

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

COURSE OUTLINE

Archaeology 601 - Theoretical Foundations

FALL 2009

INSTRUCTORS: Dr Gerald A. Oetelaar

LOCATION: ES 822

TIME: MF 9:30-11:00

Course Outline: The objective of this graduate seminar is to discuss and debate the major theoretical perspectives used by researchers in anthropology and, by extension, in archaeology and biological anthropology. Seminar topics will focus on the major schools of thought, most of which persist in contemporary theoretical approaches in anthropology.

Course Mechanics:	Presentation	25%
	Major Paper	40%
	Five short papers	25%
	General participation	10%

PRESENTATION: Each topic discussed in class will encompass two sessions with presentations being made during one class and the following class being reserved for extensive discussion of the materials presented and the accompanying readings. It is suggested that the presentation be made as a PowerPoint talk, with key points outlined on the screen, which the presenter then uses to expand on verbally, as opposed to being read out from a prepared text (this is to afford the student the opportunity to refine his or her presentation skills). The presentation should last forty minutes (without interruption), and will be followed by a short discussion of points raised in the presentation itself.

No later than the beginning of the class preceding the presentation, the presenter should email to each of the students and instructors three PDF files, each containing a relevant reading to accompany the presentation. These readings will form the basis of the discussion the day following the presentation. At least one should be a key original text (journal article or book chapter). The other two may consist of either additional original texts or more general commentaries on the topic, from secondary sources (e.g. Annual Review of Anthropology articles or monographs). The presenter will also serve as moderator of the discussion, guiding the debates along productive lines, and moving it forward if it bogs down in minutiae. The presenter should email to all participants a one-page outline of the discussion, along with a half-dozen or so discussion questions no later than 48 hours preceding the discussion.

The mark for this component of the course will cover the quality and clarity of the presentation itself, the judiciousness of the selected reading materials, and the chairing of the discussion. Grading for the first two presenters will take into consideration the fact that they have had reduced preparation time.

SHORT PAPERS: The five short papers, limited to two pages double spaced, will deal with a theory or school of thought just covered (excepting one's own presentation topic). The papers should show detached thoughtfulness, constructive criticism, and balance (i.e., noting both strengths and shortcomings). The papers should also try to take note of contrasts and resonances with other theoretical schools that have been discussed. For these short papers, the author should adopt a strictly 'objective' stance, such that the reader should ideally not be able to detect the author's personal views on the material being discussed. The instructor will read all papers and return them with a mark out of five possible points. If six short papers are handed in, the lowest mark of the six will automatically be dropped. The short papers are due one week after the topic has been discussed in seminar.

MAJOR PAPER: This paper should be a comprehensive essay on theory, with at least some treatment of all the theories covered in the course. Unlike the short papers, the author may, in this paper, indicate his or her theoretical leanings and reasons for preferring some theories over others, but the paper should nevertheless strive for balance and fairness. Suggested length: twenty pages, double-spaced, plus bibliography. This paper is due on DECEMBER 11, 2009.

GENERAL PARTICIPATION: This covers overall contribution to the learning experience. Excessive passivity or numerous unexcused absences may be reflected in this component of the grade.

DISABILITY ACCOMMODATIONS: It is the student's responsibility to request academic accommodations. If you are a student with a documented disability who may require academic accommodation and have not registered with the Disability Resource Centre, please contact their office @ 220-8237. Students who have not registered with the Disability Resource Centre are not eligible for formal academic accommodation. You are also required to discuss your needs with your instructor no later than fourteen (14) days after the start of this course.

INTELLECTUAL HONESTY: Attached to this outline is a set of Guidelines which the student should read and observe in producing written work for this course.

* * *

INTELLECTUAL HONESTY GUIDELINES

Intellectual honesty is the cornerstone of the development and acquisition of knowledge. Knowledge is cumulative and further advances are predicated on the contributions of others. In the normal course of scholarship, these contributions are apprehended, critically evaluated and utilized as a foundation for further inquiry. Intellectual honesty demands that the contribution of others be acknowledged.

Essentially, plagiarism is a form of cheating that involves submitting or presenting work in a course as if it were the student's own done expressly for that particular course when, in fact, it is not. Most commonly **PLAGIARISM** exists when:

- (a) the work submitted or presented was done, in whole or in part, by an individual other than the one submitting or presenting the work (this includes having another person impersonate the student or otherwise substituting the work of another for one's own in an examination or test)**
- (b) parts of the work are taken from another source without references to the original author**
- (c) the whole work is copied from another source and/or**
- (d) a student submits or presents work in one course which has also been submitted in another course (even though it may be entirely the work of that student) without the express consent of the instructors of the courses concerned**

While it is recognized that scholarly work often involves reference to the ideas, data and conclusions of other scholars, intellectual honesty requires that such references be explicitly and clearly noted. Plagiarism is an extremely serious academic offence.

The elementary rules of quotation and paraphrase are given below. There are further details and conventions of punctuation that you may need to look up in a manual of style, but observance of these rules should assure compliance with contemporary standards of intellectual honesty.

- 1. If you use more than four words from any source, put them in quotation marks and identify the source with a reference**

EXAMPLE

It has been observed that 'many tribes are, in a sense, ethnographic fictions' (Leach 1954: 291).

- 2. If your direct quotation is more than three lines long, put it in block form, that is, left- and right-indented and single-spaced, without quotation marks and with a reference**

EXAMPLE

Malinowski thought of tribes as social systems with well defined boundaries. This conception of tribe was later to be challenged by one of his students, who observed that:

the ethnographer has often only managed to discern the existence of 'a tribe' because he took it as axiomatic that this kind of cultural entity must exist (Leach 1954: 291).

- 3. To paraphrase the work of another means to present the same train of thought and evidence, but rephrased into your own words. Whenever you do this, you must include a note or reference to the source. A common mistake is to break up an author's words, and rearrange them slightly, passing them off as your own. This is wrong, even if you include a note or reference to the source. To do this for more than a few words is to commit plagiarism**

Below are three passages. The first is an excerpt from E. A. Leach, *Political systems of highland Burma*. The second is an improper paraphrase of the passage that would be considered plagiarism. The third is a proper paraphrase.

EXAMPLES

(1)

It is largely an academic fiction to suppose that in a 'normal' ethnographic situation one ordinarily finds distinct 'tribes' distributed on the map in orderly fashion with clear-cut boundaries between them. I agree of course that ethnographic monographs frequently suggest that this is the case, but are the facts proved? My own view is that the ethnographer has often only managed to discern the existence of 'a tribe' because he took it as axiomatic that this kind of cultural entity must exist. Many such tribes are, in a sense, ethnographic fictions (Leach 1954: 290-1). [SOURCE]

(2)

It is an academic misconception to think that in a typical ethnographic situation tribes with clear-cut boundaries can be found distributed in an orderly fashion on the map. Ethnographic monographs often imply that this is so, but what are the facts? The ethnographer is often able to find a 'tribe' only because she takes it for granted that this kind of group must exist. Many tribes are figments of the anthropologist's imagination. [PLAGIARISM]

(3)

Ethnographic monographs often suggest that it is normally the case that there exist in the real world contiguous tribes with clearly discernible boundaries; however, it is Leach's view that such units are found only because the ethnographer has taken their existence for granted (Leach 1954: 290-1). [PROPER PARAPHRASE]

* * *

POSSIBLE SEMINAR TOPICS

Topic	Proponents	Student	Presentation	Discussion
EVOLUTIONISM	<i>Tylor, White, Sahlins</i>			
DIFFUSIONISM	<i>Ratzel, Frobenius, Schmidt</i>			
FUNCTIONALISM	<i>Malinowski, Richards, Fortes</i>			
HISTORICAL PARTICULARISM	<i>Boas, Wissler, Kroeber</i>			
PSYCHOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY	<i>M. Mead, Wallace, Hallowell, Whiting</i>			
BRITISH STRUCTURALISM	<i>Radcliffe-Brown, Firth, Evans-Pritchard</i>			
FRENCH STRUCTURALISM	<i>Mauss, Hertz, Lévi-Strauss</i>			
SYMBOLIC ANTHROPOLOGY	<i>Turner, Douglas, Obeyesekere</i>			
CULTURAL CONFIGURATIONALISM	<i>Dilthey, Kroeber, Benedict, M. Mead</i>			
CONFLICT THEORY	<i>Lowie, Gluckman, Carniero</i>			
ECOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY	<i>Kroeber, Steward, Vayda, Rappoport</i>			
STATISTICAL-COMPARATIVISM	<i>Tylor, Ginsberg, Murdock, Ember</i>			
CULTURAL MATERIALISM	<i>Marx, White, Harris, Schneider</i>			
COGNITIVE ANTHROPOLOGY	<i>Pike, Metzger, Conklin, Tyler, Goodenough</i>			
POSTCOLONIALISM - CRITICAL THEORY	<i>Hobsbawm, Said, Berque, Comaroff</i>			
FEMINIST ANTHROPOLOGY	<i>M. Mead, Ortner, Lamphere, Rosaldo</i>			
POSTMODERNISM	<i>Geertz, Clifford, Marcus, Tyler</i>			
STRUCTURATION THEORY	<i>Goffman, Giddens</i>			
PRAXIS	<i>Bourdieu, Foucault, Blaise</i>			
TRANSACTIONAL THEORY	<i>Bailey, Barth</i>			