

ANTHROPOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY COURSE, PROGRAM AND GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR 2009-2010

Where are Anthropology and Geography in the Assessment Cycle?

We have integrated the comprehensive synthesis measures with the Senior Thesis. The Behavioral Science Senior Thesis data analysis is below. All courses are evaluated by their contribution to some of the values and goals expressed in that rubric.

Evidence is present in the integrated syllabi and course outcomes (along with measured outcomes in all introductory courses and selected upper division courses) which link directly into the assessment measure grid.

The key measure of success at the program level is the rubric developed for the analysis of the Senior Thesis.

We have completed 2 cycles of the assessment process which we began in 9/05.

What evidence supports the progress noted above?

The Senior Thesis data report is attached. All senior theses are on file (back to 1988) and available for review.

How has the program used the assessment evidence to improve the curriculum?

The Senior Thesis Assessment rubric supports the current curriculum.

A number of courses were modified in the period of 2004-2006 as a result of the initial assessment cycle. No major course modifications have been undertaken in the last 4 years, though classroom pedagogy has been moving to a more visually-driven model.

Links to Program Skills/Conceptual Understanding

All Anthropology and Geography courses require essay answers to tests. In the introductory courses these are relatively short answer essays done in class, while the upper division courses all essay exams are 'take-home', due a week after assignment. All essay questions are graded on the student's ability to illustrate their command of the subject matter based on making a synthetic analysis of a situation that was not covered specifically in class. They are graded on 1) their ability to clearly define and use appropriate terminology and related concepts, both in understanding the question and structuring their answer (40% of essay score); 2) their ability to argue a particular point of view in a lucid, clear and concise manner that relates the concepts and terminology to the argument they are developing (i.e., their ability to manipulate and use the course material)(40% of essay score); 3) Developing an analysis or point of view that goes beyond repetition of the material presented in class, developing their own 'voice' which shows command of the material (20% of essay score). Examples of essay questions can be seen in Appendix B.

COURSE-SPECIFIC ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT

BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE PROGRAM GOALS:

Competent understanding, synthesize, apply theory

Effective command of the subject material/professional terminology

Ability to acquire and apply research materials

Satisfactory level of understanding and application of the scientific method and scientific techniques

Awareness of cultural/ethnic diversity

Awareness of the complex relationship between social/group forces and individual perception
and/or behavior

Awareness of their own life experiences and how they relate to the group

Awareness of ethical issues within the professional discipline

UNIVERSITY GOALS-RELEVANT CORE VALUES TO PROGRAM GEN-ED:

Aware of cultural diversity / ethnocentrism

The student has exhibited the ability to view issues in a holistic form

The student has exhibited an understanding of the Marianist values of community and service
leadership

The Course-Specific Analysis is based on the following points:

1. Is there a relationship between the class 'picture' based on evals in terms of satisfaction levels and the success rate in assessment?
2. In the last 4 years I have moved to a very structured set of expectations in lower division courses with term guides and sample questions as part of initial course syllabus. Does this result in a) better retention (i.e., higher assessment scores); b) higher satisfaction with the course?
3. Has the change to more structured courses resulted in easier courses (measured both in lower scores in 'Course Challenging' on evals and higher % of B+ grades)?
4. Has the assessment/retention rate remained constant? Are there any suggestions that course content or design has changed assessment/retention rates? Is there any way to separate the issue of the validity of the assessment instrument (i.e., the questions used) from the assessment/retention rate? In other words, is it necessary to keep the same assessment questions or can they be changed without artificially compromising the 'apparent' assessment/retention rates?

COURSE-SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT RESULTS:

Lower Division General Education:

AN 200 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2000-08; Assessments for 2003-05, 2007-08; Grading image for 2001-08. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears:

The course appears to do well in the General Education Goal of Marianist Community. The course did well in student evaluations both in providing added value and being challenging. Assessment scores for ethics and ethnocentrism dropped dramatically (from 70% average down to 37%) when the questions were redesigned in 2007-08, so further modification of the questions has to be done. Anthropology conceptual understanding was generally very good. There was no

statistically significant correlation between course success/failure rates and either evaluations or assessment scores.

GE 102 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2000-08; Assessments for 2004-09; Grading image for 2001-09. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears: The course appears to well across the board. It scores consistently well in General Education Goals of Marianist Community and Sensitivity to Cultural Diversity. The course did well in student evaluations both in providing added value and also in being challenging. Assessment scores for developing awareness and sensitivity for ethnocentrism and cultural diversity were good. There was no statistically significant correlation between course success/failure rates and either evaluations or assessment scores.

GE 103 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2001-08; Assessments for 2004-2008; Grading image for 2001-08. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears: The course appears to do well with the exception of the culture questions which were modified in 2007-08, so these will have to be re-examined. It scores consistently well in General Education Goals of Marianist Community and Sensitivity to Cultural Diversity. The course did well in student evaluations both in providing added value and also in being challenging. Assessment scores for developing cultural awareness were good until the question change in 2007, but sensitivity to ethnocentrism continued to do good except for a significant drop in 2008 when the questions was changed. Geography conceptual understanding was good.

Lower Division Courses:

AN 210 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2006, 2008-09; Assessments for 2006; Grading image for 2006-2009. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears: The course appeared to do well across the board. The 2006 assessment scored well in General Education Goals of Marianist Community. The course did well in the 2006 student evaluations both for added value and also in being challenging. Anthropology conceptual understanding was very good.

GE 204 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2001-08; Grading image for 2000-2008. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears: The course does well in student evaluations both for added value and also in being challenging. The goals in this course will be to keep the value added scores at 90%+ and the course challenging scores at 85%+.

Upper Division Courses:

AN 340 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2000-08; Grading image for 2001-2008. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears: The course does well in student evaluations both for added value and also in being challenging. The goals in this course will be to keep the value added scores at 80%+ and course challenging scores at 85%+.

AN 350 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2001-09; Grading image for 2001-2009. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears: The course does well in student evaluations both for added value and also in being challenging. The goals in this course will be to keep the valued added scores at 80%+ and the course challenging scores at 90%+.

AN 357 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2000-08; Grading image for 2000-2008.

As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears:

The course does well in student evaluations both for added value and also in being challenging. The goals in this course will be to keep the valued added scores at 90%+ and the course challenging scores at 90%+.

AN 360 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2001-09; Grading image for 2001, 2005-

9. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears:

The course does well in student evaluations both for added value and also in being challenging. The goals in this course will be to keep the value added scores at 90%+ and the course challenging scores at 90%+.

GE/ID 335 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2001-09; Grading image for 2001-2009. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears:

The course does well in student evaluations both for added value and also in being challenging. The goals in this course will be to keep the value added scores at 85%+ and the course challenging scores at 85%+. It should be noted that this course requires a group final project which is evaluated by members of the design and commercial development community on O`ahu so there is direct feedback on the level of competency presented by students. From 2007-2009 (the period in which external review and critique began) most student work has been evaluated at acceptable levels, with some group projects as very good. Usually there is one group per semester that fails the review, in every case due to lack of application and time spent on the project.

APPENDIX A

COURSE TALLY ASSESSMENT DATA

****Check N, add %=B or higher as part of acquisition of thematic knowledge; /D-F Non-participating

****On Evals, 'gain signif know/would recommend= Value Added; Acad require challenging agree/strong agree= Course Challenging

AN 200:

2000= Evals(n= 25)= Value Added= 92%; 100%; Course Challenging= 92%
Evals(n= 13)= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 77%

2001= (n= 34)[B+= 22/65%+; DNF= 2/6%]
Evals(n= 25)= Value Added= 92%; 96%; Course Challenging= 88%
(n= 21)[B+= 9/43%+; DNF= 3/14%]
Evals(n= 12)= Value Added= 92%; 92%; Course Challenging= 92%

2002= (n= 31)[B+= 23/74%+; DNF= 3/9%]
Evals(n= 19)= Value Added= 95%; 95%; Course Challenging= 95%
(n= 25)[B+= 16/64%+; DNF= 4/16%]
Evals(n= 16)= Value Added= 81%; 93%; Course Challenging= 94%

2003= (n= 17)[B+= 6/35%+; DNF= 5/29%]
Ethics= 65%+; Marianist Community= 100%+
Ethnocentrism= 75%+; Anthro= 82%+; individ/group= 59%+; Religion/diversity= 59%+
Evals= Value Added= 83%; 83%; Course Challenging= 83%
Evals(n= 20)= Value Added= 90%; 90%; Course Challenging= 90%

2003= (n= 38)[B+= 21/55%+; DNF= 7/18%]
Ethics= 76%; Marianist Community= 100%+
Ethnocentrism= 61%+; Anthro= 61%+; individ/group= 68%+; Religion/diversity= 74%+

2004= (n= 21)[B+= 7/33%+; DNF= 4/19%]
Ethics= 71%+; Marianist Community= 91%+
Anthro= 100%+
Evals= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 93%

2004= (n= 34)[B+= 38%+; DNF= 6/18%]

2005= (n=25)[B+= 17/68%+; DNF= 5/20%]
Ethics= 64%+; Marianist Community= 96%+
Anthro= 80%+; individ/group= 72%+
Evals= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

2005= (n= 11)[B+= 5/45%+; DNF= 2/18%]
Ethics= 74%+; Marianist Community= 100%+
Ethnocentrism= 100%+; Anthro= 100%+; Religion/diversity= 92%+
Evals= Value Added= 100%; 90%; Course Challenging= 100%

2006= (n= 21)[B+= 13/62%+; DNF= 1/.5%]
Evals= Value Added= 89%; 78%; Course Challenging= 77%

2007= (n= 30)[B+= 20/67%+; DNF= 3/1%]
Ethics= 37%+ [new question]; Marianist Community= 83%+
Ethnocentrism= 74%+; Anthro= 47%+/80%+; Religion/diversity= 87%+
Evals(n=24)= Value Added= 96%; 96%; Course Challenging= 96%

2008= (n= 24)[B+= 16/67%+; DNF= 1/4%]
Ethics= 38%+; Marianist Community= 100%+
Ethnocentrism= 63%+/22%+; Anthro= 72%+/95%+; Religion/diversity= 77%+
Evals(n=17)= Value Added= 94%; 100%; Course Challenging= 94%

GE 102:

2000= Evals(n= 23)= Value Added= 86%; 82%; Course Challenging= 96%

2001= (n= 34)[B+= 25/74%; DNF= 3/8%]
Evals(n= 29)= Value Added= 90%; 90%; Course Challenging= 97%

2002= (n= 25)[B+= 14/56%; DNF= 2/8%]
Evals(n= 16)= Value Added= 94%; 67%; Course Challenging= 100%

2003= (n= 38)[B+= 16/42%; DNF= 13/34%]
Evals(n= 17)= Value Added= 71%; 71%; Course Challenging= 88%

2004= (n= 33)[B+= 19/57%; DNF= 6/2%]
Marianist Community= 88%+
Ethnocentrism= 73%+; Religion/diversity= 79%+
Separate Assess Instrument (n=19)= Marianist Community= 74%; 95%
Culture= 84%; 79%; Geog= 74%; 95%
Evals= Value Added= 79%; 79%; Course Challenging= 89%

2005= (n= 27)[B+= 18/67%; DNF= 5/18%]
Marianist Community= 100%+
Ethnocentrism= 81%+; Religion/diversity= 67%+
Evals= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 91%

2006= (n= 36)[B+= 27/75%; DNF= 2/5%]
Marianist Community= 100%+[question flawed]
Ethnocentrism= 89%+
Evals= Valued Added= 100%; 90%; Marianist Community= 88%;
Culture= 92%; 92%; Geog= 92%; Course Challenging= 81%

2007= (n= 28)[B+= 24/86%; DNF= 1/3%]
Marianist Community= 100%+
Evals(n= 16)= Value Added= 89%; 100%; Course Challenging= 89%

2008= (n= 24)[B+= 19/79%; DNF= 2/8%]
Marianist Community= 92%
Evals(n= 19)= Value Added= 100%; 95%; Course Challenging= 95%

2009= (n= 23)[B+= 17/74%; DNF= 0]
Marianist Community= 96%

Ethnocentrism/Culture= 83%; Geog= 100%/100%/100%
Evals(n= 19)= Value Added= 95%; 90%; Course Challenging= 95%

GE 103:

2000= (n= 21)[B+= 16/76%; DNF= 0]

Evals(n= 16)= Value Added= 82%; 88%; Course Challenging= 87%

2001= (n= 29)[B+= 19/66%; DNF= 0]

Evals(n= 24)= Value Added= 80%; 80%; Course Challenging= 76%

2002= (n= 26)[B+= 16/62%; DNF= 2/7%]

Evals(n= 18)= Value Added= 100%; 95%; Course Challenging= 95%

2003= (n= 31)[B+= 20/65%; DNF= 4/12%]

Evals= Value Added= 93%; 93%; Course Challenging= 93%

2004= (n= 30)[B+= 18/60%; DNF= 4/13%]

Marianist Community= 97%+

Evals= Value Added= 100%; 94%; Course Challenging= 88%

2005= (n= 14)[B+= 10/71%; DNF= 0]

Marianist Community= 100+

Evals= Value Added= 100%; 85%; Course Challenging= 71%

2006= (n= 23)[B+= 17/74%; DNF= 1/4%]

Marianist Community= 100%+

Ethnocentrism/Culture= 100%+; Geog= 100%+; Religion/diversity= 100%+
[flawed questions]

2007= (n= 14)[B+= 11/79%; DNF= 0]

Marianist Community= 79%+

Ethnocentrism/Culture= 100%+/43%+; Geog= 100%+;

Religion/diversity= 100%+

Evals(n= 11)= Value Added= 100%; 92%; Course Challenging= 100%

2008= (n=23)[B+= 22/96%; DNF= 1/4%]

Marianist Community= 87%+

Ethnocentrism/Culture= 75%+/40%+; Geog= 95%+

Evals(n= 16)= Value Added= 100%; 87%; Course Challenging= 100%

AN 210:

2006= (n= 5)[B+= 4/80%; DNF= 1/20%]

Evals= Value Added= 67%;100%; Marianist Community= 100%; Ethics= 100%

Anthro= 100%; Arch= 100%; 90%; Course Challenging= 100%

2008= (n= 8)[B+= 8; DNF= 0]

Evals(n= 4)= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

2009= (n= 12)[B+= 11/92%; DNF= 1/8%]

Evals(n= 8)= Value Added= 90%; 70%; Course Challenging= 100%

GE 204:

2000= (n= 13)[B+= 6/46%; DNF= 3/23%]

2001= (n= 16)[B+= 14/88%; DNF= 0]

Evals(n= 9)= Value Added= 89%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

Evals(n= 12)= Value Added= 75%; 83%; Course Challenging= 83%

2002= (n= 12)[B+= 7/58%; DNF= 2/17%]

Evals(n= 6)= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

2003= (n= 12)[B+= 11/92%; DNF= 0]

Evals= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

2004 (n= 13)[B+= 11/85%; DNF= 0]

Evals= Value Added= 100%; 82%; Course Challenging= 82%

2005= (n= 9)[B+= 6/67%; DNF= 1]

Evals= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

2006= (n= 15)[B+= 10/67%; DNF= 2/13%]

Evals= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 77%

2007= (n= 16)[B+= 10/63%; DNF= 2/13%]

Evals(n= 9)= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

2008= (n= 21)[B+= 12/57%; DNF= 1/5%]

Evals(n= 11)= Value Added= 91%; 91%; Course Challenging= 100%

AN 340:

2000= (n= 20)[B+= 14/70%; DNF= 2/10%]

Evals(n= 14)= Value Added= 86%; 79%; Course Challenging= 78%

2001= (n= 14)[B+= 9/64%; DNF= 1/7%]

Evals(n= 9)= Value Added= 78%; 89%; Course Challenging= 100%

2002= (n= 21)[B+= 16/76%; DNF= 2/10%]

Evals(n= 14)= Value Added= 93%; 93%; Course Challenging= 86%

2003= (n= 19)[B+= 13/68%; DNF= 4/21%]

Evals= Value Added= 86%; 86%; Course Challenging= 93%

2004= (n= 24)[B+= 14/58%; DNF= 3/12%]

Evals= Value Added= 84%; 84%; 84%

2005= (n= 12)[B+= 5/42%; DNF= 3/25%]

Evals= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 88%

2006= (n= 26)[B+= 18/69%; DNF= 4/15%]

Evals= Value Added= 75%; 70%; Course Challenging= 86%

2007= (n= 19)[B+= 12/63%; DNF= 3/16%]

Evals(n= 10)= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 90%

2008= (n= 32)[B+= 23/72%; DNF= 2/6%]
Evals(n= 17)= Value Added= 100%; 89%; Course Challenging= 100%

AN 350:

2000= Evals(n= 10)= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

2001= (n= 24)[B+= 15/63%; DNF= 2/8%]
Evals(n= 16)= Value Added= 89%; 81%; Course Challenging= 89%

2002= (n= 29)[B+= 23/79%; DNF= 1/3%]
Eval(n= 19)= Value Added= 76%; 85%; Course Challenging= 81%

2003= (n= 37)[B+= 28/76%; DNF= 5/13%]
Evals(n= 18)= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

2004= (n= 20)[B+= 12/60%; DNF= 6/30%]
Evals= Value Added= 5%; 77%; Course Challenging= 92%

2006= (n= 18)[B+= 11/61%; DNF= 6/33%]
Evals= Valued Added= 92%; 100%; Marianist Community= 94%
Anthro= 92%; 96%; 94%; Course Challenging= 100%

2007= (n= 20)[B+= 14/70%; DNF= 2/10%]
Evals(n= 15)= Value Added= 100%; 92%; Course Challenging= 100%

2008= (n= 22)[B+= 18/82%; DNF= 3/14%]
Evals(n= 16)= Value Added= 100%; 86%; Course Challenging= 86%

2009= (n= 19)[B+= 15/79%; DNF= 0]
Evals(n= 15)= Value Added= 100%; 93%; Course Challenging= 100%

AN 357:

2000= (n= 12)[B+= 9/75%; DNF= 2/17%]
Evals(n= 9)= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

2001= (n= 10)[B+= 8/80%; DNF= 1]
Evals(n= 6)= Value Added= 83%; 83%; Course Challenging= 83%

2002= (n= 13)[B+= 7/54%; DNF= 5/35%]
Evals(n= 10)= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 90%

2003= (n= 4)[B+= 3; DNF= 0]
Evals= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

2004= (n= 11)[B+= 8/73%; DNF= 2/18%]
Evals= Value Added= 89%; 100%; Course Challenging= 89%

2005= (n= 17)[B+= 13/76%; DNF= 2/12%]

2006= (n= 15)[B+= 11/73%; DNF= 2/13%]

Evals= Value Added= 89%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

2007= (n= 15)[B+= 14/93%; DNF= 0]

Evals(n= 9)= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

2008= (n= 21)[B+= 14/67%; DNF= 6/29%]

Evals(n= 14)= Value Added= 93%; 93%; Course Challenging= 100%

AN 360:

2001= (n= 15)[B+= 8/53%; DNF= 4/27%]

2002= Evals(n= 7)= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

2005= (n= 16)[B+= 9/56%; DNF= 5/31%]

Evals= Value Added= 86%; 86%; Course Challenging= 85%

2006= (n= 19)[B+= 15/79%; DNF= 1]

Evals= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Marianist Community= 96%

Anthro= 98%; 98%; 96%; Course Challenging= 100%

2007= (n= 11)[B+= 8/73%; DNF= 1]

Evals(n= 10)= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

2008= (n= 22)[B+= 13/59%; DNF= 4/18%]

Evals(n= 17)= Value Added= 89%; 94%; Course Challenging= 83%

2009= (n= 11)[B+= 10/91%; DNF= 1/9%]

Evals(n= 9)= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

GE/ID 335:

2000= Evals(n= 5)= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 80%

2001= (n= 7)[B+= 7/100%]

Evals(n= 7)= Value Added= 72%; 72%; Course Challenging= 86%

2002= (n= 11)[B+= 10/91%; DNF= 0]

Evals(n= 7)= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

2003= (n= 9)[B+= 7/78%; DNF= 0]

Evals(n= 5)= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 80%

2004= (n= 19)[B+= 17/89%; DNF= 0]

Evals= Value Added= 94%; 89%; Course Challenging= 89%

2005= (n= 19)[B+= 10/53%; DNF= 2]

Evals= Value Added= 73%; 73%; Course Challenging= 73%

2006= (n= 21)[B+= 17/81%; DNF= 3/14%]

Evals= Value Added= 89%; 92%; Course Challenging= 77%

2007= (n= 26)[B+= 20/77%; DNF= 3/12%]

Culture= 88%; 82%; Geog= 92%; 86%

Evals(n= 15)= Value Added= 91%; 94%; Course Challenging= 88%

2008= (n= 22)[B+= 20/91%; DNF= 0]

Evals(n= 13)= Value Added= 100%; 92%; Course Challenging= 100%

2009= (n= 19)[B+= 17/89%; DNF= 0]

Evals(n= 15)= Value Added= 100%; 100%; Course Challenging= 100%

APPENDIX B

EXAMPLES OF ESSAY QUESTIONS FOR VARIOUS COURSES

AN 200:

The “Merchants of Cool” video examined marketing to teenagers in modern American society. In a society so consumed by the need to be individualistic, did you see any examples of explicit group behavior? How would you define American individualism based on this video and your own personal observations? Why would “Cool Hunting” require classic anthropological field techniques? Detail and support from class material.

Nerburn’s book is your personalized look into cross-cultural dialog. How was Nerburn dependent on his informants? How do you see ethnocentrism on the part of Anglo-Americans exhibited in this book? How did this affect Dan’s view of Nerburn? Does this book explain some of the social/psychological impacts of the reservation system in the U.S? In your view, what are they? Use examples to support your analysis.

GE 102

You are Sarkozy, the French Prime Minister. Bretagne (and the Chunnel) has just gone independent, and Normandie will follow next year. Given that the EU constitution will accept them as independent states, what can you do about it? Can you afford to send the army in and take them back? What would be the disadvantages of re-taking your sovereign land? How does ethnicity vs. nationalism fit here? Use the class material to back up your argument.

You have seen 2 videos relating to immigration and national identity (Germany and Australia). What issues of identity and culture were common to both? How do they differ? Which one would be closer to the dialog going on in the U.S. with all the effort being spent to keep out illegal immigrants from Latin America and Asia? Explain and defend your analysis with examples from the course material.

GE 103

The Coming & Going car video reflects American perception of the physical landscape—what do Americans see Nature as? What social function does the car serve in the video? What social function does your car serve? Why do you value it so highly? Support your discussion with the material from class.

Tourism here is based on the use of a specific set of ethnic symbols/ethnic culture—whose symbols/culture? Why doesn’t tourism here market the large local Japanese population? What are the basic criteria to make a successful tourist destination? What symbols/images does Hawaii use to project its tourism image to North America? How does this conflict with the ethnicity of certain groups here? Use the class material to support your analysis.

AN210:

Why would a theoretical approach be necessary to excavating burials in China, as in your handout? What happens (or doesn’t happen) if you don’t have a theoretical basis to your work? I go back to dig at your burial site 20 years later—all I have is your field notes and final report. How did you make my life really miserable with your lack of theoretical approach? Use the course materials to back up your answer.

You have been recovering burial data within a large burial complex. You have now been told that this is going to be an industrial park and highway complex. What are your mitigation options?

To add to your miseries, there is limited time and you do not have sufficient staff. How does that change your mitigation? What issues do you face with the recovered materials? Use the course materials.

GE 204

Why is personal transportation (“I must have my own car”) such an emotional issue on O’ahu given the obvious impacts (especially around Christmas)—we have one of the highest rates of car ownership per mile in the world here. What behavioral/social issues are at work here? If the rail system is completed will it be used enough to turn a profit? Will you and your relatives/friends use it? Remember to add in that current predictions are reductions in oil production and increased demand by 2010, so prices can be expected to be double current levels by the time the rail system is completed. Use yourself and your contacts as source material along with the class material.

What do you feel are the 3 most powerful tourism stereotypes of Hawai‘i that are visible in the two videos (E! Hawaii-Fiji/Step by Step)? Interpret them--what is their meaning, values, imagery. What relationship do they have to the Hawaiian culture described in Thrum’s articles? The Hawai‘i that you live in? Do they have special significance to the ethnic group called Hawaiian? Detail and support your point of view.

AN 340

You have watched the “American Aloha” video. A major point in discussions on contemporary Hawaiian identity is the increasingly geocentric definition of ethnicity (in part due to State and Federal definitions in terms of \$\$ and resources). How are the *kumu* in this video ethnically Hawaiian? In what ways might local ethnic Hawaiians (i.e. residing in Hawai‘i) view them as not being ethnically Hawaiian? How long (years-generations-other criteria) before a Hawaiian migrant ceases to be ethnically Hawaiian? Use Merry, Thrum and the course material to support your analysis. Remember not to get caught up in a critique—I want to see evidence to support your opinion, not just a opinion. If you want to use material outside of class, it must be cited and available.

One of the major changes in contemporary Hawaii has been the movement of the tourist/part-time resident into the local community. Is local a culture? An ethnicity? Define it. How is it related to Hawaiian culture? Define contemporary Hawaiian culture. The tourism industry (and tourists themselves) are interested only in Hawaiian culture—how will this impact the more complex relations developing between the Hawaiian, non-Hawaiian residents and tourists? How would the rapid development of high-rise or subdivision ‘gated communities’ limited to upper socio-economic groups impact this relationship? Support your analysis with the course materials.

AN 350

In the readings and videos we saw the tensions between customary practices (*kastom*) and the modern world (*sukulu*) in Melanesian societies. Define ‘*kastom*’ and ‘*sukulu*’ in Melanesia. Can you be ‘*sukulu*’ and still hold to your culture in Melanesia? What aspects of ‘*kastom*’ life are most threatened by ‘*sukulu*’ outside of religion? How, if at all, does ‘*sukulu*’ change interpersonal relationships? Detail with course material, especially Lockwood and videos.

Most Micronesian and Polynesian societies are having major problems with alcoholism and high suicide rates, especially in the 10-25 age group (as noted by Hezel). There doesn’t appear to be any close correlation between how conservative the society is and the problems—they are all really high. Did you see any specific social indicators in the video on Samoan gangs in California that would help to reinforce Hezel’s analysis? What specific social factors are most responsible?

If you were in charge of health services in Hawaii for Polynesians or Micronesians, how would you combat this problem? Use the course materials, specifically Hezel, to support your analysis.

AN 360

Do you see a coherent aspect of world view dealing with space, place and property (as in private) in one region we've covered so far? Is it the same or different than the Anglo-European world view brought over with the colonists? How, if at all, has it lead to conflict in the past? Have these divergent views reached a position of mutual accommodation, especially in the American legal system? Use the readings and videos to support your analysis.

By the 20th century, Anglo-Indian relationships became defined by the Rez and mainstream media (western lit, movies, TV). What was the goal of the Reservation system—why were they established? Do they have the same function now? What has been the social impacts of the Rez system? Should the Reservation system continue—if not, replaced with what? Detail with course materials.

AN 357

You have a friend who will be teaching in a Japanese high school. They are clueless about Japanese culture. They have been warned by older Japanese that 'young people are so different, they don't really seem Japanese.' Your friend wants your expert opinion (having taken this class), especially your analysis of what you saw in the 'Youth Rebellion' and 'O Miai' videos. Are the younger generation (30-somethings and younger) still really 'Japanese'? What (if any) traditional normative Japanese values and attitudes do they exhibit? In what way (if at all) are the older Japanese correct, that younger Japanese are not Japanese? Detail with the course materials.

A friend of yours is planning on marrying into a Chinese family but they are classically mainstream American in their cultural background. What would be the main 3 social values/rules/norms you would want to warn them/caution them about in terms of major differences from mainstream American culture? Make your points significant social ones, not stuff like 'learning to use chopsticks' or such.

GE/ID 335

Discuss Hall's Hidden Dimension within the context of the shift in American society that the car (suv) has become a 2nd residence not only in terms of time spent but also in "creature comforts". What are the social/spatial implications, especially in regards to social interaction? Do you see Americans as being aware of these shifts in values/attitudes towards the car or just as passive actors? How does this impact the design and use of the traditional home?

You have 6 pictures—3 are from Japan, 3 from China Pick which are images of Japan—what makes them Japanese (aesthetics, symbolic)? Which images are of China—what makes them Chinese (aesthetics, symbolic)? What examples do these images provide of the cultural nature of the built environment/cultural landscape?