

Venner og fjender.

Som vi tidligere har skrevet, var formålet med formidlingen i hele perioden i Vognmandsmarken, at den skulle føre til ændrede levevilkår for en gruppe, hvor personerne var magtesløse eller manglede politisk opbakning.

Vi har derved forsømt udgivelse af videnskabelige rapporter i traditionel forstand, idet aktionsforskningen hele tiden relaterer sig til aktionen og ikke til teorien.

Det betyder, at vi i forhold til Instituttet står umiddelbart svagt, uden egentlig forståelse for vores form for forskning.

Der er andre, som har haft lettere ved at forstå os.

Den nuværende boligminister Erling Olsen skrev i en anmeldelse af bogen "EV ISTIYOR UZ - Vi vil have bolig" den 9.1.1980 i Ryvængeladet bl.a. under overskriften:

"Forskningsprojekt manipulerer groft med fremmedarbejdere".

At bogen har givet ham anledning til den efterhånden sædvanlige hoveddrysten over, hvad man på visse dele af Københavns Universitet bruger skatteydernes penge til.

"Kan det virkelig være meningen, at bruge offentlige midler til politisk mobilisering af en gruppe fremmedarbejdere?"

spørger ministeren, som også skriver, at vi har haft halvrevolutionære ledetråde og misbrugt både Universitetet og Nationalmuseet.

Man må derfor gøre sig klart, at går man ind i et forskningsprojekt af denne karakter med en formidlingspraksis, som den vi har haft får man:

Magtesløse venner og indflydelsesrige fjender.

This article describes the present day structure of Anthropology training in the average American university. Like all social institutions, the American system of producing anthropologists has aspects which are positive, depressing and even mystical. The following description is meant to be neither an advertisement nor a condemnation of that system. My goal is to orient the readers so that we perhaps could consider what elements from that system should be avoided here in Copenhagen and what elements could be borrowed with some advantage. Additionally, I should state that this "analysis" is based on my own personal experience, and from conversations with other Americans who were in Copenhagen during May of 1979. Clearly, there will be some disagreements....

The American type of anthropological education reflects the interaction of three separate features: 1) the American interpretation of "Anthropology" as a discipline and how that knowledge should be transmitted; 2) the American university structure which combines mass education on lower levels with individual competition at higher levels; 3) the social-economic situation of the USA in the 1970s, where heightened personal expectations confront the realities of the economic crisis and academic unemployment.

Anthropology in America is still considered in its broadest interpretation. There are the four major subdisciplines--social/cultural anthropology, physical/biological anthropology, archaeology, and linguistic anthropology. Insofar as a textbook reflects the paradigm of the field, Harris' Culture, People, Nature (formerly called Culture, Man and Nature) can serve as an example. It is one of the most widely sold, if not the most widely sold, textbook in the USA. It reflects the desire to retain this 4-field approach, while simultaneously bringing in more political and bio-ecological aspects.

Newer textbooks have gone in two directions: some stress the sociobiological/demographic elements of human culture; others have started to make anthropology more "relevant" to modern social problems, employing political-economy to analyse such phenomena as racism, sexism, war, poverty, development, progress, and especially issues of (over)population and environment.

Because of this broad interpretation of Anthropology in America, all middle and large sized anthropology departments* have teachers in each of the 4 subspecialties mentioned above. A typical example is the University of Massachusetts (Amherst) where I have studied. UMASS is a middle sized department which expanded in the 1960s to include 20 full time teachers. At any time 3-4 of these are away on fieldwork or leave (orlov). Of the 20 anthropologists at UMASS, there are 10 cultural anthropologists, 5 physical anthropologists, 4 archaeologists and one linguistic anthropologist. (One of the archaeologists is a computer specialist and one of the physical anthropologists is a demographer-statistician.) Similar proportions can be found in most American anthropology departments which award professional degrees (Ph.D.). Students choose their specialties within anthropology in about the same proportion. At the moment, the worst unemployment is among the cultural anthropologists. Massachusetts is also typical in another way: of the 20 teachers only 4 are women, only one is nonWhite, and none of these have received the lifetime contract of employment called "tenure" (lektorbedømmelse).

Each of the teachers gives 2-3 courses per semester plus advising students who are writing their Masters or Doctoral theses (afhandler). Because all students must have at least 3 advisors, the teachers spend a considerable amount of time reading students' work. In the small colleges, however, teachers are expected to use most of their time in teaching. Some may be teaching as many as four different courses per semester. In their spare time, the teacher is supposed to do research.

While each teacher has a specialty, they often teach in other sub-fields too. Thus, our 'Ecology' course is taught by an archaeologist, and one of the social anthropologists also teaches 'Linguistics'. There is also a broad communication among students because archaeologists must study some social anthropology and physical anthropology, and vice versa. This can be compared with Copenhagen,

where disciplines such as Socialantropologi, Europæisk Etnologi, Lingv. Fysikanthropologi og Førhistorisk arkæologi are separated in five different places.

American universities have been known for their mass education techniques, where any and all subjects are taught at the same institution. At Massachusetts, for example, where there are about 20,000 students, they can get a degree in everything from Business, Nursing and Education, to Agronomy, Physics and Food Science, to the more modern Sports Administration, Black Studies, Women's Studies, Landscape Architecture and Hotel Administration. The students normally attend 3-5 courses per semester for 8 full semesters, a total of 25-35 courses. After 4 years the students graduate with a B.A. or B.S. degree, and with a "major" specialty which is equivalent to about 10 courses in a given subject. These 10 courses can be taken at any time during the 4 years.

Students are thus attending many "elective" (fri valg) courses in humanities, social science and natural science to fulfill the university requirements of a "general education", and for their personal interest. In any given semester, a student might be taking courses in Physics, Art History, Sociology, French Literature and Swimming. Because of this "course" system, there are many thousands of students who, out of curiosity, will take one or two anthropology courses but never go further. In fact, at the large universities, teachers and staff use most of their resources on the Introductory courses. These introductory courses are of crucial importance to an anthropology department: the more students who choose to study anthropology, the more teaching positions and money come into the department. Thus, the social science departments are actually in competition for students. More teaching positions usually mean more positions for teaching assistants, which gives more money for the advanced students while they are studying.

Competition for the student "market" has in many cases resulted in new kinds of teaching styles: through films, through science fiction books or novels, student field work projects, etc. At UMASS, there are about 500 students who take Introductory Anthropology each semester. There are several Introductory courses: one is a general course which combines the 4 subfields, for those who know they will never taken another anthropology course; there

* there is a dansk ordliste som skulle bedst læses først for at der ikke skal være forvirring over amerikansk terminologi (S. 19-21)

Venner og fjender.

Som vi tidligere har skrevet, var formålet med formidlingen i hele perioden i Vognmandsmarken, at den skulle føre til ændrede levevilkår for en gruppe, hvor personerne var magtesløse eller manglede politisk opbakning.

Vi har derved forsømt udgivelse af videnskabelige rapporter i traditionel forstand, idet aktionsforskningen hele tiden relaterer sig til aktionen og ikke til teorien.

Det betyder, at vi i forhold til Institutet står umiddelbart svagt, uden egentlig forståelse for vores form for forskning.

Der er andre, som har haft lettere ved at forstå os.

Den nuværende boligminister Erling Olsen skrev i en anmeldelse af bogen "EV ISTIYOR UZ - Vi vil have bolig" den 9.1.1980 i Ryvangeladet bl.a. under overskriften:

"Forskningsprojekt manipulerer groft med fremmedarbejdere".

At bogen har givet ham anledning til den efterhånden sædvanlige hovedrysten over, hvad man på visse dele af Københavns Universitet bruger skatteydernes penge til.

"Kan det virkelig være meningen, at bruge offentlige midler til politisk mobilisering af en gruppe fremmedarbejdere?" spørger ministeren, som også skriver, at vi har haft halvrevolutionære ledetråde og misbrugt både Universitetet og Nationalmuseet.

Man må derfor gøre sig klart, at går man ind i et forskningsprojekt af denne karakter med en formidlingspraksis, som den vi har haft får man:

Magtesløse venner og indflydelsesrige fjender.

This article describes the present day structure of Anthropology training in the average American university. Like all social institutions, the American system of producing anthropologists has aspects which are positive, depressing and even mystical. The following description is meant to be neither an advertisement nor a condemnation of that system. My goal is to orient the readers so that we perhaps could consider what elements from that system should be avoided here in Copenhagen and what elements could be borrowed with some advantage. Additionally, I should state that this "analysis" is based on my own personal experience, and from conversations with other Americans who were in Copenhagen during May of 1979. Clearly, there will be some disagreements....

The American type of anthropological education reflects the interaction of three separate features: 1) the American interpretation of "Anthropology" as a discipline and how that knowledge should be transmitted; 2) the American university structure which combines mass education on lower levels with individual competition at higher levels; 3) the social-economic situation of the USA in the 1970s, where heightened personal expectations confront the realities of the economic crisis and academic unemployment.

Anthropology in America is still considered in its broadest interpretation. There are the four major subdisciplines--social/cultural anthropology, physical/biological anthropology, archaeology, and linguistic anthropology. Insofar as a textbook reflects the paradigm of the field, Harris' Culture, People, Nature (formerly called Culture, Man and Nature) can serve as an example. It is one of the most widely sold, if not the most widely sold, textbook in the USA. It reflects the desire to retain this 4-field approach, while simultaneously bringing in more political and bio-ecological aspects.

Newer textbooks have gone in two directions: some stress the sociobiological/demographic elements of human culture; others have started to make anthropology more "relevant" to modern social problems, employing political-economy to analyse such phenomena as racism, sexism, war, poverty, development, progress, and especially issues of (over)population and environment.

Because of this broad interpretation of Anthropology in America, all middle and large sized anthropology departments* have teachers in each of the 4 subspecialties mentioned above. A typical example is the University of Massachusetts (Amherst) where I have studied. UMASS is a middle sized department which expanded in the 1960s to include 20 full time teachers. At any time 3-4 of these are away on fieldwork or leave (orlov). Of the 20 anthropologists at UMASS, there are 10 cultural anthropologists, 5 physical anthropologists, 4 archaeologists and one linguistic anthropologist. (One of the archaeologists is a computer specialist and one of the physical anthropologists is a demographer-statistician.) Similar proportions can be found in most American anthropology departments which award professional degrees (Ph.D.). Students choose their specialties within anthropology in about the same proportion. At the moment, the worst unemployment is among the cultural anthropologists. Massachusetts is also typical in another way: of the 20 teachers only 4 are women, only one is nonWhite, and none of these have received the lifetime contract of employment called "tenure" (lektorbedømmelse).

Each of the teachers gives 2-3 courses per semester plus advising students who are writing their Masters or Doctoral theses (afhandler). Because ^{all} students must have at least 3 advisors, the teachers spend a considerable amount of time reading students' work. In the small colleges, however, teachers are expected to use most of their time in teaching. Some may be teaching as many as four different courses per semester. In their spare time, the teacher is supposed to do research.

While each teacher has a specialty, they often teach in other sub-fields too. Thus, our Ecology course is taught by an archaeologist, and one of the social anthropologists also teaches "Linguistics". There is also a broad communication among students because archaeologists must study some social anthropology and physical anthropology, and vice versa. This can be compared with Copenhagen,

where disciplines such as Socialantropologi, Europæisk Etnologi, Lingv. Fysiskantropologi og Førhistorisk arkæologi are separated in five different places.

American universities have been known for their mass education techniques, where any and all subjects are taught at the same institution. At Massachusetts, for example, where there are about 20,000 students, they can get a degree in everything from Business, Nursing and Education, to Agronomy, Physics and Food Science, to the more modern Sports Administration, Black Studies, Women's Studies, Landscape Architecture and Hotel Administration. The students normally attend 3-5 courses per semester for 8 full semesters, a total of 25-35 courses. After 4 years the students graduate with a B.A. or B.S. degree, and with a "major" specialty which is equivalent to about 10 courses in a given subject. These 10 courses can be taken at any time during the 4 years.

Students are thus attending many "elective" (fri valg) courses in humanities, social science and natural science to fulfill the university requirements of a "general education", and for their personal interest. In any given semester, a student might be taking courses in Physics, Art History, Sociology, French Literature and Swimming. Because of this "course" system, there are many thousands of students who, out of curiosity, will take one or two anthropology courses but never go further. In fact, at the large universities, teachers and staff use most of their resources on the Introductory courses. These introductory courses are of crucial importance to an anthropology department: the more students who choose to study anthropology, the more teaching positions and money come into the department. Thus, the social science departments are actually in competition for students. More teaching positions usually mean more positions for teaching assistants, which gives more money for the advanced students while they are studying.

Competition for the student "market" has in many cases resulted in new kinds of teaching styles: through films, through science fiction books or novels, student field work projects, etc. At UMASS, there are about 500 students who take Introductory Anthropology each semester. There are several Introductory courses: one is a general course which combines the 4 subfields, for those who know they will never taken another anthropology course; there

* there is a dansk ordliste som skulle bedst læses først for at der ikke skal være forvirring over amerikansk terminologi (S. 19-21/)

are introductory courses in each of the subfields; there is an intensive "honors" course containing more reading; a course called Anthropology Through Film; an evening course, a summer course and even a January course where students do a whole semester's work in 3 weeks, 5 hours day.

Of the 500 students taking introductory courses in any given semester, about 90% will never take another course. Several will take one or two more courses, either as support for a degree in sociology or for general interest. About 25 of the original 500 will eventually take ten Anthropology courses and receive a B.A. degree, about the same as a Danish bifag. Some of the better B.A. candidates will be encouraged by their teachers to extend their education and take a Master's degree or Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree.

The following schema can serve as a summary of this process:

STAGE	DEGREE	No. of STUDENTS from initial 500 who begin	Nr. COURSES (cumulative)	YEARS	REMARKS
<u>"Undergraduate"</u>					
	Introduction	500 (100%)	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	
	Intermediate level	50 (10%)	2-3	1-1 $\frac{1}{2}$	støttefag el. hobby
	Bachelors (B.A.) (Bachelor of Arts)	25 (5%)	9-12	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ -2	svar til "bifag"
<u>"Graduate School"</u>					
	Master's (M.A., M.S.) (Master of Arts) or Master of Science)	2-5 (1%)	10 + thesis el. eksamen	1-2 (afhængig af hvis B.A. var også i Antropologi)	
	Doctorate (Ph.D. in Anthropology)	0-2 (.5%)	6-8 feltarbejde dissertation	3-6	obligatorisk feltarbejde, afhandling omkr. 200-400 s.

A "course" is 2-3 hours per week for 14 weeks.
Reading may be from 4-7 books, plus examination or written paper.

Real anthropological socialization begins when a student reaches
GRADUATE SCHOOL.

Studying anthropology in graduate school can lead to three kinds of degrees: 1) a M.A. without permission to continue, called "terminal Master's"; 2) a M.A. with permission to continue to Ph. D.; and 3) Ph.D. degree. Many of the incoming students in

grad school do not have a B.A. in Anthropology; they will have to take some extra preparatory courses. Normally, it takes 3 semesters to earn an M.A. Students may have to write a thesis of 50-100 pages and/or take an examination. Ten or 15 years ago, someone with an M.A. degree could have gotten a job at an American college, but with so many unemployed Ph.D.'s, this is now impossible. The American M.A. could be equivalent to something between a cand. fil and mag.scient. The American Ph.D. is roughly equal to the Danish licentiat grad. The Ph.D. consists of 1-2 years individualized study beyond the Master's level, plus at least one year's fieldwork, plus a dissertation which is usually from 200-400 pages. In 95% of the cases fieldwork is obligatory for American cultural anthropologists.

There are 1200 colleges and universities in America which teach anthropology. Most of them give a B.A. degree but only about 100 give M.A. or Ph.D. degrees. Each year about 300-400 new Ph.D.'s are generated by the system. About half of these come from just 4 universities: Chicago, Berkeley (Calif.) Columbia (N.Y.) and Michigan! Most of the others come from about 20 other schools. If one were to make ratings of the best schools (and these ratings DO exist), they would include the previously mentioned schools plus Stanford (Calif.), Harvard (Mass.), Yale (Connecticut), Pennsylvania, Arizona, Illinois, UCLA (U. of Calif. at Los Angeles), North Carolina, Texas and, oh yes... Washington. The largest of these departments have 35-40 teachers and 150-200 graduate students.

Most students coming to graduate school will have studied at another college. To choose the "right" school, there are several factors to consider. Location is obviously one of them: some schools are in big cities, others out in the country. Most schools also have specialties for which they are well known, and "superstars" which give them atmosphere. Costs for the school can be as low as \$300 per semester and as high as \$2000 per semester (just for teaching).

To take some examples, the University of Chicago is well known as a center for structuralist and British social anthropology, although Victor Turner has now left Chicago for Virginia, where he, Sapir, and Chris Crocker are trying to build their own little Chicago-east. Michigan was a center for ecology and evolutionism, but over the last few years, Leslie White and

Elman Service went to sunny California, Marshall Sahlins went to Chicago and Eric Wolf to New York (City University). Roy Rappaport is holding the fort at Michigan. Columbia University has cultural materialists like (Fried and) Harris, but is so big that there is something for everybody. Universities in the western USA are more oriented to the study of American Indians and North American Archaeology, (New Mexico, Illinois, Arizona, etc.). U. of Pennsylvania is known for cognitive anthropology (Goodenough, Wallace) and for South Asian Studies (India, Iran). Pennsylvania State University has specialties in Latin America and in sociobiology (Paul Baker, Chagnon, Irons). Harvard is known for primate studies, U. C. San Diego (Calif.) has a program in psychoanalytic anthropology, Boston University offers an M.A. in Applied Anthropology, and U. of Massachusetts at Amherst specializes in European studies and biological anthropology. Finally, the only faculty known for being Marxist oriented is New York's New School for Social Research (Stanley Diamond, Rayna Rapp, W. Roseberry), although there are marxist anthropologists all over New York and the rest of the USA.

Some graduate schools are very selective, taking only one out of every four applicants. However, the poor job possibilities for anthropologists have resulted in a decline in the number of applications to anthropology departments and a stabilization or decline in the number of students.

Choosing a graduate school also depends on costs, since America is unique in the world as a place where you have to pay to go to university. In general, the better schools are more expensive, but Michigan and Berkeley are exceptions to this (only if you are also a resident of Michigan or California). Total costs for teaching and for living can be as high as \$9000 a year at Columbia or as low as \$3000 at Berkeley. Why someone would like to struggle through with \$9000 than \$3000 are interesting questions. Often there are personal motives involved, of rich parents, or special relations with professors. In addition, a degree from an established university like Columbia may carry more status and more possibilities than one from a newer, State university.

Paying for grad school is done with odd jobs, help from parents, loans from banks and jobs within the university, especially teaching assistants. Jobs are limited however, because many universities lie in smaller towns. For married students, the most common arrangement is for one spouse (usually the wife) to work while the husband goes through school. Think of the movie "Love Story". If you'll remember,

Ryan O'Neal wanted to be a famous lawyer, while Ali McGraw was about to go to Paris and study the piano. Ryan enters Harvard Law School while Ali has to teach school in order to make the money. Ryan becomes a successful New York lawyer, while Ali McGraw dies of Leukemia, never having gotten to Paris. While most "grad student wives" do not die of Leukemia, the hardships are still well known. Her best years may be spent working as secretary instead of pursuing her own education. Combinations of isolation, boredom, frustration and financial pressures put strains on the marriage, especially in cases where both husband and wife want to pursue academic careers in different locations. It is nice to see a recent US divorce case where, after the wife had put her husband through medical school, he was forced to pay for her costs of returning back to school to finish her own education.

Aside from normal jobs, anthropology grad students earn money via grants (legater). The best of these is a "fellowship" where you are simply paid to study. These are rare, won in competition, and amount to \$3000-\$5000 per year, from 1 to three years, plus exemption from paying fees and tuition at the school.

Another type is a "research assistantship" where you are paid to help another professor with his/her research for 20 hrs. per week. Sometimes this IS real work, other times it is exactly what you would be doing anyway. Research assistantships are received through competition and patron-client relations with a professor.

The most widespread type of aid is the "teaching assistantship" or TA. TAs can function as helpers to the main teacher in the Introduction courses (dvs som "hjælpelære" el. "manuduktør"), or they may be teaching their own course independently. Money for TAs is allocated by the university on the basis of the total number of students taking courses in the department. It is here that the role and quality of the Introduction courses becomes crucial. The more students who take the course, the more money is available for TAs. A teaching assistant normally can

are introductory courses in each of the subfields; there is an intensive "honors" course containing more reading; a course called Anthropology Through Film; an evening course, a summer course and even a January course where students do a whole semester's work in 3 weeks, 5 hours day.

Of the 500 students taking introductory courses in any given semester, about 90% will never take another course. Several will take one or two more courses, either as support for a degree in sociology or for general interest. About 25 of the original 500 will eventually take ~~ten~~ Anthropology courses and receive a B.A. degree, about the same as a Danish bifag. Some of the better B.A. candidates will be encouraged by their teachers to extend their education and take a Master's degree or Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree.

The following schema can serve as a summary of this process:

STAGE	DEGREE	No. of STUDENTS from initial 500 who begin	Nr. COURSES (cumulative)	YEARS	REMARKS
<u>"Undergraduate"</u>					
	Introduction	500 (100%)	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	
	Intermediate level	50 (10%)	2-3	1-1 $\frac{1}{2}$	støttefag el. hobby
	Bachelors (B.A.) (Bachelor of Arts)	25 (5%)	9-12	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ -2	svar til "bifag"
<u>"Graduate School"</u>					
	Master's (M.A., M.S.) (Master of Arts) or Master of Science)	2-5 (1%)	10 + thesis el. eksamen	1-2 (afhængig af hvis B.A. var også i Antropologi)	
	Doctorate (Ph.D. in Anthropology)	0-2 (.5%)	6-8 feltarbejde dissertation	3-6	obligatorisk feltarbejde, afhandling omkr. 200-400.

A "course" is 2-3 hours per week for 14 weeks.
Reading may be from 4-7 books, plus examination or written paper.

Real anthropological socialization begins when a student reaches
GRADUATE SCHOOL.

Studying anthropology in graduate school can lead to three kinds of degrees: 1) a M.A. without permission to continue, called "terminal Master's"; 2) a M.A. with permission to continue to Ph. D.; and 3) Ph.D. degree. Many of the incoming students in

grad school do not have a B.A. in Anthropology; they will have to take some extra preparatory courses. Normally, it takes 3 semesters to earn an M.A. Students may have to write a thesis of 50-100 pages and/or take an examination. Ten or 15 years ago, someone with an M.A. degree could have gotten a job at an American college, but with so many unemployed Ph.D.'s, this is now impossible. The American M.A. could be equivalent to something between a cand. fil and mag.scient. The American Ph.D. is roughly equal to the Danish licentiat grad. The Ph.D. consists of 1-2 years individualized study beyond the Master's level, plus at least one year's fieldwork, plus a dissertation which is usually from 200-400 pages. In 95% of the cases fieldwork is obligatory for American cultural anthropologists.

There are 1200 colleges and universities in America which teach anthropology. Most of them give a B.A. degree but only about 100 give M.A. or Ph.D. degrees. Each year about 300-400 new Ph.D.'s are generated by the system. About half of these come from just 4 universities: Chicago, Berkeley (Calif.) Columbia (N.Y.) and Michigan! Most of the others come from about 20 other schools. If one were to make ratings of the best schools (and these ratings DO exist), they would include the previously mentioned schools plus Stanford (Calif.), Harvard (Mass.), Yale (Connecticut), Pennsylvania, Arizona, Illinois, UCLA (U. of Calif. at Los Angeles), North Carolina, Texas and, oh yes... Washington. The largest of these departments have 35-40 teachers and 150-200 graduate students.

Most students coming to graduate school will have studied at another college. To choose the "right" school, there are several factors to consider. Location is obviously one of them: some schools are in big cities, others out in the country. Most schools also have specialties for which they are well known, and "superstars" which give them atmosphere. Costs for the school can be as low as \$300 per semester and as high as \$2000 per semester (just for teaching).

To take some examples, the University of Chicago is well known as a center for structuralist and British social anthropology, although Victor Turner has now left Chicago for Virginia, where he, Sapir, and Chris Crocker are trying to build their own little Chicago-east. Michigan was a center for ecology and evolutionism, but over the last few years, Leslie White and

Elman Service went to sunny California, Marshall Sahlins went to Chicago and Eric Wolf to New York (City University). Roy Rappaport is holding the fort at Michigan. Columbia University has cultural materialists like (Fried and) Harris, but is so big that there is something for everybody. Universities in the western USA are more oriented to the study of American Indians and North American Archaeology, (New Mexico, Illinois, Arizona, etc.). U. of Pennsylvania is known for cognitive anthropology (Goodenough, Wallace) and for South Asian Studies (India, Iran). Pennsylvania State University has specialties in Latin America and in sociobiology (Paul Baker, Chagnon, Irons). Harvard is known for primate studies, U. C. San Diego (Calif.) has a program in psychoanalytic anthropology, Boston University offers an M.A. in Applied Anthropology, and U. of Massachusetts at Amherst specializes in European studies and biological anthropology. Finally, the only faculty known for being Marxist oriented is New York's New School for Social Research (Stanley Diamond, Rayna Rapp, W. Roseberry), although there are marxist anthropologists all over New York and the rest of the USA.

Some graduate schools are very selective, taking only one out of every four applicants. However, the poor job possibilities for anthropologists have resulted in a decline in the number of applications to anthropology departments and a stabilization or decline in the number of students.

Choosing a graduate school also depends on costs, since America is unique in the world as a place where you have to pay to go to university. In general, the better schools are more expensive, but Michigan and Berkeley are exceptions to this (only if you are also a resident of Michigan or California). Total costs for teaching and for living can be as high as \$9000 a year at Columbia or as low as \$3000 at Berkeley. Why someone would like to struggle through with \$9000 than \$3000 are interesting questions. Often there are personal motives involved, ^{of} rich parents, or special relations with professors. In addition, a degree from an established university like Columbia may carry more status and more possibilities than one from a newer, State university.

Paying for grad school is done with odd jobs, help from parents, loans from banks and jobs within the university, especially teaching assistants. Jobs are limited however, because many universities lie in smaller towns. For married students, the most common arrangement is for one spouse (usually the wife) to work while the husband goes through school. Think of the movie "Love Story". If you'll remember,

Ryan O'Neal wanted to be a famous lawyer, while Ali McGraw was about to go to Paris and study the piano. Ryan enters Harvard Law School while Ali has to teach school in order to make the money. Ryan becomes a successful New York lawyer, while Ali McGraw dies of Leukemia, never having gotten to Paris. While most "grad student wives" do not die of Leukemia, the hardships are still well known. Her best years may be spent working as secretary instead of pursuing her own education. Combinations of isolation, boredom, frustration and financial pressures put strains on the marriage, especially in cases where both husband and wife want to pursue academic careers in different locations. It is nice to see a recent US divorce case where, after the wife had put her husband through medical school, he was forced to pay for her costs of returning back to school to finish her own education.

Aside from normal jobs, anthropology grad students earn money via grants (legater). The best of these is a "fellowship" where you are simply paid to study. These are rare, won in competition, and amount to \$3000-\$5000 per year, from 1 to three years, plus exemption from paying fees and tuition at the school.

Another type is a "research assistantship" where you are paid to help another professor with his/her research for 20 hrs. per week. Sometimes this IS real work, other times it is exactly what you would be doing anyway. Research assistantships are received through competition and patron-client relations with a professor.

The most widespread type of aid is the "teaching assistantship" or TA. TAs can function as helpers to the main teacher in the Introduction courses (dvs som "hjælpelære" el. "manuduktør"), or they may be teaching their own course independently. Money for TAs is allocated by the university on the basis of the total number of students taking courses in the department. It is here that the role and quality of the Introduction courses becomes crucial. The more students who take the course, the more money is available for TAs. A teaching assistant normally can

earn from \$80-100 per week for 15-20 hours teaching, plus dispensation from university payments.

While TAs are awarded via competition, at Massachusetts we have a rule that every student must have taught at least two semesters, in order to get pedagogical experience. Teachers will often invite students to come into their classes to give a talk about their own work. The student is not paid, but the experience improves his chances of receiving a TA next time. Some universities have policies whereby they accept only that number of students for which they have TA money, so that all students can be assured money through their study time. Generally, at least 30% of qualified grad. students will have received some financial support in their graduate school studies, though most will have had to pay something, usually at the beginning. The amount of support is low, however, and the number of positions is shrinking.

Students coming to graduate school are expected "to know what they want". Normally, after 1 or two semesters, each student will form of "committee" of 3-5 teachers who guide and help the student formulate his study program, which must combine general education in anthropology with special expertise (in a "marketable" specialty). At the Master's level, students will have taken courses in at least 3 of the 4 subfields, in "Theory and Method," and then special courses. Virtually all courses are taken within the anthropology department; there is no time for hobby courses.

Most students normally connect up with a "patron" teacher as soon as possible. This teacher will help the student obtain an assistantship, socialize him/her into the discipline and offer sensible guidance and juicy gossip. It is a curious habit in America that when students from other schools meet each other they do not ask "What are you studying" but "WHO are you studying with?" (Sometimes the teacher's academic and personal traits get passed onto his students. Cultural materialists, for example, are incredible arrogant just like Harris; certain archaeologists of the Binford "New Archaeology" school are like missionaries; the structuralists are downright mystical sometimes; and anyone who comes from Chicago is obviously a genius.)

How do these patron-client relations begin? It is a "natural" process which evolves out of the requirement that students must write papers for each course. If the paper is good, the professor

will suggest the student to revise it for publication; perhaps even offering to help the student and co-sign the paper with him/her. While the professor's name may help the chances of the paper to get published, this practice,--widely known and widely condemned--has the potential to result in the exploitation of students.

Patron-client relations may also begin from the professor's part, when he receives grant money for his own research project and needs students. Patron-client relations are most important when a student is himself applying for money or for a job. Most every application in America requires three recommendations from professors, so they will constantly be writing letters for you. Students cultivate links with several professors, and easily switch patrons if a professor is unable or unwilling to help them. This patron-client system affects professors' egos too, since some are more popular than others.

Students can maintain ties with their professors in various ways: through frequent meetings with the professor to discuss their own work, informal gatherings, or the more overt "invite-your-professor-to-dinner" method. Patron-client relations within the American system have a special aspect to it, in that the student will eventually grow to become a "colleague". At some point the inequality/patronage relation gives way to collegial relation. A professor who is a good patron produces clients who become colleagues, thus expanding his own network and his reputation in the field. In the USA the networks can grow to be enormous because of the number of schools involved.

Pressure is relatively constant in Graduate School. Students take 3-4 courses per semester, reading 6-7 books per course, and writing (usually) a 20 page paper at the end, from which the student receives a grade (karakter). After 4 weeks, the student has paid for the courses; if he decides not to continue, he risks being given a failing grade for the course. (Besides giving the student a bad image in the professor's eyes, a failing grade in graduate school is usually enough to have a student kicked out.) Besides the official courses, students also "audit" courses for necessary knowledge or interest.

Most teachers do not take the grade system very seriously, but students who do no work will quickly ^{be} dropped from the university.

There is at least one advantage in the American system: students who do not take their studies seriously are either thrown out because they fail a course, or they ^{themselves} decide to stop paying every semester when they see that their money is not being used the way they think best. Class differences also play a role, as those who do not have to work--or those whose work is "anthropological"--have more time and energy for their studies, give a better image to their professors, get better grades.

Now the system is not so authoritarian as it looks. Under most circumstances, the student can get a three month delay to deliver his/her paper if ^{he} pressed for time; the student can also drop out for a semester, pay a small fee (\$50-\$500!) and stay on the "list". Courses can be held at the home of one of the teachers, and students and teacher drink beer ^{or} smoke a little dope afterwards. Even obtaining admission as a new student can be made possible, because a student can attend the school as an "auditor" (dvs take courses on an informal basis), show the professors that he/she is competent and be admitted on the recommendations of the staff, instead of an impersonal written record of his grades. This is a much-used tactic of students who had troubles early in college, or those who "don't look good on paper".

It would be impossible to comment on the "faglig indhold eller faglig niveau" of American anthropology education. By comparison with Copenhagen, the Americans lay more stress on empirical studies, on data gathering techniques and less on teorihistorie. There is a much lesser degree of critical, marxist oriented teaching, and because of language problems, less knowledge of the latest developments in European social thought. This ties in, of course, with the role of American universities as mass producers of intellegentia, and with the necessity for students to learn field work techniques. For most American students, the amount of material coming out in their own language is so voluminous that the thought of reading something in French, German, etc. is rather peripheral. (In American terms, the language problem could be put this way: If something published in French or German is good, then it will be translated into English. Ergo: if it isn't in English, it probably isn't that important. While this may seem crude, most of the time it is right. (desværre).

For those students not satisfied with their courses, the opportunity exists to form one's own "reading course" and study informally with a group, or alone. The "reading course" is formulated together with one of the teachers; student(s) and teacher might meet for an hour every 2 weeks; the student could deliver a paper at the end and receive a grade. At higher levels, most of the courses are actually independent study connected with the student's Ph.D. research. At Massachusetts, we had incidents where a teacher exploited the students who did reading courses, forcing them to read and write more than originally intended. Thus, student and teacher now make out a written "contract" where each agrees to the rights and obligations of the other, the amount of reading (fx 150 pages/weekly) and the type of written work to be done (fx an annotated bibliography, theoretical paper, etc.)

One advantage of all this pressure to take courses, read and write is that students are continually working on something (when they are not confused). Without questioning the actual content of what is done, ^{all} students get ^{minimal} experience in carrying out research, using libraries, formulating themselves in writing, taking criticism without having a nervesammenbrud, etc. The many courses and grading system also force students to read books about things they never would have if it were voluntary.

There is also a good deal of psychic pressure in the system. The lack of money and dark future job possibilities are enough to cause uncertainty among students. There is the isolation of being far from home, and students may feel insecure about not having a teacher-patron. The system fosters a high degree of privatisation and competition. Research in anthropology is especially individualized at American universities (at least that's my impression). For two or more students to write an M.A. or Ph.D. thesis together would be impossible. The competition is leading students to establish more patron-client relations, and there is an underlying competition among them, for example, when a student succeeds in getting something published. The current economic situation has made this pressure so great that students are now expected to have published articles even before receiving their Ph.D.

The subdued competition and individualistic "cowboy" mentality prevailing in some high-pressure departments produces a lot of stress. In this case, what is most amazing is the amount of community and solidarity that exists among American grad students. There are various factors contributing to this solidarity. First, most

American universities lie outside the major cities. Students come to these college towns--Berkeley, Ann Arbor, Amherst, Princeton, Cambridge, Madison--with the single object of going to school there. They live on or near the campus. Work place and residence are often united; people ^{sometimes} sleep or live in their offices ^{in the evenings, weekends and summers}. Most graduate schools have students from all parts of the USA; they are alone, often insecure or uncertain about their studies and their futures. Most are unmarried. There are no childhood friends or kin networks to fall back on. The university (the Anthro. department) becomes their "life" their fellow students become their friends and their "family". They live together, study together, go to parties together. Professors expect that students are in grad. school as a full-time endeavour and the study burden can increase without their having to justify it. Compare this, for example, with Copenhagen, where the majority of the students have other lives beyond the Institute, other friends and colleagues, other interests, and other distractions which would not be available in the small college town.

The *communitas* of the students often extends to the teachers. This is especially true in the small college towns where students and teachers may see each other informally, have barbecues, watch football games, etc. etc.

A further motive for the increased work burdens at American universities is that most American students will, ^{avoid} having any children until they have finished school. For a grad student couple to have children would be difficult: child care facilities in America are inadequate if not lacking; even when present they cost money, and the staff are often volunteers rather than skilled staff. It has now become common for many academic couples where both husband and wife are full time ^{to} not have any children. Kids interfere with their careers. Even though most grad students are in their mid to late 20s, only a very small number have children.

The papers and courses that the student takes keep most people moving through the system. There are also examinations. The most important of these is the "Comprehensive" "General" or "Preliminary" (to fieldwork) examination. On passing the examination, the student has only to do fieldwork, write the dissertation and defend it orally in a departmental rite de passage.

There have been several attempts to reform the examination process. At Massachusetts we abolished the examination and, instead, required everybody to write 3 long papers, which they choose in cooperation with their committee. One of the papers is theoretical. Another can be of varied type for practical use, e.g. a detailed course plan or annotated bibliography that can be used for future teaching. The third paper is the research "prospectus" which explains the field research that the student is planning, theory, method, hypotheses, etc. The prospectus is printed in 50 copies and the student holds a seminar where positive criticism is invited. The seminar is not an exam.

After the three papers have been written the student holds an oral exam with his committee, lasting perhaps 2 hours. This has proved to be a less nerve-racking process, and actually forces the students to do more work than they would in preparing for the 2 day "preliminary" exam of former years.

Innovations also apply in the once-strict foreign language requirements. Instead of French or German, the student can substitute statistics, EDB, or other essential "tool of research" as determined by the committee.

After the exam comes the fieldwork. Because of the world situation, many Indian reservations and foreign countries are closed to American anthropologists. (Perhaps also because ethnographers have established such a reputation for studying primitives that Third World countries feel embarrassed to be studied. Compare this with the request by the archaeologist, who wants to do research to "discover our lost civilization".)

Americans have thus been forced to carry out field work in new locations--Western Europe, the urban United States, studying urban social networks, ethnic groups, organizations and institutions such as schools, hospitals, Japanese banks!, law and legal problems, health, women's roles, etc. etc.

Following the field work, usually 1-2 years, is a period of write-up time, up to 5 years, for finishing the Ph.D. thesis. With a good school, a good teacher-patron, some marketable specialties (medical anthropology, Spanish), ability to receive grants, some publications, and a willingness to relocate anywhere in the continental United States one can then go onto "the job market."

In the 1960s there were enough jobs for everyone. Those students who did not have the psychic strength or financial resources to ~~get~~ through grad school were seen as poorly qualified and nothing else. Today, the unemployment situation has gotten worse. But because of the privatization-- the individualizing cowboy mentality of American graduate education, many competent anthropologists who are without work are still taking the matter as a personal defeat, without considering the social forces behind their dilemma, and without building any kind of collective consciousness about their situation. Those professors who graduated before the lean years of 1970s know ^{this}. Let's face it. We don't have our jobs because we are better. We have them because we are older," as one remarked.

With the lack of social laws and "a-kassen", and absolutely nothing like the Danish "dimittender understøttelse", Americans have been forced to become entrepreneurial enough to redefine anthropology ~~and turn~~ themselves into more marketable commodities. There are now a few anthropologists in planning offices, development programs, urban and rural welfare offices, and with poor and minority "public interests groups". Archaeologists have been fortunate because new American laws require that every major government project have an "environmental impact" analysis. "Contract archeologists" and ecologically oriented anthropologists have been able to obtain some of these contracts for making this research. Other anthropologists are suddenly interested in "population studies". If or when Carter finally gets around to having a federal health plan, medical anthropologists will be able to do research on problems of "health delivery systems". Other anthropologists have gone into educational programs to take the teaching down to the elementary school level. Physical anthropologists have concentrated on population research and stress research, while sociobiology has become popularized. Other Ph.D.'s have sought to continue their research hoping that with more publications their resumes will look better and they will be able to obtain a job.

Jobs are getting difficult, nevertheless. At last year's Anthropology Congress-fewer than 100 jobs were open, and each could receive as much as 200 applicants. In the competition for jobs, those from older, well established schools may have some advantage in having more personal contacts. Only in the last 5 years has it become obligatory for universities to publically

advertise open positions. Before that time it was difficult to find out what jobs were open. In the large meetings of anthropologists, the most important conversations are not about Australian kinship systems but about job openings and possibilities for research money.

With the importance of academic positions, some description of the work of an average American university anthropologist can be helpful. Most of the teachers teach from 2-4 courses per semester, advising students, publishing, etc. Bigger universities require fewer courses from their teaching staff, but instead they spend more time reading student's dissertations and are required to publish more. What are the benefits of all this: a newly hired Ph.D. will expect to make from \$12000-\$15000 per year before taxes (60-70,000 kr.). After 10 years, 20-\$25,000. This is not a lot of money. The garbage men in New York make \$17,000. The school teachers make even more.

When a university is ^{to} hire a new teacher, the most important rule is that the applicant must come from another school. This anti-incest rule prevents personality conflicts and jealousies among students. After an interval of 3-5 years one may seek an open job in the university where you have studied, but with so many different schools, this is not usually the case.

Anthropology departments are attempting to hire more blacks, women and Latin-American candidates. At Massachusetts, we had the policy that all the women who applied would receive an oral interview with our selection committee, whereas we would talk only with the top 5 male applicants. (Eventually, we hired a Spanish-speaking, Black female anthropologist.) The selection process begins when each applicant sends in his/her Curriculum Vita (resumé), a sample of publications, and three letters of recommendation from teachers. For young candidates, the recommendations are the most important. Most of the letters read something like, "X is the best student I have had in the last _____ (5,10,20) years, and is expected to make great contributions to anthropology in the future."

Positions are advertised by way of theoretical and regional specialties, so that departments can maintain a broad spread of the field. If a Professor with interest in Latin America and economic anthropology died, the new position would be in those areas.

From among those candidates who look best on paper, the top 3-5 are invited to give a lecture in front of students and professors,

and be interviewed by the teachers separately over dinner. At some schools the students also interview the various candidates, focusing their judgement on the applicant's pedagogical abilities.

The process is usually completed within 3 months, and the unlucky candidates receive a letter that says "Thank you, but we're sorry...etc." Not knowing who made the decisions, nor any of the other candidates, not even knowing who did get the job, there is no opportunity to protest.

((A comparison with the process of Adjunkt/Lektor selection at Københavns Universitet may be helpful here. At Copenhagen there were 20 applicants for the position, which had no special qualifications except ability to handle empirisk data from a teoretisk ~~ramme~~. About 8 of the applicants were graduates of the institute itself and thus, personally known to the members of the bedømmelsesudvalg. The applicants usually sent in all their published and even unpublished written work, some as many as 22 separate manuscripts. For an American committee receiving 200 applicants for one job this would have been an impossible situation. The top candidates were chosen by a committee of three teachers, solely on the basis of their published material, without any regard to pedagogical experience, and without consultation with the students. Applicants were judged on their "production", and not on recommendation letters. At the end of the process, each applicant received a written "bedømmelse" which justified the selection of the top candidate. Finally, each candidate was given the opportunity to protest the composition of the bedømmelsesudvalg, and of their decision. Various protests were lodged by candidates, and they are still being considered. The original position was advertised in April of 1978. Now, almost TWO YEARS later, the position is still unfilled.

((Thus, it appears that the American process of candidate selection is more democratic when seen from within, dvs students and teachers participate in selecting the candidate. In Copenhagen, the process is more democratic from without, in that the candidates themselves can protest a decision, with the complication that there is a long delay in the selection process.)))

Once a teacher is hired in the American system the next phase is to secure tenure (lektorbedømmelse). It is every teacher's

lifelong desire to get a tenured "slot" at a decent university. This is difficult because some teachers are hired for positions where there is no possibility of tenure, dvs for temporary positions of 6 months to 3 years.

If, however, a teacher has been hired for a tenure-track position, the next phase of the rat race begins. It is usually in the university's interest to limit the number of tenured positions. The proportion can vary from 50-90% of the teachers in a given department. Tenured faculty are very expensive. Much of their work can be done by nontenured faculty or even by teaching assistants. The young instructor hired at \$14000 will do the same work as a professor at \$35000. By hiring and firing teachers every 2-3 years universities can keep their expenses low. This system is maintained by the intense competition for jobs and the low "fagforenings bevidsthed" among university intellectuals.

If a teacher is hired for tenure track, he/she will receive a tenure decision after about 5 years. In the old days the judgement was based on publications: articles in a respected journal (one a year), a book within three years, etc. Thus, the younger teachers were under the most stress because they were having to publish and to learn how to teach at the same time. Tenure decisions, carried out by vote of the other tenured teachers, led to tensions and department politics. If the teacher was recommended for tenure by his department, the decision was then confirmed by the university rektor. (nowadays this is far from automatic). If not recommended for tenure, the teacher had to leave within a year.

The tenure system is greatly criticized: it stimulates quantity over quality, research over teaching. It also creates a staff of teachers with lifetime jobs and prevents new blood from entering the university.

At Massachusetts, which I use as an example and not as an ideal tenure criteria have been restructured to include 1) teaching quality, 2) research/publications, and 3) "service" to the university/community.

To receive tenure the teacher must have excelled in two of the three areas. A year before someone goes up for tenure, comments and criticisms are solicited from anyone who has had contact with that person--student or teacher. To prevent undocumented gossip, these letters must be signed, where before they were anonymous.

The "publications" criteria is handled by the teachers. The "teaching" criteria are often in control of the students.

This is done by collecting the teacher's former evaluations which are done after every course. At most large universities in America, it has become normal to institute a systematized evaluation procedure where students write evaluations of their courses and the teacher's "performance" after each course. This schema is tabulated and published, so that ^{other} students planning to take that course will know something about the teacher. The process is controlled by Studenterraadet. If the teacher gets especially good "ratings" there is a small prize of \$100. Most teachers condemn teaching evaluations as crude popularity contests; still, even they are excited to see their own "ratings" (and those of their colleagues!) at the end of each semester. For most of the teachers, it has served to improve their pedagogy. Using these teaching evaluations and other comments by students, the overall "teaching quality" of the person is summarized in a report.

The "service" criteria vary, but serve especially to help some of the teachers who are active politically.

For example, one teacher spent a lot of time organizing a university-wide Women's Studies Program. She is an inspiring teacher but does not get time to publish. Her chances of tenure are now much better than under the old system. Still, the problem with the tenure system is that some professors have had a tendency to "slow down" once the crucial selection process was passed. Students have protested this "dead weight", but cannot import any "new blood". As a higher proportion of the teachers become tenured within the department, this problem will arise increasing frequency.

This extended description was meant to give the readers some idea of how the American system works right now. It is not just part of American anthropology, but part of American university structure and American society. Students learn; anthropologists are produced; but this is done without consideration to financial problems ^{or} family considerations. The patron-client relations may develop into true friendship, ^{or} help ^{the} student get a job, but they sometimes leave a bad taste and set students against each other, as well as professors.

Some aspects of this system could well be brought into KU. Other aspects seem to be emerging even though their overall effect is negative. The reader should be able to decide what should be brought in and what should be avoided. ###

ORDLISTE

Amerikansk universitets termer som oftest forvirrer danskere

TERM	DANSK OVERSÆTTELSE
Anthropology	består af 4 subdiscipliner: social/cultural antropologi, fysisk antropologi, arkaeologi, og antropologisk lingvistik
Generalist	en antropolog med særlig interesse i at bevare/undervise alle subdiscipliner
Department of (anthro.)	svarende til dansk "Institut"
Faculty	samlede lærerkræfter i et Department/Universitet.
Member of the faculty	een af lærerne
"Professor (Smith)"	titel der bruges til <u>alle</u> lærerne ansat ved college eller universitet, dvs. formelt brug.
Degree	"grad", eksamens papir
Grades (fra A til F-fail)	"karakter" der gives til kurser, øvelser
B.A., B.S. with major in Anthropology	Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science. svarer til 9-12 kurser i et bestemt emne plus 20 andre kurser på college.
Major	hovedfag ved B.A., B.S. eksamen
M.A. el. M.S. degree	2-4 semestre mere end B.A. uddannelse, samt en thesis af 50-100s. midt imellem en cand. fil. og mag. art.
Terminal Masters	en Master's grad som ikke tillader fortsættelse til Ph.D. grad.
ABD ("all but dissertation")	studerende der har lavet alt undtagen at skrive doktorafhandlingen. Bruges i stillingsopslag, fx "Ph.D.'s preferred but ABDs will also be considered for this position."
Ph.D.	Doctor of Philosophy with major in _____. 1-2 års kursus arbejde efter Masters, plus 1-2 års feltarbejde, og afhandling af 200-400 sider. Svarer til en meget omfattende mag. art. eller licentiat grad i Danmark.
M.A. thesis	størøpgaven til M.A. grad
Ph.D. dissertation	afhandlingen til Ph.D. grad
General eller Comprehensive examination	efter alle kurser er færdige. Efter denne eksamen er der kun afhandlingen tilbage.
State school	college/universitet der har finansiell støtte af de enkelte stater; forholdsvis billigere i sammenligning med private colleges.

College	en af de 1200 højere læreanstalter som tilbyder B.A., B.S. degree men <u>ikke</u> andre grader.
University	en af 100-150 institutioner hvor man får ikke blot B.A./B.S., men også M.A., M.S. og Ph.D., eller andre professionelle uddannelser. Alle Universities består af flere "Colleges" (dvs på dansk: "fakulteter"), fx College of Arts and Science, College of Medicine, Gradual School, osv.
Undergraduate	studerende der ikke har fået sin B.A. grad
Graduate student	grad student. een der studerer til M.A. eller Ph.D. eksamen.
Grad school	graduate school, stedet hvor man studerer for M.A. el. Ph.D. eksamen.
Course	Kursus-14 uger, 2-3 timer om ugen, læsestof, skriftlig eksamen/paper, og karakter.
Auditing, auditor	at deltage i kurser som du ikke har betalt for og heller ikke får karakter for; normalt vil man audit 1-2 kurser om året for generelle eller specielle interesser, især som støttefag.
Seminar	et kursus hvor deltagerantallet er under omkr. 15
Reading course	self-studium med lærerens vejledning
Tuition and Fees	tarifferne man betaler for undervisningen. kan variere fra \$50-\$500 <u>per kursus</u> per semester.
Scholarship	legat som dækker tuition. til undergraduates
Fellowship	legat/stipendium til grad students eller Ph.D. som dækker tuition og leveomkostninger. Mellem \$3000-\$10,000 om året,
Grant, grant money	alle slags legater, stipendier der tildeles for forskning, rejser, udstyr. Når universitetet indregner grants i deres <u>indkomster</u> er der tale om "soft-money", da grants kommer fra staten og varierer fra år til år. Grants fås igennem konkurrence mellem projektforslag.
Grantsmanship	kundskab for at skaffe grant money.
Entrepreneur	een der er helt vild med at søge grants; dygtig med sin grantsmanship
Committee	3-5 lærere som vejleder Ph.D. studerende med hans/hendes afhandling.
Chairperson, advisor	hovedvejleder, "mentor"
Teaching Assistant (TA)	hjelperlærer/manuduktør stilling <u>som giver penge til grad students.</u>
Teaching Associate	kursus leder, underviser sit eget kursus; en undervisningsassistent/instruktør stilling <u>til delt til grad students</u>

Research Assistant (RA)	legater for grad students for at hjælpe andre med deres forskning. Mere almindelige i naturvidenskab, sociologi.
Instructor/Lecturer	laveste grad i et Departments full-time lærerkraft. Nogle ABDs men fleste er Ph.D.s. Svarer til dansk "undervisningsassistent" eller "eksternlektor", dog de underviser flere kurser.
Assistant Professor	næste laveste grad. man sidder her 2-5 år. Løn begynder med \$12-16,000 årligt. "adjunkt".
Associate Professor	"lektor". her ^{bliver} man 5-15 år. Løn er \$17-\$25,000, afhængige af anciennitet publikationer, osv.
(Full) Professor	"professor".
Department Head	eller Chairperson. "Institutbestyrer"
Tenure	lektorbedømmelse som gives efter 3-6 år
open slot	ledig stilling
Tenure-track position	stilling hvor besætter evt. har mulighed for at blive tenured.
NON-tenure-track	kortvarig, vikariat stilling
"make a slot for yourself"	kundskab ^{til} at omforme en kortvarig stilling til en permanent/tenured stilling
"Who are you working with"	"Er du strukturalist, økolog, marxist, eller?"
Curriculum Vita "vita"	Resumé, som skal være så langsom muligt
"get some publications out of it"	(fx fra afhandlingen), skriver man for at forlange eens vita.
"Let's write an article together"	"Nu kan vi begge forlange vores vita-er.
"old boy network"	lærere der kender hinanden fra grad school, især fra de gamle, etablerede universiteter, og som hersker over oplysninger, stillinger, grants, tidsskrifter, osv.
"dead weight"	tenured lærere som slapper af. Lærere som er blevet "out" i teoretisk forstand.
"rethinking his paradigms"	marxister der bliver strukturalister, strukturalister der bliver økologer, økologer der bliver marxister, osv.
"doing self-financed research"	Arbejdsløs
"formulating a research project"	\$\$\$