

**Chapter 1 : The Geek Anthropologist | An anthropological approach to all things geek**

*An anthropological approach can help researchers evaluating the PCMH identify transformations, along with the underlying factors in the practice, among patients, and in the community that drive how transformation decisions are made, how the changes occur, and how the changes affect those involved.*

Are you as interested as I am in knowing how, when, and where human life arose, what the first human societies and languages were like, why cultures have evolved along diverse but often remarkably convergent pathways, why distinctions of rank came into being, and how small bands and villages gave way to chiefdoms and chiefdoms to mighty states and empires? But what is anthropology? Study of Humankind The word anthropology itself tells the basic story. Nothing human is alien to anthropology. Indeed, of the many disciplines that study our species, *Homo sapiens*, only anthropology seeks to understand the whole panorama—in geographic space and evolutionary time—of human existence. Though easy to define, anthropology is difficult to describe. Its subject matter is both exotic e. And its focus is both sweeping the evolution of language and microscopic the use-wear of obsidian tools. Anthropologists may study ancient Mayan hieroglyphics, the music of African Pygmies, and the corporate culture of a U. But always, the common goal links these vastly different projects: We are curious about ourselves and about other people, the living as well as the dead, here and around the globe. We ask anthropological questions: Do all societies have marriage customs? As a species, are human beings innately violent or peaceful? Did the earliest humans have light or dark skins? When did people first begin speaking a language? How related are humans, monkeys and chimpanzees? Such questions are part of a folk anthropology practiced in school yards, office buildings, and neighborhood cafes. But if we are all amateur anthropologists, what do the professionals study? As a discipline, anthropology begins with a simple yet powerful idea: Any detail of our behavior can be understood better when it is seen against the backdrop of the full range of human behavior. This, the comparative method, attempts to explain similarities and differences among people holistically, in the context of humanity as a whole. Anthropology seeks to uncover principles of behavior that apply to all human communities. To an anthropologist, diversity itself—seen in body shapes and sizes, customs, clothing, speech, religion, and worldview—provides a frame of reference for understanding any single aspect of life in any given community. To illustrate, imagine having our entire lives in a world of red. Our food, our clothing, our car—even the street we live on—everything around us a different shade of red. We [anthropologists] have been the first to insist on a number of things: Most important, we were the first to insist that we see the lives of others through lenses of our own grinding and that they look back on ours through ones of their own. Culture represents the entire database of knowledge, values, and traditional ways of viewing the world, which have been transmitted from one generation ahead to the next—nongenetically, apart from DNA—through words, concepts, and symbols. Cultural anthropologists study humans through a descriptive lens called the ethnographic method, based on participant observation in tandem with face-to-face interviews, normally conducted in the native tongue. Ethnographers compare what they see and hear themselves with the observations and findings of studies conducted in other societies. Originally, anthropologists pieced together a complete way of life for a culture, viewed as a whole. Today, the more likely focus is on a narrower aspect of cultural life, such as economics, politics, religion, or art. Cultural anthropologists seek to understand the internal logic of another society. It helps outsiders make sense of behaviors that, like face painting or scarification, may seem bizarre or senseless. We can turn the principle around and see our everyday surroundings in a new light, with the same sense of wonder and discovery anthropologists experience when studying life in a Brazilian rain-forest tribe. Though many picture cultural anthropologists thousands of miles from home residing in thatched huts amid wicker fences, growing numbers now study U. Linguistic Anthropology One aspect of culture holds a special fascination for most anthropologists: The organization of systems of sound into language has enabled *Homo sapiens* to transcend the limits of individual memory. Speech is the most efficient medium of communication since DNA for transmitting information across generations. They are fully and firmly formed; they have movement. But they cannot talk. That is the proper

thing they lack. So I want you to give them speech. He gave them also the wisdom and the power to reproduce and multiply. They study prehistoric links between different societies, and explore the use and meaning of verbal concepts with which humans communicate and reason. Linguistic anthropologists seek to explain the very nature of language itself, including hidden connections among language, brain, and behavior. Language is the hallmark of our species. It is upon language that human culture itself depends. Linguistic anthropologists, of course, are not the only ones who study historical dimensions of culture. They also need information about what came before. But how can they trace the long-ago prehistory, reaching far back into the millennia, of societies that left no written record? Archaeology Fortunately, the human record is written not only in alphabets and books, but is preserved in other kinds of material remains—in cave paintings, pictographs, discarded stone tools, earthenware vessels, religious figurines, abandoned baskets—which is to say, in tattered shreds and patches of ancient societies. Archaeologists interpret this often fragmentary but fascinating record to reassemble long-ago cultures and forgotten ways of life. Archaeologists, long interested in the classical societies of Greece, Rome, and Egypt, have extended their studies in two directions—backward some 3 million years to the bones and stone tools of our protohuman ancestors, and forward to the reconstruction of lifeways and communities of 19th-century America. Biological Anthropology But human history begins in a different place further back in time. It starts about 8 million years ago, when a population of apelike creatures from eastern Africa turned onto a unique evolutionary road. To fully understand humankind we must learn more about its place in the natural habitat of living things. Biological or physical anthropology looks at *Homo sapiens* as a genus and species, tracing their biological origins, evolutionary development, and genetic diversity. Biological anthropologists study the biocultural prehistory of *Homo* to understand human nature and, ultimately, the evolution of the brain and nervous system itself. These, then, are the four main branches that make anthropology whole: Anthropology asks a most difficult and most important question: What does it mean to be human? Each of the four fields of American anthropology has its own skills, theories, and databases of special knowledge. Most anthropologists, therefore, pursue careers in only one of the four subdisciplines. Anthropologists may specialize in two or more geographic areas of the world, such as Oceania, Latin America, and Africa, for reasons of comparison. More than U. Because the subject matter of anthropology is so broad, an undergraduate major or concentration can be part of a broad liberal arts background for men and women interested in medicine, government, business, and law. There are more nonacademic career opportunities available to PhD anthropologists, currently, than there are jobs in the academy itself. Increasingly, PhD students begin their training with academic as well as nonacademic careers in mind, and seek admission to programs that include applied-anthropology courses. Academic Work Setting Academic settings include departments of anthropology, nonanthropology departments e. Nonacademic Work Setting In recent years, many anthropologists have chosen to utilize their specialized training in a variety of nonacademic careers. Cultural and linguistic anthropologists work in federal, state, and local government, international agencies, healthcare centers, nonprofit associations, research institutes, and marketing firms as research directors, science analysts, and program officers. Biological anthropologists work in biomedical research, human engineering, private genetics laboratories, and pharmaceutical firms. Archaeologists work off campus in environmental projects, human-impact assessment, and resource management. At present there is no discernible limit for PhD anthropologists targeting the nonacademic realm for employment. Today, half of new doctorates find professional jobs off campus. Additional information on careers in anthropology is available from AAA. This article was written by David Givens, and appears courtesy of the American Anthropological Association. Its purposes are to encourage research, promote the public understanding of anthropology, and foster the use of anthropological information in addressing human problems. Anyone with a professional or scholarly interest in anthropology is invited to join. For further details, please contact AAA at [www.aaa.org](http://www.aaa.org).

**Chapter 2 : Race & Anthropology | Peoples & Cultures of the World**

*The basic concept of anthropology is culture: learned behavior, socially transmitted. This includes extant cultures, traditional cultures, and prehistoric cultures. The other concept central to anthropology is its holistic approach to understanding culture. This essentially means that culture is an.*

Advanced Search Anthropologists study culture. As a medical anthropologist interested in the role of culture in health care, I have been intrigued by the growing number of articles that point to organizational culture as an important factor related to quality of care [ 1 ]. Apparently one review cited 15 different definitions [ 2 ]. Culture is seen as an independent variable that can be manipulated through management interventions in order to achieve organizational goals. Research studies from this approach tend to reflect a positivist stance, using structured instruments which pre-define the institutional attributes of interest and explore the correlation between these attributes and the quality-related outcomes of interest. However, as Scott et al. In addition, such studies contribute little to our understanding of how organizational cultures are created and communicated, and the mechanisms through which culture influences performance. Anthropology takes quite a different approach to culture. Most anthropologists would define culture as the shared set of implicit and explicit values, ideas, concepts, and rules of behaviour that allow a social group to function and perpetuate itself. Rather than simply the presence or absence of a particular attribute, culture is understood as the dynamic and evolving socially constructed reality that exists in the minds of social group members. It is an empirical question as to whether members of an organization have a shared culture, and anthropologists have long pointed out that in fact virtually all complex societies including health care organizations tend to have a number of co-existing, overlapping and competing subcultures. Anthropologists have traditionally used a qualitative research approach to study culture, and such an approach is well suited to many of the complex questions confronting researchers interested in quality and culture. It emphasizes context and the ways in which features of a specific situation or setting impact upon the phenomenon under study. Because qualitative research tends to be flexible and iterative, it allows for the discovery of unexpectedly important topics which may not have been visible had the researcher been limited to a pre-defined set of questions or data collection methods. The classic form of qualitative research, with roots in anthropology and sociology, is often known as ethnography or naturalistic enquiry. This kind of inquiry is most likely to be used when situations are novel or complex and the researchers are not yet sure what questions to ask of whom. Examples of ethnography in health care include a study of clinical reasoning among haematologists [ 9 ] and a study of the impact of managed care on clinical decision-making for mental health [ 10 ]. The study suggests the existence of professional subcultures which present barriers to and opportunities for improving incident reporting. Anthropologists also use a number of more structured data collection techniques to study culture. The most common of these techniques include free listing, pile sorts and rank order methods [ 12 ]. These methods have been used extensively in the field of international health, but much less so closer to home. Cultural consensus analysis is another method used by anthropologists to identify groups with shared values, and which may be especially useful to those interested in studying organizational culture. Culture is a complex and multi-faceted concept, and its study requires conceptual models and research methods that can reflect this complexity and which acknowledge the existence of multiple views and voices. Anthropology and qualitative research have much to offer those interested in culture and quality, and I hope that more researchers in the future will be motivated to apply these approaches to the understanding of organizational culture and its impact on the quality of health care.

**Chapter 3 : An Anthropological Approach to Sarkicism - Case Study The Vasì·nì·a of Sarvi - SCP Foundati**

*Best Answer: To take an anthropological approach is to study a culture by participant observation with out using any of your own values systems to judge it. You study the culture as a member of the culture and define it in it's own terms.*

The development of cognitive anthropology. New York, Cambridge University Press. New Directions in Psychological Anthropology. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press. Children of Six Cultures: Depression, Buddhism, and the work of culture in Sri Lanka. Culture and human nature: Theoretical papers of Melford E. Chicago, University of Chicago Press. Person-centered interviewing and observation in anthropology. Handbook of methods in cultural anthropology. The Development of Cognitive Anthropology. Rethinking "status" and "role": New York, Holt, Rhinehart and Winston: Schizophrenia, Culture, and Subjectivity. From Cultural Category to Personal Experience. Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc. Selected theoretical works in psychological anthropology[ edit ] Bateson, Gregory Steps to an Ecology of Mind. Irving Culture and Experience. Kilborne, Benjamin and L. Culture and Human Nature: University of Chicago Press. University of Wisconsin Press. A Problem that Cannot be Solved. Social Anthropology 23, vol. Sapir, Edward Culture, Language, and Personality: University of California Press. Schwartz, Theodore, Geoffrey M. White, and Catherine A. Shore, Bradd Culture in Mind: Essays on mind, self, and emotion. Strauss, Claudia and Naomi Quinn A Cognitive Theory of Cultural Meaning. Wierzbicka, Anna Emotions across Languages and Cultures: Selected ethnographic works in psychological anthropology[ edit ] Benedict, Ruth The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture. Wombs and alien spirits: Women, men, and the Zar cult in northern Sudan. Univ of Wisconsin Press, Briggs, Jean Never in Anger: Portrait of an Eskimo family. A Study in Moroccan Ethnopsychiatry. University of California Pr, University of Chicago Press, With analyses by Abram Kardiner and Emil Oberholzer. Herdt, Gilbert Guardians of the Flutes. Knowledge and practice in Mayotte: University of Toronto Press, Lutz, Catherine Unnatural Emotions: Everyday sentiments on a Micronesian atoll and their challenge to Western theory. Rosaldo, Michelle Zimbalist Knowledge and Passion: Ilongot notions of self and social life. Selected works in psychiatric anthropology[ edit ] Beneduce Roberto Undocumented bodies, burned identities: Ethnopsychiatry, Identities and Migration, Beneduce, Roberto Etnopsichiatria. Barrett Schizophrenia, Culture, and Subjectivity: The Edge of Experience. School of Advanced Research. Kleinman, Arthur Patients and healers in the context of culture: Kleinman, Arthur Social origins of distress and disease: The growing disorder in American psychiatry. History, identity, and depression in an American Indian community.

Chapter 4 : what is meant by saying "an anthropological approach"? | Yahoo Answers

*Feminist anthropology is a four field approach to anthropology (archeological, biological, cultural, linguistic) that seeks to reduce male bias in research findings, anthropological hiring practices, and the scholarly production of knowledge. Anthropology engages often with feminists from non-Western traditions, whose perspectives and.*

Anthropological Approaches David N. Gellner The historical development of anthropological approaches Just what anthropology is supposed to be about has changed considerably over time. The subject began in the nineteenth century as the search for the origins of humankind. They thought all human societies could be arranged in order, as if on a giant historical escalator: Within more advanced societies certain social circles - especially peasants in geographically remote parts of the country - were thought to preserve the customs and thought patterns of earlier epochs. Children were believed to recapitulate the history of the human race, gradually achieving adult rationality through rigorous education. They predated Darwin and could indeed be held in a Christian and anti-Darwinian manner. As such, in fact, they were an obvious justification for missionary work and for the whole colonial enterprise. These associations with the colonial era mean that among intellectuals today the theory of social evolutionism is barely respectable, whereas in popular culture and everyday speech the theory is alive and well. Where the theory of biological evolution is concerned, it is the other way round: Early anthropologists engaged in fierce debates over the form of the earliest human societies: Solid evidence for either institution has never been found. The prehistory of religion was also a controversial matter. Was the earliest form of religion magic? Was it the worship of forces of nature? Or was it totemism, the worship by each constituent clan of the society of its own special totem sacred object? For some the very difference and strangeness of exotic practices confirmed them in the rightness of their own ways. Let us start by considering two very different works: The Golden Bough, first published in 1890 and going through numerous editions, is a massive work. It was read very widely and influenced writers and thinkers far beyond the narrow confines of anthropology. It brought together examples of ritual and magic from classical texts and all over the world. Beautifully written though by modern standards over-written, it saw all religion as a kind of fertility magic. In later editions of the work Frazer proposed a simplistic evolutionary schema, an expression of his confident rationalism: The history passed through three stages dominated respectively by magic, religion, and science (cf pp. 1-2). In the first place, in contrast to Frazer, Durkheim realized that taking examples from all over the world with little regard for the original context, and piling them high, was faulty as an anthropological method. Piling up examples of what was supposedly the same phenomenon only worked to persuade as long as everyone was agreed that all the things piled up were the same. It assumed what needed to be proved. In fact Durkheim could also be accused of assuming the truth of his theories and using the Australian data simply as an illustration, not a test. But the richness of his analysis has made his book an enduring and fertile classic of ethnography. Furthermore, by focusing on a single case study and attempting to extract universal truths from it, Durkheim had - probably unwittingly - moved significantly beyond the evolutionist concern with historical stages and mechanisms of historical development. Durkheim was very concerned to stress that he was not writing about religion in order to discredit it: "Religions are true after their own fashion: At the same time he had an even more ambitious aim. He believed that by analysing the origin of religion he was also revealing the origin of human thought as such. The most general categories of human thinking - "space, time, and cause and effect" - are inculcated in people by society; different societies have different versions of these categories, which are essentially religious. Durkheim criticized other definitions of religion as belief in the supernatural, or belief in God or spiritual beings. A religion is a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is, to things set apart and forbidden - beliefs and practices which unite into one single moral community called a Church, all those who adhere to them, p. 1. His stress on community is also particularly significant: Among the evolutionist anthropologists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, the discussion of totemism, which was held to be the earliest form of religion, was particularly controversial. As new reports were received from Australia, scholars fought over their correct interpretation. Among the Arunta each clan had its own totem, usually an animal or a plant, which was sacred

to it but not to other clans. The clan collect in the places sacred to the ancestors, find stones associated with the totem, strike them and collect the dust, which is believed to strengthen the clan, DAVID N. Then there is the sacrificial consumption of the totem. For example, if the totem is a kangaroo, which is normally tabooed to members of the kangaroo clan, on this occasion alone the young men of the clan must catch one, and the elders eat a small portion of it, and anoint their bodies with its fat. Durkheim saw the ethnographic data reported by Spencer and Gillen as evidence that Frazer had been quite wrong to see totemic ritual as mere magic: It is that society, of which the gods are only the symbolic expression, can no more do without individuals than individuals can do without society. To have a sound basis for seeing the efficacy that is imputed to the rites as something other than offspring of a chronic delusion with which humanity deceives itself, it must be possible to establish that the effect of the cult is periodically to recreate a moral being upon which we depend, as it depends upon us. Now, this being exists: It is society, pp. So he posed the rhetorical question: This is perhaps the severest criticism. At that time 95 per cent of the local population still lived from agriculture. Theologically, the Virgin Mary is a single figure, but the doctrine of advocations allows there to be many different forms within Roman Catholicism, for example, Mary of the Immaculate Conception, Mary of the Purification, Mary of the Sorrows, and so on. There are also different forms associated with different places, such as Our Lady of Lourdes, Our Lady of Montserrat, and so on. In this way there has developed in northern Spain a whole hierarchy of shrines which symbolize and serve to create different social units. At the annual festival of El Brezo every September there is an open air mass attended by 15,000 people. At a lower level there are shrines that symbolize the unity of a whole valley, and people from all the villages of the valley come together to worship at its annual festival. Finally at the village level, each village has its own shrine, often on a ridge or mountain top above. For its festival a procession forms, the children first, then the men, then an image of the Virgin Mary, and finally the women, and climbs up to the shrine. The procession forms an image of the way the social unit views itself, or is encouraged to view itself, as an organic whole made up of distinct parts. The villagers for once in the year see the village as a social unit, abstracted from the buildings and the location that make it a geographical unit. The church always taught a person-centred doctrine of salvation which had nothing to do with symbolizing group solidarity. Christian describes how, in the 19th century, this part of Catholicism was gradually becoming more important, and rituals of the group less so, as a new generation of priests began to have influence at the village level. Karl Marx and Max Weber This evolutionism of his meant that he was little read by the British structural functionalists see below though there was certainly some similarity between the Marxist view that religion serves to legitimate and perpetuate the position of the ruling class and the structural functionalist one that it serves to legitimate and perpetuate the existing social structure. Later, in the 19th and 20th centuries, Marx and his collaborator Engels were at last read by and began to influence at least some anthropologists. The revolt against evolutionism came about independently in the USA and in Britain, but in both cases it was inspired by the development of fieldwork methods. Close study of particular societies was to suggest that explaining everything in terms of some grand historical design was hardly the way to understand a living society. Educated in the German historical school, he insisted that societies must be studied and understood in their own terms; he discouraged grand evolutionary speculation. In Britain it was a Pole, Bronislaw Malinowski, who opened the way to modern fieldwork. Having done considerable library research on the aborigines already, he set out for Australia in 1901. When the First World War broke out in 1914 he found himself, as a citizen of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, in the difficult position of an enemy alien. The Australian authorities allowed him to do fieldwork providing he remained within their territory. He spent a total of two years in the Trobriand Islands off the north-east corner of Papua New Guinea. The mass of rich material he gathered there served as the basis for the monographs which made his name in the 1920s and 30s. What he understood by this was the idea that society was to be seen as a functioning whole: Everything that people did was to be explained by its role in the present; even customs that looked like leftovers from an earlier period must have a function and that function is the real explanation for their existence. This method came to be called participant observation. The method and the theory went together like hand and glove. In a late work, he listed seven spheres within which society must satisfy basic human needs: Fishing in the lagoon was highly predictable; Trobrianders performed no magic for this. Fishing out at sea was both dangerous and highly

unpredictable: Magic and religion, whether in the Pacific or in the West, were simply responses to ignorance. More importantly, in my opinion, Malinowski distinguished between magic and religion in terms of their very different purposes. Magic is intended to bring about some specific result better crops, recovery from illness, whereas religious practices aim at no such precise goal: Malinowski was acknowledged as a brilliant fieldworker. Even though he never wrote the synthetic overview of Trobriand life that he always planned, his collected corpus is so rich that it has stood up to repeated re-interpretations by anthropologists of succeeding generations who have never been anywhere near the Trobriand Islands. His functionalist theory of human needs has not fared so well. Of course social institutions must serve human needs in some sense, but frequently - as individuals often complain - social arrangements ride roughshod over what particular humans feel they need right now. The problem with his theory as applied to religion has been eloquently pinpointed by Geertz. Different subsystems within societies were to be analysed in terms of their contribution to the good functioning of the social whole. It was admitted that sometimes certain parts of a society might not be functioning very well, but this was seen as due to change introduced from the outside. It was assumed that the natural state of all societies was one of smoothly functioning stability. Radcliffe-Brown systematized the outlook of a whole generation of British social anthropologists. In the structural functionalist view, religion was seen as the cement of society: In so far as attention was paid to magic, it was in the context of witchcraft. The anthropological consensus which existed at least in Britain fell apart in the very changed intellectual climate of the 1950s. Malinowski and the structural functionalists were seen as having benefited from colonialism and were charged with having actively supported it. In their monographs they ignored or minimized the role of the colonial state:

**Chapter 5 : Anthropology - Wikipedia**

*The guides to anthropological theories and approaches listed below have been prepared by graduate students of the University of Alabama under the direction of Dr. Michael D. Murphy.*

This would require a volume of its own. Most of these concern the problem of culture. Where possible, I have paired the studies with the reactions of anthropologists, as well as other historians. The exchanges serve to highlight the strengths and some of the limitations of an anthropological approach. It also suggests some of the evolving concerns of both disciplines over the last four decades, and, I hope, why the approach continues to be of value to historians. Some of the issues raised concern the intelligibility of past beliefs, expressions and usages; the apparent otherness or alienness of the past and the people at least some of them who inhabited it; the homogeneity or diversity within cultures; and cultural change and how it happens. Evans-Pritchard<sup>73</sup>, published a lecture in which he advocated a rapprochement between the by-then very separate disciplines of anthropology and history. At most, the past might be an aid to understanding the social systems of the present, Schapera argued. First, he suggested that it could widen the subject matter of academic history, to include subjects that historians now take for granted but were then little studied: Keith Thomas and Hildred Geertz In the book that followed a few years later, Thomas practised what he preached. His *Religion and the Decline of Magic* has justly become a classic, never out of print and the subject of a retrospective study 25 years after its initial publication. The study employed a wide range of sources to explain witchcraft and magic on a variety of levels intellectual, sociological and psychological and account for their subsequent decline. The work is generally associated with functionalist anthropology, a school that explains phenomena in terms of the function or purpose, utility they purportedly serve. Thomas explored witchcraft in terms of social tensions by means of village-level analysis. He cited anthropologists to suggest hypotheses and provide analogies, but never to prove a point or sustain an argument he preferred to quote contemporary Tudor and Stuart writers for that. His use of anthropology is most evident in his focus on the accused-accuser relation in witchcraft accusations. Thomas suggested that most accusations of witchcraft developed out of social situations where the accused was refused charity by the accuser. The latter would then feel guilt and attribute subsequent malady and misfortune to the ill will of the person refused. Witchcraft was thus a gauge of social tension. Known as the charity-refusal model, this has become common currency among historians of early modern witchcraft. While it is true that discussion of this model occupies only one chapter in his witchcraft section, Thomas can be accused of placing more weight on the model than it could bear. Indeed his preference for the language of primitivism and his concentration on African anthropology were outmoded in anthropological circles when the book was published. In his reply, Thomas stressed that he had written English history and not cross-cultural analysis. If there was a distinction between magic and religion, it was the one originally formulated by sixteenth-century Protestant reformers, later exported to other societies by early anthropologists like E. Tylor and James Frazer As a theory of anthropology, structuralism seeks to identify cultural codes as a means of exploring important themes in human thought and action. His response to Geertz a few years later is more helpful. Changes in the context helped account for changes in beliefs and practices. It is therefore somewhat surprising that Thomas did not pay more attention to the processes of cultural transmission. Compare this to the approach taken by French historian Robert Muchembled a few years later. Here witchcraft beliefs are seen as an example of acculturation: Geertz found this explanation problematic, since there was no reason to consider recourse to magic any less self-reliant than other responses. Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie and Renato Rosaldo Thomas regarded his own work as a contribution to what anthropologists refer to as ethnography: This was due as much to its use of an inquisitorial trial as an ethnographic source for the study of peasant life, as its focus on a single community. Historians had hitherto used Inquisition records either to study the institution itself or to explore the nature of heresy. It is divided into two sections. The peasants themselves seem to come across as reliable informants, articulate and aware, their evidence assembled and collated by the capable and invisible hands of the expert and meticulous inquisitor. Le Roy Ladurie was aware that the evidence he was using was not an objective

ethnographic document. And yet, as the anthropologist Renato Rosaldo b. This gives the false impression that what follows is objective, disinterested and unproblematic. They stem from the very structure of what were after all inquisitorial proceedings: However, Le Roy Ladurie fails to go into any detail about another potential problem: Clues, signs and new standards of proof: Moreover, he too is able to tell this story thanks to an inquisitorial trial for heresy. Menocchio is much more contextualized in time, place and circumstance than the shepherd Maury. Ginzburg still dazzles with the virtuosity of his methods and the boldness of his conclusions. From a village focus in Montaiou, we move to a single individual, the miller Menocchio. That said, it is not without its risks. This is especially so for the historian, for whom the problem of ascertaining typicality is ever present. Menocchio, a literate and widely read miller, freethinking, eccentric and outspoken, was hardly representative of peasant culture. This is where the cheese and worms of the title come in: Ginzburg went to great pains to stress the nature of this relationship in the preface to the English translation of his work. This was in response to a lengthy criticism from Paola Zambelli, a historian of philosophy with a specialization in natural magic. Menocchio may simply have had contact with someone who was a student there, rather than come up with such a notion himself based on an ancient myth. At times the ideas are said to be his own; at other times they are a refraction of peasant culture. The only testimony for this peasant culture is Menocchio himself. For all his stress on cultural transmission and this remains the most fascinating and ambitious aspect of the book Ginzburg still has a gut sympathy for the immemorial and collective nature of popular tradition. How can we believe that such long-term and autonomous, but almost hidden, structures exist, if their existence is not amply and independently ascertained and documented? The historian should carefully select exceptional documents and read them to neutralize distortions. The issue of evidence is crucial: In another article in his collection, Ginzburg explored the use of inquisitorial records by historians as sources of ethnographic data. The records were far from neutral. Bakhtin argued that all discourses are multivocal. Ginzburg concluded that a close reading of a relatively small number of texts, related to a possibly circumscribed belief, could be more rewarding than the massive accumulation of repetitive evidence. As a sort of intermezzo it might be useful to examine the state of the relationship at this midway point in our survey. But what sort of dialogue was it? How accurate or useful was it? It is possible to have a foot in both camps, as in the case of Alan Macfarlane,<sup>33</sup> William Christian<sup>34</sup> and Richard Trexler,<sup>35</sup> to name but three. This is not the same as saying that historical anthropology is itself a specialized discipline, however. It was, and continues to be, more of an approach. Here history and anthropology overlap and collaborate with one another. Thompson<sup>93</sup>, commenting on the Thomas-Geertz exchange, suggested it was all well and good to be stimulated by anthropologists, but historians should avoid becoming ensnared in their debates and ulterior assumptions. After all, historians turn to anthropology for suggestions rather than prescriptions, comparisons rather than universal rules. They have borrowed concepts from anthropology without attempting to make a contribution to anthropology in return. In this context it is viewed as one way of doing anthropology. Other historical anthropologists, who have written and taught as anthropologists, include Marshall Sahlins, who writes about Hawaii and Fiji, Bernard Cohn on India and Eric Wolf. One of the key areas of interest is how local people coped with change. Bernard Cohn praised some historians for being aware that anthropology suggested a certain reading of documents, providing hypotheses rather than clear-cut answers. They sought to build this ambiguity into their narratives. It is worth noting, however, that this was due not only to a perhaps misplaced perception of what anthropologists were good at. Apparently marginal phenomena, like begging, can suggest important new ways of understanding broader developments, like economic changes or attitudes towards the poor. The study of ritual has been one of the most exciting contributions of anthropologically minded historians to the study of early modern Europe. It is an attempt to add a dimension based on the culture of the crowd to a behavioural approach based on economic determinism. In this respect it is a model of the microhistorical style, which looks at the small-scale to ask new questions and suggest hypotheses, with the aim of relating these back to larger questions and trends. For the historian, it downplays the bread and butter of historical research: And how can we relate the macro the major processes of the past to the micro level? Relating local-level responses to the Protestant and Catholic Reformations in terms of continuities and changes in beliefs, attitudes and practices would certainly qualify as an exploration of the complex

relationship, with each level shedding light on the other. The point is that small-scale data must be made to speak to large-scale or abstract and conceptual issues. They will not do so by themselves. Microhistory, by contrast, takes advantage of the exceptional normal, relating in concrete detail how actual entities, personal experiences or events can relate the micro with the macro. It represents a new way of describing and analysing the micro-macro link. From Geertz, historians learn to see culture as consisting in systems of often ritualized meaning. Actions are systems of meaning; they are symbolic. Contat was a participant in the event. However, Chartier argues that his *Anecdotes* belong to a literary genre, and yet Darnton treats it as a transparent vehicle for the full recovery of meaning. Then there is the meaning itself. Indeed his belief in the authority of the text recalls Le Roy Ladurie. Did it actually happen? We have certainly heard this before.

**Chapter 6 : - Anthropological Theories - Department of Anthropology - The University of Alabama**

*Bell's work is one of the most significant attempts to bridge the gap between "reductive" social and anthropological approaches, and approaches that attempt to take "religious" or "supernatural" phenomena on their own terms.*

Various short-lived organizations of anthropologists had already been formed. Its members were primarily anti-slavery activists. They maintained international connections. Anthropology and many other current fields are the intellectual results of the comparative methods developed in the earlier 19th century. Theorists in such diverse fields as anatomy, linguistics, and Ethnology, making feature-by-feature comparisons of their subject matters, were beginning to suspect that similarities between animals, languages, and folkways were the result of processes or laws unknown to them then. Darwin himself arrived at his conclusions through comparison of species he had seen in agronomy and in the wild. Darwin and Wallace unveiled evolution in the late 1800s. There was an immediate rush to bring it into the social sciences. He wanted to localize the difference between man and the other animals, which appeared to reside in speech. The title was soon translated as "The Anthropology of Primitive Peoples". The last two volumes were published posthumously. Waitz defined anthropology as "the science of the nature of man". By nature he meant matter animated by "the Divine breath"; [13] i. He stresses that the data of comparison must be empirical, gathered by experimentation. It is to be presumed fundamentally that the species, man, is a unity, and that "the same laws of thought are applicable to all men". In the explorer Richard Francis Burton and the speech therapist James Hunt broke away from the Ethnological Society of London to form the Anthropological Society of London, which henceforward would follow the path of the new anthropology rather than just ethnology. It was the 2nd society dedicated to general anthropology in existence. In his keynote address, printed in the first volume of its new publication, *The Anthropological Review*, Hunt stressed the work of Waitz, adopting his definitions as a standard. Previously Edward had referred to himself as an ethnologist; subsequently, an anthropologist. Similar organizations in other countries followed: The majority of these were evolutionist. One notable exception was the Berlin Society for Anthropology, Ethnology, and Prehistory founded by Rudolph Virchow, known for his vituperative attacks on the evolutionists. During the last three decades of the 19th century, a proliferation of anthropological societies and associations occurred, most independent, most publishing their own journals, and all international in membership and association. The major theorists belonged to these organizations. They supported the gradual osmosis of anthropology curricula into the major institutions of higher learning. By the American Association for the Advancement of Science was able to report that 48 educational institutions in 13 countries had some curriculum in anthropology. None of the 75 faculty members were under a department named anthropology. Anthropology has diversified from a few major subdivisions to dozens more. Practical Anthropology, the use of anthropological knowledge and technique to solve specific problems, has arrived; for example, the presence of buried victims might stimulate the use of a forensic archaeologist to recreate the final scene. The organization has reached global level. For example, the World Council of Anthropological Associations WCAA, "a network of national, regional and international associations that aims to promote worldwide communication and cooperation in anthropology", currently contains members from about three dozen nations. Cultural anthropology, in particular, has emphasized cultural relativism, holism, and the use of findings to frame cultural critiques. Ethnography is one of its primary research designs as well as the text that is generated from anthropological fieldwork. In the United States, anthropology has traditionally been divided into the four field approach developed by Franz Boas in the early 20th century: These fields frequently overlap but tend to use different methodologies and techniques. European countries with overseas colonies tended to practice more ethnology a term coined and defined by Adam F. It is sometimes referred to as sociocultural anthropology in the parts of the world that were influenced by the European tradition. American anthropology Anthropology is a global discipline involving humanities, social sciences and natural sciences. Anthropology builds upon knowledge from natural sciences, including the discoveries about the origin and evolution of Homo sapiens, human physical traits, human behavior, the variations among different groups of humans, how the evolutionary past of Homo sapiens has influenced its social organization and culture, and

from social sciences , including the organization of human social and cultural relations, institutions, social conflicts, etc. According to Clifford Geertz , "anthropology is perhaps the last of the great nineteenth-century conglomerate disciplines still for the most part organizationally intact. Long after natural history, moral philosophy, philology, and political economy have dissolved into their specialized successors, it has remained a diffuse assemblage of ethnology, human biology, comparative linguistics, and prehistory, held together mainly by the vested interests, sunk costs, and administrative habits of academia, and by a romantic image of comprehensive scholarship. During the s and s, there was an epistemological shift away from the positivist traditions that had largely informed the discipline. In contrast, archaeology and biological anthropology remained largely positivist. Due to this difference in epistemology, the four sub-fields of anthropology have lacked cohesion over the last several decades. Cultural anthropology , Social anthropology , and Sociocultural anthropology Sociocultural anthropology draws together the principle axes of cultural anthropology and social anthropology. Cultural anthropology is the comparative study of the manifold ways in which people make sense of the world around them, while social anthropology is the study of the relationships among individuals and groups. There is no hard-and-fast distinction between them, and these categories overlap to a considerable degree. Inquiry in sociocultural anthropology is guided in part by cultural relativism , the attempt to understand other societies in terms of their own cultural symbols and values. Ethnography can refer to both a methodology and the product of ethnographic research, i. As a methodology, ethnography is based upon long-term fieldwork within a community or other research site. Participant observation is one of the foundational methods of social and cultural anthropology. The process of participant-observation can be especially helpful to understanding a culture from an emic conceptual, vs. The study of kinship and social organization is a central focus of sociocultural anthropology, as kinship is a human universal. Sociocultural anthropology also covers economic and political organization , law and conflict resolution, patterns of consumption and exchange, material culture, technology, infrastructure, gender relations, ethnicity, childrearing and socialization, religion, myth, symbols, values, etiquette, worldview, sports, music, nutrition, recreation, games, food, festivals, and language which is also the object of study in linguistic anthropology. Comparison across cultures is a key element of method in sociocultural anthropology, including the industrialized and de-industrialized West.

**Chapter 7 : Taking an Anthropological Approach to Biodiversity Loss | HuffPost**

*An Anthropological Approach to Sarkicism. Dr. Matthieu Desmarais, Department of Anthropology. Forward: Our understanding of Sarkicism has changed dramatically over the last few decades.*

One of the earliest debates among evolutionary biologists and anthropologists centered around the origin of human races. Polygenists such as Agassiz, Cuvier and Gliddon hypothesized that each human race originated in a different geographic location. Monogenists such as Charles Pickering and Charles Darwin argued that humans emerged from a single common origin. Both camps included those who relied on biblical interpretations as well scholars who employed scientific approaches. Today, genetic evidence confirms the monogenic perspective that modern humans share a common ancestor. Why was race so important? Contemporary critical race theorists point out the political and economic motivations behind race science, human origin debates and the construction of hierarchical human typologies. Race science emerged from the activities of colonial imperialists who aimed to document and describe indigenous people and situate non-European cultures into a globalized interpretation of social organization. Race science also helped reconcile tensions between contradictory practices on the part of Europeans and euro-centric settler nations such as the United States. Europeans and Americans were faced with the the hypocritical contradictions associated with ideas revolving liberty and equality while engaging in exploitative institutions such as enslavement and occupation. Many scientists produced scientific findings to legitimize atrocities and human exploitation committed by imperialists and slave-owners. For example, an American Physician named Samuel Cartwright published *Diseases and Peculiarities of the Negro Race* where he described a mental condition called drapetomania that allegedly compelled enslaved people to to run away from their owner. He claimed that the condition was induced by masters who became too familiar with or too kind to enslaved people, and his recommended treatment was based on whipping and removing the big toes to impede the ability to run. Physical scientists also aimed to prove the racial inferiority of non-European people by producing comparative evidence of measurable biological data. To which is Prefixed *An Essay on the Varieties of the Human Species* , Samuel George Morton measured the cranial capacity brain size of skulls representing different groups e. Morton was considered a distinguished professor of human anatomy and his scientific methodologies remained unquestioned for more than years. In , Stephen Jay Gould published *The Mismeasure of Man* which revealed that like many race scientists of that time, Samuel George Morton produced research that supported a pre-existing agenda. Despite patterns in the measurements however, there is no scientific evidence to support the relationship between brain size and intelligence. The director of the institute, anthropologist Eugen Fischer, published *Principles of Human Heredity and Race Hygiene* which outlined strategic ways to implement social cleansing. After his election as head of state in Germany, Hitler gathered a team of anthropologists to produce scientific evidence to support the notion of Aryan supremacy and garner enough public support to put idea into practice by initiating a series of segregation and extermination policies that eventually culminated into the extermination of 11 million people that included Jews, psychiatric patients, Roma, homosexuals, Jehovah Witnesses, and others. Race science gave way to more nuanced understandings of the ways that experience rather than biology shapes the human condition. Anthropologists began to take a closer look at the role of human relations and power structures which redirected anthropology as a field aimed at understanding rather than describing and categorizing. In the United States, Melville Herskovitz changed the way that anthropology approached African-American culture by emphasizing that race was a sociological concept, not a biological one. The emergence of cultural centers in U. Medical anthropologists are also identifying ways that the social experience of race and inequality generates biological patterns within marginalized populations, particularly in patterns of disease Gravlee Contemporary anthropological approaches to race are now beginning to identify the ways that social relations can affect human biology and cultural patterns of behavior. Do you consider race an important topic for discussion today? If so, provide links to resources that can help educators teach and learn about race. In order to receive credit, you must refer to the material presented in this module and respond to other student posts. When you complete the discussion, prepare to take the Midterm Exam.

**Chapter 8 : What is Anthropology? » Anthropology » Boston University**

*Principal characteristics of anthropological approaches One of the most important key concepts of modern anthropology is, as already indicated, holism, that is, the idea that social practices must be investigated in context and seen as essentially connected to others within the society in question.*

What may be considered good etiquette in one culture may be considered an offensive gesture in another. As this occurs constantly, cultures push each other to change. The biological variations between humans are summarized in the ideas of natural selection and evolution. Human variation is based on the principle that there is variation in traits that result for recombination of genes from sexual reproduction. These traits are variable and can be passed down generation to generation. An example of human variation can be found with a cline. A cline is a genetic variation between populations of species that are isolated in their reproduction such as skin color variation in humans. Because of pigmentation characteristics within the human population, a system and term emerged to categorize the differing variations. This category is recognized as race. Populations of humans in equatorial regions have selective advantages as a result of their darker skin pigmentation, whereas populations in more northern environments have less selective pressure to evolve darker pigmentation and have lighter skin. Other clines include differences in stature and hair type. Origins of Ethnography[ edit ] The route of first voyage of Columbus in the Caribbean. Ethnography is a core modern research method used in Anthropology as well as in other modern social sciences. Ethnography is the case study of one culture, subculture, or micro-culture made a the researcher immersing himself in said culture. Before ethnography, immersive research, the prevailing method was unilineal. This led to colonizers feeling able to set the rules for what is a "modern" or "primitive" culture and used these self-made justifications in order to rule over new colonies in the name of advancement for their people. This view came into question with Anthropologists like Franz Boas, offering the multilinear model for cultural evolution we have today. This model closer, reflects the realities of different cultures across the world advancing in separate ways and highlights the impossibility to call one culture "primitive" in relation to another. These cultures do not evolve from one another but evolved separately from each other into other cultures. A large part of the issue with early Anthropology was a reliance on second-party information while lacking any first-hand research of cultures. Armchair Anthropologists usually refers to late 19th century and early 20th century scholars coming to conclusions without going through the usual anthropology motions€"fieldwork or lab work. They would then create wild theories based on these accounts. This led to a high degree of bias against these cultures, more so than firsthand research, and were not scientific in the way Anthropology is today. These biases turned into stereotypes which are still prevalent today. This form of research drove much of the colonial primitive culture narrative and necessitated the adaptation of Ethnography. Ethnography, or the immersive method of case study research, has to lead to the dispelling of rumor and a much deeper understanding of cultures through great effort. To begin, he clearly states his bias, being a male researcher and dealing primarily with the males of that society due to a highly gendered culture found there. He explains with great care that he is not searching for what men "do" but what they "say and do to be men. He had limitations both being an outsider and being male, only being able to see how one-half of these people portrayed their culture and even then through the lens of an outsider with his own biases, stated as clearly as possible within the paper. This is the value of Ethnography, it allows researchers to further understand their research while remaining as unbiased as possible, highlighting weaknesses and need for further research from people of different genders and backgrounds. An Ethnographic Analogy is a method for inferring the use or meaning of an ancient site or artifact based on observations and accounts of its use by living people. Here we see an old pick, not much different from those used today We can infer the use of an ancient tool by seeing how similar-looking tools are used in existing or recent societies. By analogy we can hypothesize the same use for the old tool. Fieldwork Methods[ edit ] In anthropology there are several types of fieldwork methods that are used while conducting research. Below we will go more into depth with several fieldwork methods that are used. Observational Methods[ edit ] The observational method is viewed as the least invasive method where the anthropologist

minimally integrates themselves into the society they are studying and gathers data through verbal communication while attempting to remain non-intrusive of the culture. This group of methods focuses on community interaction through language. It usually entails many open ended interviews with participants who are members of a group being studied. The researcher strives to learn as much as they can about the history of the community as well as the individuals within it in order to gain a full understanding of how their culture functions. Interviews can take place individually or with focus groups within the community based on age, status, gender, and other factors that contribute to differences within the community. This type of research often strives to create an open dialogue, called a dialectic, in which information flows back and forth between researcher and subject. Think of this situation as a conversation between two people about homework or an upcoming exam. This dialectic poses a challenge to the objectivity of socially produced data. The challenge is dealt with through reflection on the inter-subjective creation of meaning. This leads anthropologists to value reflexive abilities in their ethnographic writing. Because many anthropologists also hope to help the communities they work with to make change on their own terms within the confines of their own culture, in some cases objectivity is abandoned in favor of community based activism and social change.

**Participant Observation**[ edit ] Participant observation is a method for anthropological Fieldwork, used to collect data such that the anthropologist must create an intimate relationship between themselves and the culture studied. This method requires that an anthropologist participate in a social event that is part of a specific culture. This includes, but is not limited to, observing members of a culture by taking notes, eating the food that is provided, and participating in festivities. The goal of participant observation is to be involved in the culture like a member of that society, all while observing and studying the culture. An example of participation observation would be if an anthropologist went to a Native American Tribal gathering and took notes on the energy and traditions they were being shown. This anthropologist could participate in things like face painting or songs, and eat the food that the Natives eat. The information gathered in this observation is then recorded and reflected upon to gain further insight into the culture being studied. This observation method helps the anthropologist develop a deeper rapport with the people of the culture and can help others understand their culture further. This experience may result in the individuals opening up more to the anthropologist which allows them to understand more than an etic point of view of the culture.

**Non-Participant Observation**[ edit ] In contrast to participant observation, non-participant observation is the anthropological method of collecting data by entering within a community but with limited interaction with the people within the culture. This anthropologist can be thought of as a fly on the wall. An etic approach that researchers often use to examine the details of how the subjects interact with one another and the environment around them. Detailed research such as body behavior e. An example of data collected through non-participant research would be the estimation of how often women in a household wear high heels due to how worn out the carpet is. The non-participant observation, although effective in providing some research, has limitations. One being, the observer affect. The researcher may use systematic approaches of field notes, sampling and data to ensure and increase comfortable interactions. The only solution to this problem and to have a fuller and unbiased take on the research is to use both non-participant and participant method. These demands are met through two major research techniques: After the initial orientation or entry period, which may take 3 months or longer, the researcher follows a more systematic program of formal interviews involving questions related to research hypotheses and specialized topics. Several different methods of selecting informants are possible. Usually, a few key informants are selected for in-depth sessions, since the investigation of cultural patterns usually calls for lengthy and repeated open-ended interviews. Selection of such a small number does not allow for strict assurance of a representative sample, so the anthropologist must be careful to choose subjects who are well informed and reliable. Ethnographic researchers will also train informants to systematically report cultural data and recognize significant cultural elements and interconnections as the interview sequences unfold. Key informant selection is known as judgment sampling and is particularly important for the kind of qualitative research that characterizes ethnography. Anthropologists will very frequently also need to carry out quantitative research from which statistically validated inferences can be drawn. Accordingly, they must construct an either larger random sample or a total population census for more narrowly focused interviewing

according to a closed questionnaire design. Aside from written observation and records, researchers will often provide ethnographic representations in other forms, such as collected artifacts, photographs, tape recordings, films, and videos. Comparative Method[ edit ] Since the beginning of anthropological studies, the Comparative Method has been a way to allow a systematic comparison of information and data from multiple sources. It is a common approach for testing multiple hypotheses on subjects including co-evolution of cultures, the adaptation of cultural practices to the environment, and kinship terms in local languages from around the world. The comparative method, may seem like an outdated form of fieldwork information gathering, however this method is still quite prevalent in modern day anthropological research. The use of this form of information gathering is intended to compare globalization, which uses a version of this method called multi-sited Ethnography by participant observation gathered from many different social settings. Another form of the comparative research method is shown through the Human Relations Area Files , which collects and organizes ethnographic texts from hundreds of societies all over the world. These files cover topics ranging from types of kinship systems, to trading practices found in all of human culture. Anthropologists Ruth Mace--an anthropologist who specializes in evolutionary ecology--and Mark Pagel explore the comparative method of anthropological research in their article The Comparative Method in Anthropology. They explain how in the past decade there have been many expansions in other branches of anthropology, including cultural diversity as a scientific endeavor. This is when the comparative method is used by those interested in cultural evolution and by those who study other human sciences. However, "cultures cannot be treated as independent for purposes of investigating cross culture trends," therefore they must instead be studied in relation to one another: How two or more cultures grow together, or how they are researched together has the ability to outline the entire premise of the comparative method. Having been used for hundreds of years, this method is still one of the main forms of research for anthropologists all over the world. Reflexivity[ edit ] Reflexivity is the awareness of the researcher of the effect they may be having on the research. This principle was perhaps first thought of by William Thomas, as the "Thomas Theorem". Fieldwork in cultural anthropology is a reflexive experience. Anthropologists must constantly be aware that the information they are gathering may be skewed by their ethical opinions, or political standings. Reflexive fieldwork must retain a respect for detailed, accurate information gathering while also paying precise attention to the ethical and political context of research, the background of the researchers, and the full cooperation of informants. In our everyday lives reflexivity is used to better understand ourselves by comparing our culture to others. For example, when someone talks about their religion, you may immediately disagree with specific aspects of their religion because you have not grown up believing it as they have. By being reflexive, one would be able to recognize their bias. The concept was first introduced by the principal founder of phenomenology, Edmund Husserl, and creates a "theoretical frame for thinking about the ways in which humans interpret, organize, and reproduce particular forms of social life and social cognition". Intersubjectivity is defined by five key principles. Instead of a one-way transaction, intersubjectivity should be seen more as a type of mutual understanding. Through empathetic insight, human beings achieve Platzwechsel, which is a term used in chess to mean "place exchange". The third claim is that intersubjectivity creates a synthesis of worldviews through the usage of empathy.

**Chapter 9 : Anthropological Approach to Consumer Behavior - SfAA Community Network**

*An anthropological approach to all things geek. [Click to print \(Opens in new window\)](#) [Click to email this to a friend \(Opens in new window\)](#).*

Around the world, people group themselves along certain lines- lines that also present significant obstacles to the spread of the gospel from one group to another. Ethnography, the practice of studying and categorizing groups of people, provides the mission with a framework for the measurement, organization, and global strategy for missionary engagement. When we know what languages people speak, we can make efforts to get them the scriptures and a gospel witness that they can understand. Strategies were built around the prioritization of certain groups over others based on ethnography, population, degree of difficulty, and access to the gospel. People Group missiology goes like this: During that time, anthropology as an academic discipline moved away from science toward theory. Cultural anthropology was separated out from the sciences of archeology and biological and linguistic anthropology. It deliberately takes into consideration only what can be objectively observed by outsiders. People groups, though, are not static. Through intermarriage, assimilation, global influence, and desertion, ethnolinguistic groups die out all the time. Meanwhile, new such groups are emerging at a surprising rate. According to missiologist Carol Davis, transitional peoplesâ€™ second- and third-generation immigrant groups, for exampleâ€™ are not simply combinations of host- and home-cultures. They are completely new people groups, with distinct cultural identities, worldviews, and use of language. This complicates the notion that we might somehow be gaining on the goal of finishing the task. The ever-changing unbelieving world is a moving missiological target. Neither is the spiritual status of a group permanent. Once a person is in Christ, he is forever in Christ. But if he is not faithful to make disciples of his own, knowledge of the Creator can and will be lost in future generations. In all of Turkey, where those churches once thrived, there are only three thousand known believers today. While ethnography is helpful to us in missions, it is not strictly biblical. Jesus never mentions the idea of unreached people groups; His emphasis was on those who believed and those who did not. This was the radical shift in the New Testament concerning the recipients of the gospel: Christ is the only salvation for people of any ethnicity. Otherwise, there is no evidence that any of the New Testament authors displayed any anthropological savvy in their missiology. If instead he means only that Jerusalem was quite diverse at the time, it presents a problem for this particular understanding of the word. There is no historical evidence of ethnography ever being a factor in missions. According to David Bosch , even the word mission was not applied to the idea of Christians sharing the gospel with non-Christians in other cultures until the sixteenth century. Before that, it was used in reference to the doctrine of the Trinity as in, the Father sent the Son. Roland Allen , in his book *Missionary Methods*: Again, the concept of people groups is extremely helpful to our mission. As we identify significant barriers to the communication of the gospel, we can be smart about overcoming them. Every Christ-follower everywhere needs an indigenous expression of church in which to worship. As God has demonstrated since Babel , cultures are valuable things, and part of His redemptive work among humanity. The only biblical mechanism for organizing our work is the Holy Spirit. Through the local church, He equips, calls, and sends missionaries. In Acts 16 , Luke writes that Paul clearly had a desire to preach the gospel in Asia, where it seemed to be his assumption that the gospel had not yet been proclaimed. Nevertheless, he was forbidden by the Holy Spirit. As Paul and his companions attempted to go into Bithynia, the Spirit of Jesus prevented them. Finally, they were lead to Macedonia by a vision. By using human means, God has proven Himself to be neither logical by human standards nor efficient. Some have come to assert that Christ will not return, indeed cannot come back until this task of reaching every unreached people group is completed. Some have even taken to using this as a motivation for missions- that Jesus is just waiting in the wings, unable to return until we finish the job. This, of course, contradicts verse 36 of that same passage , where Jesus says that no oneâ€™ not even the Son of Manâ€™ knows when He will return. The greatest danger in the anthropological approach is that it has made missions a problem to be solved rather than our very identity in Christ. Francis Dubose, who coined the word missional, wrote that God is a sending God. We are a sent people. And ours, as His

people, is to be sent. So mission will not end when the last of the people groups is reached. We are not sent because of the temporary need in the world which is indeed great! We must recognize that mission is the very nature of God and the basis of our relationship to Him.