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“There is no such thing as a new idea. It is impossible. We simply take a lot of old ideas and put them into a sort of mental kaleidoscope. We give them a turn and they make new and curious combinations. We keep on turning and making new combinations indefinitely; but they are the same old pieces of colored glass that have been in use through all the ages.”

- Mark Twain, A Biography

INTRODUCTION

In turning Twain’s kaleidoscope and looking through the light of the social sciences a new combination of colored glass comes into view. The overlap of the glasses, which are the study of leadership and the study of culture, shines through as a vibrant combination of older ideas in a new configuration. It is the vision of this new mosaic, and the belief that the academic world provides one of the best ways not only to explore, but to disseminate new ideas that I have decided to undertake the creation of a course designed for any student interested in either field. This new course takes as its main function to allow the student and professor alike to explore tonal ranges and different shading of the overlapping glasses of Leadership Studies and Cultural Anthropology.

I was originally inspired to take on this project out of my own curiosity as to a possible future made of the combination described above. My undergraduate studies, made up of study in the field of Leadership Studies and Cultural Anthropology, have showed me a interesting set of overlapping ideas that seem to me are begging to be combined in a formal and academic manner. I see the field of Leadership studies touching some of the ideas often covered in Cultural Anthropology. Ideas such as social organization, power, and the concept of leaders or chiefs in general have been central in the study of culture. Similarly the connection exists in the other direction; Cultural Anthropology seems to be calling for more definition and study within the larger picture that can help define ‘culture.’ The idea that a concept of what Leadership is and the various capacities in which it can be used as a method of defining a culture has yet to be explored in depth, an could offer much to the way we think of human interactions.
This project is important to the field of Leadership Studies mainly in that it formally and directly adds to the resources that the field can use to further its knowledge. Limiting the field of Leadership Studies to be offshoots of Political Science, Sociology, Communications Theory, or Organizational Theory seems unfair to me. This is especially true when I see such obvious connections between the two fields. In disseminating the idea of thinking about leadership through cultural lenses (and focusing Cultural Studies through the concepts of Leadership Studies) I feel I can make a significantly expanding contribution to the study of leadership.

The project is titled ambiguously with a purpose. The "n" is a combination of 'and' or 'in.' It is hoped that through this combination both fields will be able to gain equally in insights from the other. For this reason it seemed in appropriate to state in a title that one was being used by the other. This way, the two are combined in such a way that they may play off of each other equally, without being weighted toward one field or the other.
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this project is to design a course combining the ideas and thought processes within the disciplines of Leadership Studies and Cultural Anthropology. The basic problems at issue in this project are a) the need for a course of this nature; b) the design of the course itself, including general topic selection and specific course requirements; and c) (albeit loosely) the feasibility of such a combination. In this research it will be purported that this course is needed; that the proposed design is as will follow in the project; and that (if completed) the combination will be practicable. The research will combine both inductive and deductive reasoning. This section will explain the resources used in this project to the extent as to explain why and how these resources were chosen.

For this research there are several sources. The first, in the initial phases of planning and throughout the project as needed, will be interviews with current professors of both Leadership Studies as well as Cultural Anthropology. This has merit on a number of levels. The first, and foremost, is that hearing the reactions and suggestions of people with experience in both fields concerning the make-up of the course will be nothing but valuable to the course’s design. There will be no set schedule of questions for these interviews, rather a more informal format with less control over content. Within the interviews the project will be introduced and from there it will be up to conversation to decide specifically where the interview goes. From each interview, however, it would be expected to understand what each interviewee thinks of the project, their suggestions for topics to be covered within the course, and specific assignments or suggestions they might have for giving the course structure. Getting to this information should give each interview enough structure, as well as enough freedom, to allow information to flow. This process will be mostly inductive, allowing for as much free flow of ideas from the interviewers. However, the ideas for the course will be brought into the discussions adding an element of deductive reasoning to the process that will allow for information to be filtered through several steps.
In conjunction with this, past and other current resources will be used heavily. By this it is meant that syllabi posted on the Internet, found in source books, and/or provided by professors in both fields will lead the thought process into the areas and specifics of the units that will later be chosen for inclusion in the course. Similar to the faculty interviews, the past syllabi will be examined for content in the areas of general topic selection and guidance as to where and what to look for in specific readings. This process will, in the beginning, be inductive, as the use of the syllabi should point to avenues that should be considered as topics or themes of the course. Later, these syllabi will be examined deductively looking for flaws or merits that will support the completion of the project. Specifically, the research will take into account what was included and excluded from specific areas of other courses. For example, in examining a unit on “culture” syllabi from introductory level anthropology course will looked at for material seen as vital to the study, and will further be evaluated for their merit to this project.

Once the background has been established, i.e. the general outline for the course, the major resource will be any library. The specific purpose of conducting this study is to find the readings that should be included in the course. Also, within this review it would be hoped to discover other avenues to explore as methods of teaching the subject matter. In this reading section of the research the general topics for in the course will need to be looked at a number of the relevant angles in order to preserve the multidisciplinary stance the course takes. In keeping with the multidisciplinary aspects of both fields it is important to read a diverse selection as to explore the angles in which any particular subject might be approached. By this it is hoped that the major readings/ lines of thought for each concept will be explored and specific readings selected by the guidelines described below.

Readings for possible inclusion in the course will be selected based on the ideas presented within and the topical relevance they would contribute to each unit individually. This is contrary to some ideals that would have a course determined by the school of thought, rather than the ideas. In a course this general (possibly serving as an introduction to both fields), it is
important to present the ideas, taking into account their academic stance, rather than vice versa. As should be expected, quality of writing and relative accuracy of the material being presented will also be considerations. These criterion will apply differently depending on the reading in question and which idea/ set of ideas being presented are. For the background readings for a particular section or sub-unit of a section readings will be selected that cover the most ground in a fashion that remains focused and on topic. For the ethnographic examples the major standard that will placed will be one of topicality. This will be difficult because, as will be noted in the literature review topics of ethnographic consideration have yet to include specific 'leadership' examples, although 'leadership' issues are brought up in many and most ethnographies. To this end, ethnographic examples will be chosen on their ease of relation to Leadership Studies and the points being made at the time.

The analysis of this research will be as inductive as the rest of the process will to have been up to this point. Much of it will seem like a jigsaw puzzle, or could be viewed as one views Pointillist art, from a slight distance. The small dots of smaller images will form a complete picture as the viewer moves away, and the picture comes into view. As this multitude of ideas is looked at it will be important to let the articles and central themes within fit together, and in a sense, and choose themselves. While this method may seem a bit loose to some, it is actually more appropriate, in a way, than it may appear at first, and is by design as to allow new ideas to surface more readily as the research continues.
As mentioned in the introduction, some of the main ideas and concepts behind the study of leadership and the study of culture appear to have much to be gained from an overlap. Despite this, the first thing one observes when trying to research the topics together is that there has been nothing written explicitly combining the two as a mode of thinking. Hence, the impetus behind the creation of this course. The purpose of this literature review is to show that this crossover in fields of thought is not currently being explored either in classroom settings or in the academic literature of both fields and that the combination would be mutually beneficial. Due to the nature of this project, the review of literature will not cover the basics of each theme in the course being proposed, as they are adequately described in the teaching reference for each unit.

The idea of looking at leadership from a multi-disciplinary perspective is not a new one. Books aimed at developing better leaders come at the issue from most angles, most notably Philosophy, Religious Studies, Psychology, and Political Science. However, despite a relative importance of ‘culture’ on leadership, there is currently little written combining the two formally.

In her book, Leadership: Multidisciplinary Perspectives, Barbara Kellerman includes a chapter entitled “Leadership Systems in World Cultures,” by David Rosen, giving way to the possibility of an Anthropological perspective. The book was written to “…provide interested students and practitioners with a comprehensive range of perspectives on the interactions between those labeled leaders and those labeled followers.” However, in the chapter itself provides nothing more than a reference dictionary of terms used in both Political Science and Political Anthropology. He covers topics that undoubtedly would affect a study conducted in an ethnographic manner, but provides very limited examples nor a full explanation of the importance of this perspective to her definitions.

Another flaw in Rosen’s literature is that his examples are all very distant, in that they deal cultures removed from our own without drawing connection between the two, such as an
example of Authoritarian leadership in New Guinea without any mention of an analogous situation. This ignores a significant move in Cultural Anthropology to not only relate the author’s local culture to that of another system, but also to study one’s own culture as a mode of understanding. This is significant to this project in that it affects its scope. The mission statement of the Jepson School is to provide education “for and about” leadership. To the extent that this course would provide education for leadership, it would be important that students be able to relate to the information they receive.

The majority of the literature within Leadership Studies that is relevant to this issue discusses leadership in cross-cultural perspectives. A classic article by Geert Hofstede entitled, “Motivation, Leadership, and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad?” introduces the idea that through the study of various aspects of the phenomenon of leadership an observer can see if a particular theory can be applied in different countries. What this article attempts to study empirically are four aspects of a leadership relationship in forty countries and then analyze how the groupings match up and compare to the scores that the United States shows. What this hopes to show is that the majority of leadership theory, being produced in the United States, is not necessarily applicable to foreign situations because of long term cultural elements. This study is significant in that it shows the need for a more multi-cultural view of leadership.

Another work that is significant to this study is “Contemporary Leadership Theory,” by Martin Chemers. This article traces some of the current movements in leadership theory and specifically covers contingency theories, transactional theories, cognitive theories, and cross-cultural theories. In this fourth and final section of the piece, Chemers focuses on reviewing some of the work that has been done with a cross-cultural perspective while avoiding any depth

1 Kellerman 1983: XI
2 Leadership Studies Pamphlet, Jepson School of Leadership Studies; University of Richmond, VA
3 “Motivation, Leadership, and Organization: Do American Theories Apply Abroad?” by Geert Hofstede was originally published in Organizational Dynamics, Summer 1980.
4 “Contemporary Leadership Theory” by Martin Chemers from The Leadership Companion edited by J. Thomas Wren.
of description or analysis. However, Chemers does offer the critique of these works that trying to study U.S.-American theories abroad can lead to "very inaccurate" results.

Within Cultural Anthropology, to look at leaders of a culture and the issues surrounding leadership is not a new idea. In most ethnographic works one can find ideas and relationships that can very easily be put into a Leadership Studies context. (One of the assignments in this course is to do just that.) Unlike Leadership Studies, Cultural, or Social Anthropology developed an entire sub-field devoted to study along, but not on, these lines. This sub-field, Political Anthropology focuses mainly on the inner workings of politics on many different levels. While the themes can easily be changed, in terminology, to have a similar 'leadership' orientation, they are in essence different.

As an introduction to the unit of the course entitled "Power and Authority" a chapter from Ted C. Lewellen’s book Political Anthropology is included that gives a short history of the sub-discipline. From this short chapter it is easily seen that Political Anthropology focuses more on whole systems, with leaders as a part, as opposed to the leaders and issues of leadership as the focus. A simple scan of the index of this book reveals that does include "leadership" as a topic addressed**. However, the style of analysis and depth thereof does not include some of the major theories of leadership and leadership styles that it could have. This shows a great lacking, as the field of leadership studies has moved beyond focusing on leaders alone, to focusing on followers and the process as a whole.

To further show that the idea of combining Leadership Studies and Cultural Anthropology, courses currently being taught in both fields will be used to show there is an absence. To examine this, syllabi and course descriptions from both disciplines will be examined from both fields. These syllabi will show the impact a course of this nature could have, and the importance of its creation.

** Lewellen 1992, 226
At the Jepson School of Leadership studies several syllabi indicate the need for Cultural Anthropology as an influencing discipline, but do little in the actually teaching to support this. First, in looking at a syllabus for the introductory course *Foundations of Leadership* (LDSP 201) uses the Introduction to Barbara Kellerman’s book referenced above as a reading for the class entitled, “Social Analysis and Approaches to the Study of Leadership.” After this lone mention, the course continues to examine historical, contextual, organizational, and individual aspects of leadership, but does not do more than make a cursory mention of culture without noting how it may aid the study of leadership.

A second syllabus that demonstrates culture is being thought of, but not acted upon, is a syllabus for *Leading Groups* (LDSP 351), a required course for all Leadership Studies majors at the Jepson School of Leadership Studies. In the course description the instructor notes, “the literature on groups and leadership within groups comes from several disciplines including...anthropology...” However, this is the only mention made specifically of anthropology or even generally of culture in the course. Organizational culture is not included as one of the major themes of the course, nor is mentioned as a sub-theme for a particular lecture. This seems odd considering the importance of organizational culture placed on this area of leadership studies by the text used in the course, and in other areas of the field.

A course entitled *Leadership in Historical and Cultural Contexts* (LDSP 306) was taught in the spring semester of 1998, although, despite it’s title, the course lacked the cultural elements it seems to have claimed in the title. An examination of the syllabus reveals that the course’s focus is mainly on historical context, and makes little to no effort to examine culture from an ethnographic (or even ethno-historic) angle. The benefit of this course is that it was a first step to the addition of the concept and study of ‘culture’ into the study of leadership. The ideas

---

†† As taught by Dr. Douglas Hicks in the fall semester of 1998. Syllabus obtained online at [http://www.richmond.edu/~jepson/hicks/foundationsyllabus.html](http://www.richmond.edu/~jepson/hicks/foundationsyllabus.html)

†† As taught by Dr. Tiffany Keller in the spring semester of 1999. Syllabus obtained online at [http://www.richmond.edu/~jepson/LeadingGroups'99.html](http://www.richmond.edu/~jepson/LeadingGroups'99.html)
presented in this course may be a variation that a professor may add into this course. Instead of focusing on current examples, a professor may instead choose to look at historical instances. For example, a study of the French Revolution may be valuable in the study of 'power and authority.'

In the field of Cultural Anthropology no courses could be found that even mention themes of Leadership Studies explicitly. This survey of courses consisted of searching the websites of the top ten ranked departments (National Resource Council Study of Graduate Programs) as well as a search of posted syllabi on the anthropology virtual library (the only one of its kind) that can be found at http://anthrotech.com/resources/.  

It goes without saying that the further a discipline can expand its basis for information and knowledge, the more successful it will be in its search. Beyond this, most basic assumptions as to what both fields stand to gain from a cross-disciplinary look at the issues, each has specific elements of their study that will be strengthened. For the study of leadership the knowledge and style of examination gained after years of thought on the matter from cultural and political anthropology can only strengthen definitions and ways of studying the “most enigmatic phenomenon.” Specifically, the style of research found in ethnography is a little used method of research in Leadership Studies, but would serve the purpose of examining and defining leadership in a broader sense than has been accomplished to date. Also, by examining theories cross-culturally and applying them to other systems their validity could be shown or disproved.

Cultural and Political Anthropology stands to gain another philosophical perspective, adding depth to the already broad subject. The terms and theories used in Leadership Studies that are not being currently applied to the study of leaders and politics in other societies will be readily available for better use by ethnographers. An application of this sort would widen the debate about universal theories, and would provide a forum for these ideas to be discussed further, at least as they pertain to leadership.

A related emerging field that seems to be looking into this option to strengthen its claims is Peace and Nonviolence Studies. In the book The Anthropology of Peace and Nonviolence,
Leslie Sponsel outlines the relevance of each field on the other as a basis for a similar type of combination. The conclusions he reaches concerning the relevance of Anthropology for Peace Studies are the following: they share the ideal of historical, multidisciplinary, and holistic approaches to research, they are both “comfortable with global thinking;” Anthropology will broaden the narrow focus of Peace Studies through its diversity of approaches, the current wealth of ethnographic work, if learned and understood, will add new areas of study to the field, and, what Sponsel remarks as most “indispensable”, is that anthropology must be considered when constructing theories of human nature (Sponsel and Gregor 1994: 7-11). It is reasonable to say that Leadership Studies stands to gain a similar list.

As for the reverse, Sponsel also argues that Anthropology can and will benefit from Peace and Nonviolence Studies, in a similar way that I believe Anthropology will benefit from a look at Leadership Studies. These elements are outlined by Sponsel as follows: Peace Studies will be a catalyst to rethinking anthropological “theory, data, and practice,” Peace Studies will provide background and theory of militarization of areas where Anthropologists traditionally conduct field work, by broadening the concept of peace, Peace Studies will change the ways and language used when discussing the idea changing linguistic biases as the concepts are better understood, and finally that Peace Studies will “help” Anthropology to develop a new, or a least current, agenda for “research, teaching, and action.” (Sponsel and Gregor 1994: 11-14) In a similar regard, the same could be said of the impact of Leadership Studies on Cultural Anthropology.
A NOTE ON THE EVOLUTION OF THIS COURSE

This section will serve to explain the manner in which the general themes for the units of the course were reached. In it, the interviews that were conducted with professors in both fields concerning the specific content of the course will be summarized. Also, the process for reading selection will be examined and explained. It will approach the course, and each theme within, chronologically as to show the process, as well as explain the outcome of the research.

The interviews really came in two waves. The first with the faculty interviews for a new faculty position at the Jepson School in 1999. At this point the conception of the course was virtually nil, other than in base idea. The focus of these interviews surrounded the candidates' views on what they would include in a course of this nature. The information from this set of interviews was used to form a further concept of what the course would be, and to guide further areas to look into as possibilities. The second wave of interviews came later in the development of the course when specific guidance was needed in topical areas. While the focus of the interviews was meant to be topical and looking for individual readings to turn to, they ended up partially fitting this and partially fitting the description of the first set of interviews, providing advice for possible directions the course could go.

In the early stages of development of this course, the only ideas were to design something that would be able to combine Leadership Studies and Cultural Anthropology in a classroom setting. Beyond this, there was no concept of the class. The only element conceived of was the idea that interviews with faculty candidates could be conducted to gain an idea of what to do. The first of these interviews, conducted with Elizabeth Faier, left many good ideas, and one discouraging one that ended up serving as an impetus for motivation. This discouraging remark was, "Anthropologists don't do Leadership." A statement that it is the expressed purpose of this project to disprove. The good ideas, however, began the process of thinking of the course in terms of units. The units Ms. Faier suggested were "Democracy and Ethnography," "Historical
Perspectives,” and “Domination, Subordination, and Resistance.” As will be seen some of these ideas carried through into the course as it is designed here.

The second, and probably most influential on the process, as that conducted with Dr. John Cinnamon. Dr. Cinnamon agreed with organizing the course around a set of themes that were clearly distinguishable and prominent in both fields. The most far-reaching of his suggestions, however, was to begin the course with an introduction to culture. The other sections of the course Dr. Cinnamon advised were glimpses at “Power and Authority,” “Misuses and Abuses of Power (née Leadership),” “Colonialism case studies,” and “Revolution.” He was skeptical about the amount of leadership literature that would be available on any given subject that was not terribly limited to Western society. The biggest piece of advice he gave, that came back much later to guide the completion of this project was to, “choose a set of readings first, and construct the course around those.”

Finally, the interview with Dr. Michael Moody served mostly to solidify the conception of the course to that time, and to offer a perspective on teaching this course that was eventually discarded. Moody suggested, and later agreed, with the themes for the course being, “Culture,” “Power and Authority,” “Leadership Conceptualization,” and “Abuses of Leadership.” His suggestions for teaching the course centered on using many of the philosophical texts that serve as underpinnings for anthropological theory. He suggested using a lot of Marx, Weber, Simmel, and Foucault as a basis for the course. This idea was later discarded as being impractical and not leading enough into the concepts, but more debating them without application. Dr. Moody made a point of cautioning away from only applying leadership theory to ethnography as he felt it would not give a “complete picture” without the anthropological perspective.

At this point the themes for the course were “Culture,” “Power and Authority,” “Leadership Conceptualization,” and ‘something concerning when leadership breaks down’, possible ‘abuses’ or ‘revolution’. The first two of these themes were, and remain, self-explanatory, but the later required much more thought. The idea of “Leadership
"Conceptualization" was one that came from a personal interest in examining the ways in which the concepts surrounding 'leadership' are perceived cross-culturally. This section was aimed at being the 'ultimate' crossover between Leadership Studies and Cultural Anthropology. Consequently, as shown above there is little in the way of literature that makes this combination. The readings that were being developed for this section of the course were becoming increasingly complex and decreasingly related to either field. Topics in social and analytic psychology that didn’t seem appropriate to include for reasons ranging from their limited scope to the fact that I couldn’t understand them (let alone teach them) kept surfacing more often than readings in either of the disciplines that were being focused on. Even though it would have made an interesting investigation, the feasibility of such a theme looked bleak, and it was scratched at this point.

The research that would produce the specific readings for the units on 'culture' and 'power and authority had begun by this point. As the methodology suggests, this involved sifting through the literature on each subject until a set of readings could be filtered out. The idea behind the 'culture' unit, as explained further in it's teaching notes, was to provide a crash course in culture theory. Finding and choosing between the voluminous tomes of articles and books on culture theory was the difficult part. The sources that were chosen are all from the most prominent in culture theory and present definitions of culture that are either essential as an introduction to anthropology, or are concise, understandable, and applicable.

The strength of this unit is that the theories conflict to some degree and will force students into thinking critically about the definitions in order to complete the assignment associated with this division that will help through the remainder of the course. There are several drawbacks to this unit as well. The most prominent of these is that there is no leadership literature in this section, and thus not facilitating the combination of the fields. However, to the extent that this course is being designed to be taught to students of Leadership Studies, who would have been required to take the introductory class to the major, it could be assumed that students will have a background in Leadership Studies, and will have formed a concept thereof.
Another drawback to this is that the list of major cultural theorists is not complete. Rather, it combines some of the more basic and influential examples to begin the process of thinking about culture.

Research for the second unit of the course, “Power and Authority,” first involved beginning this second set of interviews mentioned above. From these interviews, conducted with Drs. Lewellen, of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Richmond, and Couto, a political scientist who teaches at the Jepson School of Leadership Studies, a beginning set of readings began to emerge. Readings were selected at this point somewhat arbitrarily based solely on the information contained within them. Although, a level of complexity was added in this research because the goal of combining equally the two fields became an issue. Balancing the two became an issue of quality as both disciplines have more than enough literature on these subjects. In grouping the readings together under major themes, three presented themselves as predominating in number, quality, and ease of application within ethnographic examples. These three sub-units surfaced as “Power,” “Authority,” and “Power and Authority in Groups.” The first of these two sections aims to define their respective terms, while the third simply tries to apply those definitions in a different setting; adding another level of critical thinking skills to the course.

As a major component of the course a cross-cultural perspective was built into the readings. As noted above, each of the sub-unit has an ethnographic example at the end of it from a different culture. This will not only provide a multitude of different perspectives, but will allow for the examination and application immediately of the ideas in the sub-units. The ethnographic examples chosen in this and following sections are based less on the prestige of the author, but on a myriad of other factors. The first, and most important, of which is the degree to which they relate, or can be related, to the ideas being covered for the material they are to exemplify. Occasionally, however, ethnographic examples do not exemplify the theory, rather they provide another perspective through which the information can be discussed in greater depth. Secondly,
the examples were chosen based on their geographic locality as to try to present as many systems from around the world. This was one of the more challenging aspects, not only to find relevant examples, but most anthropologists, myself included, are trained in a geographic area of specialization as well as a topical area of specialization, so to step outside of this knowledge is trying.

The research for the third unit of the course was the most complex. The reason for this is because, to the point when the research began, the idea for the unit was, “and something concerning when leadership breaks down, either abuses or revolution.” Not having a theme to come back to was difficult, but through the experience learned the value of Dr. Cinnamon’s early advice. As different angles were tried on every side of this general theme ‘good’ readings seemed to stand out and fit well with other readings, without a unifying theme to tie them all together. So many issues and topics were considered that ranged from the purely theoretical to the purely practical. In a re-examination of the readings that had been selected out of this confused research the theme of “change” came to mind, and presented itself, out of the readings, as the theme for this last section of the course.

By the end the readings combine to form a complete set of ideas including both leadership issues and anthropological issues and showing how they can be thought of together to add light to both subjects. The leadership issues covered through anthropology include issues of ‘power’, ‘authority,’ ‘followership,’ ‘imposed change,’ and ‘resistance.’ The anthropological issues addressed by way of leadership studies involve ‘culture,’ ‘holding power,’ ‘legitimizing power,’ ‘imposed change,’ and ‘violence/rebellion.’ As proposed in the discussion of Sponsel and Gregor’s *The Anthropology of Peace and Nonviolence*, the issue do seem to overlap quite significantly and point to the idea that both fields of study have much to be gained from a glimpse at the other, if not an deep combination of the two.

The course was not designed to be taught in lecture format, as it provides not explicit answers. Instead, the course offers a perspective and will require discussion from many different
angles in order to bring to light concrete ideas for students. There are certain principles and
central ideas that will need to be clarified explicitly in order for some of the material to be clear.
These topics are clearly, few as they may be, are clearly noted in the teaching notes for each unit.
Pedagogically group interactions and class discussions have been placed in the highest regard for
the merits they add to a class and learning in general.

There are two types of assignment for the course, those which are based on the units the
course is divided into, and those which are semester long projects. The assignments for each
individual unit are listed at the beginning of the teaching notes for every unit; and are explained
within the text of the teaching notes. The assignments that will span the semester are listed and
described in the teaching notes of the first unit, so as to allow as much time as possible for the
assignments' completion. A list of all the assignments will appear in the sample syllabus that can
be found in the appendix.

One of the goals set at the onset of this project was to make it so the final product could
be picked up by a professor of Leadership Studies or Cultural Anthropology and be taught with
minimal preparation. With the teaching guide that follows this is possible. However, as it stands,
the course would be fairly dry from a student's point of view. The individual professor would
need to research into teaching tools such as film clips and activities to make the course more
exciting. Also, this is but one interpretation of how the fields of Leadership Studies and Cultural
Anthropology could be taught. It is based on one set of learning and could be adapted in an
infinite number of ways. Other units that might be considered, depending on the professors
area(s) of specialization might include issues of gender in leadership/culture, globalism and its
effects on culture, and any other area of knowledge touching both fields.
UNIT ONE: CULTURE

READINGS:
1) "Body Ritual Among the Nacirema" Horace Miner American Anthropologist Vol. 58 Num. 3 1956 ppg. 129-130
2) "What Do Anthropologists Do?" Sol Tax Many Answers West Pub. Co. 1974 ppg. 3-9
3) "Culture: Concept and Phenomenon" Ward Goodenough The Relevance of Culture Bergin & Garvey 1989 ppg:93-97
4) "Anthropological Ancestors and Interpretation Theory" Robert Ulin Understanding Cultures Univ. of TX Press 1984 ppg. 1-22
5) "The integration of Culture" Ruth Benedict Patterns of Culture Houghton Mifflin Co. 1959 ppg. 45-56
6) "Culture, Genuine and Spurious" Edward Sapir Edward Sapir: Culture, Language and Personality Univ. of CA Press 1966 ppg. 78-118
7) "The Impact of the Concept of Culture on the Concept of Man" Clifford Geertz The Interpretations of Culture Basic Books 1973 ppg.33-54

ASSIGNMENTS:
1) Definition of Culture Paper
2) Ethnography Choice and Summary Paper for Ethnographic Comparison project
3) Begin process on semester-long ethnography process (including proposal and approval of the organization's leader consenting to the study)

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
• To gain an understanding of what Cultural Anthropology is, and what Cultural Anthropologists do.
• To explore some varying definitions of Culture across various traditions.
• To lead students into thinking about and forming a definition of culture as it will relate to a concept of leadership.
• To introduce ethnography as a method of studying human behavior.

REVIEW OF READINGS AND TEACHING NOTES :

This first section of the course, entitled “Culture,” is designed to begin the class by introducing some of the basic tenants of Cultural Anthropology and to kick off the thought process on the concept of culture. Included in this section of the course are readings ranging from
a humorous example of ethnography, to an essay on the anthropologist and its work, to several
definitions of culture representing different schools of thought within Cultural Anthropology, and
ending with a note that will help students with the semester long ethnography project. The idea is
to start the students thinking about culture and its various definitions and manifestations, as well
as to introduce students to Cultural Anthropology both in what is produced and how the
anthropologist works.

It is vital that the instructor remember the audience to which this course is being taught.
It is my estimation that there will be far more Leadership Studies students than Anthropology
students in this course (especially if it is taught at the Jepson School of Leadership Studies at the
University of Richmond). For this reason the first section of the course is designed to be not only
an introduction into the course, but also into Cultural Anthropology. In the event that the course
is being taught to predominantly Anthropology students there are several options for adaptations
to make the course more suiting to their needs. The first of which is to keep the course the same
and stress more of the different intellectual periods that are covered within the readings as a short
history (condensed as it may be) of Cultural Anthropology and Culture Theory. A second option
would be to change it into a crash course in Leadership Studies. The readings would need to be
changed to focus on some of the history and basic theories of leadership. A similar theme of
historical content would be appropriate to run through the readings, as it is in its current form.
The capstone assignment in this case would be to have the student form their own concept of
Leadership, just as in this form they are forming an idea of ‘culture.’ A third, and far more
complex, option would be to somehow try to cram an introduction to both of the concepts into a
shorter introductory period. No matter the case, if the instructor would like to include a reading or
two better introducing Leadership Studies, they might consider articles of a general nature such as
Joseph Rost’s, “Leadership in the 21st Century.” Questions should be raised of students that
relate one field to the other in class discussions. By combining questions of ‘leadership’ into a
discussion of 'culture' the instructor will effectively be able to begin to introduce the two ideas simultaneously.

Assignments: Semester Long and for Unit One

As would be necessary in any beginning there are certain housekeeping needs that will need to be seen to in the first couple of sessions the course meets, and definitely by the end of the first two weeks. The most major of these being to explain the assignments that will span the entire course.

The first of these is a semester long mini-ethnography that will be carried out by groups of students. This is a group project designed not only to give the benefit of group, but more importantly to give the students an idea of the complexity of putting together an ethnography. In this assignment groups of about six students (or whatever number higher than four, as much less will sacrifice the quality of product within the time-span of a semester, will divide evenly for the class size) will be asked to pick an organization, either professional or social in nature, and spend a semester writing an ethnography of the chosen organization. Through the reading, *Unleashing the Untrained*, by James Meyer, and another major assignment of the course, the students should gain a fairly detailed understanding of what it would entail to write and ethnography. It is important to stress the idea that the entire group will not necessarily be working on the same aspect of the ethnography, as they should be as detailed as possible. A final element to this assignment is that each group should be responsible for presenting their mini-ethnography to the class as a whole at the end of the semester.

The merit of this assignment is threefold. First, and most obvious, is that it will give students a taste for what it means to work as an Anthropologist. By this I mean that the students will most likely have to (and probably should) try to do some participant observation, but this will be tempered by the willingness of the organization to allow the students to participate in their functions. To this end, and to ensure that the students don’t waste half of a the semester on an organization that is truly not willing to be studied, by the end of the first two weeks (or no later
than the end of the third week) each group should turn in a short ‘proposal’ saying which organization they have chosen to study. Included with this ‘proposal’ should be the signature of the manager or leader(s) of the group signifying that they understand that these students will essentially need to join the organization and take part in its activities in order to complete the assignment.

Second, this assignment will allow the students to gain a more complete understanding of what ‘culture’ is, at least the aspects of ‘culture’ that relate directly to the course. Through struggling to write up the culture of an organization the students should come to the realizations of the complexities of culture. This aspect of the assignment may take some direction from the instructor; and to this end, I suggest that the instructor meet with each group early in the semester, and periodically throughout, to make sure that the students are on the right track. The elements that should be included in a ‘good’ mini-ethnography (for this course) are a history of the organization, and a topical focus on the issues that will be covered throughout the course (namely power and authority within the organization, concept of a leader within the organization, and the different manifestations of power within the organization). To reach these goals the students will have to behave as Anthropologists both observing and collecting data from the subjects themselves on the issues. It is to be expected that within the mini-ethnographies themselves that the students make connections between what they have read in class, and what they have experienced in the ‘field.’ As they go through and try to write these different aspects of an organization’s ‘culture’ they will soon discover some of the finer and more important aspects of culture that might not have been readily apparent before. This exercise is aimed at achieving the learning objective of “gaining an understanding of what Cultural Anthropology is, and what Cultural Anthropologists do;” as well as, “leading students into thinking about and forming a definition of ‘culture.’”

Third, in a pedagogical sense this assignment is important to the class. It stresses both group work and public speaking as major components of the assignment, the merit of each do not
need to be discussed here, but are evident in not only the literature of education, but in the practices of the Jepson School and many other institutions and departments.

A second semester-long project the students will need to begin working on as individuals early in the semester is the "Ethnographic Comparison" project. This assignment entails the students each choosing a professional ethnography from the library or bookstore that they wish to work with throughout the semester§§. There are no limitations set on ethnographies that can be chosen, and in fact, the greater variety throughout a class the better the exercise will work. The students should have selected and summarized the ethnography they have chosen by the end of the first two weeks. This summary need be no longer than a page long, but should include the general idea(s) presented in the ethnography. It is unrealistic to expect the students to read their ethnography thoroughly as well as the very important material being covered in these first two weeks; so these first summaries should be more of a statement of selection that shows the students did more than pick off a self arbitrarily. If a student is having trouble finding or selecting an ethnography, as the instructor you could suggest the student look within a region of interest and pick an ethnography that covers a group within that region. Some reviews are available on the internet at http://www.ethnographic.com/ if further aid is needed.

It should be suggested to the students that they either buy a copy of their ethnography (considered one of their texts for the course) or, at very least, to secure with the library the exclusive use of the text for the entire semester, as they will need to return to these texts at the end of each subsequent section of the course. At the end of each section of the course the students will be expected to turn in a three-to-five page paper relating the material covered in that section to their specific ethnography. This exercise also has several purposes. First, it will allow the students to truly gain a fuller understanding of another culture. Through the analysis of an ethnography repeated several times over the semester the students may find central issues that

§§ Please see the appendix for a list of possible/suggested ethnographies for this exercise. It should be stressed that this list is by no means exhaustive and students are encouraged to seek a 'new' ethnography to use in this assignment.
they missed the first time around, which could cause them to change their view of their ethnography and the culture portrayed within. This actually introduces a central idea in the study of Cultural Anthropology, that of questioning assumptions and previously thought ideas (including one’s own). Through a survey of syllabi for Introduction to Cultural Anthropology courses posted on the internet one can see that this idea is a common one taught at this basic level. These syllabi ranging from the Anthropology Departments of the University of Richmond, the University of Florida, to Northern Arizona University include statements that stress the importance of challenging one’s own cultural boundaries in the search for an understanding of culture in general.

Second, through this repeated analysis the students should gain an appreciation for the concepts being taught. This exercise will lead to the realization of the learning objective “to introduce ethnography as a method of studying human behavior.”

The final assignment for this section of the course, and designed to be a capstone activity for this unit, is for the students to write a two-to-three page paper using what they have read in the section to form their own definition of ‘Culture.’ It is important to note that these definitions will be in flux throughout the semester and, for grading purposes, should be looked at in terms of whether the students included in their thinking the central ideas surrounding those concepts of ‘culture’ studied, as well as considered their definition of ‘leadership’ as part of the definition. This does not mean that a definition of ‘leadership’ must be reached in this writing, more that their definitions of ‘culture’ reflect the connecting leadership issues as discussed in class. The purpose of this assignment is to get the students thinking formally about ‘Culture’ as a concrete concept and not a buzzword or unidentifiable entity, and thus fulfilling one of the learning objectives of the course.

*** For a listing of syllabi posted on the internet please see http://www.anthrotech.com/resources/Categories/Education/courses.html.
The Readings

None of the above assignments or activities will have any impact without effective in-class discussion of the readings which the students are to be responsible for. The readings for this section were selected around the learning objectives for this section and as a basis for the course. The main idea of this section is to introduce Cultural Anthropology to the average Leadership Studies student who might not have had any exposure to the subject before. Within this, there are two major aspects to the articles that were chosen for this section. First, the articles were chosen for representing some of the more prominent ideas associated with Cultural Anthropology. Second, the articles providing different definitions of "Culture" were chosen because of their significance to Cultural Anthropology either individually or as representatives of a school of thought, thus giving the students a little history of the subject as well as thoughts on the topic. The following will outline some teaching notes on each of the articles chosen as to specific information that could be given to the students and will give some notes and conversation questions.

"Body Ritual Among the Nacirema" Horace Miner

This article, not printed in its entirety for the sake of time, is a spoof. It is intended to point out a number of things vital to the course, and important to Cultural Anthropology as a whole. What the author describes is a typical morning routine of a typical United States American ("Nacirema" = "American" spelled backwards) and some of the key topics surrounding this ritual. It is written in a style that takes the anthropological vocabulary to an extreme, the ridiculous.

This article would work wonderfully as a first day activity. If it were passed out after the general housekeeping chores (handing out syllabi, etc.) and read in class it would not only serve it's functional purposes, but as it is humorous, a good icebreaker as well. The points that should be made in association with this article are; first, that anything, if observed as ridiculous can be
conveyed as ridiculous. Second, that we need to step outside of our own culture when trying to examine another. This point is central to Cultural Anthropology as when studying another culture one must be aware of their own cultural bindings in order to examine the intricacies of another.

The Nacerima example is a pervasive and important example that is widely used in Cultural Anthropology courses, to the extent that it has courses devoted to it at several schools. There are several resources that may give ideas for different ways of attacking this article. A website devoted solely to the Nacerima and similar articles can be found at http://www.beadsland.com/nacirema/. After reading the article in class questions could be given in a deadpan manner as to make the students think that this is a very foreign culture group. Questions such as, "Describe the shrine of the Nacerima. Why do you think such a structure could be so pervasive in a culture?" Leading the students until the realization comes that they are in fact the Nacerima could be humorous for the instructor, and eye-opening for the students, which is the key to this article.

"What Do Anthropologists Do?"  

Sol Tax

This article serves the purpose of further helping introduce the new student to the core concepts of Cultural Anthropology, and what it is to be an anthropologist. The major points of this article that should be high lighted are: that the scope of Anthropology is all of human kind and that in focus it tends to fill in gaps, or round edges that other disciplines leave out; that the interests of Anthropologists are varied yet specialized for the individual in a limitless manner (for example: the study of leadership as a cultural phenomenon could easily become a specialization for an Anthropologist); and the importance of field work on the work of an anthropologist.

During a discussion of this article it might be appropriate for the instructor to introduce themselves through their work as it relates to the article. Through the explanation of one’s own field experience the professor could show how Sol Tax’s points are in fact real, as well as taking
a good opportunity to introduce one’s personal take on these issues and to explain one’s topical and geographic focus.

“Culture: Concepts and Phenomenon”  
Ward Goodenough

Just as Sol Tax’s article will serve as an introduction to Anthropology as a field and a profession, Goodenough’s article serves as an introduction to the concept of ‘culture,’ and the status of this concept in today’s age. This article was chosen partially because of its bluntness in showing the confusion over the word culture. Before discussing in depth the substance of this article a worthwhile activity might be to have several students use the word “culture” in a sentence so that the differences and ambiguities can be noted by the class. For this to be readily evident some follow up questions to the made up sentences might be necessary to point to the fact that most of the time we do not directly know, or better cannot define, what we mean when we refer to the culture of a person or peoples.

It is important before reviewing Goodenough’s statements on the basics of a concept of culture to note for the class that he is doing this from a post-modern, or phenomenological stance, and that there are opposing viewpoints to this. This distinction points to one of the central problems Goodenough has in setting a definition, and that is that it is very difficult in identifying and analyzing cultures to know which of the phenomena to separate and examine without stripping a culture of identity or drastically changing the basis for comparison.

With this in mind pulling the major points from his attempt at base-line unification should be a fairly simple task. The first characteristic he describes as being fairly agreed on is that ‘culture’ is made up of a learned set of expectation of both your own and others’ actions. The second characteristic Goodenough tries to separate out has to do with group identification, and in this statement he accounts for different group cultures within a larger society as an analogy of seeing one’s self in a larger group, which he calls, “propiospect.” “Operating culture” is how Goodenough describes our everyday actions that are so commonly thought to prescribe culture.
His fourth idea behind the concept of 'culture' denotes the concept of how a group chooses to behave itself. Goodenough seems to compare this “public culture” as being similar to the concept of “propiospect,” but for group life. His fifth cultural factor is that of a social hierarchy that will tend to exist between groups. And finally Goodenough refers to the overall ‘culture’ of a society which balances all of these factors on all levels and forms how complex human interaction will need to be.

Above is a rough summary of Goodenough’s argument. A discussion of this would need to begin with analysis on a personal level as to whether or not individual student agree or disagree with what he is saying. The argument, without any counterpoints might seem very logical. However, if the instructor was to point out some of the inconsistencies such as, “Why does he feel the need to repeat the concept of ‘propiospect’ for both individuals and groups in a society?” Questions like this aimed at pointing out the ambiguities may facilitate a discussion as well. It is important to note that this is only the first of several theories of culture that will be covered in the first two weeks, and that as the students learn more they will have more to discuss once they see different approaches to ‘culture.’ All the same this article should go well with the Tax article because it serves as a nice introduction to the problems in defining ‘Culture,’ and should start the thought process for the students.

“Anthropological Ancestors and Interpretation Theory” Robert Ulin

This chapter is the only, or one of few, non-primary sources. The intent was, originally, to only use primary sources as to avoid unnecessary analysis; but this chapter does a nice job of summarizing three very distinct and very separate points of view concerning a theory of ‘Culture.’ This chapter also gives the reader a good impression of the dynamic nature of the history of Culture Theory, as well as pointing out some of the faults in these early theories.

The first ethnographer covered in this chapter is Franz Boas, a figure, it should be noted, who was key in the shaping of American Anthropology. As for the aspect of educating about
Anthropology it is important to make note in reference to Boas many of the contribution to the discipline that he made. These contributions are: demonstrating the importance of field work, a tradition which continues even to his length of stay recommendation today; campaigning against racism, ethnocentrism, and the arguments made by the popular Social Darwinists; and emphasizing the critical aspect of Anthropology represented in the Nacerima exercise.

The most important aspect of Boas' work that should be highlighted in class is his idea of perception. Boas' theory of which even changed over time, as noted in the chapter. What began as being called "apperceptive processes," moved into 'cultural background to human perception,' which in turn became described as 'culture shaping (or framing) experience.' While these concepts make very good sense, where Boas runs into trouble is when he tries to explain these 'processes' or 'backgrounds' in terms of the historical events which may have shaped them. This is not to say that history ma not have an effect on 'Culture,' but that it is the only factor that troubled critics.

The second Anthropologist focused on in this chapter is Malinowski, who had a quite profound, if hypocritical, effect on the discipline. Unlike Boas, Malinowski was much less interested in explaining the 'why's' of a culture, but was more interested in seeing the world from the point of view of a native of another culture. This was hypocritical because his methods ran antithetical to those of Boas, and Malinowski tends to be increasingly ethnocentric in his interpretations. So why study him as a factor in the history of modern Anthropology? His impact on the methodology of Anthropology was as significant as the introduction of fieldwork. For Malinowski theory could not presuppose the experience, and should be formed out of data collecting. The school of thought Malinowski subscribed to is Structural-Functionalism, which says that cultural phenomena are equivalent to social facts and can be understood through the logic of science. This positivistic inductive method lead Malinowski to view Anthropology as a natural science, which eventually would lead to his critics debunking his ideas because he makes no attempt, despite valuing the idea, to truly understand the native perspective.
The third and final Anthropologist discussed in this chapter is E.E. Evans-Pritchard, a student of Malinowski's and probably the most famous of the Structural-Functionalist school. The major difference was in Evans-Pritchard's acceptance of theory as a vital part of gathering data. Evans-Pritchard's major contribution to the face of Anthropology was the introduction of language as the determinant factor of culture. From this he reintroduced the importance of authentic participant observation so that the nuances of the language could be grasped in order to fully gain an understanding of a subject. Evans-Pritchard gave Anthropology a very strict set of rules to follow while in the field to make it a successful venture.

In terms of teaching this chapter, this reading lends itself to in-class group work. The instructor should divide the class in thirds and have them spend ten minutes or so summarizing and listing the major points of one of the Anthropologists in the chapter. After each group presents to the class as a whole discussion should flow easily. At this point the critical part is that the student are independently doing a lot of compare and contrast with the theories of 'culture'—making sure to include the ideas from Goodenough as well. As a fair warning it is possible that the students might be feeling some frustration over the complexity of the issue, which is to be expected. However, they must understand that out of this confusion they will be forming their own ideas about 'culture,' and should be thinking ahead to doing that now instead of trying to process all of the theories at the end of the unit.

"The Integration of Culture"  
Ruth Benedict

The book from which this chapter is taken, Patterns of Culture, is probably one of the best selling Anthropology texts of all time. When it was first published in the 1930's it was immensely popular because it was written as much for the non-anthropologist as it was the Anthropologist. Because of this it was greatly criticized for being 'fluff' or non-substantive.

All the same it did have a profound effect on the field of Anthropology, introducing the idea of Gestalt (usually used in reference to psychology) as an explanation of 'culture.' With this
theory Benedict was able to assert that cultures cannot be separated parts from wholes, and must be studied as whole entities. The problems with this logic that Benedict encountered was that it allowed for her personal prejudices to come out in her writing, as she was led to put value statements on the societies she was studying.

An important element of Benedict’s theory of ‘culture’ that was not covered in this chapter that could be brought out in conversation is the element of the individual in the whole culture. A question based on the reading such as, “How would you imagine Benedict would account for the individual in her concept of ‘culture?’” would be good. The critical look at what was given trying to take it a step further in her logic would be a good exercise. The dichotomy to make sure is understood about Benedict is that she really does not account for the individual in the same logic she looks at the culture as a whole with. Unlike customs and other manifestations of ‘culture,’ the individual can stand alone in her view. This is because she draws a connection between ‘culture’ and ‘personality’ as analogous entities.

“Culture, Genuine and Spurious” Edward Sapir

Edward Sapir is best known for his theory of linguistics, which shaped modern linguistic theory more so than any other hypothesis. This hypothesis which Sapir published with his protégé Benjamin Whorf states that language transmits “culturally learned perceptions of existence.” While this would be good information for the students to know, the focus of this discussion should be on the reading, and thus his theory of ‘culture.’

Sapir first takes on the task of defining ‘culture’ as it is used. He points out that the ethnographer uses the term to mean the socially learned elements of life. For the common person and the “savage” alike however, “culture” refers to those habits which seem to be preserved by no other force than society itself, which is essentially the same—just in different words, the point being that while using different words both the ethnographer and the lay-person have that understanding of ‘culture.’ The second definition of ‘culture’ he offers is based not in habit, but
rather reaction and expectations of others (similar to one of Goodenough's points). Sapir's third
definition is by far the most complex. It starts by taking the essence of the first two definitions
and adds into it the concept of nationality and the "spirit" of civilization. His logic to add this
was that in today's age we are so deeply shaped and affected by the notion of a national society.

The major contribution that Sapir makes in his further discourse on the definitions of
'culture' is that he breaks away from value statements which had lead the Anthropologists before
him to ethnocentrism. Another contribution he makes in this discussion is that 'culture' is in
constant change being pushed and pulled as if in the currents of economics, disunity, and
personalities. Through these ideas he completely separates group culture from individual culture.
At this point a discussion of the importance of the distinction between the two would be in order.
Having the class think through a)what the difference is, and b)why that matters (because it will be
directly talked about in future units of the course) could only be beneficial and will aid in the
understanding of the Sapir chapter. The most important part of Sapir's 'culture' theory to note is
that communication is the transmitter of culture and not actions, although the language dictates
them themselves used around them.

"The impact of the Concept of Culture on the Concept of Man"  Clifford Geertz

Clifford Geertz, one the most noted of the modern Anthropologists, is most noted for his
discourse on the nature of ethnographic works and how they should be composed, as well as his
interpretive view of 'culture.' In the article that was included in this course he defines 'culture'
outright as the "totality of patterns," and the interpretation thereof. This is to say that people and
cultures can be defined and understood in the symbols and manifestations of individual
expression they use. One of his most noted ethnographic works concerns the Balinese traditional
and ritual of cock fighting. In this account he takes apart layer by layer, as his theory of how to
approach understanding 'Culture,' until he can draw conclusions about the society from the ritual
and symbols surrounding the tradition.
This idea is also carried over in his theory of how ethnographies should be written. This concept will need to be explained separately as it is not included in the chapter that was read for class. He calls this “Thick Description.” The concept behind it is that the ethnographer uses creativity to add the gloss to the description in an ethnography that allows for the reader and analyzer to understand the native point of view.

The discussion concerning Geertz should be aimed at first understanding the chapter assigned, then some examples hopefully drawing from the students ethnographies (assuming someone has picked one and found one anecdote that could be used in a sample analysis of a culture). Beyond that this discussion should be used as a wrap-up for the discussion of ‘culture.’ The students should be leaving the class on Geertz with not only ideas on Geertz and his definition of culture, but also how this definition relates to some of the other definitions that were covered in the first unit. By the end of class there should be the feeling that the students are ready, whether or not they know what are going to say, to go back and write a personal definition of ‘culture’ that they can use as a working model throughout the semester.

"Unleashing the Untrained"  

James Meyer

This final article in this unit is a humorous account of one professors experience in having a class do mini-ethnographies. The discussion of this article should be done in the groups that the class is going to be working in for their mini-ethnography project. To facilitate this discussion each group should discuss individually what they saw as the authors major warnings about students doing ethnography, and what they plan to do to combat these warnings. This discussion should allow the instructor to get a feel for whether the class is on the right track to getting started on the project. This will also allow for you to add any advice (such as, ‘start yesterday’) that will help in the completion of the project in not only a timely, but a total manner as well.
This ends the first unit of the course. On the last day of class for the unit, or possibly the first day of the next unit, the students should have turned in their reflection papers on a definition of 'culture,' have picked and been approved to study an organization, and have picked an ethnography to use for the rest of the semester. Upon the completion of this unit the first learning objective of the course should either have been met, or in the works. From the Sol Tax article and the combined views of ethnographic writing students will have gained an understanding of what topics Cultural Anthropology aims to discuss, and what it is to be an anthropologist. Through the culture theories and the 'definition of culture' writing assignment an appreciation for the depth of the term 'culture' will be gained as well as an attempt at solving the question of what 'culture' is attempted. Throughout the teaching of this section the instructor needs to bring in leadership related questions so as to ground the discussion of 'culture' in the topical focus of leadership. With these objectives met the class will be off to a good start to examine more in-depth the issues that surround both fields.
UNIT TWO: POWER AND AUTHORITY

Readings:
1) "Development of Political Anthropology" Ted C. Lewellen Political Anthropology Bergin and Garvey 1992 ppg:7-19
6) "A Note on the Concept of Authority" R.F. Khan Leadership and Authority University of Malaya Press 1968 ppg:6-16
8) "Leadership as a Power Phenomenon" Kenneth Janda Political Leadership The Free Press 1972 ppg:57-66

ASSINGMENTS:
1) Ethnographic Comparison of chosen ethnography to information contained in unit
2) Informal check up on progress with mini-ethnography
Learning Objectives:

• To explore the different meanings and manifestations of ‘Power and Authority’ and relate these ideas to those of ‘leadership’ and ‘culture.’
• To further link the fields of Leadership Studies and Cultural Anthropology.
• To investigate these definitions through ethnographic examples.

REVIEW OF READINGS AND TEACHING NOTES:

This second section of the course, entitled “Power and Authority,” is to continue the thought process on Leadership and Cultural Anthropology related issues in combination. ‘Power and Authority’ as a theme, and individually, have played vital roles in the development of both disciplines, as shown in the literature review of this project. The focus of this part of the course is to intensify the thought on these central issues of the human experience. The articles contained in this division of the course fall easily into three divisions; an introduction to power (readings 1-5), an introduction to authority (readings 6-10), and a look at power in group settings (readings 11-13). These themes should alloy the students to begin thinking about ‘power and authority’ in a more in depth manner.

Assignments for Unit Two

The housekeeping inventory for the beginning of this section is far less rigorous than that of the first unit. At this point, reminders are more in order than anything else. The first of which is to remind the students that at the end of the unit they will be expected to analyze the ethnography that they chose to work with for the semester (and just summarized) in terms of what they are learning in this section of the course. Perhaps throughout the course, as the readings are dealt with, the instructor might ask students to volunteer any connections they may be making between the readings and their ethnographies. This would allow students to share their individual work in class. The other piece of housekeeping is that students need to be reminded of the mini-ethnography that they are to be working on throughout the semester. A couple of means of doing giving this reminder would be to either ask the groups to give a status report to the class (another
way of bringing their individual work into the class), or to ask each group to enter a written status report to the instructor. Either way, the groups would have to look at where they stand and evaluate their performance.

Throughout this and subsequent sections the students should be reminded of their definitions of culture, and to constantly be rethinking them in terms of the different ideas being thrown at them. Questions that need to be brought to the table for the students might include such ideas as; “Do the definitions include an idea of power?,” “Do they need to?,” “Can authority be incorporated into a definition of culture?” These questions are designed to and should lead the students into thinking about ‘power and authority’ and possibly lead them into defining these terms as well.

**The Readings**

There is a great of research on this topic, so much that it can, and does, fill up entire courses. The arguments extend into practically all fields of the social sciences. In deciding how to structure this section of the course I toyed with the idea of tracing the history of thought on the subject, but realized, quickly, that this would be a more daunting task than possible (at least if I wanted to discuss other issues in the course). Subsequently, the readings for the divisions have the basic structure of introductory readings followed by ethnographic examples covering each sub-topic. An analysis of this sort should bring out the major themes and prepare the students to easily do similar ethnographic analysis of their chosen work as a capstone for the unit.

"The Development of Political Anthropology"  
Ted C. Lewellen

This chapter serves as a further introduction into the field of Cultural Anthropology and one more of its foci. The article is a brief theoretical history of the sub-discipline and would be a nice resource for students if they should have any questions as to where to look for further readings on a variety of issues. An added bonus to using this article at the Jepson School of Leadership Studies is that Dr. Lewellen teaches in the Anthropology Department at the University
of Richmond. Asking him to be a guest to teach this article and relate it to the theme of ‘power’ may be an enriching experience. However, if this were not possible, to simply gloss over the article as an introduction into a way a classifying what it is being studied would be acceptable as well.

"The Nature of Power"  

Kenneth Boulding

This article is really where the meat of the section begins. It is a set of basic definitions of ‘power’ offered by a Political Scientist and should be taken in combination with the next article written by an Anthropologist also defining ‘power’. The first section of the chapter deals with ‘power’ as a word in need of definition. In this Boulding looks at the different way ‘power’ has been defined. Through all of this he ends up saying that ‘power’ is the ability of an individual to get what they want. This, like every other aspect and definition in this course, should not be taken without discussion, although, bear in mind that a discussion on this matter could very easily take up the majority of a class period. A good discussion question for this issue would be to ask not only if the students agree with the statement, but also ask what they see in their ethnographies that either concurs of varies from this definition.

The article goes on to discuss many other elements and types of power. Some items of particular note for the class include the distinction between positive and negative power, the perception of power, and the ideas of exchange and social power. All of these ideas will be addressed later in the semester in one form or another, either within this unit or in others.

Personal experience may be the better way to draw out conversation on this article.

The final section of this article raises questions that the Jepson School of Leadership studies doesn’t tend to like very much, these are the questions of biological factors of power. In discussing this idea it is important to note that while this is a part of Boulding’s argument of a source of power, it is not the only one. However, in examining the idea of leadership, and
consequently the issue of leaders being born vs. made, this could prove to be an important
discussion when referring to concepts of succession.

"Power in Human Societies: A Synthesis" Richard N. Adams

This article also attempts to tackle the issue of ‘power’ in a grander sense. The specific
aim of the article is to portray a theory of ‘power’ as a conceptual framework that could be
applied cross culturally. Adams traces several forms and manifestations of ‘power’ before getting
to his ideas; however, these ideas (for the purposes of this class) should not be brushed aside as
build up for the main argument. Instead, for this class some emphasis needs to be placed on each
of the ideas Adams raises as theories of ‘power.’ To help the students relate to this idea the
instructor might remind them of the process they went through in trying to write a theory of
leadership for the History and Theories of Leadership Class (LDSP 300 at the University of
Richmond). If this course is being used outside of the Jepson School, a tangible example would
be to ask students to share some of the stumbling blocks they encountered in trying to define
‘culture’ earlier. This should give them the idea that the later ideas presented are very contestable
and, while they might be applied in some places, it does not make it a perfect and complete
theory.

Some points to highlight are Adams descriptions of independent and dependant power.
Although, as a course note, his notion of, “The Creation of Powerlessness,” might be a better
point to highlight for a class period (or fraction thereof). This is because the final section of the
course will concern what happens in large-scale conflicts (i.e. power clashes such as the
introduction of Western ideas on local cultures). This point may be directly applicable to the
students in their analyses of their ethnographic texts as well. This concept is vital to the analysis
of some ethnographies in which encounter with other cultures or ‘power-play’ is highly evident,
as it is a common feature of take over situations.
Adams’ construction of ‘power’ would also be an interesting point to discuss in class. Discussion questions for this section might first center on whether or not the students agree with the “control vs. out-of-control” concept of power definition. From there the discussion should move into trying to apply the theory to the life of a student. The main point to emphasize out of this part of the article his Adams’ definition of ‘power,’ which appears on page 395 in the paragraph directly before the beginning of the section entitled “The Creation of Powerlessness.” Should the question be raised about some of the specific examples Adams uses in this chapter, the majority of the referent articles can be found in the book *The Anthropology of Power*.

“Power and Leadership”

*Bernard Bass*

This reading comes from Bass’ well-known *Bass and Stogill’s Handbook for Leadership*, and should be introduced in this context. The book is intended to aid business and professional managers in being better at what they do. While, many of the ideas that come from the work are scholarly in nature, the book was intended more as a reference manual or training guide than it was for research. Also, the notions are fairly Western in their concept. To get past all of this fairly quickly the instructor could, either make a simple disclaimer and decide to use the material lightly, or a discussion on the ability to apply the ideas to what students have read of other cultures might be an easy way to work through this.

This article would best be taught in conjunction with the next reading, “*Tzeltal Conceptions of Power.*” I will discuss the next reading more depth following the discussion of this selection. However, because of the somewhat opposing information it will probably be shown that Western conceptions of ‘power’ (or anything really) don’t and shouldn’t always apply elsewhere.

In this work Bass outlines in detail some of the forms of social power as they would relate to the work of a leader. These definitions include a very nice distinction between ‘power’ and ‘influence,’ which should be included, lightly, in any discussion of the passage. Later, Bass
outlines some sources of power. His sources include an individual's personal power (which, it should be noted, is heavily weighed down by Western culture), and titular power. This is an overly simplified look at what he is saying; however, it does point to some of the flaws. In the discussion of this article and any others that the instructor wishes to bring in, questions could be raised about divine right, or power based on lineage as viable forms of power.

"Tzeltal Conceptions of Power"  

Brian Stross

As noted above, the Bass article could be taught very effectively with the addition of this piece. Also, this account will make a nice capstone to this division of the unit as many of the ideas brought to light could are either expressed or can be dealt with through this reading. The background given by Stross in the reading describes the Tzeltal as descendants of the Maya indigenous group who live in the southern central highlands of Mexico.

Stross' version goes not contrary to what Bass was saying, but rather in a different line of thought; that of 'power' being seen metaphorically. One of the main points Stross brings to light in this article is that 'heat' is the main idea behind power for these people. From this he goes on to analyze further the structures set up in a similar fashion as described in the hierarchical theory of 'power' presented earlier.

After discussion of the content of this reading in terms of the other covered in this part of the unit the instructor should make an effort to tie together the selections in whatever manner seems appropriate at the time. For some classes this may mean analyzing our own culture in terms of power metaphors (beware of the overly masculinist points of view as they may not be as accurate as people would want to believe). Another good summation exercise might be to have students publicly think through, as a class, a definition of power. This may lead to the answering (or partial answering) of whether a 'power' concepts needs to be included as part of a definition of culture. An activity you could offer, or challenge, students with would be to revise their
definitions of 'culture' to take into account what was studied in these week, although this might be a better activity to save until the end of the unit.

The next division of this unit focuses on 'authority' and how it relates to 'power.' The instructor may note that some students may be more familiar with the term ‘legitimacy’ to have the same meaning as ‘authority,’ and for our purposes they should be somewhat synonymous. The section is organized in a similar fashion; there are a couple of introductory readings that introduce concepts, followed by an ethnographic piece that shows some angles discussed in the introductory selections.

"A Note on the Concept of Authority"  
R.F. Khan

As one will note this selection is not only written by a non-Westerner, but it is written in the pre-Leadership Studies academic era. However, this writing does an incredible job of introducing the vocabulary associated with ‘authority’ in terms that can be easily related to Leadership such as “charismatic authority,” and even a statement about the Machiavellian dichotomy between ‘power’ and ‘authority’ as they relate to obedience.

The article raises many questions about the right to ‘power.’ Questions that often go over looked, or are glossed over too easily. Questions such as, “Are leaders born or made?” come to mind through this article. As an introduction to this portion of the course asking the students to discuss this very question might be a worthwhile exercise. This may entail the instructor playing the role of the devil's advocate in order to bring out sides unseen of the issue from their own knowledge. The instructor may site examples such as the Dalai Lama, and others who gain their ‘power and authority’ just by being born. A discussion of this nature should be sure to include the ideas presented in the later part of the reading in which the author defines concepts such as 'right' and 'entitlement.' As a final note the class could discuss the author's final word on the subject; which is to say that he separates ‘power’ from ‘authority’ as being two different entities.
Janda's 1972 piece could be seen as well before its time judging by many of the ideas presented within. The work presents ideas and definitions of 'power' in a different light. Instead of presenting the dichotomy as 'power and authority,' Janda seems to prefer the dichotomy as 'authority and power.' The first section of this chapter I chose to include entitled Leadership as a Power Phenomenon, was included to give the reader a better idea of where the author is coming from in the following sections. He first provides several variations of the term 'power' which could be discussed in terms of the last division of the unit; however, have no vital point surrounding the discussion of this article.

The vital part of this selection, as far as the class should be concerned is the following section of the chapter Legitimacy as a Power Base and the Study of Leadership. The focus in this section is as defining 'legitimacy' (née 'authority') as one of the defining aspects of 'leadership.' This argument goes contrary to that which was presented in Khan's article. While Khan (reluctantly) admitted that the two are related, he refused to try to define one term by the other. Janda, on the other hand, states that leadership relies on some 'authority' that can come from a variety of sources (including cultural sources).

This last point is one that the class could easily get hung up on, and might be a good topic for consideration. It would be easy for a student to say something to the effect of, 'leadership' doesn't rest on titles and official things of the sort. To respond to this the instructor could point out the citation Janda includes on the bottom of page 59. In it French and Raven outline three definitions of legitimate power as being "cultural values," "acceptance of the social structure," and "designation by a [currently] legitimate agent."

Any one of these alone could make for an interesting discussion, however possibly a little lengthy for the class. Instead, the instructor could discuss each individually, calling on students for quick and easy examples for each legitimizing factor. As further discussion of the article the instructor could try a number of approaches. The first that comes to mind is to compare and
contrast the ideas presented in this article and the preceding and look for conclusion concerning ‘authority.’ The instructor could also opt to discuss such ideas as revolution and uprisings as a form of ‘culturally legitimate’ leadership, although that will be covered in more depth in the last section of the course.

Some last points on this reading: The three legitimizing factors would all be excellent factors to be brought up in the students’ ethnographic analyses. The article contains much information on group leadership and how the factors react in those situations. These points should be covered, or at least remembered for the next section on ‘power’ in groups.

“Authority, Responsibility, and Leadership”           Bernard Bass

This source should not be relied on too heavily as academic for the reasons described when it was used earlier in this section; however, it does contain a lot of good material. This reading would be nice as a capstone to tie together the two diverging points brought to the table by adding more concrete definitions to the terms rather than adding to the confusion. These definitions are, of course, debatable: but they tend to be fairly harmless although, like their counterparts about ‘power’ they tend to be Western.

From a “for and about leadership’ angle, the instructor could heavily emphasize the passage that begins on page 306 entitled, Authority Depends on Superiors and Subordinates. Even if one is not looking to promote the current Western conception of leadership as a relationship, the section is a nice one to highlight, especially in this discussion of ‘authority.’ The aspects of this argument that could add nicely to the discussion would be to discuss the idea from the standpoint of both a leader looking for authority (i.e. a manager who is beginning to work in a new office), and of the follower(s) granting authority (i.e. teachers looking for a balance between being told what to do and having professional freedom).

Here the terms “discretionary” and “non-discretionary,” leadership could be discussed in terms of whether the author better could have said ‘authority’ in the place of leadership. The
nature of the discussions, while having unifying elements, is to continue the process of re-examination of the students’ definitions of culture (formally), and their concepts of leadership (informally). It may be noted that Bass does not include the ‘cultural’ factors to legitimacy. A discussion of this exclusion would be fitting here to take a look at the image of Corporate America. (If one of the students has chosen for their Ethnographic comparison project a work that discussed Corporate America it would be most advantageous to use this student’s knowledge in this discussion.)

"The Yura: Social Order and the Kuraqkuna" and "The Symbolic World of the Kuraqkuna: The Staff of Authority" Roger Rasnake

The Yura, or at least this aspect of Yura life, present us with a nice ethnographic example in which the issues presented around the concept of ‘authority’ can be discussed along with some new ideas. The first part of this reading gives a description of the Yura with a fair amount of detail. It was provided as a reading in the course for a number of reasons. The first of these is that it provides some background of the Yura, their surroundings, and a basic mode of living that should put the second part of the reading into context. This element leads to the second reason the article was provided. Anthropologists, often refer to this background, or contexts, as the ‘ecology’ of a people. Because many Anthropologists study many different ideas at many different times, and one never knows the level of information a reader has received this kind of a contextualization is often included in a major work. This is important because it is an element that the students might wish (and should be encouraged) to include in their own mini-ethnography. As mentioned in the introductory bit of this unit, this would provide an easy segue for the instructor to check up on the groups of students preparing these ethnographies to make sure all is well and that they are on-track to complete the project.

The chapter entitles The Symbolic World of the Kuraqkuna focuses mainly on how the author is translating and interpreting the symbols surrounding the leadership and authority issue
of the Yura. However, in the use of this chapter, the focus should be slightly different. (Note: a quick discussion of the methods of interpretation may be warranted here for the purposes of letting mini-ethnographers in on one method for looking into the symbolic; however, unless there is a major symbol within the organization they are studying they probably won't need to worry too much about Symbolic Anthropology for this assignment.) This chapter should be used to discuss formal (a.k.a. titular) and symbolic authority as they relate to each other and to leadership.

To begin discussion of the chapter the instructor should have the students quickly review the final section of the piece (beginning on page 229). From this description it is very questionable why anybody would want the Kuraqkuna, especially the Yura. Rasnake seems to imply that the symbols attached to the staff go against some of their primary modes of behavior. I think it would be a good use of the chapter and its preceding reading to compare the two. The simplest way to do this would be to simply chart it on the board and write the given characteristics of each. The particular sections you might want to have the students use as a reference about the ecology begin on pages 33, 36, and 40. The majority of the second article should be seen as a resource for this discussion. By my read the two will, or should, be different; in which case a discussion of how differing symbols and actualities can co-exist and do even in our society. However, as I have been wrong before, and every set of people will take a different perspective on the readings, a class may find that the two are more similar than I thought.

The discussion of this chapter is meant to be a capstone to this section of the unit, so it is vital that the instructor be sure to, while raising deeper ones, answer any questions that students may have on the general topic of ‘authority.’ There are plenty of terms that have been brought into the discussion that may need a little more explanation. However, a better use of this article would not only recap the discussion of ‘authority,’ but would also incorporate a discussion of how the subject relates to power. Once again, you may challenge students to keep rethinking their definitions of ‘culture’ and to remind them that it should be a constant process.
The final element to the discussion of ‘power and authority’ as it appears in groups. I should note that this part of the topic may seem a little cursory and not covered in full depth. I also cannot fully claim that this was intentional. However, seeing as how this course is designed for the Jepson School of Leadership Studies, where students are required to take a course on group behavior (Leading Groups, LDSP 351) many of the issues would be taken in repetition. Also, the focus is not to define ‘power and authority’ in groups, but rather to differentiate this between ‘power and authority’ in general. This view also could be seen as a look at the issue from the larger, non-leader perspective, as the accounts do take as part of their telling the group dynamics, not just leader-follower relations.

This section of the unit is a little shorter than the others as to allow a little flexibility in scheduling as well as to serve a curricular purpose. This purpose is that the section is designed to be more reflexive than its predecessors. In discussing the readings the focus should be more of comparing and contrasting the information to what was read in the first two parts of the unit.

"The Dynamics of organizational Power"  
Kenneth Boulding

This chapter from Boulding’s book, Three Faces of Power, provides an excellent introduction to many facets of group dynamics, group-leader relations, and ‘power and authority’ within groups (which should be the focus). In the excerpt the author looks at the issue from many angles, and makes many key differentiations. Specifically, the reading could be used to clearly illustrate ‘power’ on a number of different levels ranging from national to small-group.

An interesting question to begin discussion of this excerpt would be to ask where ‘culture’ as a unit of people fits into Boulding’s matrix. This answer should be highly debatable because it will entirely depend on an individual’s view of culture as to whether ‘power’ is a meta-structure within it or a sub-category associated with and defined by it. Personally, I would see ‘power’ in a cultural light as being larger than exists on what the author describes as a national level. I feel this way because I see ‘cultures’ as being very loosely connected (more so than it
may seem to some) and thus there being very little power play, but more setting the rules for play that might occur within. The instructor might start the discussion by presenting this view (or even better their own) and asking for opinions.

Another area for discussion would be to ask the students, even more generally, if they think what Boulding is saying too culturally limited to the U.S. American political culture. The instructor could ask the students to either apply or show that it can't be applied to the short ethnographic pieces that have been read in class. This should provide an introduction to the differences between group and individual manifestations of 'power and authority.'

This is the only introductory article on this subject, so the instructor is urged to spend as much time as necessary to draw out any conclusion that might come of the discussion. However, following this article are two readings that touch on issues associated with groups and 'power and authority' relations within them. These readings could be taken either together or individually depending on the instructor. I would suggest together as they contain somewhat contradictory yet similar points of view that would make the distinction even more clear.

“Irrational Leadership in Formal Organizations”

“Socio-political Power and Sworn Brother Groups in Chinese Society: A Taiwanese Case”

Eric Josephson

Bernard Gallin and Rita Gallin

These two articles present two situations in which 'power and authority' in groups can be examined. The first, *Irrational Leadership in Formal Organizations*, looks at a breakdown of leadership structure in a business atmosphere, and examines why it occurred. This account is not an ethnography, and is only quasi-ethnographic at best; however, it does provide a practical example that shows the business being looked at as a culture. The breakdown described is one in which subordinates did not respond well to the style of directive leadership being used. A quick discussion analysis of the description would try to see what factors would lead to the break down. Asking the students to look back on the three legitimizing factors discussed earlier and pulling
out why authority was not achieved would be a worthwhile method for teaching this selection. It might be noted that this article was originally published in the 1950’s; however, I feel that the example is still useable and applicable to the course and in today’s world.

The second reading here is one that describes a form or group power and group authority found in Taiwan. There is much to discuss within this description that deals with the topics discussed in this unit. First, the formation and metaphors of these groups are interesting to discuss. The class might look at how the groups are formed, and discuss why the word “brotherhood” is associated with the groups. Dialogue about this should center on what it means that the members swear themselves as brothers. What does that say about other cultural elements? About the groups themselves? About the authority that exists within the groups between members? How does this affect how they treat outsiders? While there is not as much information about how the group reacts to outsiders a discourse on what their place in society could follow here, as well as an analysis of where from the brotherhoods get the authority to act in this role. Together the articles show both a positive and negative example of groups in progress and how ‘power and authority’ affect each. These readings should be used as review for the unit, so the more relationships between these and other examples shown in class the better.

This concludes this unit on ‘power and authority.’ The instructor should remember for the last session(s) of class that the students will need to be working on their Ethnographic Comparison papers as related to this topic. A class or two before this assignment is due the instructor should make sure that all of the students are on the right track with this and that there are no significant problems with the ideas presented in the unit. This unit has presented an equally-weighted-between-the-fields look at the concepts of both ‘power,’ ‘authority,’ and how the two might change in different relationships. The learning objectives, when met, will have furthered the combination of Leadership Studies ad Cultural Anthropology in such a fashion that raises questions about both and will have required much thought and discussion to be able to fully
apply them elsewhere (i.e. the Ethnographic Comparison papers for this section). Furthermore, these concepts will be looked at through many different examples that will not only illuminate different aspects of the concepts, but will allow students to see a method of interpretation when it comes to ethnographic writings.
UNIT THREE: CHANGE

READINGS:
1) “Conceptualizing the Role of Culture in Political Change” Myron Aronoff Political Anthropology Vol. 2 Transaction Books 1983 ppg:1-18
2) “Leaders and Followers are the People in This Relationship” Joseph Rost The Leader’s Companion The Free Press 1995 ppg:189-192
3) “In Praise of Followers” Robert Kelley ibid. ppg:193-204
4) “Cultural Roots” Benedict Anderson Imagined Communities Verso 1995 ppg:9-36
5) “Battling Guerrillas and Swatting Gadflies” J. Weatherford Tribes on the Hill Bergin and Garvey 1985 ppg:228-253
12) “Ritual and Revolution in Iran” Mary Hegland Political Anthropology Vol. 2 Transaction Books 1983 ppg:75-100

ASSIGNMENTS:
1) Ethnographic Comparison of chosen ethnography to information contained in unit.
2) Informal check up on progress with mini-ethnography.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
• To explore ‘change’ as it relates to the concepts of ‘leadership’ and ‘culture’
• To investigate these definitions through ethnographic examples
REVIEW OF READINGS AND TEACHING NOTES:

This third and final section, "Change," is the outcome of a desire to find a way to introduce other important ideas as well as to tie together some of the ideas already introduced in this course. 'Change' as a theme has played a role in the study of both fields. Reflected in the literature and courses on change, social movements, and volunteer/community movements being explored by leadership scholars, as well as in Anthropology by works studying chiefs and societies faced with the modern world. While any of these topics could be considered individually, as a unit they work together nicely to form a unit that brings in issues of 'power,' 'authority,' 'culture,' and are designed to make students question their original definitions of 'culture,' as well as some common assumptions they may hold about development. The articles in this section can be broken in three sub-units. First, a look at followers in the equation (readings 2-5); followed by a look at the effects of the modern world (readings 6-9), and concluding with an examination of resistance (readings 10-12). Included is an introductory article that will help to show the pieces of the process being examined by this section and ending with a look at a form of society very different from what is known by most U.S.-American students that will help to wrap up the ideas contained within.

Assignments for Unit Three

Like unit two, the housekeeping tasks for this unit are few but important. Again, a status check on the mini-ethnography assignment should occur. At this point the assignment should be well under way, as the students will have only a few weeks to complete and present their findings. Asking for voluntary connections to how the organization they are studying deals(t) with change would be helpful to bring the concepts back into the students' lives and make them more applicable and practical.

Beyond this, the only other assignment is to remind the students that they will be expected to complete the ethnographic comparison for this unit of the course, comparing the ethnography they chose to the material presented within. The difference that will need to be
noted is that there is far less theory being presented in this section than in the one previous to this. In their comparisons students will be expected to comment on the aspect of followership, the forms of change present in their ethnographies, as well as the forms of resistance described. Each student will need to address each of these issue, or the absence thereof, in order to be successful in this final analysis of their ethnographies. Perhaps, the professor might ask students to add an extra section to this comparison paper describing how this fits together with the previous paper on ‘power and authority’ in order to tie the exercises together.

As considered in the previous unit the issues of how this section influences the definitions of culture need to be raised again. Some discussion questions to this end would include; “Do the definitions of culture include the concept of followership?,” “Do they take into account the idea of change/ resistance?,” “Is there an acceptable mode of resistance that needs to be a part of any definition of culture?” Once again these questions should lead the students to consider areas of culture they may not have included in their definitions originally.

The Readings

Each of the subtopics contained in this unit could easily fill, at very least, and entire section. However, together they form a more cohesive and complete set of ideas than could be achieved individually. Similar to the ideas in the previous unit, these issues are being considered by many fields in the social sciences and have far reaching effects into the practical aspects such as development, international business, and long term conflict resolution. Unlike the sub-units of the previous section, these do not flow quite as easily, however, they do fit together in the end. A teaching tactic that is suggested would be to just plow through them not necessarily connecting them at the time of shift, but allowing the ideas to gel together by the end so that in the end they will fit in the analysis of the last cases.

The readings chosen for this section represent the major works published that have taken steps toward the combination of Leadership Studies and Cultural Anthropology. Included in the readings are selection that use ethnography as a means of studying people (Everyday Forms of
and combine the findings with Political Science and Leadership Studies formally to produce a unique set of conclusions. These readings, and this unit of the course should be used to fully exemplify this tenant of this project.

"Conceptualizing the Role of Culture in Political Change"  
Myron J. Aronoff

This article provides an excellent introduction to this section of this course in that it introduces the general theme of change and ties it directly to some of the ideas of culture that have already been discussed. While this article is aimed at political change, the slant that the professor will need to put on the teaching of this reading is that it applies to all forms of change, not just political. At very least, this point should be debated, if not just claimed outright. Aronoff’s definition of how culture fits into social/political change appears on page 7 of the reading, and essentially says that change will occur as needed and appropriated by the way a culture thinks about its institutions. Aronoff puts this in terms of openness to change based on how a political system is evaluated (rationally vs. immutable) to see how likely change is to occur. These points are highly debatable, as noted by the author with the inclusion of a critique of his own argument in the reading, and touch the issues covered in all of the previous sections. This article deserves a fair amount of discussion as it does cover a fair amount of previous discussion, if an entire class period is available for discussion of this reading, it is suggested that opportunity be taken.

"Leaders and Followers are the People in this Relationship"  
Joseph Rost

This article introduces the importance of followers in thinking about leadership. The main point Rost is making in this short reading is that it is impossible to have leaders without having followers. Another important idea Rost raises is that the relationship of leadership is just that. This article should be taught in conjunction with the reading by Kelley, who argues that the entire process is determined by the followers rather than the leaders.
The major distinction that Rost brings to light is that follower is often seen as a passive player—and that this is not only not true, but needs to change. This topic could be discussed in terms of the students ethnographies, finding examples of active followers—this may take an element of interpretation as many writers will still portray followers as passive, but asking the students to question a description may be in order for this case. This is important on a number of levels. First, in leadership education, it reinforces this idea, which is central in modern leadership theory. Second, it will add this as an important aspect to be covered in the students mini-ethnographies as well.

“In Praise of Followers”  
Robert Kelley

This reading is one of the founding pieces of thought that incorporate followers into a theory of leadership. Kelley even gives a theory of followers in this article that includes model of follower types and their respective effectiveness. This reading is very straight-forward, and in with the Rost reading gives a fairly in depth look at why followers are important in the leadership relationship. This discussion will have to be pushed into the anthropological spectrum as very few cases offer a direct analysis of the followers in a culture situation. Focusing on the leadership perspective will not draw away from the sub-unit as it will be brought together with an anthropological example later; however, as mentioned above, the professor might take this opportunity to allow the students to share how the ethnography they are analyzing may fit into this discussion. This article is aimed at U.S.-American business culture, evidenced by the use of terms such as, “Yes-people” and the like, so the instructor will have to stretch the concept to fit the cultural scale.

“Cultural Roots”  
Benedict Anderson

This chapter from Anderson’s book, Imagined Communities is one of the most important books in looking at culture on a large scale as a part of individual and national identity. This
chapter notes, in an ethno-historic fashion, some of the ways in which 'culture' is defined and how it can be seen as allegiance to one set of values or another. While Anderson does not explicitly state it in the chapter, this is a look at followers in various culture groups. This approach looks at the symbols which both allow for the rise of and the downfall of two systems which people have given-authority-to in the past (and present), namely religious institutions and dynastic regimes.

The author's look at the ways in which people have been won over by differing institutions all comes back to some basic assumptions they hold. The example that Anderson gives is that of time orientation. He shows how because of a certain series of events a person (possible renowned in today's day) could be bastardized in their own time. In terms of the discussion of followers this article almost gives a followers' perspective. For the discussion the instructor could either turn to the next article and examine which symbols are being given allegiance, or could reflect on one of the past examples. The example of the Kuraqkuna from the section on authority would be a good case to reflect on in this case. What the class would need to examine is the behavior of the followers described in the chapter. This should make the point that leadership is determined by culture/ followers very clear. It could almost be said that culture and followership are virtually synonymous in this case. A debate along these lines would be interesting and valuable to the course.

"Battling Guerrillas and Swatting Gadflies" J. Weatherford

This final article for this sub-section returns us to the line of thought that produced the piece about the Nacerima. Weatherford, a political anthropologist, ahfs taken to studying the United States Congress as a subject and, in this chapter, compares the rules of 'warfare' to those associated with the Yanomamo of Brazil. While the example he makes is a slight stretch, the point still comes across that there are certain rules by which people can show their affinities, and/or rebel against others that determine how followers can follow.
Weatherford first draws the comparison and then shows his examples in the form of tactics different congressional groups have used to go against the norm. Specifically he cites a Jesse Helms' action that forced a vote along party lines and 'guerrilla' tactics of some lobbying organizations. He uses these examples to specifically describe some of the existing 'rules' of congress, but the reading can be used in a quite different way. First, it should be noted that this is an excellent of cultural comparison, and that Weatherford does a good job of relating a part of U.S.-American culture to foreign cultures. Second, this effectively demonstrates the point that followers will be able to decide (if not, control) not only how leaders will need to react, but some of the rules themselves.

These first few articles may seem a little more disjointed than readings in previous sections, this is not the case. These selections can be connected under the flag of 'change.' In this sun-unit, while 'change' has not been addressed directly yet, this is the time to do just that. Through looking at the role of followers in the change process from the perspectives of both Leadership Studies and Political Anthropology the point becomes very clear that followers decide the change process. This trend is one area of study that could benefit from the combined study of these two fields.

"Poor Man, Rich Man, Big Man, Chief"  

Marshall Sahlins

This article begins the second look at 'change' that this course will take. The vantage point that we will take this time is to examine changes that are occurring as the world changes with and around traditional cultures. The sub-unit will begin with an in-depth examination of the transitions one set of traditional peoples have undergone, and will end with a discussion of global culture and 'cosmopolitanism.' The important points to remember to bring into these discussions are the ideas discussed previously in talking about followers, questioning where the impetus for change is coming from in these cases, and what, if anything, needs to be done about it.
Marshall Sahlins is one of the most eminent anthropologists in the world today, having published works mainly on the Southern Pacific, but reaching into the philosophical element backing Cultural Anthropology as well. In this article, Sahlins takes a look at some of the different ways in which the concept of ‘leader’ is defined in the Polynesian and Melanesian island societies. More than just looking at leaders, though, the author gives a description of ways in which tribes, or units of people, have organized themselves, and the relative importance of this. He traces the ways in which leaders are referred to and finds that many, in these cultures, have to do with their holdings or historical performance. An interesting question to pose to the class would be to ask for the differences, beyond semantics, between the ways the Melanesians refer to and decide leaders and the ways this is done in the United States.

This reading can raise many questions along these line, however this is not the purpose it directly to the course. This purpose is to serve as a backdrop for the ensuing discussion on changes related to the changing world. The next selection will give a quite different perspective on the same set of chiefs in the contemporary world. To aid the teaching of this section asking the class to come up with a list of traits possessed by the leaders (either stated or implied through comments from ‘followers’). This list will need to be compared to a similar list made after the reading of the next selection. The professor may note that this article was written in the 1960’s. As an historic note, bringing this to the attention of the class, as a frame of reference may be helpful.

"Chiefs Today"  

_Lamont Lindstrom and Geoffrey White_

This article, filling in the contemporary aspect of chiefs that the Sahlins reading does not cover offers quite a differing perspective, that will allow the class to discuss how Polynesian and Melanesian leaders have changed with some of the modern trends. It is not included in the course pack, but the photo on the cover of the book for which this is the introduction is of a man in what could be tribal gear wearing Birkenstock sandals, dark sun glasses, and talking on a cellular
phone. This visual juxtaposition is an interesting one that might be brought to class as an introduction to this article. This idea should frame the discussion on these articles in the light of globalism, which could be focused on more directly depending on the professor’s knowledge of the subject.

The reading itself backtracks on what was said in the Sahlins reading before looking at the different forms that chiefs have taken in modernity. According to the authors these forms number three. The first, the “chiefly statesman,” is described as the formal heads of state who are put in office by tribal power structure. This is not a unique phenomenon to this area of the world. For more examples there are several video documentaries on the Obi of Saharan Africa that show this same type of tradition succession pattern and how it interacts with the modern world and concepts such as democracy.

The next type of contemporary chiefs described are the “chiefly bureaucrats.” These are leaders who have risen, or been given, power on the state level without regard for the traditional role they might have played without a modern state system. According to the authors these chiefs play a more tangible role in local conflict resolution, brokering development, serving as go-betweens or representatives to the larger state government from the local levels, fostering community solidarity, and bolstering the national officers with local titles if need be. These chiefs are interesting to discuss in that they fulfill some of the roles described in the Sahlins article as the traditional chiefly roles despite the fact that they are not necessarily chosen along traditional lines.

The third, and final, type of ‘new’ chiefs that have emerged according to Lindstrom and White are the “chiefly oppositions.” These chiefs are the people who re-instate the traditional way when/if the modern state government breaks down. These chiefs tend to carry with them some sort of “symbolic charge” as they represent the traditional identity being rekindled. The example the authors give involves Papua New Guinea, however, one might look to contemporary
examples in Hawaii, or even insurgent movements such as in East Timor. Once again, the
question needs to be raised as to who, or which forces, are leading the leaders.

This article, combined with the Sahlins article will give the ideas of a drastic change that
has occurred over a relatively short period of time. The following articles deal with the ideas of
global culture, and offer a perspective on one way for us, in the western world to approach these
issues.

"On Producing the Concept of a Global Culture"            Kenneth Surin
"Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism"                         Martha Nussbaum

These two selections tie this aspect of change into the larger, global arena and introduce
very large and widely debated ideas. As such, they should probably be taught together, with that
warning. The first article, attempts to bring to light a definition of 'global culture,' the possibility
and desirability of which can be debated ad nauseam. The second reading attempts to reduce
identity, in part, to being world citizens. While it has bearing on this issue, it is included more for
the sake of debate, as the question would need to be posed, "How can we, as westerners, feel
about imposing/allowing our culture to be adapted to by others?"

In his chapter, “On Producing a Concept of Global Culture,” Kenneth Surin examines
one of the most major conceptual changes facing the world today. This change is that of thinking
of the world in terms of a global culture. The idea has received debate in fields of Political
Science and even Leadership Studies recently with such noted publications as Benjamin Barber’s
Jihad vs. McWorld addressing the same issue. Surin takes the stand that while it is difficult to
envision a global culture, it is even harder to deny a “spirit of the age.” Discussion in class
should debate this point taking into account the stories of the Melanesian chiefs just examined.
As stated in the sample syllabus, the course is not intended to provide answers, but to give
perspectives on thinking about issues that affect both Leadership Studies and Cultural Anthropology.

Martha Nussbaum’s philosophy of the cosmopolitan can most easily be summarized by saying that she believes our first allegiance should be to people (in an humanitarian sense) as opposed to nationalities, races, or ethnicities in dealing with international problems. While the point she makes is also widely contested, the application to the materials covered in this unit seem obvious. Discussion questions should range from the general, “Is this possible?” To the specific, “How then, can we account for the ‘Chiefly Statesmen’ as not really representing their cultures in the modern state system?”

“Change Resisted: Thirty Three Hypotheses Why”

This article’s title hints at what is at the core of this third and final section of this unit. The general theme is resistance, and why it occurs. From this section, and the two above, the two perspectives combined will show a different aspect of the leadership process that is heavily weighted away from leader-centric theories. A theme for which this article plays a role in introducing. O’Toole spends the beginning of this chapter describing a situation in which the leadership at General Motors fell out and gave way to resistance. O’Toole goes on to draw from experiences, stories, and literature thirty three possible reasons that resistance occurs. He finishes the chapter by looking into other disciplines, including Cultural Anthropology to draw further examples.

This selection should be used as a starting point. Perhaps in discussion a student will volunteer to explain a situation in the ethnography they are reading to exemplify one or more of the hypotheses for resistance. However, discussing the previous section in regards to the possibility of resistance occurring would prove an insightful and thought provoking class. For example, a connection that might be made is between the “chiefly oppositions” of the Lindstrom/
White reading to O'Toole's hypothesis number ten of futility. This hypothesis for resistance says that people are not willing to take part in superficial change, especially if it is realized that nothing is really going to change for them; hence, a return to traditionalism would be welcomed as "symbolically charged."

O'Toole's hypothesis are very open-ended and leave much to be desired in the way of description. Nonetheless, the ideas presented in this reading can be applied in a wide variety of situations that have either been covered in the course or will come later. The article is an excellent example of how the disciplines can gain perspective in tackling issues from one another. The book which this chapter comes from is called, Leading Change, and is used as a text in a class bearing the same name taught at the Jepson School of Leadership Studies. Through his use of E.E. Evans-Pritchard's work among the Azande, the author is able to show that the form of resistance they encountered during crisis lay at the foundation of their belief system.

"Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance"  
James Scott

This excerpt is a classic amongst political scientists and anthropologists alike as Scott used ethnographic techniques to reveal the basic currents in everyday life among peasants in Malaysia. This chapter, taken from his book Weapons of the Weak, provides this class with excellent examples of resistance and some theory to match up with that.

In the selection Scott first focuses on the histories of both resistance and peasantry, in the light that the seeds of both always exist and only the latter seems omnipresent, while the former only appears in glorified moments throughout history. With this Scott makes a vital point at the bottom of page 415 where he states that the importance is not in the visible uprising itself, but rather "the vital, day-to-day struggle on the factory floor over the pace of work." This is important to note in the class for several reasons. First, insofar as this discussion of change is

†††For further scholarly debate see For Love of Country, Martha C Nussbaum (ed.)
concerned it should be noted that while the visible elements of change, i.e. revolution, etc. receive 
more attention, the important part of resistance is the roots of it through everyday life. Second, it 
should be pointed out that if, in doing their min-ethnographies, the students have observed some 
kind of resistance, the roots of that should be examined in more depth than the event itself.

Scott gives two examples from his experiences among rice farmers in Malaysia. In the 
first example the author shows a group of women attempting to place a boycott on certain 
landowners who were trying to switch to greater mechanization. The second example, a negative 
example, describes a series of thefts. The teaching of this reading needs to include the same two 
elements noted above.

First, the examples should be discussed as forms of change. A thorough look at the 
histories of each situation will help the discussion of this article. After the events are understood 
trying to place understand the 'why' of the situations will help. Asking the students to apply one 
or more of O'Toole's thirty-three hypotheses would be an interesting and topically relevant way 
to teach this article. Asking the class to divide into groups to achieve this might add an element 
of greater variability as the points will be debated in the groups better than they might be if 
students simply chose the more obvious examples in individual work. An in class analysis of the 
'power and authority' issues at play in these examples would also be of great substance to this 
discussion.

The second point that needs to be made in this discussion is that through this the course's 
goal of combining the two fields for greater understanding is truly being met. It will be very 
important to point this out after the above exercise is completed. By proving with such a concrete 
example that they have just used texts and reference points from both disciplines to form an 
opinion will show that this combination has been successful.
These final two readings for the course are included as case studies. The first is still focused on resistance. It should be analyzed along a similar line that the Scott examples were analyzed. This article brings to the table a factor that was considered in the Benedict reading, but not much since, religion. In this example one sees religion as a motivator for many actions, some violent, some less so. A discussion of religion as part of ‘culture’ would be interesting for this article. It would be important at this point to start connecting the beginning of the course to the end. In this way the students will need to reconsider their personal definitions of ‘culture,’ and seek out a newer one that brings to light the issues covered in the class.

The second example given here is given almost for shock value. The subject is disagreement in an ‘acephalus,’ or leaderless, society. U.S.-American culture is so leader-centric that it may be hard for the students to visualize a leaderless society. As an introduction to this article a discussion on the actual possibility of a ‘leadership’-less society. One would think that if leadership is defined as a process involving interaction around an issue, that no matter where leadership will exist; however, do leaders have to be present for there to be leadership? There are several documentaries available on the Mkako and other acephalus societies of Africa that might make a nice visual aid to help students visualize the people being studied.

To analyze what happens in this description relating the concepts covered in the ‘power and authority’ unit to those covered in the ‘change’ unit will be most effective. Because the selection focuses on the power of the individual in a non-individualistic society the dichotomy is obvious for discussion.

This should make a tight conclusion to the actual course-work part of the course. These last two articles will be very effective in relating concepts covered in the beginning of the course
to those covered in the later parts. By this time the student should have a fairly strong personal
definition of culture that has been developed over the semester, a good idea of how culture and
leadership are interrelated, a strong knowledge of one (or more) ethnographies and how in the
future ethnography can be used to study behavior, and finally, should be nearing completion of
their own min-ethnographies. The remainder of the class time should be spent hearing student
presentations of their min-ethnographies to the rest of the class.
CONCLUSIONS

This project had several goals for the combination of the fields of Leadership Studies and Cultural Anthropology. First, to turn the metaphorical kaleidoscope Mark Twain referred to, so that an undiscovered way of studying and thinking about the world we live in will come into view. Second, to create a course based on this new perspective to share this new perspective with students of both fields. Hopefully the output of this project shows that the two fields can be effectively combined unique insights can be reached.

The course proposed in this work attempts to bridge the gap between Leadership Studies and Cultural Anthropology. This course could be taught by professors from either field to students of both fields. The themes, concepts, and specific cases come from both fields and can easily be applied to other course work within each field, but also as a practical lesson on ways of approaching human behavior. These topics are general in scope, but could be narrowed in any number of ways to focus the learning based on a specific area of knowledge a professor could bring into the class.

This project is important because it is a first step of a task that will be beneficial to both fields. The field of leadership studies, while trying to account for ‘culture’ as it related to ‘leadership’ (and vice versa) needs the history of thought that Cultural Anthropology has put into the subject. On a more practical level, a better understanding of ‘culture,’ and the ways in which it can affect people, a leader being trained in a program with this course included will be better prepared to handle diverse situations.

While better established as a social science, the field of Cultural Anthropology has much it stands to gain from an examination at Leadership Studies. Similar to the above, leadership scholars spent the majority of this century defining and redefining what it means to be a leader. In an ethnography in which leadership issues are heavily involved, a more in depth knowledge of the phenomenon will make for a more complete picture.
This project is one of many surfacing that attempts to combine two sub-fields of the social sciences. Contemporary studies are trying to focus on Leadership Studies combined with such diverse fields as Religious Studies, Peace and Conflict Studies, Outdoor Education, and even more traditional sciences such as Environmental Studies. This trend seems to be the way that new ideas will be explored in the social science. This give-and-take style of relationship between fields will, no doubt, as it has in this project, yield further scholarship in the end, and a better understanding of the world.
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Leadership ‘n’ Cultural Anthropology

Purpose
In this course we will take a look at the overlap that could exist between the fields of Leadership Studies and Anthropology. This will be studied through looking at various aspects of the leadership process that are also manifest in anthropological literature as well as specific examples from ethnographic texts. The course adds to some of the confusion you may be feeling about ‘leadership’ in general, as it provides no answers, but rather perspectives. This multi-lateral view of leadership is important to consider as leadership, as a phenomenon, exists everywhere, not just in western society.

This course also intends to introduce leadership students to Cultural Anthropology as a means of understanding aspects of the human condition. Thus, it will also ask you to behave not only as a leadership scholar, but also as a cultural anthropologist. The assignments will focus on ethnographic writings and analysis, and will introduce you to the idea of fieldwork.

Course Objectives
• To gain an understanding of what Cultural Anthropology is, and what Cultural Anthropologists do.
• To explore some varying definitions of Culture across various traditions.
• To lead students into thinking about and forming a definition of culture as it will relate to a concept of leadership.
• To introduce ethnography as a method of studying human behavior.
• To explore the different meanings and manifestations of ‘Power and Authority’ and relate these ideas to those of ‘leadership’ and ‘culture.’
• To further linking the fields of Leadership Studies and Cultural Anthropology.
• To explore ‘change’ as it relates to the concepts of ‘leadership’ and ‘culture.’
• To investigate these definitions through ethnographic examples.

Course Description
This course teaches students how to learn about leadership from Cultural Anthropology and vice versa. It differs from a standard leadership studies course in that it emphasizes ethnography as a method for studying leadership and surrounding ideas. The content of this course is drawn mainly from leadership studies, cultural anthropology, political anthropology, and political science. The cases are all ethnographic in nature and cover a wide variety of geographic locations and cultures. The assignments will ask students not only to analyze current ethnographic literature, but to attempt ethnography as a method of studying leadership.
Requirements

Definition of Culture Paper—Following the first unit on ‘culture’ a paper is to be submitted in which you will create and support a personal definition of culture which will be referred to and revised throughout the course. A successful paper will incorporate elements covered in readings, but not rely solely on these sources.

Ethnographic Comparison—This assignment involves choosing an ethnographic work and examining it several times throughout the semester. First, a cursory ‘book report’ will be assigned to ensure that the work chosen is suitable for the rest of the assignment. Following each of the major units of the course, papers relating the information in each individual’s ethnographic work to the information covered in the unit.

Mini-Ethnography—The mini-ethnography project is a group project in which groups will select an organization (either professional or social) and write an ethnographic paper concerning the leadership of that organization. A successful paper will include elements covering elements such as, participant observation, social history, and other themes covered directly in the course. Each group will be expected to present this min-ethnography at the end of the semester.

Participation—Attending and participating in class and group activities will be vital to the understanding of the material.

Course Outline

Week 1: Introduction and begin discussion of culture: readings 1-4

How does anthropology fit into leadership studies? How is it that we are culturally bound into thinking about ourselves? How will the anthropological perspective aid in learning about leadership? What is culture? How has culture been thought about?

Week 2: Continue discussion of culture: reading 5-8

What are ways in which culture has been conceptualized in the past? How does culture theory take into account ideas of leadership? What is ethnography? How can it be used? What mistakes have been made in the past in doing ethnography as a student?

Week 3: Begin Unit on Power and Authority: readings 1-5

What is power? How has this idea been manifest in human society? What theories of power exist in these two fields? How can they be applied to other theories of leadership? (Culture paper, mini-ethnography proposal, ethnographic comparison ‘book report’ due)

Week 4: Authority: readings 6-10

What is authority? How is it different from power? How does authority relate to leadership? On an individual level? On a cultural level? What determines authority? How can that change between cultures?

Week 5: Power and Authority in Organizations: readings 11-13