

MODELS AND BEST PRACTICES
FOR JOINT SOCIOLOGY-ANTHROPOLOGY
DEPARTMENTS

Edward L. Kain, Southwestern University
Theodore C. Wagenaar, Miami University
Carla B. Howery, American Sociological Association

A project of the ASA's Academic and Professional Affairs Program

2006

MODELS AND BEST PRACTICES **FOR JOINT SOCIOLOGY-ANTHROPOLOGY DEPARTMENTS**

INTRODUCTION

Sociology is often combined with anthropology and other disciplines in departmental units. Indeed anthropology is the most common pairing in joint sociology departments. What is the history of such combinations? What models are followed? What potential models for fuller integration exist? What considerations need to receive attention when issues of merging and separation occur?

The ASA's Academic and Professional Affairs Program has written this paper to guide departments to make careful decisions in joining with anthropology, offering different models for the combined department. We hope that departments will use this booklet to discuss options, examine what model is most appropriate for their institutional context, and to make intentional decisions about joint courses, majors, and so forth.

HISTORY

Anthropology and sociology have a long shared history of departmental coexistence. With rare exceptions, sociology has been the “bigger” or “first” discipline. This evolutionary development has affected the nature of the interaction between the disciplines within one department. Disciplines that developed on campuses earlier (such as biology and psychology) tend to have more prestige than those that arrived later (such as sociology and political science). The usual arrival of sociology on campuses before anthropology yielded a power and prestige imbalance that manifests itself today in the usually lower numbers of anthropologists in combined departments.

The combination of sociology and anthropology in one department is not universally evident throughout the country. Historically, this combination occurred somewhat more frequently in the Midwest and South for the PhD-granting schools. Among liberal arts institutions, 25 of the top 50 liberal arts institutions have a joint sociology/anthropology department, and the bulk of those are in the Northeast—about half of them are in NY, ME, PA, and MA. Many research universities had joint departments for many years, splitting into separate departments (e.g. Ohio State University, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill) in the 1960s. Others, such as Purdue University, remain joint departments. At Kenyon College, anthropology existed first and was later joined by sociology. The combination also seems to be more frequent among smaller schools, due perhaps to administrative feasibility.

Various reasons may help explain the presence or absence of combined sociology-anthropology departments. Some developments are simply historical—an anthropologist was hired first at Kenyon. A Midwest land grant university needed a sociologist to assist with rural development. At another school, the president may have influenced the decision to hire a sociologist or an anthropologist.

Some reasons are intellectually based. Anthropologists and sociologists both study cultures and how people negotiate their social realities. Anthropologists and sociologists frequently study the same social phenomena—such as the family—but at different levels or through a different lens. Intellectually, these levels are often connected. For example, the family could be studied from a kinship structure approach for anthropology and a structural-functional or symbolic interactionist approach for sociology. Both disciplines' approaches provide different but complementary strategies for studying families.

Some reasons are simply administrative, a marriage of convenience. Most combined departments have more sociologists than anthropologists and it “makes sense” to combine them. Smaller schools may have just one or a few anthropologists, a size that does not warrant a separate department. Sometimes a single anthropologist is asked to do teaching duties in sociology or some other field.

Key Developments in Higher Education

Three developments within higher education have heightened the attention to anthropology and its role in higher education. First is the rise in globalization and the need for students to learn more about other cultures. The call for greater cross cultural awareness and analysis skills came from business, the arts, the humanities, and the social sciences.

The second development is the shift in general education requirements that followed the first development. Many schools added a “non Western” or “nondominant” requirement. Some schools have added a “US cultures” requirement to make sure students know about the cultural diversity in their own society.

The third development is the renewed interest in interdisciplinarity. Many schools have added social science and other courses that are taught from multiple disciplinary perspectives (think “Ethics and the Science of Chemistry”). Schools have seen how anthropology can make a substantial contribution to interdisciplinary teaching and learning.

All three of these trends have paved the way for anthropology's rise. Many anthropologists were hired to provide the cross-cultural awareness and skills called for in public discourse. They were asked to teach the new requirements in general education programs. They were key players in new and existing area studies programs and course offerings. As a result, anthropology has played an increasingly central role in liberal learning. Many of these newly hired anthropologists were placed in sociology departments.

One can also make the case that sociology contributes to the three developments mentioned above. Indeed, there seems to be more convergence and overlap among the fields¹ than in earlier decades.

¹ We center our remarks on cultural anthropology which is the dominant emphasis in undergraduate programs, especially at smaller institutions.

New Common Ground for Sociology and Anthropology

Several developments *within* the fields of anthropology and sociology are also salient to the potential for a truly joint department. First, anthropologists have increasingly focused on their own culture and on other more developed cultures while sociologists have turned more to cultures other than their own. For example, one of the most popular recent developments in anthropology has been organizational anthropology. Anthropologists have examined how people use computers, how students adjust to college life, and how drug transactions occur. Second, a renewed focus on race, class, and gender has occurred within anthropology, already key topics in sociology. Anthropologists have also returned to social network analysis popular in earlier days. Third, some convergence in methodology has occurred, with anthropologists showing more interest in quantitative analyses and sociologists showing more use of the ethnographic approach. These developments showcase the growing intersection between the two fields, making them increasingly ripe for interdisciplinary teaching and coexistence.

Nonetheless, sociology and anthropology are separate disciplines and faculty trained in one may be intellectually drawn to the other field, but not *de facto* trained in both fields. Some administrators may consider the fields interchangeable and ask faculty to teach “out of field”, especially in a joint department. A department should be able to express the ways in which there is and is not curricular overlap and faculty cross-preparation.

The history of the intersection between anthropology and sociology has at times been characterized by conflict. In classical sociological fashion, the impact of numbers, balance, and tipping ratios have mattered. Anthropologists have usually been in the minority. Being in the minority generally means less power and respect, and can lead to a “neglected stepchild” status. Both disciplines are relatively young, which can lead to turf battles and ambiguous self identities. How social entities are defined often influences their self perception, and anthropology is often thought of in a second class status given its position in departments.

In a world organized alphabetically, it is a powerful indicator of relative power and status that virtually all combined departments have “sociology” first in the department’s name. This can be illustrated in several ways. Using Academic Search Premier, a web-based full-text database including nearly 4,000 scholarly publications, a search for “Department of Sociology and Anthropology” yielded 2,458 citations, while a search using “Department of Anthropology and Sociology” yielded only 262. [Search performed 27 January, 2006]. The vast majority of these keywords were found in the affiliations of the authors of articles. Perhaps a more valid measure is yielded by an examination of names of departments listed in the ASA 2000 Guide to Graduate Departments of Sociology. Of the 34 joint departments listed in the U.S., all list sociology first in the name. Of the 11 international joint programs listed, only one (The University of British Columbia) is a program of “Anthropology and Sociology”. Even in joint programs with three or more disciplines (22 cases), sociology is always listed before anthropology. When sociology, anthropology and social work are in a combined department (8 cases), they are listed in that order in every case except one (Utah State University).

CURRENT MODELS/ARRANGEMENTS IN SOCIOLOGY PROGRAMS

Sociology programs are situated in a wide range of institutional settings and structures. As highlighted in *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major Updated* (2004), institutional and department context have important implications for teaching and learning in sociology. The most common structure, after a stand-alone sociology department, is some type of joint sociology/anthropology department; 22.2% of sociology programs are located in this type of structure (Spalter-Roth and Erskine, 2003, p.12). These combined departments are found in all types of institutions (as defined by the Carnegie Foundation), but are more common in Masters and Baccalaureate institutions (Spalter-Roth and Erskine, 2003, p. 13). A more recent study of the structure of sociology departments using a national sample of 145 institutions (Kain, 2005) verified this, finding that over half of the combined sociology/anthropology departments were at baccalaureate liberal arts institutions; only two of the 16 cases were at doctoral institutions.

Requirements for the major in stand-alone versus joint sociology/anthropology departments have many similarities. There is typically a requirement for an introductory course, a research methods course, theory, and some type of capstone experience. The sociology major in joint departments is much more likely to have an additional requirement that students take an introductory anthropology course--50% of the cases in joint departments, and only about 10% of the cases in stand-alone departments (Kain, 2005). Another contrast is that joint departments are slightly less likely to require a statistics course. In addition, the course descriptions of the methods course are more likely to explicitly mention a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods in joint departments. Finally, joint departments are slightly more likely to have higher levels of sequencing in the curriculum, with nearly 45% having an introductory requirement, sequencing within upper-level courses, and a capstone (compared to less than 30% of stand-alone departments having this level of sequencing in the curriculum.) (Kain, 2005)

Undergraduate majors

Within these joint departments, at the undergraduate level there is a range of options in terms of majors and minors, concentrations and tracks. Even the wording on the transcript reveals considerable variation in joint departments. A department may offer only a combined sociology/anthropology major, with or without options to minor. (One example of this type of structure is found at Carleton College.) In the 2005 study, this was the most common situation--7 of the 16 cases in the sample offered only a combined major in sociology/anthropology. Within this first type of institution, students may have the option to focus upon one of the two disciplines. At Colgate University, for example, there is an undergraduate concentration in Sociology and Anthropology. Within that, students choose to have an emphasis in Anthropology, in Sociology, or in a combination of the two.

Alternatively, a department may offer a major in only one of the two fields, with minors in one, both, or neither available. When that is the case, the sole major is typically in sociology. Yet another option is that the department might offer a major in both disciplines. Finally, some

programs offer three (or more) majors—one in sociology, one in anthropology, and a joint major or concentration that combines the two. In addition, there may be the option for undergraduates to follow specialized tracks within the major in one or both of the disciplines, such as social psychology, criminal justice, or demography in sociology, or cultural anthropology or archeology in anthropology. At Northern Kentucky University, for example, the department offers majors in both sociology and anthropology. In addition, they have an interdisciplinary major in Applied Cultural Studies, consisting entirely of department courses (plus statistics, which is taught in the department of mathematics.)

Sometimes the availability of majors is a resource issue. A very small department with a handful of faculty may be unable to offer full majors in two different fields. Sometimes, philosophical issues lead to the choice of major options. What we are suggesting in this document is that these choices should be intentional.

A Continuum of “joint-ness”

A variety of models exist for the extent of connection between disciplines within joint departments of sociology and anthropology. These can be conceived as falling along a continuum from the case where the two disciplines are housed in the same department, through a completely integrated program with a single major combining the two fields. Thus, along this continuum you will find:

1) *Parallel play*. In this case, the structure is basically a federation. The two disciplines are administratively in the same department, and this may result in some economies of scale such as sharing of support staff. They do not, however, share a philosophical approach or curriculum, participate in collaborative research or teaching, or think of themselves as having a common enterprise. This model does not necessarily imply that department members do not get along interpersonally, which is a separate dimension of department life for any of the models! While it is probably unnecessary to offer examples of this model, some departments that are joint but have little overlap include University of Central Florida, Loyola University (Chicago), Indiana University-Purdue University-Fort Wayne, and Auburn University.

At the same time, the best practices that we outline later in this document apply even at this end of the continuum. At the College of Charleston, for example, the department has two majors, and two completely separate curricula in anthropology and sociology. Historically there was some overlap in the curriculum, but over time as the department grew, the two majors have become completely separate. All faculty members in the department nonetheless share a set of common goals including high quality teaching, a commitment to strong undergraduate majors, and a model of the teacher scholar in a liberal arts setting. They are highly successful in having a joint department that falls as this end of the continuum of joint-ness. Structure is central to this success. The department has one web page; structurally it has shared sections as well as separate sections by discipline. They have separate as well as joint activities for students, for example, there is an Alpha Kappa Delta chapter in sociology and Lambda Alpha chapter in anthropology, but there is also a joint Sociology/Anthropology club. In addition, there is an annual program to recognize outstanding academic achievement among students in both anthropology and sociology.

2) *Tokenism*. The two disciplines in this type of joint department have some type of requirement that students are exposed to the other discipline. One or two courses in the other field are required or encouraged, such as taking the intro course in both fields. There is no systematic effort, however, to help students integrate the two disciplines. Examples of this model are Amherst College and University of Louisiana-Lafayette.

3) *Minors or concentrations*. In this type of department/program, students are required/encouraged to select 3-4 courses in the other discipline, and there is a notation of this minor or concentration. Students thus have a major in sociology with a minor/concentration in anthropology, or vice-versa. At Hiram College all students major in sociology but can minor in anthropology. At Spelman College, students may major in either field, but all students take sociology research methods.

4) *Exposure and respect*. In this situation, courses taught in each field contain material from the other discipline as well as encouragement as to how that field looks at the phenomenon in question; courses are still taught separately. To really enact this model, the department must make a collective commitment to include materials from both fields. Faculty consult about readings before developing their syllabi and talk about points of overlap and complementarity. Southwestern University is an example of this approach.

5) *Cross listing*. In this case, courses in both disciplines are cross-listed. They may be cross-taught or co-taught by faculty in each field, with varying degrees of “monitoring” of course content. Central Michigan University reflects this approach.

6) *Complete cross-listing with no distinctions between disciplines*. At this end of the continuum, there is only a joint, shared major in anthropology and sociology. All courses are listed with only one prefix and there is little administrative distinction made between what is a sociology course and what is an anthropology course. While both intellectual convergences and divergences are made explicit, the curriculum clearly and explicitly integrates the two disciplines. Carleton College exemplifies this model.

We are not suggesting that any particular place upon this continuum is ideal. Issues of institutional and departmental history and mission, individual faculty personalities, and the culture of a department/program must all be taken into account. What we are suggesting is that departments need to be aware of their levels of jointness, as this has important implications for a wide range of issues, including department planning, student needs, program assessment, faculty hiring and faculty strengths, and curriculum planning.

Furthermore, especially for models two and three, students should not be primarily responsible for the integration of the disciplines. Any joint department should have careful advising and knowledge of core course objectives and content to help students achieve intellectual integration.

Some promising places for integration/collaboration

In addition to shared historical intellectual roots, there are at least three places in which both sociology and anthropology share current concerns. The first, and perhaps most obvious, of these is in globalization. The second is in areas related to the environment. Finally, both have a current focus upon issues of race/ethnicity and how these categories are socially and culturally constructed.

In addition to these three areas of contemporary interest in both disciplines, there are also several standard courses in the curriculum that provide fertile territory for integration and collaboration in the classroom. The study of families is significantly strengthened when taught from a perspective that combines research and theoretical insights from both anthropology and sociology. The same can be said for courses in gender, aging, and stratification.

If your department is seriously considering more careful integration of courses in the two disciplines, issues of substantive “turf” may arise. Gender, for example, may be considered a “sociology course”, while family may have typically been approached from a more ethnographic, anthropological perspective. Rather than thinking about courses or topics as “owned” by a discipline or by a specific faculty member, however, it is useful to ask questions such as “What are the student learning outcomes for this course?” and “What are the overall goals for the curriculum?” Questions like these can help guide discussions about courses that might be productively cross-listed, or cross-taught.

At Colgate University, for example, faculty decided that the theory course would focus on the classical theorists who are shared by both anthropology and sociology. The course focuses upon Marx, Weber, and Durkheim, and is sometimes taught by an anthropologist, and sometimes taught by a sociologist. For their capstone senior seminar, they have three options. Students who concentrate in sociology and anthropology can choose one of three emphases (as noted in the earlier section on structure of departments and majors). Each of these emphases (anthropology, sociology, or sociology and anthropology) has a different capstone. The anthropology capstone is always taught by an anthropologist, and students do theses using ethnographic methods. The sociology capstone is always taught by a sociologist, and students do independent research using a range of sociological methods. The capstone for the sociology and anthropology emphasis, however, is consciously and clearly interdisciplinary. It is cross-taught, sometimes by an anthropologist and sometimes by a sociologist. Students in that capstone choose from a variety of research methods in both disciplines.

Criteria for cross-teaching

Ideally, faculty trained (with a PhD) in one field would only teach in the other field if they had substantial graduate training in that field. Some faculty team teach and then later teach solo, or engage in other forms of faculty development to be able to cross-teach. Some departments just accept that if an anthropologist is teaching a cross-listed course it will be much heavier in that content and vice versa when taught by a sociologist. Most departments we consulted did very little cross teaching except in the few explicitly cross listed courses.

THINGS TO CONSIDER WHEN HIRING FOR A JOINT SOCIOLOGY/ANTHROPOLOGY DEPARTMENT

Where does your department fall on the “Continuum of Jointness”?

The type of joint department you have will determine many things about the hiring process. On one end of the continuum, if you are a joint department purely administratively, then it may be

that the hiring process is no different than in a stand-alone sociology or anthropology department. At the other end of the spectrum, if you are a joint department in which there are intellectual and curricular connections between the disciplines, then this connectedness needs to be considered throughout the process. Much of what we say here applies to departments all along the continuum. Some only applies to the latter situation.

Determining the disciplinary home of a new position

One of the most politically charged activities in many departments is determining the nature of a new position. In a sociology department, political divisions may occur by theoretical tradition, methodological preference, and/or topic area. When a department includes a combination of multiple disciplines this adds yet another dimension to the question of defining a new faculty position. A department with a relative balance in the number of sociologists and anthropologists faces very different decisions and challenges than a department with a significant imbalance in the number of faculty. A very common situation is the case where there are fewer anthropologists, often leading to a “step-child” situation where resources, decisions, and power all lie in the hands of one discipline.

Within anthropology, the types of resources that are necessary for faculty vary considerably in the different major sub-fields. Cultural anthropologists, in particular, need extended periods of time and travel money for fieldwork. Archeologists and physical/biological anthropologists are more likely to need lab resources. These resource needs must be part of the calculus in determining the new position as well as the costs and benefits to the department. In general, combined departments (particularly at smaller institutions) tend to have a strong focus upon cultural anthropology rather than the other subfields within the discipline.

The importance of a department assessment plan, self studies, and external reviews

Ultimately, decisions should be based upon a clear and deliberate long-term plan that is linked to the department/program goals, and congruent with the University or College mission statement. An assessment plan should outline clear goals for the department, and must include explicit and measurable learning outcomes for students at both the undergraduate and graduate levels (where appropriate). Lowry *et al.* (2005) is a useful document for helping departments/programs develop and implement an assessment plan. One sample of shared learning outcomes from a joint sociology/anthropology program is found in Appendix A.

An assessment plan that has been in place over a number of years, combined with regular self studies and external reviews of both sociology and anthropology which have identified areas of strengths and weaknesses should provide significant guidance in determining areas for hiring new faculty. The Department Resources Group (DRG) is a set of consultants trained by the ASA. A central part of their training is for doing external department reviews. The Academic and Professional Affairs office of the ASA can provide guidance in finding trained reviewers, with experience in joint departments, from the DRG who can visit your program.

Linkages with other departments/programs

Just as the resources needed by different types of anthropologists vary, so too do their potential linkages with other campus-wide programs. Both when making a case for a new departmental position, and when hiring for a position once it is approved, this variation needs to be considered.

Linguists may have potential ties with Modern Languages and Literatures. Physical/biological anthropologists may have potential ties with Biology and Animal Behavior programs. Cultural anthropologists would be more likely to have affinities with area studies programs such as Latin American studies or Asian studies, or interdisciplinary programs such as Women's Studies or Environmental Studies. Be sure that the job advertisement is clear about the priorities. These linkages need to be considered at several points in the process: 1) in garnering support for a new position from interdisciplinary programs, 2) in making a case to the dean for a new position in terms of contributions to general education and interdisciplinary programs, 3) in selecting external members of a search committee, 4) in setting up on-campus interviews and 5) in thinking about cross-listing courses.

Having both anthropologists and sociologists in one department can strengthen a case for department contributions to general education requirements. University-wide diversity/multicultural requirements can often be met with anthropology courses. Creative and authentic development of multidisciplinary courses that integrate both sociology and anthropology faculty can often result in courses that fulfill general education requirements for a multi-disciplinary component.

The Importance of Deliberately Thinking about Shared Intellectual and Curricular Needs

If your department/program falls near the end of the continuum where you regularly discuss a shared intellectual tradition and implement this in terms of the curriculum, then much more care is needed in crafting the position description and developing your job search strategy. If this is the case, then it is important that your job listing explicitly state the importance of working in a joint department. If you have a joint major or concentration that combines sociology and anthropology, then this should be indicated in the position description. Further, if co-teaching courses with someone from the other discipline, or teaching courses that are cross-listed is desired, this should also be included in the description.

Networking In Advance Of a Job Search

In addition to listing the position through the American Anthropological Association (for an anthropologist) or the ASA online Job Bank (for a sociologist), you may find it useful to do advance networking. Letters sent to the department chairs at top graduate programs a year to two years in advance may help identify graduate students in the pipeline who may be appropriate for your setting. Contacting the AAA and the ASA about appropriate sub-groups in their organization (such as cultural anthropologists who study Native Americans, or focus upon a specific cultural area such as Asia or Latin America, or sociologists interested in development/cross-national issues) may also be fruitful in generating appropriate candidates. Attending the AAA/ASA annual meetings a year in advance of the search, and participating in meetings and receptions for appropriate subgroups can be very productive as well.

Some Things to Think About Once You Have Listed the Position and As You Are Interviewing Candidates

As you look through candidate folders, or interview candidates at the meetings, think about ways you will explicitly build the “joint-ness” of your department/program into the process. For example, if you call potential candidates on the phone before interviews at the AAA/ASA meetings, write out a script of what you will say to each person on the phone. Be certain that it provides them with some things to think about in advance, including the joint nature of the department. You might tell them a question or two that they can anticipate answering in the short interviews at the annual meetings. For example, you might want them to be ready to reflect upon questions such as:

- 1) How might their research program be enhanced/hindered in a joint department?
- 2) Which (if any) of their courses might be cross-listed in both sociology and anthropology, (or particularly appropriate for students in the other discipline)?
- 3) Are there any potential constraints/conflicts they might anticipate in a joint program?
- 4) What are the pros and cons of undergraduate/graduate courses in theory and methods when joint/separate/team-taught between the two disciplines?
- 5) What are the pros and cons of having the undergraduate capstone experience include both sociology and anthropology students versus done separately in each discipline?

The On-Campus Interview

Involve faculty from both disciplines in the interview process. (We recommend this at all stages of the process, including interviews at the national meetings.) Make sure that students from both disciplines (both undergraduate and graduate) meet with the candidates and are given the opportunity to provide feedback to the search committee. Student representation on the search committee can be very helpful. If your department has a joint program that links anthropology intellectually as well as in the curriculum, one strategy that can be very useful is to have candidates teach a class and/or give a research presentation to students and faculty in both disciplines. Collect feedback in such a way that you can look for patterns in the feedback based upon discipline. If a candidate is very popular (or unpopular) among anthropologists but not sociologists, or vice versa, this is an important piece of information in your deliberations.

The list of questions provided above for short interviews at the annual meetings will also be useful in an on-campus interview. It may be fruitful to prompt faculty in the department to ask questions related to the “joint-ness” of the program in their one-on-one interviews with candidates.

Ultimately, no matter where your program falls upon the continuum of “joint-ness”, you want to hire a candidate who will help the department thrive. This includes everyday interactions between colleagues. Even if your department falls on the end of the continuum where the joint-ness is entirely administrative in nature, you want to encourage and build a culture of mutual respect, trust, and cordiality between colleagues. This process begins with hiring faculty who are right for your department/program.

Faculty Development and Socialization

Faculty who are hired into joint departments should be hired in terms of their credentials in their discipline. Once arriving, however, socialization into the culture of a joint department is essential. Some faculty development may be fruitfully directed toward issues unique to a department that combines sociology and anthropology within the same program.

BUILDING A CULTURE IN WHICH BOTH DISCIPLINES THRIVE---BEST PRACTICES FOR JOINT SOCIOLOGY/ANTHROPOLOGY DEPARTMENTS

No matter where a program/department falls upon the continuum of “jointness”, there are a series of best practices that can help develop, encourage, and nourish a culture in which both disciplines thrive. This section focuses upon some of these best practices, some of which have already been discussed in earlier sections. These are all congruent with the recommendations put forth in *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major Updated* (2004).

1. Develop structures that integrate both disciplines into common activities, both academic and non-academic. Examples:
 - a) A colloquium series that brings in external speakers—an anthropologist one semester, a sociologist the other; all students and faculty are encouraged to attend all speakers.
 - b) Annual picnic for all faculty and students;
 - c) A student club (See College of Charleston and University of Northern Iowa as two examples)

2. Hire new faculty who are committed to working together within a joint department. Examples:
 - a) Make this an explicit statement in the job listing.
 - d) During interviews, ask questions that explore ways in which the candidates think of the inter-relationships between the two disciplines.
 - c) Include faculty from both disciplines on search committees.
 - e) Include students from both disciplines in the interview process—having lunch with the candidates, attending their class sessions and/or research presentations.

3. Talk as a group about shared goals. Work at developing a shared department philosophical orientation to the program(s), and to teaching and learning and research. Examples:
 - a) Develop student learning outcomes as separate disciplines, then come together and see where they overlap. (See Appendix A for one example resulting from this type of process.)
 - b) Talk about how recommendations from *Liberal Learning* apply to each discipline, and where there may be significant differences in their applicability.

4. Develop separate activities, support groups, and functions, as well as shared. Examples:
 - a) Have regular department meetings with all faculty; have task groups that sometimes are single discipline in structure.

- b) Develop and encourage an active student organization that includes both disciplines; have social functions at faculty members' homes for students in one discipline (such as a dinner celebrating the end of capstone presentations.)
5. Promote reward structures that are similar. Examples:
- a) Have an annual outstanding student award—with separate award winners in sociology and anthropology, but similar recognition, and perhaps a joint award ceremony and honors society induction event.
 - b) Develop criteria for status and tenure decisions that are similar.
6. Talk about curriculum issues on a regular basis. Examples:
- a) Have an annual department retreat during which curriculum planning plays a role.
 - b) Focus upon shared issues as well as issues unique to each discipline. Depending on where the department falls on the “continuum of jointness,” there would be more or fewer such joint planning sessions.
7. Develop a department culture where faculty honor serious input into and discussion about decisions relating to each discipline, while ultimately deferring to those in the discipline.
Examples:
- a) In developing job descriptions, areas of expertise ideally will complement coverage in both disciplines.
 - b) In the aforementioned colloquium series, speakers will ideally be of interest to people in both disciplines.
8. Require students to take coursework in both disciplines and help them develop skills in comparing and contrasting anthropology and sociology. Examples:
- a) Sociology majors could be required to take an introductory level anthropology course, while anthropology majors could be required to take an introductory level sociology course.
 - b) Consider a 1-credit hour pro-seminar for majors in both disciplines where the explicit focus is a comparison between the two disciplines. All faculty in the department could talk about their research program.
9. Once students already have a good idea of the basics of their chosen discipline, in upper level courses include one book or a couple of articles by scholars from the other discipline. Examples:
- a) In a Latin American Cultures class (in anthropology) students read a book by a sociologist; it is useful both for understanding the topic being studied and for talking about differences and similarities between anthropology and sociology in connection to the specific topic we studied.
 - b) In a family sociology course, ethnographic materials about families in other cultures can be built into the course.
10. Have continued discussions about the nature of the linkages between sociology and anthropology within your program. Examples:

- a) A joint sociology/anthropology major is very different than two separate majors. Hiring decisions, curriculum structure, and interactions in the department will likely be very different depending upon this structural difference.
- b) Cross-listing or sharing core courses (like theory, method, and capstone) has serious implications. We do not recommend sharing these, particularly when there are separate anthropology and sociology majors within the program.

11. Build structures that promote a representative voice within the department.

Example:

a) When a person in one discipline is chair, have someone from the other discipline serve as the “coordinator” or “head” of the other discipline. At the College of Charleston, for example, if the Department Chair is in anthropology, then a Director of Sociology is also appointed, and vice versa.

Considerations for forming a joint department

The main point we stress with forming a joint department is that it should be intentional. The decision should not be an incremental result of non-planning. It should not be the end result of avoiding personality clashes. It should not be an incidental decision made to save money in a fiscal emergency, or as a result of administrative fiat. We offer these additional suggestions:

1. Consider first the separate strengths of the two disciplines. The decision to merge sometimes results from feelings of inadequacy in the two programs. The thought becomes: we’ll be stronger together. While that may, in fact, become the case, becoming a strong merged unit depends first on the strengths of the two units.
2. Identify clearly the program goals for the separate programs. Use these goals to identify the program goals for a merged major, should that become a choice. Strategically, it may be easier to first maintain separate programs while the logistics of merging occur.
3. Realize that turf issues will come into play. Decisions to include or exclude particular courses will depend on whether or not there are enough courses from each discipline. Dual programs in one department often require at least one course in the other’s discipline to bolster departmental enrollments.
4. Think about administrative issues. For example, previously each department or program lived with its own SCH per FTE and other administrative data. What happens when the program with lower enrollments merges with a program with higher enrollments? Does the latter program suffer in the eyes of administrators? At program review time, are both programs externally reviewed by one person? From which discipline?
5. Decide ahead of time the process for selecting chairs. If you decided later, some may interpret the process as favoring a particular candidate. Some joint departments decide to simply rotate the position among the disciplines. Others decide that it should be based on the proportions of faculty from each discipline.

6. Determine hiring, promotion, and tenure decision processes. One issue of perennial concern is the relative autonomy of each unit. Does each unit have full autonomy in hiring and promotion and tenure? If so, must the candidate pass a departmental vote? If so, what sometimes happens is that candidates put forward by the unit with fewer faculty members are voted down in the departmental vote. In other words, the larger unit always has veto power and the smaller unit is always subject to approval by the larger unit.
7. Think about the students. Are they SOAN students or anthro and soc students? What identity do you wish to promote? Should students become proficient in both disciplines? Is there a status hierarchy such that students pursuing one major or program have greater status? Will the student club be merged? Or is it important for students in each discipline to have their own place of identity and social interaction?
8. Realize that power issues will emerge and prevail. One unit will feel like it does not have enough physical space, and that it needs additional space due to archaeology labs and museums. Another unit will feel like it needs lower teaching loads due to courses taking students overseas. The sociology faculty wishing to teach summer classes of three hours will resent the archaeologist who needs to teach a 12-credit field school in the summer. The person teaching a 250-student gender course will object to someone teaching a highly esoteric course in the other program to 8 students.
9. People may feel uncomfortable with the “other.” Engage in faculty development strategies to make people in one discipline at least sufficiently familiar with the other discipline so that effective comparative frames of reference can be made in their courses. Or perhaps teaching seminars that highlight particular issues in each discipline would be helpful.

Considerations for Separation

We have pointed out above that decisions to merge should be intentional and based on careful self-reflection and analysis. We feel that the decision to separate should be similarly based. As in family dynamics, however, too often the decision to split is based on emotion and territoriality, and is made hastily. Conflict within the department often simmers for years, with the two sides engaged in warfare over curriculum issues, space, support staff, and faculty lines. The conflict is often laced with personality differences that become identified along disciplinary lines.

Fermenting conflict makes it difficult for an amicable and structurally sound separation. Many divorce dynamics set in—denigrating the other, early staking of possessions, a new found sense of identity and importance, searching for financial stability, and mapping a new future. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the separation is initiated more often by anthropology than by sociology. Perhaps this is because those with power do not typically see the disadvantages of current structural arrangements. Anthropologists may suggest separation as a strategy to gain autonomy, independence, and more complete recognition of their discipline. We offer the following as advice for successful separation, but recognize that rational thinking is sometimes lacking at separation time.

1. Start talks early. The best separations evolve from a sufficiently long period of reflection and discussion. Early discussions encourage planning and discourage knee-jerk reactions.
2. Identify the sources of the desire to separate. Be honest if the goal is to separate personalities or if the desire lies in giving anthropology greater recognition and autonomy on campus.
3. Be clear about the goals for the two programs. Do not deliberately avoid courses in the other discipline just because you are separating. After the separation, it may still make sense, for example, for sociology majors to take an anthropology course.
4. Negotiate strategies for continued coexistence. Just because the programs separate does not mean, for example, that cross-listed courses need to decouple. Negotiate which program will be responsible when for which courses. Separately, it may even turn out that the two disciplines may have greater impact on, say, the Black World Studies Program, than they might have had as a combined department.
5. Don't burn your bridges. It is generally best to avoid any personal or personality issues. At separation, there is the temptation to tell others what you really think about them, to complain about the weak contribution of the other discipline to the department's reputation on campus, etc.
6. Keep students' needs uppermost. Their needs may become secondary in the mad dash to acquire resources, stake out office space, and physically move. Yet this is a time of social and curricular dislocation for students. Prepare a handout about what the separation means and doesn't mean for students. Be clear if what was a joint student club will remain joint or become two separate clubs.
7. Involve key administrators and get it in writing. What happens to the joint positions? What happens to the two new positions that the provost promised the department?
8. Emphasize curricular issues when dealing with administrators and try to avoid dealing in personalities. For example, explain how anthropology may be in a better position to contribute to the newly revised general education program by being autonomous. Explain how the proposed applied anthropology program will now come into fruition when it could not before due to an anti-applied bias among the sociologists in the department.
9. Realize that efforts to dissolve may actually result in a decision to stay together. Sometimes merely talking about the concrete arrangements of separation makes people realize that they are better together than separate.

Considerations for departments where there is a majority/minority arrangement

People often exist in social structural arrangements while giving little thought to the impact of those arrangements. Such is the case in merged departments where one discipline, usually

sociology, has greater power and the other discipline, usually anthropology, takes on the neglected stepchild status. Many of the issues raised above are salient here as well.

1. Understand the history of the merged status. Was it administratively or faculty initiated? Was it a “temporary” arrangement due to a budget shortfall or a personnel shortage? Were there any promises made in writing when the merger occurred? Of course, the merger usually occurred so long ago that no one remembers such issues. But attain at least a broad understanding of the historical sequence of events.
2. Decide if what you have is simply an administrative federation or a serious effort at a merged status. Most departments are simply federations. Some of these federated structures have completely separate faculty meetings for sociology and anthropology while others might have “component” meetings in addition to regular department meetings. What are the implications of such arrangements?
3. Making this decision is coupled with the decision to offer only separate majors, a major in one discipline and a minor in the other, a combined major, or some other arrangement. We have noticed that departments often offer only separate programs when the course offerings and faculty positions would allow for a combined program at no extra cost, i.e., when there is sufficient student interest.
4. Decide on decision making strategies. Will the chairship rotate? Must hiring and promotion/tenure candidates pass votes at the departmental level? Does this mean that one unit always has veto power?

CONCLUSION

Perhaps this document has raised more questions and options than provided answers and guidance. The authors have a simple message:

- Sociology and anthropology programs can be a rich intellectual partnership for students and faculty;
- There are many models for “jointness” but administrative convenience is the least appealing, as is the decision by administrators alone to make a department a joint one;
- For any program or curriculum, faculty need to make intentional decisions about what courses and co-curricular options they offer, must have goals for doing so, and assessments to see if those goals are met. Of course this is an ongoing and iterative process of continual improvement;
- There are resources to help you – websites with program descriptions, ASA consultants, and more.

APPENDIX A: SHARED UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES IN ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY *

The department that originally developed this list has a cumulative curriculum based upon the recommendations found in Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major Updated (McKinney et al. 2004). The sociology faculty first developed a set of cumulative student learning outcomes based upon the first edition of this report (1990). These have been updated and modified over time during annual department retreats. The anthropology faculty used this as a model, and developed a separate set of student learning outcomes. After both groups had developed their student learning outcomes, they worked together to identify those that were shared in both disciplines. This is a department that has separate majors. Both majors require that students take an introductory course in the other discipline, and ask at least one question during the senior oral final examination that requires students to reflect upon the interconnections between the two disciplines.

“The Department of Sociology and Anthropology aims to cultivate in our students (our majors in particular) the following skills, knowledge and abilities:

1. Each major should develop a mastery of the concepts, theoretical approaches and methodological practices of the discipline of their major. More detailed descriptions of our learning outcomes for majors within Anthropology and Sociology are listed below.
2. Each of our majors will learn how to find, critically read, analyze and critique academic journals within her/his discipline.
3. Each major will learn how to become fluent in electronic and traditional library searches for scholarly literature.
4. Each of our majors will be able to write a review of the scholarly literature relevant to a particular topic.
5. Each of our majors will be able to do original research. This involves being able to:
 - a) Formulate a research question.
 - b) Implement research methods to explore the question.
 - c) Connect theory in her/his discipline to the data she/he gathers.
 - d) Write an in-depth journal-length paper on the topic.
 - e) Give a professional-quality oral presentation of her/his original Research.
6. One result of doing original research is that many of our majors will present papers at national or regional professional meetings in their fields.
7. Each of our majors will become familiar with the Human Subjects Review process, and the ethical dilemmas posed by sociological and anthropological research projects.
8. Our department places a particular emphasis, within both anthropology and sociology, on analyzing systems of privilege—and especially the ways in which race, class and gender shape social and cultural life. As a result, each of our majors will be able to articulate:
 - a) Ways in which categories of difference are culturally constructed.
 - b) The relationships between difference and inequality.

- c) Interconnections between race, class, and gender.
9. Finally, our department explicitly aims to develop in our students a good understanding of the points of difference and similarity between sociology and anthropology. Students are required to take at least one course from the discipline in which they are NOT majoring, and are encouraged to take more. Professors routinely address the ways in which anthropologists and sociologists approach questions, methods, theory, etc. differently from one another. As a result, each major should be able to articulate some of the major differences and similarities between anthropology and sociology in terms of theory, method, and philosophy.

* Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Southwestern University. Developed over a period of years through faculty discussion by Cristina Alcalde, Dan Hilliard, Maria Lowe, Edward L. Kain, Melissa Johnson, and Sandi Nenga.

APPENDIX B: GRADUATE PROGRAMS WITH JOINT DEPARTMENTS

Names of graduate departments

United States

	Soc	Soc/Anth	Anth/Soc	Other comb with both	Other c. w/o anth.
A's	5			1	3
B's	6			1	
C's	30	2		1	2
D's	3	1			2
E's	2	1		1	
F's	2	2			
G's	2	3			
H's	4	1			
I's	7	2			1
J's	1				
K's	3			1	
L's	1	3			1
M's	11	3		2	5
N's	16	6		2	1
O's	6	1			1
P's	5	1		1	1
R's	1				
S's	16	3		1	1
T's	6	2		1	2
U's	1			1	
V's	3	1		1	
W's	8	2			2
Y's	1				
Tot:	140	34		14	22

S/A

Cal-State-Bakersfield
 University of Central Florida
 East Tennessee State
 Florida International
 Fordham (NY)
 George Mason University (VA)
 Georgia Southern University

Howard (DC)
Illinois State
Indiana University/Purdue University at Fort Wayne
Kansas State
Lehigh University (PA)
Longwood College (VA)
Loyola University-Chicago
Maryland-Baltimore County
Middle Tennessee State University
University of Mississippi
University of Nebraska-Omaha
University of New Hampshire
New Mexico State University
North Carolina State University
North Dakota State University
Northeastern University
Ohio University
Purdue University
St. John's University (NY)
University of South Alabama
Southern Connecticut State University
University of Texas at Arlington
University of Toledo
Virginia Commonwealth University
West Virginia University
Western Illinois University

A/S

Other comb with both

Auburn (AL)
Baylor (TX)
Central Michigan University
Eastern MI University
Miami University
Mississippi State University
University of North Carolina-Charlotte
University of Northern Iowa
Sociologia Y Antropologia, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales
State University of West Georgia
Texas Tech University
Utah State University
Valdosta State University (GA)

Other countries

	Soc	Soc/Anth	Anth/Soc	Other comb with both	Other c. w/o anth.
Austr.	1	1			
BWI	1				
Can.	15	7	1		
Egypt				1	
G.B.	9				2
Ger	1				
Ire.	1				
Isr.		2			
Sing.	1				

S/A

Australian National University
Carleton University (Canada)
Concordia University
Dalhousie University
University of Guelph
Laurentian University
Simon Fraser University
University of Windsor
Bar-Llan University (Israel)
Tel-Aviv University

A/S

University of British Columbia

Other

American University in Cairo (Dept. of Soc, Anth, Psych., and Egyptology)

REFERENCES

Kain, Edward L. 2005. Unpublished data on the structure of sociology departments in the U.S. Funded by a grant from the ASA Teaching Enhancement Fund.

Lowry, Janet Huber, Carla B. Howery, John P. Myers, Harry Perlstadt, Caroline Hodges Persell, Diane Pike, Charles H. Powers, Shirley A. Scritchfield, Cynthia M. Siemsen, Barbara Trepagnier, Judith Ann Warner, and Gregory L. Weiss. 2005. *Creating an Effective Assessment Plan for the Sociology Major*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

McKinney, Kathleen, Carla B. Howery, Kerry J. Strand, Edward L. Kain, and Catherine White Berheide. 2004. *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major Updated: Meeting the Challenge of Teaching Sociology in the Twenty-First Century*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

Spalter-Roth, Roberta M., and William B. Erskine. 2004. *How Does Your Department Compare? A Peer Analysis from the AY 2001-2002 Survey of Baccalaureate and Graduate Programs in Sociology*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

As we developed this document, we talked with a number of colleagues. We would like to acknowledge the time and insights provided by the following sociologists and anthropologists: Cristina Alcalde (Southwestern University) Pamela Feldman-Savelsberg (Carleton College), Maureen Hays (College of Charleston), Melissa Johnson (Southwestern University), Sandi Kawecka Nenga (Southwestern University), Nancy Ries (Colgate University), Idee Winfield (College of Charleston), and Kristen Yount (Northern Kentucky University). We thank Victoria Hougham, ASA, for her assistance.