

...I don't go into a class and start rambling about my love life, my family life or anything. But when it comes to specific discussions...then yes I would draw, I would definitely draw upon my life experiences because what is in the textbook and whatever the students can take from my lectures, I really don't have to repeat them, they all have that common bond of data, whereas my lived experiences are very specific to myself, to me so I will bring that to supplement and they love it..."wow it's great to hear about what you did and so on" because they relate the data to a living person (Interview 13).

I don't discuss very much me - no, it's not my way of teaching. I certainly talk a lot about the groups but I certainly don't give many anecdotes about my fieldwork, once in a while I do but that's more a sense as a self-conscious teaching device which is... The way I started teaching was rigidly presented, all the information was there, highly impersonal, but then I realized that part of what I was doing had an element of "show", that a performance aspect was important because I could teach better (Interview 22).

If I can impart anything to students it is to share my experience... born of the experience of doing fieldwork (Interview 5).

[Lived Experience is] probably very important, I would think it would be relatively uncommon not to... I could see how people would pick it up intellectually if they were trained otherwise but I would think that anyone that takes the ethnographic research approach not just anthropologists be inclined towards that partly because then you have the potential also of learning from your students experiences (Interview 12).

I suspect that which makes me anomalous to the rest of humanity is the fact that I see the world, I don't see it as other people do, I see the other side of every moment (Interview 20).

I teach by telling a lot of stories. Anecdotes about fieldwork, take the generalizations down to the level of this person doing this on this occasion...(Interview 27).

I have attempted to bring together possible ways in which anthropological identity is reproduced which serve to attract student interest and to legitimize anthropology and anthropologists within the university structure. I have examined three elements of anthropology where reproduction could take place. I began with the textual packaging of the anthropological world view and perspective. I then proceeded to show how that world view has been interpreted by anthropologists themselves who view this as something that anthropology has to offer students. I then turned my focus towards conscious reproductive activity where I identified the diverse positions that anthropologists take with regards to reproduction. The final area that I examined was the role of 'lived experience' in teaching and communicating anthropology. By illustrating the interconnectedness of subject matter with personal anthropological experiences, I am attempting to show that while unconscious, these elements do have implications for reproducing not only anthropology, but specific

perspectives and theoretical positions. Curriculum content and choice will reproduce certain aspects of anthropology while downplaying or ignoring others. Needless to say much of what an anthropology student walks away with is dependent on what a professor teaches.

Finally, I am not suggesting that there's anything wrong with reproduction. It is rather a strategy for reinforcing anthropological identity. If there is a reproductive process taking place it may only be to validate and legitimize the need for anthropology and its valuable contribution to the social sciences. I believe that the connection between the anthropologist and her subject (anthropology) are too intertwined and humanistic to not be reproduced in others that are attracted to this unique perspective and world view. If anything is reproduced, it may simply be the anthropological curiosity to experience and understand the world. That in itself is significant for perpetuating the ongoing continuity of anthropology and the identities of those who make it up.

Chapter VI

Conclusion: Final Thoughts

This chapter is intentionally titled, "Final Thoughts." For me, this has been an opportunity to look inside the anthropologist, to focus the anthropological lens inward. This chapter completes this process. As I stated in the introduction, this research was devoted to examining the possibility of an anthropological identity. Furthermore, I wanted to investigate what dimensions may exist to facilitate, maintain, and legitimize this identity construction. It was not my objective to 'prove' that an anthropological identity exists, nor that it is necessarily reproduced in students. Nevertheless, I believe I have presented an argument for such an identity and its reproduction.

I hoped that by illustrating this identity, it would shed light on the importance of the Ph.D. and fieldwork. I wanted to identify if somehow they were viewed as criteria for becoming an anthropologist. I have argued throughout this discussion, that consensus directly influences group membership and collective identity. In order to maintain an anthropological identity, it must be legitimized within the

larger domain of academe. Anthropology has maintained (or perceives) a 'unique' status by drawing its own disciplinary boundaries that separates it from other disciplines. This has been done, I argue through its disciplinary focus on holism, cross-culturalism and through fieldwork as a primary anthropological method.

Within each of these broad, dualistically conceived divisions, particular disciplines congealed and erected themselves rapidly along professional lines. Given the individual's need to form an identity through mimetic engulfment in a determinate group, the various professional associations turned in upon themselves, and there began that monopolizing of "turf," that marking off of distinctive sets of concepts and methods (Wilshire 1990:64).

The introductory texts and informants' perceptions cited throughout this thesis, exemplify the marking of 'turf' that Wilshire suggests occurs. By doing this, anthropology has gained legitimacy.

This thesis concludes by explicating the potential complexities of the dual role of professor and anthropologist. I believe that by focussing on university-based anthropologists, some interesting questions did surface. Specifically, where does professional identity come from? I have attempted to highlight the construction of an anthropological identity; however, is it the same as

professional identity? Or do university-based anthropologists derive their professional identity from both the 'field' and the 'university'? In my interviews, informants suggested that there is an overlap between the two identities of anthropologist and professor. Moreover, women as we saw in Chapter IV, identified three identities that they felt existed for them: anthropologist, academic and teacher. Male informants, as I previously stated did not divide their identity in this way.

For all the informants however, their perceptions of the pressures of academe and the concomitant obligations were crucial. I would suggest that university-based anthropologists, as do other academics, find themselves in the midst of two, or perhaps three, competing professional foci in the university. I believe that these can be viewed as the roles of teacher, researcher and writer. They are a result of the tensions in trying to do your job (teach) and gain prestige (publish). For women, gender becomes an added dimension.

For the anthropologists interviewed, the pressure to "publish or perish" was repeatedly raised. Informants described this as central to academic status not to mention promotions and tenure within the university. Bruce Wilshire in

his book *The Moral Collapse of the University: Professionalism, Purity, and Alienation* (1990), suggests that one's identity in 'scholarly life' is not constructed through teaching. Rather, academics derive it from published research. Therefore, according to Wilshire, "the lighter the teaching loads, the greater the prestige (Wilshire 1990:78)." Wilshire, calls this the double-bind, in that one must teach to be in a university, and one must publish to get promoted, and gain prestige.

...In large research universities most professors concentrate on publication and on those students who directly aid their research efforts - graduate students. Undergraduates are often experienced as a burden...(Wilshire 1990:73).

This may be further complicated for anthropologists, whose identity is partially constructed and maintained by the field. I would suggest that this poses a triple-bind for university-based anthropologists. This triple-bind may lie in the pressure to publish; the requirement to teach; and access and time to do research (fieldwork). For most social and cultural anthropologists, the field is the 'lab' where research is done. Therefore, being inside a university may limit anthropologists' freedom to go into the field and 'be' anthropologists.

In trying to investigate these three foci, I asked informants if they felt teaching was required to be an anthropologist. The premise for this was the fact that there are fewer academic opportunities for newer anthropologists. How this might affect their anthropological identity? I discovered that for most of the informants, teaching did not hold the same status as the Ph.D. and fieldwork. Whereas informants did feel fieldwork and a Ph.D. were required to be an anthropologist, the same was not true for teaching. The exception to this was one informant who considers herself an applied researcher. She felt that her sessional teaching was the only time she felt like an anthropologist.

Yes, I would say that [teaching] is the only defined anthropological thing I do. I teach this course why? Because I'm an anthropologist. Much of what I do outside is only tangentially connected to anthropology. Teaching an anthropology course is a big part of my anthropological identity (Interview 6).

Teaching however, was identified as a job requirement in a university. Many informants perceived teaching as an interference to doing research. Further, being away from your research impacts your ability to write and publish.

I'm tired, I don't mind teaching. But, as I'm getting older and seeing that I have less time to go away, I am simply frustrated by the time that I spend away from my research (Interview 22).

Students also, through discussion, can take you down new avenues of thought and understanding of a subject. However, I do know several colleagues who work in museums and do not teach and the effect is that they have plenty of time to write and we are in a "publish or perish" world here in North America (Interview 15).

When informants did not view teaching as a fundamental aspect to being an anthropologist, I refocussed the question by asking if teaching helped them in their publishing and research efforts. Graduate courses in particular were viewed as an important avenue for pursuing research and publishing. Most informants who felt that teaching did help their research, referred primarily to graduate seminars. The following informant was one of the only anthropologists I interviewed who had published directly from undergraduate courses.

I started teaching a course, an undergraduate course probably some time in the late 60s, early 70s- anyway that course has been written up as [a] book _____, which was one of my more widely read and successful books and then I taught another course and this one certainly from the late 60s, called the _____ and then over the last ten years, that has been developed into quite a theoretically oriented comparative research project which I'm just about to start writing up as a book as well. So basically I've turned over the years two of my undergraduate courses into fairly major research projects (Interview 23).

Finally, teaching, while central to their academic lives, was perhaps the one job that most of the informants felt the

least qualified to do. They had done fieldwork which qualified them to be anthropologists. They had completed their Ph.D. which qualified them to be academics. Yet, for most of them, their professional role as a teacher was an area for which they had insufficient training. This underlines a central problem in the role and importance of being a teacher in a university. The emphasis on, and pressure to "publish or perish" suggests that one does not get hired or even tenured for their teaching abilities. This may serve to explain why informants did not view teaching as something you had to do to be an anthropologist.

Teaching undergraduates is required of most university professors at least some of the time. In no other profession is the training for, and the evaluation of, an essential function of professional life so slighted. Typically no systematic guidance in learning how to teach is ever provided. It is a hit or miss proposition, with some being naturally gifted, or others able to reproduce mimetically the skills of the talented professors they may happen to have had in their own student days (Wilshire 1990:77).

This lack of emphasis on teaching, and the pressure to "publish or perish" could be paralleled with those anthropologists who may not enjoy fieldwork, but are required to do it. As fieldwork is paramount to anthropological identity, publishing and research may also be paramount, for an academic identity. One informant in particular, expressed

his opinion that those who do not like to write, find themselves in a difficult position within academe.

I've heard a lot about that [publish or perish] and I really feel sorry for people in that they're missing something which should be an enjoyment. And I've seen it in people who are very well known. There's somebody who I won't name who is an international scholar he was caught in that feeling that he had to publish more because it was asked of him, rather than just sit down and say, "hey, this is what I like doing, it's fun" (Interview 22).

A final aspect of the triple-bind that may be particularly problematic for anthropologists is research. If the field is the source for anthropological data, as is the case for social and cultural anthropology, then being able to gather the material to fulfill writing and publishing demands may be difficult. For anthropologists to collect their data, they need time in the field. On the other hand, for them to analyse and write their findings, they need time in the university. Informants raised the problematic of data collection and the ability of a university-based anthropologist to continuously pursue new research interests. The following excerpt raises an interesting point related to this issue.

It is often said that anthropologists only get one good idea and then they publish it over and over again, while it is sort of appalling, on the other hand it takes a long time to master the literature and then to keep up

with it...So I can see why people have one research interest. It's comforting and you do know that field, and I think academics, not just anthropologists feel uneasy if they're out of their own area of expertise. So I can understand that and as far as the repeated publication of the same stuff - there are many ethical questions involved in that, but the pressure to publish is considerable and so all of us rework stuff...(Interview 16).

The issue raised above, is one that I gave much thought to throughout my fieldwork, particularly with regards to identity. I had noticed in my early Internet and library searches that many anthropologists I interviewed had not done recent research. I then began to speculate what this may mean for issues of identity. It was evident by the responses of the informants in Chapters III, IV, V, that fieldwork is essential in defining the anthropologist. The question that arose for me, and is still left unanswered is: "Is fieldwork necessary for maintaining that identity?" That is, do you have to continue to do fieldwork to remain an anthropologist? Some people did suggest that using old research to teach, and for publishing was problematic. Others did not express any feelings on this issue either way. However, this may be the only place where there seemed to be generational differences. Most of the young(er) informants interviewed identified the importance of ongoing research. This may also explain why

these informants in particular stressed a need to (re)define the field. To do ongoing research, the field has to be closer, particularly if you are (in fieldwork terms), only an 'anthropologist' in the summer.

Moreover, the pressure to "publish or perish" may be primarily an issue for the young(er) anthropologists who are not tenured. Many of these informants are in tenure-track positions, but others are only in sessional positions. This may mean that like those before them, they are in the midst of academic competition. Further, there are many issues that face them, that did not face their predecessors. Indeed, I have highlighted some of these issues, specifically changing definitions of the field, and the difficulties many anthropologists face in trying to do work in communities now closed to them. As well, interviews with old(er) anthropologists highlighted that teaching was a given when they finished their Ph.D., which is not true today. These questions may raise some important questions around the fate of anthropologists who wish to be university-based, and for those who still view anthropology in its traditional terms.

Finally, as stated in the last paragraph of the introduction, I had hoped my thesis would provide insight into the complexities of the anthropologist, and the culture of

anthropology within a university structure. Before concluding this thesis, however, there are remaining 'silences' that need to be highlighted.

As I stated Chapter II, my informants represented the four fields of anthropology, yet their responses were more indicative of cultural/social anthropologists. I suggested that this could be partially due to the nature of the interview questions. I was specifically trying to elicit views on, and perceptions of fieldwork and the Ph.D. Even for those informants who identified themselves as physical anthropologists and/or archaeologists, a substantial weight was placed on field research. There are obvious differences in the 'fields' of these anthropologists, but it was evident that the field in its many forms, was key to the identity construction of 'anthropologist'. Furthermore, had I pursued training and methodological issues, it is likely that the 'voices' of physical, linguistic, and archaeological anthropology would have been more pronounced. This is true also for the introductory texts which were more sociocultural in their content. This is primarily because these texts focussed on the anthropological perspective, fieldwork, cross-culturalism, whereas physical anthropology texts tended to be more 'scientific' in nature.

Another issue which I briefly touched on in Chapter II, is related to the idea that much of what I have investigated may be relevant to other disciplines. The extent to which, rites of passage occur in other disciplines could be an interesting area of inquiry. While I was focusing specifically, on anthropological identity, it would be worthwhile to broaden and reexamine these identity issues by doing a comparative analysis. Often throughout my fieldwork, I thought of geologists vis a vis anthropologists. I wondered if they might draw some of the same identity lines as anthropologists, particularly if they are university-based and also do fieldwork. Moreover, I am not suggesting that rites of passage, consensus and legitimacy are solely specific to anthropology. Indeed I would venture that most members of a discipline agree on what it means to be part of that particular category membership. Further, the issue of legitimacy in a university is paramount for all disciplines, especially for the social sciences and humanities. These disciplines are often shadowed by the 'hard' sciences and business related disciplines. What may however, be specific to anthropologists is how 'blended' the lines become between self (individual), and self (professional). The informants I interviewed, viewed anthropology as a fundamental part of who

they are, how they think, and approach their world. Additionally, because anthropology is fundamentally concerned with human societies, it may be, that through the investigation of the Other, the anthropologist comes to know him/herself. This connection may explain the importance of fieldwork as a personal growth experience. Again, the degree to which this occurs for others cannot be measured by this work, but it may underline a need to investigate how identity is constructed and communicated in other disciplines and professions. Certainly, the issues raised by informants in this chapter would be similar for other academics precisely because professional obligations and requirements in a university are standardized. The question that is left unanswered is, "Does a similar kind of professional identity construction exist for other academics? If so, what comprises the dimensions of that identity?"

Finally, as an anthropology student, I have come to understand the value of fieldwork both as a learning experience and an exercise in personal growth. It has been an interesting and valuable journey. Through this experience I have gained a better understanding of the anthropological perspective and its merit.

Appendix A1Electronic Message (CASCA)

My name is Laura Cohen. I'm a Master's student in anthropology at Carleton University. I will be attending CASCA this year, and would greatly appreciate the opportunity to interview anthropologists at the conference.

I'm interested in exploring how anthropologists identify the elements and process by which their professional identity as "anthropologist" was constructed. I would like to interview anthropologists who are presently teaching (full-time or sessional) in other academic institutions.

All interviewees will be provided with an informed consent form. I anticipate that individual interviews will take no longer than an hour and a half. I can be contacted at lcohen@ccs.carleton.ca. I look forward to hearing from you.

Appendix A2Electronic Message (General)

Dear (Professor's Name),

My name is Laura Cohen. I'm a Master's student in anthropology at Carleton University. My reason for contacting you is that I am currently in the process of collecting data for my Master's thesis and would like very much to interview you.

My research is primarily concerned with how professional identities of anthropologists are constructed. The purpose of the interview is to explore if anthropologists identify the elements of, and process by which their professional identity as "anthropologist" was/is constructed. It is also my objective to explore ways in which these "identities" translate into what and how anthropologists teach.

I am very committed to this research and hope to collect a broad and diverse sample of anthropologists in Canada. I am interviewing anthropology professors from Carleton, Concordia, McGill, UQAM, University of Calgary, University of Toronto and York University.

All interviewees will be provided with an informed consent form. I anticipate that individual interviews will take no longer than an hour and a half. If you are interested, perhaps it might be possible to give me a sense of your availability over the summer. If you are unable to meet with me and are indeed interested in being interviewed, perhaps we could do so by electronic mail.

I can be contacted at lcohen@ccs.carleton.ca. I look forward to hearing from you. Should you wish further elaboration, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Appendix B

Letter of Consent

I am in the process of gathering information on if anthropologists identify elements and a process by which their professional identity as anthropologist was/is constructed. My interest is in examining if there is such a construction, how it impacts and influences pedagogical practices and approaches. The title of my thesis is; "The Construction of Professional Identity: A Look Inside Anthropology". This interview will focus on your experience of, and thoughts on this process.

Your participation in this project will require one interview. You are free to stop or withdraw from this interview process at any time, for whatever reason. Equally, you are free to respond only to those questions with which you are comfortable. This letter of consent clarifies the nature of my research, my responsibilities as a researcher, and your rights as a respondent. Any complaints relating to this interview process may be communicated to Jacques Chevalier, Chair of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Carleton University. The supervisor for this thesis is Bruce Cox.

With regard to confidentiality, the following precautions will be taken:

- I will personally transcribe each tape recorded interview.
- I will eliminate any identifying information from the transcripts of this interview, from my thesis product, and from any research, or articles or books not yet written or published.

To protect your anonymity, you will not be asked to sign this letter of consent. Instead, a typed copy of this agreement will be included in my thesis as the only proof of our confidentiality agreement. Thank you very much for your time and input.

Laura Cohen

Appendix CInterview Questions

1. How did you decide to be an anthropologist?
2. Can you describe your transition from "student" to "anthropologist"?
3. How did you begin university teaching?
4. How are teaching and anthropology related for you?
5. When you think of fieldwork, what does that mean for you? From your perspective, what constitutes the "field"?
6. How might the possibility of not doing fieldwork and/or teach affect new anthropologists?
7. I'd like to read you this quote, and then perhaps you could share with me your thoughts with respect to training students. "I train to reproduce myself, insofar as I want to communicate what I think I know and as well as my particular biases, ideologies, etc."
8. Do you feel that there are specific skills which you pass on to students? If so, what might some of those skills be?
9. How closely related might these skills be to your "lived" experience as an anthropologist?
10. How important was fieldwork in developing these skills?
11. Is the role of anthropologist changing in the years since you were a student? If so, can you tell me how it has changed?
12. Have these changes affected your teaching style, if so in what ways, ie. content and/or method of instruction?
13. When you hear the word "anthropologist", what does that mean to you?
14. What in your view constitutes good anthropology? What in your view constitutes bad anthropology?

Appendix DBreakdown of Informants by Anthropological Fields

Applied Anthropologist (2)
Archaeologist/Anthropologist (1)
Archaeologist (1)
Cultural/Social Anthropologist (14)
Cultural/Physical Anthropologist (1)
Economic Anthropologist (1)
Linguistic Anthropologist (1)
Urban Anthropologist (1)
Physical Anthropologist (4)
Sociologist/Anthropology Professor (1)

Appendix E

Introductory Anthropology Texts and Instructor Manuals

- Bodley, John H.
1994 *Cultural Anthropology: Tribal, States, And the Global System*. Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Ember, Carol R., Melvin Ember
1990 *Anthropology (6th ed.)*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Ferraro, Gary, Wenda Trevathan, Janet Levy
1994 *Anthropology: An Applied Perspective (includes instructor manual)*. St. Paul: West Publishing Company.
- Howard, Michael
1996 *Contemporary Cultural Anthropology (5th ed.)*. New York: Harper collins College Publishers.
- Hughes, Charles C. (ed.)
1972 *Make Men of Them: Introductory Readings for Cultural Anthropology*. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.
- Nanda, Serenda
1980 *Cultural Anthropology*. New York: D.Van Nostrand Company.
- Pearson, Roger
1974 *Introduction to Anthropology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Wilson, Inc.
- Podolefsky, Aaron, Peter J. Brown
1994 *Applying Cultural Anthropology: An Introductory Reader (2nd ed.)*. Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Rosman, Abraham, Paul G. Rubel
1995 *The Tapestry of Culture: An Introduction to Cultural Anthropology (5th ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Scupin Raymond, Christopher R. DeCorse

1992 *Anthropology: A Global Perspective (includes
 instructors manual)*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice
 Hall.

Spradley, James P., David W. McCurdy

1994 *Conformity & Conflict: Readings in Cultural
 Anthropology (8th ed.)*. New York: Harper Collins
 College Publishers.

Bibliography

- Blumer, Herbert
 1969 *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Bohannan, Paul, Mark Glazer (eds.)
 1988 *High Points in Anthropology (2nd ed.)*. USA: McGraw-Hill, Inc. 422-425.
- Charon, Joel
 1985 *Symbolic Interactionism (2nd ed.)*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Clifford, James, George Marcus (eds.)
 1986 *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Denzin, Norman
 1992 *Symbolic Interactionism and Cultural Studies: The Politics of Interpretation*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- 1989 *Interpretive Interactionism*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- 1978 *The Research Act. U.S.A.*: McGraw-Hill.
- Glaser, Barney, Anselm Strauss
 1967 *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.
- Goffman, Irving
 1959 *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Gottlieb, Alma
 1995 "Beyond the Lonely Anthropologist: Collaboration in Research and Writing" in *American Anthropologist* Vol.97(1). 21-26.
- Hollan, Douglas
 1992 "Cross-Cultural Differences in the Self" in *Journal of Anthropological Research* Vol.48(4). 283-299.

- Jackson, Winston
1995 *Methods: Doing Social Research*. Scarborough:
 Prentice-Hall Canada.
- Lewis, Oscar
1969 *A Death in the Sanchez Family*. New York: Random
 House
- Levi-Strauss, Claude
1974 *Tristes Tropiques* (translated by John and Doreen
 Weightman). New York: Athenium.
- Medicine, Beatrice
1987 " Leaning to be an Anthropologist and Remaining
 "Native" in *Applied Anthropology in America (Second
 Edition)*. Elizabeth M. Eddy and William Partridge
 (editors). New York: Columbia University Press.
 282-295.
- Messerschmidt, Donald A. (ed.)
1981 *Anthropologists at Home in North America: Methods
 and issues in the Study of One's Own Society*. New
 York: Cambridge University Press.
- Parezo, Nancy J. (ed)
1993 *Hidden Scholars: Women Anthropologists and the
 Native American Southwest*. Albuquerque: University
 of New Mexico Press.
- Prus, Robert
1996 *Symbolic Interaction and Ethnographic Research:
 Intersubjectivity and the Study of Human Lived
 Experience*. Albany: State University of New York
 Press.
- Rosenberg, Morris
1979 *Conceiving the Self*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Schwalbe, Michael L.
1993 "Goffman Against Postmodernism: Emotion and the
 Reality of the Self" in *Symbolic Interaction* (Vol
 16(4). 333-349.

- Singleton, Royce, Bruce Straits, Margaret Miller Straits
1993 *Approaches to Social Research* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stocking, George
1992 *The Ethnographer's Magic*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Tedlock, Barbara
1995 "Works and Wives: On the Sexual Division of Textual Labour" in *Women Writing Culture*. Ruth Behar and Deborah A. Gordon (eds). Berkeley: University of California Press. 267-287.
- Warren, Carol A.B.
1988 *Gender Issues in Field Research*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Weigert, Andrew J., J. Smith Teitge, Dennis W. Teitge
1986 *Society and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wengle, John L.
1988 *Ethnographers in the Field: The Psychology of Research*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Wilshire, Bruce
1990 *The Moral Collapse of the University: Professionalism, Purity, and Alienation*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Zumwalt, Rosemary Levy
1992 *Wealth and Rebellion: Elsie Clews Parson, Anthropologist and Folklorist*. Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

IMAGE EVALUATION TEST TARGET (QA-3)

APPLIED IMAGE, Inc.
1653 East Main Street
Rochester, NY 14609 USA
Phone: 716/482-0300
Fax: 716/288-5989

© 1993, Applied Image, Inc., All Rights Reserved