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**Course Syllabus**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Title of the course | | Applied Anthropology | | | | | | |
| Title of the Academic Programme | | History Department (Social Anthropology minor) | | | | | | |
| Type of the course | | Elective | | | | | | |
| Prerequisites | | None | | | | | | |
| ECTS workload | | 5 | | | | | | |
| Total indicative study hours | | Directed Study | | Self-directed study | | | Total | |
| 60 | | 130 | | | 190 | |
| Course Overview | | This is a concluding course in the social anthropology minor. Its goal is to situate anthropological research in a broader landscape of social theory from Marx to Agamben and Schmitt, explore uses of anthropological knowledge that were engendered by this social theory and the history of anthropology, and revise the readings for this minor. This course links the history of anthropological theory with the history of applied anthropology, action anthropology and engaged anthropology. Lectures and seminars are structured by main schools of thought in social theory, which are illustrated by chapters from ethnographies, by applied anthropology examples and by readings from the other courses of this minor that we have already studied. | | | | | | |
| Intended Learning Outcomes (ILO) | | *ULo 1 Able to learn and demonstrate skills in the field, other than the major field*  *ULo 5 Work with information: find, define and use the information from different sources which required for solving of research and professional problems (including the system approach)*  *ULo 8 Able to efficiently communicate based on the goals and communication situations* | | | | | | |
| Teaching and Learning Methods | | The course consists of both lectures and seminars that will focus on selected readings. Students are encouraged to lively participate in the discussions both during lectures and seminars. | | | | | | |
| Content and Structure of the Course | | | | | | | | |
| **№** | **Topic / Course Chapter** | | **Total** | | **Directed Study** | | | **Self-directed Study** |
| **Lectures** | **Tutorials** | |
| 1 | Ethnography, applied anthropology and social theory | | 14 | | 4 | 0 | | 10 |
| 2 | Anthropology since the 1960s | | 10 | | 0 | 2 | | 8 |
| 3 | Marxist perspectives | | 12 | | 0 | 4 | | 8 |
| 4 | Durkheim and the invention of society | | 8 | | 2 | 0 | | 6 |
| 5 | Durkheimian perspectives | | 12 | | 0 | 4 | | 8 |
| 6 | The invention of Society | | 8 | | 0 | 2 | | 6 |
| 7 | Weber and ‘understanding anthropology’ | | 8 | | 2 | 0 | | 6 |
| 8 | Ethics and Economy | | 12 | | 0 | 4 | | 8 |
| 9 | Polanyi | | 12 | | 0 | 4 | | 8 |
| 10 | Distributed personhood and dividual | | 8 | | 2 | 0 | | 6 |
| 11 | Distributed personhood | | 12 | | 0 | 4 | | 8 |
| 12 | Feminist theory | | 16 | | 2 | 4 | | 10 |
| 13 | Panopticism | | 14 | | 0 | 4 | | 10 |
| 14 | The state of exception | | 16 | | 2 | 4 | | 10 |
| 15 | Schmitt | | 16 | | 2 | 4 | | 10 |
| 16 | Anthropology since the 1980s | | 12 | | 4 | 0 | | 8 |
| **Total study hours** | | | 190 | | 20 | 40 | | 130 |
| Indicative Assessment Methods and Strategy | | The course is designed as a series of lectures and seminars devoted to the discussion of key conceptual issues related to applied anthropology and social theory. Attendance of seminars and participation in the discussion are taken into account when calculating the accumulative mark. The discussion during the seminar takes place on the basis of selected fundamental works from the list. To assist in preparing for the seminar, some reading lists contain leading questions (questions for discussion). Students must participate in a colloquium at the end of the course, which is considered to be a brief revision of the material studied, additional preparation for the exam, and discussion of project research papers.  Research is the main substantive basis of the accumulative assessment. This is a work based on individual or group research on one of the given topics. In the case of a group research project, the written work must be done by each member of the team separately. The purpose of this study is to become familiar with the skills of anthropological research (observation included, interviews and other types of field work). The topic can be proposed by the student and agreed with the teacher during the first month of the course.  As an exam, the student must submit an exam essay. An essay is a written discussion of two randomly selected questions from a list (students get acquainted in advance with a list of sample exam questions). The student needs to analyze the empirical material and the various theoretical approaches considered in the course. In particular, when answering each of these questions, students should use at least three key jobs marked “\*” in the course curriculum (what was discussed at the seminars) and not repeat the material when answering each of the two questions. EITHER / OR in the exam question means that the student can choose one of the question formulations. Sending a work after the deadline (both essay and research paper) takes 10% of the maximum possible estimate (10% for each day of delay).  Formula for calculating the final and accumulative marks:  Macc.= 0.1 \* Mattendance + 0.2 \* Mdiscussion + 0.1 \* Mcolluvium + 0.6 \* Mresearch paper.  Mexam = Messay  Mfinal = 0.2 \* Oacc. + 0.8 \* Oexam | | | | | | |
| Readings / Indicative Learning Resources | | Mandatory  Polanyi, Karl. *Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Beacon Press, 2001.  Optional  Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. *The Mushroom At the End of the World: On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins.* Princeton University Press, 2015.  Gusterson, Hugh. *Drone: Remote Control Warfare.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2016. | | | | | | |
| Indicative Self- Study Strategies | | **Type** | | | | **+/–** | | **Hours** |
| Reading for seminars / tutorials (lecture materials, mandatory and optional resources) | | | | + | | 20 |
| Assignments for seminars / tutorials / labs | | | | + | | 50 |
| E-learning / distance learning (MOOC / LMS) | | | | - | |  |
| Fieldwork (field + analysis) | | | | + | | 40 |
| Project work | | | | - | |  |
| Other (please specify) | | | | - | |  |
| Preparation for the exam | | | | + | | 20 |
| Academic Support for the Course | | Academic support for the course is provided via LMS, where students can find: guidelines and recommendations for doing the course; guidelines and recommendations for self-study; samples of assessment materials. Readings could be found in the Electronical Resources of HSE (via full text founder <https://elib.hse.ru/e-resources/e-resources.htm>, it is more comfortable to do search by the title). | | | | | | |
| Facilities, Equipment and Software | | (If required) | | | | | | |
| Course Instructor | | Alexandra Kasatkina: [alexkasatkina@gmail.com](mailto:alexkasatkina@gmail.com)  Asya Karaseva: [asya.karasyova@gmail.com](mailto:asya.karasyova@gmail.com)  Ekaterina Melnikova: [melek@eu.spb.ru](mailto:melek@eu.spb.ru)  Maragita Kuleva: [mkuleva@hse.ru](mailto:mkuleva@hse.ru)  Nikolai Ssorin-Chaikov: [nssorinchaikov@hse.ru](mailto:nssorinchaikov@hse.ru) | | | | | | |

**Аnnex 1**

**Lectures**

**Lectures 1&2 Ethnography, applied anthropology and social theory**

**Seminar 1 Anthropology since the 1960s**

Questions for discussion:

- What are main foundational theories in the anthropology before 1960s?

- What are, according to Ortner, main schools of thought in the anthropology after 1960s? Who is absent in Ortner’s outline of the history of anthropological theory?

**Seminar 2&3 Marxist perspectives**

Questions for discussion:

- What is ideology?

- What is interpolation?

Ssorin-Chaikov, Nikolai. “Writing Power: An Anarchist Anthropologist in the Looking Glass of Critical Theory*.” Critique of Anthropology* 32, no. 2 (2012): 189-205.

Ssorin-Chaikov, Nikolai. “Sociopolitics.” *Reviews in Anthropology* 44, no. 1 (2015): 5-27.

**Lecture 3 Durkheim and the invention of society**

**Seminar 4&5 Durkheimean perspetives**

Questions for discussion:

- what is ‘social’ in Durkheim and Mauss’ theorisation? How one can interpret the following quotes from Durkheim and Mauss:

“…if totemism is, in one aspect, the grouping of men into clans according to natural objects (the associated totemic species), it is also, inversely, a grouping of natural objects in accordance with social groups”.

“…the two types of classification which we have just studied merely express under different aspects the very societies within which they were elaborated; one was modelled on the jural and religious organization of the tribe, the other on its morphological organization. When it was a matter of establishing ties of kinship between things, and of constituting more and more vast families of creatures and phenomena, this was done with the aid of ideas supplied by the family, the clan, and the moiety, and the totemic myths were taken as starting point. When it was a matter of establishing relations between spatial regions, it was the spatial relations which people maintained within their society that served as starting point. In one case, the framework was furnished by the clan itself, in the other by the material mark made on the ground by the clan. But both forms are of social origin.” (Durkheim and Mauss)

Key readings:

Gane, Mike J. *Radical Sociology of Durkheim and Mauss*. Routledge, 2002, pp. 1-21, 135-165.

**Seminar 6 The invention of Society**

Questions for discussion:

- Who and what is ‘associate’?

- What is the place of Gabriel Tarde the history of social thought and in contemporary anthropology?

Key readings:

\*Joyce, P, ed. *The Social in Question: New Bearings in the History and the Social Sciences*. London: Routledge, 2002, pp. 117–132.

**Lecture 4 Weber and ‘understanding anthropology’**

**Seminar 7-8 Ethics and Economy**

Questions for discussion:

- What is ideal type?

- ‘Believing, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning’. (Geertz) What is the difference between experimental science and interpretive method?

- What is ‘Verstehenden methodology’?

Key readings:

Swatos Jr, William H., Kaelber, Lutz, ed. *The Protestant Ethic Turns 100: Essays on the Centenary of the Weber Thesis*. Routledge, 2005, pp. 53-77.

**Seminar 9-10 Polanyi**

Questions for discussion:

- How, according to Polanyi, ‘society’ was invented as a concept?

- How different are Polanyi’s, Latour’s and Poovey’s takes on society?

Key readings:

\*Polanyi, Karl. *Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, Beacon Press, 2001.

**Lecture 5 Distributed personhood and dividual**

**Seminar 11-12 Distributed personhood**

Questions for discussion:

Key readings:

\*Strathern, Marilyn. Kinship as a relation. *L'Homme* no. 210 (2014): 43-61.

**Lecture 6 Feminist theory**

**Seminar 13-14 Feminist theory**

Questions for discussion:

- How different are Strathern’s, Polanyi’s, Latour’s and Poovey’s takes on society?

- What are performatives?

- What is natural from the point of view of feminist theory?

Key readings:

\*Ortner, Sherry B. “Dark Anthropology and Its Others: Theory Since the Eighties.” *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 6, no. 1 (2016): 57-73.

**Seminar 15-16 Panopticism**

Questions for discussion:

- How differently Polanyi and Foucault use the example of Bentham’s Panopticon?

- What are ethnographic examples of disciplinary power?

- What is the difference between Foucault’s approach to power and Russian meanings of the term ‘power’ (vlasti)?

Key readings:

\*Foucault, Michel. “Panopticism” from Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison. *Race-ethnicity: Multidisciplinary Global Contexts* 2, no. 1 (2008): 1-12.

**Lecture 7 The state of exception**

**Seminar 17-18 The state of exception**

Questions for discussion:

- The sovereign is the source of law but he is also above the law (Agamben). Discuss

- How is the concept of sovereignty linked with the logic of contemporary warfare?

Key readings:

McLoughlin, Daniel. The Fiction of Sovereignty and the Real State of Exception: Giorgio Agamben’s Critique of Carl Schmitt. *Law, Culture and the Humanities* 12 no. 3 (2016): 509-528.

\* Agamben, Giorgio. The Power of Thought. *Critical Inquiry* 40, no. 2 (2014): 480-491.

**Lecture 8 Schmitt**

**Seminar 19-20 Schmitt**

Questions for discussion:

- Is nomos constituted through the state of exception?

- What are or could be ethnographic examples of the amity lines?

Key readings:

Antaki, Mark. Carl Schmitt's Nomos of the Earth. *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 42, no. 2 (2004): 317-334.

**Annex 2**

**Assessment Methods** **and Criteria**

**Assessment Methods**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Types of Assessment** | **Forms of Assessment** | **Modules** | | | |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| Formative Assessment | Test |  |  |  |  |
| Essay |  |  |  |  |
| Report/Presentation |  |  |  |  |
| Project |  |  |  |  |
| In-class Participation |  |  |  | \* |
| Attendance |  |  | \* | \* |
| Interim Assessment  (if required) | Colloquium |  |  |  | \* |
| Summative Assessment | Exam (take-home essay and research paper) |  |  |  | \* |

**Assessment Criteria**

**In-class Participation (discussion and colloquium)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grades** | **Assessment Criteria** |
| «Excellent» (8-10) | A critical analysis which demonstrates original thinking and shows strong evidence of preparatory research and broad background knowledge. |
| «Good» (6-7) | Shows strong evidence of preparatory research and broad background knowledge. Excellent oral expression. |
| «Satisfactory» (4-5) | Satisfactory overall, showing a fair knowledge of the topic, a reasonable standard of expression. Some hesitation in answering follow-up questions and/or gives incomplete or partly irrelevant answers. |
| «Fail» (0-2) | Limited evidence of relevant knowledge and an attempt to address the topic.  Unable to offer relevant information or opinion in answer to follow-up questions. |

**Research paper**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grades** | **Assessment Criteria** |
| «Excellent» (8-10) | • The submitted paper fulfills all basic requirements (the length, relevance to the course subject, number of methods used).  • The chosen research question is formulated in a transparent way and terms of the course key topics.  • The paper is well structured, logical, and coherent.  • The choice of methods is well proofed.  • The research paper contains cogent and convincing arguments, contributing to an existing debate on the topic.  • The paper demonstrates excellent skills of English and ideally follows the formatting guidelines. |
| «Good» (6-7) | • The submitted paper fulfills all basic requirements (the length, relevance to the course subject, number of methods used).  • The chosen research question is formulated in a transparent way and terms of course key topics.  • The organization of the paper is logical, the critical elements of it are identifiable, it’s coherent.  • The choice of methods is more or less clear; the materials analyzed carefully; the paper contains some excerpts from the sources of analysis (quotations from interviews, examples of discourse or historical documents).  • The main findings of the paper should be formulated in relevance and terms of an existing debate.  • The paper demonstrates good skills of English, follows the formatting guidelines. |
| «Satisfactory» (4-5) | • The paper partially fulfills the necessary formal requirements of the assignment (technical requirements as relevance to the course agenda, length).  • The paper lacks a certain research question. The research methods are unclear.  • The paper in structured poorly, it is illogical and not coherent. The main ideas of the paper are vague or incomplete.  • The materials used in the analysis and research methods are unclear.  • The paper contains pervasive errors in the use of English, style, or formatting. |
| «Fail» (0-2) | • There is no paper provided.  • The paper doesn’t meet the requirements of the assignment regarding length or topic.  • Plagiarism or data falsification is detected. |

**Take-home essay**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grades** | **Assessment Criteria** |
| «Excellent» (8-10) | • The submitted paper fulfills all basic requirements (the length, relevance to the course subject).  • The two answers are given, there theoretical sources (three key readings) are used in discussion of each question;  • The organization of the paper is logical; the giving arguments are strong and convincing.  • The student demonstrates an excellent knowledge of the introduced concepts and can compare these concepts with each other.  • The paper is well structured, logical, and coherent.  • The paper demonstrates excellent skills of English and ideally follows the formatting guidelines. |
| «Good» (6-7) | • The submitted paper fulfills all basic requirements (the length, relevance to the course subject).  • The two answers are given, three theoretical sources (three key readings) are used in discussion of each question.  • The organization of the paper is logical, the given interpretations are correct in principle, but shallow. The analysis needs more work.  • The paper demonstrates good skills of English, follows the formatting guidelines. |
| «Satisfactory» (4-5) | • The paper partially fulfills the necessary technical requirements of the assignment (relevance to the course agenda, length).  • Only one question is covered.  • Less than three of key readings from the course syllabus is covered in each question.  • The argumentation is illogical; the answers are not coherent.  • The paper contains pervasive errors in the use of English, style, or formatting. |
| «Fail» (0-2) | • There is no paper provided by the deadline.  • The paper doesn’t meet the requirements of the assignment regarding the topic; no key reading is covered in the essay.  • Plagiarism is detected. |

**Annex 3**

**Examples of exam questions (take-home essays).**

1. What is the place of Gabriel Tarde the history of social thought and in contemporary anthropology?

2. How can anthropological concerns with classification be understood in the context of anthropology itself?

3. Is power a useful analytical category?

4. How, according to Polanyi, ‘society’ was invented as a concept?

5. What are performatives?

**Recommendations for students about organization of self-study**

Self-study is organized in order to:

* Systemize theoretical knowledge about milestones in the history of anthropological thought (by refreshing materials received through lectures);
* Extending theoretical knowledge during preparation for the seminars (a student can look through the additional literature suggested for the deep understanding in lecture materials);
* Enhancing critical thinking and personal development skills through comparing different fieldwork methods studied, analyzing the theoretical concepts of the different anthropologists, etc.;
* Development of research skills through the fieldwork (participant observation, interview, digital ethnography, etc.)

In order to show the outcomes of self-study it is recommended:

* Try to compare different stages of the development of the anthropological thought, naming the divergences of scholars using such criteria: where did this scholar get his or her education? What is his or her background (family, religion, political view)? What was the first field experience (if any) of this scholar? What was his or her impact on the development of the anthropological thought?
* Revise as many research methods, as possible and try to think about the applicability of them for different cultures, institutions, etc. What difficulties could be faced?

**Recommendations for essay**

The topic for essay includes development of skills for critical thinking and written argumentation of ideas. An essay should include clear statement of a research problem; include an analysis of the problem by using correct theoretical framework. The volume of the paper should not exceed 2,000 words, the minimum word limit is 1,000 words (each essay). If you managed to develop the topic using less than 1,000 words, you could stay with this amount.

Essay structure:

1. *Introduction and the brief explanation of the question.*

2.*Body of the essay* which include both elaboration on the theoretical concepts and certain examples which are presented in the monograph, article, etc. which correspond to the topic.

3. *Conclusion* and argumentative summary about the question and possibilities for further use or development of this question in anthropology.

**Recommendations for research paper**

The volume of the paper should not exceed 4,000 words. The minimum word limit is 2,000 words.

In the research paper:

1) explain why you have chosen your project (groups that you studied, a case, a situation). This explanation should include a clear connection to course topics to which it is related.

2) explain why you have chosen your research method — in particular if you decided to use methods other that ethnographic participant observation and ethnographic interview. Make sure you use more than one method (interview, discourse analysis, historical analysis, comparison with other cases). Use qualitative, rather that quantitative methods.

3) clearly formulate you research question or hypothesis. What is the question to which your paper and its materials are the answer?

4) explain how your research and methods help you to address the question/hypothesis

5) present your material — including quotations from interviews, examples of discourse or historical analysis.

6) describe the context of your material. In what context your interviews or observations were made? What is the social, cultural and historical context of the material that you have collected/explored?

7) describe if you had any ethical difficulties in doing this research

8) present the main results and conclusions of your research

Paper structure:

- Paper title and your name, and the course which this paper is for.

- Introduction (points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the above) - Main body of the paper (points 5, 6 and 7 of the above)

- Conclusion (point 8 of the above)

- list of references: bibliography and other sources that you used

**Special conditions for organization of learning process for students with special needs**

The following types of comprehension of learning information (including e-learning and distance learning) can be offered to students with disabilities (by their written request) in accordance with their individual psychophysical characteristics:

1. *for persons with vision disorders:* a printed text in enlarged font; an electronic document; audios (transferring of learning materials into the audio); an individual advising with an assistance of a sign language interpreter; individual assignments and advising.
2. *for persons with hearing disorders: a* printed text; an electronic document; video materials with subtitles; an individual advising with an assistance of a sign language interpreter; individual assignments and advising.
3. *for persons with muscle-skeleton disorders: a* printed text; an electronic document; audios; individual assignments and advising.