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Introduction

My goal here is to share some ideas that I have learned about the teaching and learning process and to apply them to a specific course where I used food as a teaching tool. Before I do the review, let me say a few words about why it is fun and useful to teach with food. Others can come up with their own ideas, but here are some of mine:

1. Use the fact that everybody eats! Since everyone eats, all students will have experience with food and food preparation from at least one tradition, so they will be able to relate their experience to the course materials. *Everybody Eats!* is actually the title of a book I used for the course. (See Anderson 2005.)

2. When teaching with food, it is easy to make comparisons between: (a) cultural groups, (b) food types, and (c) cultural preferences.

3. There are also lots of foodways available, and they are often highly visible and easy to find.

The subject should be accessible to students and faculty and provide many ways to make comparisons and generate hypotheses about human behavior.
Pedagogy

Until recently the term *pedagogy* was not one I used often. Usually it had some vaguely obscene connotations, like “matriculation,” and hence was not something that one would say in the presence of one’s mother (and perhaps not in front of one’s colleagues).

In terms of pedagogy, I count myself as a long-time practitioner of what I call the “Table of Contents” School of Course Design. This system makes it easy to design a course; all the instructor does is open the textbook to the Table of Contents, count the number of chapters, and then, depending on the number of them, make each chapter the topic for a week’s worth of classes.

For example, if the text is divided into sixteen chapters, and there are sixteen weeks in the semester, then one chapter is assigned for each week. Simple. All the instructor needs to do is put in some material about office hours, grading system, and related information, and Presto! The syllabus is complete.

The catch here is that the syllabus, and hence the course, is designed solely around content. Issues about student learning and how best to formulate what the instructor wants to accomplish for the semester, are not dealt with at all.

Although I had been a long-time practitioner of this method, I was not always comfortable with it. While I made modifications to my syllabi and teaching methods that I thought were improvements, I was not aware of the scholarship of teaching and learning.

In the past few years, my campus, North Carolina A&T State University, has been blessed with a formal Academy for Teaching and Learning, currently led by the dynamic Dr. Scott Simkins, a reformed economist. He sponsors workshops and lectures by noted scholars in the area of teaching and learning, building on a tradition established by the Director of the University’s Honors Program, Dr. Meyers. Through my attendance at these activities, I have come to
learn more about alternatives to Table of Contents Pedagogy. I will discuss some of the workshop leaders and their ideas that have impacted me before I move on to discussing food.

Student Teams

Barbara Millis conducted workshops on using groups effectively. I was interested in her material because I have been using groups for a long time but never felt that I was as effective with them as I could be.

The titles of her workshops will give an idea of her approach: “Using Groups Wisely and Well,” “Promoting Deep Learning/Critical Thinking through Cooperative Activities,” “Sequencing Cooperative Activities for Course Redesign,” and “Cooperative Learning through Groups and Games.” Note that games recurs in the titles, as does cooperative. (For more discussion, see Millis and Cottell 1998.)

As Millis has presented it, cooperative learning can be characterized as follows. First, it is “a structured form of small group problem solving that incorporates the use of heterogeneous teams.” Second, it “maintains individual accountability.” Third, it “promotes positive interdependence and instills group processing.” Finally, it “sharpens social skills.”

Millis is a proponent of using groups and prefers groups of four, a size that I now use and that I call Teams. As I use them, these Teams are permanent (in my case, semester-long) groups that work together in cooperative learning activities and have a division of labor in terms of what each individual is asked to do. Each Team has a permanent folder into which I put assignments and where students place the work they turn in. Team roles include a “Folder Monitor,” who keeps track of the folders and has each member sign the roll; the “Facilitator,” who keeps the Team on task and makes sure discussion is relevant to the class; the “Recorder,” who writes down material relevant to class discussion (and is usually the person I ask to share
that material with the class); and the “Reporter,” who is responsible for giving oral reports on Team deliberations to the class or other Teams. Usually I try to rotate the roles periodically so that everyone gets to share. Before employing this method, I had used groups in my classes but had not been as systematic in creating and using them as Millis and others advocate.

When handled in the ways that Millis suggests, Teams can be beneficial to the course by providing a way for each member to support the others and by getting all members to participate in completing the work done. Some students complain that they dislike working in groups, that some members are slack, and that only some do the actual work. Millis offers ways to get all members to do more and to identify Team members who are and are not cooperating. For example, currently after every major Team project, I have each Team member anonymously and confidentially fill out a “Peer Evaluation” form, where each Team member gives specific information about the contributions of each member to the project. I use these forms to evaluate each member’s work on the project so there is individual accountability. I also try to have a mixture of assignments done by individuals and by Teams, so I can tell where the work is being done.

I have just begun to use the practical ideas found in an article by Barbara Oakley, Rebecca Brent, Richard Felder, and Imad Elhajj, “Turning Student Groups into Effective Teams” (2004), which gives step-by-step suggestions for getting the most out of teams, including policy statements and forms useful for rating individual and team performance, among others.

Course Design

Beyond the use of cooperative groups is the issue of more systematic course structuring for student learning. I have been influenced here by a workshop by Dee Fink, who has codified his thinking into the
book *Creating Significant Learning Experiences: An Integrated Approach to Designing College Courses* (2003). For Fink, what a student carries away from the course is much more than just the content. For example, his “Taxonomy of Significant Learning” (2003, 30) includes the following topics arranged in a circle so that none comes before the other:

- Foundational Knowledge
- Application
- Integration
- Human Dimension
- Caring
- Learning How to Learn

Fink is especially concerned that teachers should plan courses starting with learning objectives, what one wants students to get out of the course, and then work back to the actual assignments and day-to-day activities. The activities should be subordinate to the goals of the course. He also advocates a series of interlocked objectives that engage the student as a person and a learner, not just objectives that emphasize content.

I have used Fink’s ideas in “Topics in Cultural Anthropology,” the principal cultural anthropology course for the department. It is listed as a Sociology course (Sociology 300) since my department is a Department of Sociology and Social Work. In addition to being required for departmental sociology majors, the course is taken primarily by freshmen and sophomores from a wide variety of majors as their principal social science course, since it has no prerequisites. For Sociology majors, it usually constitutes their only exposure to anthropology.

Perhaps the main idea I carried away from the workshops is that actual content is one of the less important parts of a course. That
doesn’t mean that content is not important; it means that students don’t remember much of the content unless they receive it in ways they can relate to and find interesting. I have had a difficult time wrapping my mind around this point, even though my experience tells me that it is true.

Activities that Promote Active Learning

Fink and others are also concerned with what they call “active learning,” that the students are actively involved in their own education and feel empowered to make that happen for themselves. I reproduce here, with slight variations in wording and formatting, a table from Fink (2003, 108) that outlines “Activities that Promote Active Learning.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Getting Information and Ideas</th>
<th>Experiencing by Doing</th>
<th>Experiencing by Observing</th>
<th>Reflecting (on what and how one is learning)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Methods</td>
<td>Original data</td>
<td>Real doing, in authentic settings</td>
<td>Classroom discussions, Term papers, In-depth reflective dialogue and writing on the learning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect, Vicarious</td>
<td>Secondary data</td>
<td>Case studies, Simulations, Role playing</td>
<td>Students can record their reflections, and then, if they choose, share their reflections with others in writing, via TV, or online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and sources, Lectures, texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Learning (</td>
<td>Course web site,</td>
<td>Teacher can assign students to “directly experience...”</td>
<td>Students can record their reflections, and then, if they choose, share their reflections with others in writing, via TV, or online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online courses,</td>
<td>Internet, Video</td>
<td>Students can engage in indirect kinds of experience, at distant sites or online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interactive video,</td>
<td>lectures, Printed</td>
<td>Teacher can assign students to “directly experience...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correspondence courses)</td>
<td>materials</td>
<td>Students can engage in indirect kinds of experience, at distant sites or online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. (From Fink 2003, 108)

Fink has a lot of things he wants us to consider in designing a course. He is bringing together what he wants students to know with methods that help them relate the new knowledge to what they knew before, preferably using methods that are memorable, and that
involve activities both in and outside the classroom. When I have students reflect on their learning during the semester in their Learning Portfolios, they often say that they prefer “hands-on” activities. My challenge, as I see it, is to find activities that we can do, both in and outside the classroom, that allow them to see relationships between what I am bringing to them and the activities and knowledge they have in their world outside the classroom. This is a tall challenge, but it keeps me motivated to work at making it happen, since the payoff is excitement and learning for myself and my students.

Evaluation Methods

To follow Fink’s ideas about the course and about building in ways to get feedback on student learning and evaluate that learning, I created an outline of the semester’s activities, including a timeline specifying what projects and activities were due at what time. For consistent feedback on student learning, I had students write a series of “Logs” that were due about every two weeks and that were designed to have students capture their thoughts and feelings about the learning process at those frequent intervals. They were asked to respond to the “Questions for the Log” that appear in Appendix 1.

At the end of the semester, students summarized these logs and the other semester activities in their Learning Portfolio. The outline of what was to be in the portfolio was given in the syllabus itself. Specific requirements for the portfolio are given in Appendix 2.

Fink suggests that it is very effective to have a major project or two that can involve a lot of the course objectives and reinforce them in memorable ways. With that in mind, and while we’re digesting Fink’s message, I want to move on to talk about some of these projects and how they relate to the course.
Teaching with Food

Ethnography

In terms of activities that fit with my overall course objectives and that involve active learning, I want to talk here about two—skills in interviewing and activities with food—that provide ways for comparisons and contrasts between cultural foodways. These objectives are related two objectives of the course that require both application and integration of knowledge.

For the interviewing part, I required each student to buy McCurdy, Spradley and Shandy’s book *The Cultural Experience: Ethnography in Complex Society* (2005), which lays out an ethnosemantic system for doing interviews and constructing ethnographies based on them. Each team was required to choose one member of the team to do an extended ethnography on one of his or her microcultures. I tried to model the process by reviewing parts of the book and then by interviewing a volunteer class member. This particular student volunteer shared his knowledge of his music studio and music creation, and I tape-recorded the conversation and transcribed it. I shared the transcription with the class and went over cover terms and other ideas in reference to the transcription, as practice in doing the work. (Note that this is a much different model for interviewing and processing the interviews than those shown nightly on the news and other media. Part of my effort in using this system is to compare and contrast it with what students are used to and to give them pointers on how to interview in the ethnosemantic way.)

Teams were asked to share with me their transcriptions so I could help them with the process and then to post their completed ethnographies on a special section of Blackboard (a web-based, course-management system that the university uses). All students were asked to read each other’s ethnographies, and then we had a special poster day, when each Team put posters on the wall of the
classroom giving highlights of their ethnographies. All teams were given color-coded reward stickers for first, second, and third place and were asked to “vote” for the best ethnographies by putting the stickers on the posters. This process led to some lively discussions (although I don’t think everyone read all the ethnographies) and to some winners. Winning teams got candy prizes and extra points on their grades.

This ethnography project was designed to help students learn a useful skill—that of structured interviewing—and also get skills they were to use in doing an ethnography of the foodways of whatever ethnic or other group they chose for their big end-of-semester project. This assignment was designed as preparation for the larger project.

In terms of evaluation of the ethnographies themselves, each Team was to evaluate each other’s ethnographies using the rubric for evaluating ethnographies given in Appendix 3. I was also concerned about whether the team members were all contributing equally to the work of doing the ethnography; and in order to get feedback on that, I had each member anonymously fill out a peer-evaluation form. This form is given in Appendix 4. I specified as often as I could that I would use the results of these forms to adjust the grade (expressed as points toward the semester’s total) earned by the Team itself when awarding points to each individual member. I used this peer evaluation form for all of the major reports done by teams during the semester.

Comparisons: Farm Field Trips

Another set of class activities involved field trips to two farms that provided a range of comparisons and contrasts between philosophies and practices in agriculture.
The first trip was to A&T’s own farm. Founded as an 1891 Land Grant college, A&T (hence the Agricultural and Technical part of the name) has an extensive farm in terms of acreage and in terms of the activities that it undertakes, all part of the School of Agriculture (now called the School of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences). The farm cultivates and researches a variety of animals and plants. It apparently has so many visitors and tours that it has dedicated tour wagons that can be towed behind large tractors. Our guides were agricultural graduate students and staff of the Agricultural Extension Service. We were not able to see the poultry unit but got to visit the beef pens, horses, and small animals (goats and sheep). Our main focus was on the vegetable crops, which were mostly played out by the time in the fall semester when we took the tour. What interested me about the tour—which I have now done two years in a row—is that by the second year, all the crops shown to us were claimed to be “organic,” since those kinds of crops were said to fetch the highest prices. (See the “Farm Assignment” in Appendix 5.)

The other trip was to the “Handance Farm,” a small farm run by a husband-and-wife team who bring their produce to the Farmers Curb Market, located in a city building right down the street from campus. (A visit to this market was an optional extra-credit assignment.) The couple is practicing CSA (community shares agriculture), which involves selling shares in their upcoming harvest to interested customers. In return, the customers get bags of vegetables each week (usually during the Saturday market time) during the season. The farm is located about twenty miles north of Greensboro, and the proprietor gave us a tour of the premises, including what was left of their crops for the year, and also their own chickens and turkeys, and their recently started shiitake mushroom logs. (Incidentally, the couple is involved in the local “Slow Food” movement, but neither I nor they talked much about this social movement because of time constraints...
and the focus on the farm itself. This movement is certainly another source of comparisons for food studies.) (The assignment for this trip is given in Appendix 6.)

We discussed what the term “organic” means and heard the proprietors’ take on its usefulness now that it is an official category sanctioned by the USDA (United States Department of Agriculture). They pointed out that they do not label their food as “organic” even though they follow organic practices, since they don’t want to put up with the paperwork and costs involved in the certification process.

The visits to the two farms provided a comparison between two sets of farming practices, the small scale farm and the agribusiness-oriented university farm, and students wrote some thoughtful essays about the comparisons. One of the comparisons that came through loudest, however, was how “messy” the students thought the small farm was. Those who had family members who had gardens remarked that their families would never have anything that messy. They thought that the A&T farm looked much better, with its neat rows and delineated crop areas.

Comparisons: Meals

I also had students do an assignment where they described and analyzed a major meal that they witnessed or partook of, using an analysis scheme I developed with Sandrea Williamson, a history department colleague with whom I have collaborated for many years on assignments and field trips. (See “Meal Context Analysis Checklist” in Appendix 7.)

As an in-class practice for this, I dusted off a set of films that I have used for years in various classes, Four Families (1959), with Margaret Mead and Ian McNeill of the Canadian Broadcasting System. Although designed to showcase ideas about infant enculturation, each vignette (about fifteen minutes each) from four cultures
(India, France, Japan, Canada) features a complete meal with the entire family as part of the video. This meal component allows for analysis of social, cultural, and technological factors involved in the meal (through using the Meal Context Analysis Checklist). It also invites comparisons and contrasts among the cultures and with what the students observe in their own family or in another context that they studied. (They were especially encouraged to do a homecoming meal or Thanksgiving meal.)

**Comparisons: Foodways**

An ongoing major project during the semester was the study of the book *Everyone Eats: Understanding Food and Culture*, by E. N. Anderson (2005). Each Team was responsible for giving a brief review of a chapter to the class, with comparisons to the *Four Family* film and other materials. The dates for these reports were in the “Weekly Steps” outline given at the beginning of the semester. (The rubric for evaluating these reports is given in Appendix 8 as “Criteria for Evaluating Team Reports on Book Chapters.”)

While this review was going on, each Team was charged with finding an informant and researching his or her foodways and with doing an ethnosemantic ethnography called the “Global Meal Report.” The criteria can be seen by referring to Appendix 7. The assignment was described in an information sheet, “Expectations for Global Meal Project” (Appendix 9).

The charge to the Teams was to: (a) find a local informant, (b) do an ethnography of his or her foodways, leading up to (c) getting a recipe from them, and (d) providing samples of the food cooked from that recipe to be presented to the class as part of a ten-minute, oral report on the ethnographies.

This charge led to some lively reports, including several where the informants did most of the presentation. The students reported on
Kenyan food, West Indian food, some Asian varieties. The presentations included one by a local gentleman who is an advocate of raw foods and who handed out cards advertising his business.

In terms of evaluation, a couple of assignments are related to this project; one is the “Global Meal Expectations” assignment, and the other is the “Criteria for Evaluating Team Reports on Global Meal,” used to evaluate the project (Appendix 10).

Unfortunately, for the semester I am reporting on, this project got started late enough in the semester that the ethnographies were not particularly comprehensive. Most of the reports were given on the last two days of class, with the result that a lot of food was eaten but the reports were hurried. (With this project, there seemed to be a lot of the different foods being eaten by class members, although by no means did all members taste all the food. This was in contrast with a previous incarnation of this course, which I have done in collaboration with Ms. Williamson, where the students brought in foods cooked with recipes, ingredients, and technologies as they would have been prepared in 1859. In many cases with these foods, the students would bring their assigned nineteenth-century food but refuse to eat any of it.)

For review of what I have been covering, we can consider how the activities and assignments fit into Fink’s model. Direct methods included Spradley-style interviews, field trips, the global meal research and reports, logs, and learning portfolios. Indirect methods included lectures and texts, video, and the Blackboard system class website. I used materials from the various projects reviewed above, exams, and the end of the semester Learning Portfolio, to assess how close the course came to fulfilling the objectives given earlier in this paper. Based on my assessment criteria, I conclude that overall the students met the goals I outlined for the semester, including gaining knowledge of food and foodways, the ability to do interviews
and analysis, and the ability to do comparisons between cultural systems. The course was a success on those scores.

Conclusion—“Carry Out” Lessons

I have two of what I call “carry out” (in reference to the food theme) conclusions I want to share here. One is that the group process with the teams takes a lot of time, especially class time, and I need to provide more time for it but structure it so that it is productive. For this course, I had so many projects that we didn’t do them justice. The other conclusion is to find ways to model or show what the result of an assignment should be so that students will know what to strive for. I cannot assume that students will know what I want from an assignment (such as an analysis of a meal) unless I can model it or give a cogent example. I did that to some extent with the Ethnography project but not enough with the others; as a consequence I don’t think the students knew what they were to produce. I have been using Rubrics for assessment, but did not take the time to go over those and to model outcomes. [See my comments on “Scaffolding” in the postscript below.]

A Recommended Treat

I do not claim to have command of the literature on foods and foodways but want to recommend an author whose books have helped me think about food. Michael Pollan’s work appears in the New York Times as well as in books. One of his latest books, which parallels some of what anthropologists talk about in terms of subsistence patterns, is The Omnivore’s Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals (2006). At the time I was preparing this paper, he also published a valuable article in the New York Times that seems to summarize a lot of his thinking. It is called “Unhappy Meals,” and was printed in

https://egrove.olemiss.edu/southernanthro_proceedings/vol41/iss1/7
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**Postscript (or should it be labeled “Dessert?”)**

Continuing in the tradition of “chef’s surprise,” I want to add some comments stemming from a recent workshop held by Craig Nelson, a long-time thinker in the area of the scholarship of teaching and learning. As I understand his story, his involvement in this area came from his studying ways to decrease the number of students who did poorly, or failed courses in his area—that of biology. He cites the work of Treisman (1986), who discovered that changing one’s pedagogy can make a dramatic difference in the outcomes of students studying in mathematics. Here, I want to highlight some ideas I got from Nelson (1994) and the workshop he conducted at my institution.

The first idea is that of *mental models*—both those that the students bring with them to college and to any of our courses—and also those of the disciplines they study. The fact that students’ brains are not tabulae rasae when they reach us should be obvious to anthropologists who are using the concept of culture to understand the world of human behavior. Nelson shows that it is important for faculty to find ways to explore what these student models are and build from these to what they want students to learn. Nelson suggests ways for students to do out-of-class exercises that are then shared with small groups of students in class so that all involved can make explicit what they bring with them and study it in light of what the instructor brings. In this way, Nelson advocates the use of small groups of students who are teaching and learning from each other, which ties in with what I have said above about Barbara Millis’s work.

The other kind of mental model is that of the discipline that is being studied, which often has methods and expectations, as well as
definitions of key terms that are different from what students probably learned before they entered the profession, and often different from what other disciplines they may be studying at the same time are doing or expecting. An example here is the concept of culture; anthropologists have argued for generations about what it is and have struggled for the definitive definition (or definitions?) of this key concept. But our use of the term is different from what students may meet in English or literature courses, and certainly different from what they meet in biology. Students need for us as instructors to make these differences explicit and to reinforce their learning about them.

Tied into these models are many unspoken approaches and concepts that can trip up students. Many of us, as well-socialized members of the profession, have so internalized these concepts that we forget about them and are puzzled when students cannot use them on assignments. For example, there are widely varying standards of proof and steps to defining problems between disciplines, and these differences can be dizzying for students. In literary studies, one may prove a thesis by relating it to other parts of the text that is being studied without any use made of empirical data. This approach is sometimes used in parts of anthropology, while other types of anthropology require certain kinds of field research to be conducted in order to find the information that can be used to prove a thesis, often with certain kinds of statistics displayed as evidence of proof. In many cases, these differences in approaches and proof are not explicitly taught by the instructors, who expect students to infer this from examples or from study of professional literature. This lack of explicitness brings me to the second point, which is sometimes referred to by Nelson and others as scaffolding.

Scaffolding refers to a process by which an instructor gives students, in a series of assignments and exercises, the skills and
experience needed for them to conduct the kinds of assignments and to perform proofs that are in line with what is demanded by the discipline being studied. I tried to do this with my course by having us all study the McCurdy book and do a “practice” ethnography of a member of the Team before tackling the “real” ethnography of a food item for the final project. As part of the practice, we were all supposed to read one or more of the student ethnographies that are part of the Spradley book. I did not spend class time in the study of any particular one of those, since I assumed that students would get the connection between the ethnography in the book and the steps to creating their own that we were reviewing in class. I think my assumption was incorrect; when I do this again, I will assign a particular one of the ethnographies, and then have the teams review each member’s understandings of it, and provide a way for the whole class to do a review before we move on to the step of creating our own ethnographies.

For me, learning of the achievements that have been made by applying Nelson’s ideas for improving teaching and learning is inspirational. Of course, it sounds easy when the masters discuss them, but applying them to one’s own work and teaching requires constant work. I hope that this article has given my readers some ideas and inspiration to do this sort of work themselves.
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Appendix 1

*Questions for the Log*

(The following are suggested questions to write about briefly to gather material for your logs, which will be part of the material for your Learning Portfolio.)

At what moment in class this week (or in the past couple of weeks) were you most engaged as a learner? What do you think contributed to this engagement?

At what moment in class this week (or in the past couple of weeks) were you most distanced as a learner? What contributed to this disengagement?

At what moment during your out of class work this week (or in the past couple of weeks) were you most engaged as a learner? What do you think contributed to this engagement?

At what moment during your out of class work this week (or in the past couple of weeks) were you most distanced as a learner? What contributed to this disengagement?

What action taken by anyone in the room took during class this week did you find the most affirming or positive or helpful?

What action taken by anyone in the room took during the class this week did you find the most puzzling or confusing?

What surprised you most about the class this week or in the past couple of weeks?

What have you learned about your learning styles and abilities during the past couple of weeks? How are you going to use this knowledge to help you learn better?
For stat class: What have you learned about your learning when you compare your performance on the quizzes with the Team performance?

What resources do you think you need in order to learn better?
How are you going to get these resources?
Appendix 2

Learning Portfolio

This is a notebook created by each student that contains his or her work during the semester, logs of experiences, and reflections on learning. The rubric that the instructor will use to mark the portfolio will be shared with the class during the semester.

The portfolio will have an extended essay, with supporting exhibits of work, that discusses the following:

a. What key ideas or information have you learned about the subject of this course?

b. What have you learned about how to use or apply the content of the course?

c. What parts of your knowledge, thinking, or actions have you been able to integrate or connect within or external to this learning experience? In other words, what knowledge or thinking or behaviors have you been able to relate to other parts within the course and to other parts of your life outside the course?

d. What have you learned about the human dimension of the subject? That is, how have you changed in some important way, and how have you changed in your ability to interact with others?

e. What interests, feelings, or values have changed as a result of this learning experience?

f. What have you learned about how to learn?
Appendix 3

Team # ______

*Marking Rubric for evaluating the Ethnographies*
*(taken from Spradley, Chapter 9)*

1. Thesis statement: concise statement of what the ethnography is about
   2 4 6

2. Parts of the paper
   Lead section (clarity, detail)
   5 10 15
   Methods used in the data gathering
   2 4 6
   Methods used in protecting informants (use of pseudonyms, masking people, places, events) 2 4 6
   Cultural Setting for the ethnography
   2 4 6 8

Body of paper
   Use of analytical taxonomies 5 10 15
   Narrative discussion 5 10 15

Conclusion
   5 10

Total  

Bonus from Class  

Total Points for Team __________
Comments:

Note: Individual Team member’s scores may be different based on evaluations by other Team members.

Member Scores:

_________________________  ___________

_________________________  ___________

_________________________  ___________

_________________________  ___________
Appendix 4

*Peer Evaluation of Team Member’s Contributions to the Oral Report*
(to be filled out anonymously and returned to the instructor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Team #</th>
<th>Title of Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column One</th>
<th>Column Two</th>
<th>Column Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Team Member</td>
<td>Specific contributions made to the creation of the ethnography</td>
<td>Points earned (0-10 scale) with 10 highest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5

Assignment for Field Trip to A&T Farm (Greensboro, NC)

Purpose: The purpose of the trip is to learn about the operation of the A&T farm itself and to learn about agricultural practices that the operators of the farm demonstrate and advocate.

Directions to Site: (Specifics are given)

Assignment: The workshop will be led by . . . and . . . members of the local Ag Extension program.

Listen to what the leaders have to say and record information about how the farm is laid out, what kinds of things it does, and especially what you can learn about the agricultural products and processes that it teaches about and is researching.

Written Assignment: Do a write-up about the trip in which you briefly discuss:

a) what you learned about the farm
b) the two ideas/artifacts/experiences you found the most interesting about the trip
c) how the trip compares/contrasts with Handance trip
d) two terms/concepts from the Anderson book

Due date and value for written assignment:
Typed or computer-written assignment is due within 1½ weeks from time of trip; value is 100 points. This assignment is to be done by INDIVIDUALS!
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Assignment for Field Trip to Handance Farm (near Reidsville, NC)
Travel date: XXXXX

Purpose: The purpose of the trip is to learn about the operation of the farm itself and to learn about organic, agricultural practices that the operators of the farm demonstrate and advocate.

Directions to Site: (Specifics are given)

NOTE: The trip will involve walking around the site, so wear comfortable walking shoes and suitable coats, sweaters, etc. depending on the weather.

Assignment: The workshop will be led by the farm owners/operators.

1. Listen to what they have to say about the farm and the kinds of crops/animals they raise and also to their discussion of organic farming methods, as well as their CSA initiative.

2. Record information about how the farm is laid out, what kinds of things it does, and especially what you can learn about organic agricultural products and processes.

Written Assignment: Do a write-up about the trip in which you include:

a) your map of how the farm is laid out and what crops and animals, etc. are where,

b) a brief discussion of what you learned about the farm and how it is operated,
c) a comparison and contrast of what you learned at this farm and A&T’s farm, and  
d) a brief discussion of two ideas/artifacts/experiences you found most interesting about the trip.

Due date and value for written assignment:  
Typed or computer-written assignment is due within 1½ weeks from time of trip; value is 100 points. This assignment is to be done by INDIVIDUALS!
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Meal Context Analysis Checklist
by David Johnson and Sandrea Williamson

1. Social context:
   - What is the name of meal (if it has a name)?
   - Who is present (status and economic condition of people being served and eating and of those doing the serving)?
   - How do they sit? What kinds of clothing do they wear?
   - What do they sit at (table, floor, etc.)?
   - Who is in charge, if anyone?
   - What kinds of topics are discussed?
   - Who cooks; who serves; who is served (in terms of age/gender or other statuses); in what order?
   - When does the meal start? When does it stop?
   - Who decides when it will start and stop?
   - When is it held; is it considered an ordinary, everyday meal, or a special ritual meal (such as a holiday, religious, or political occasion) or some special occasion?
   - Who is in charge of cleaning up and who is expected to help with the clean up and resetting of the area to a non-meal status (gender/age/ethnicity/other status)?

2. Foods and preparation
   Food items presented at the meal:
   - What foods were used for the meal? For each, discuss the source of the food (who grew it, when and how).
   - What status/economic factors were involved in food choices (such as costs for sugar or meats or other items)
- What kinds of preparation procedures are used (such as baking, frying, serving raw) and what preparations go with what foods?
- What kinds of technological devices are needed to process them?
  (and see below)
- What work process is used to prepare the foods?
- What kinds of foods are presented to the assembled group?
- What is the order of presentation of the food? List any foods that are considered defining of that kind of meal (such as turkey at Thanksgiving, etc.).
- What foods would not be considered appropriate (such as hot dogs for breakfast for many Americans)?
- Who is expected to prepare the foods (gender/age/ethnicity/other status)?
- Who is expected to serve the foods (gender/age/ethnicity/other status), if not the preparer?

3. Technology
   1) Food preparation
   What items are used to create the meal in the cooking area?
   For each item, discuss:
      - Who made these? When are they considered routine and ordinary, or special?
      - Were they created by the owners or users or bought from some outside source?
      - Who are the owners of the items?
      - Are the items expensive or ordinary?
      - Are they part of the fixed furniture of the kitchen or cook area (such as stoves) or movable?
      - Where are they stored?
Describe where the meal is prepared (for example, in a special room, in a building outside of the main house, or elsewhere).

2) Food serving
- What kinds of items are used to serve and to consume the foods?
- What items go with what kinds of foods?
- Where are these stored when not in use?

3) Food consumption area
- Describe the area where the food is consumed and the kinds of fixed and movable objects used for such consumption.
- Describe how this area is related to other parts of the dwelling.

4) Summary
- Why is this information important?
- What have we learned about gender roles and individual or group statuses?
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Criteria for Evaluating Team Reports on Book Chapters

Presenters’ Team # ______ and Title of Chapter _______________

Team # of Evaluator ______. (Note: Evaluator should come to class having read the chapter and Team online report)

I. Online Summary of Chapter
   • displays knowledge of chapter material
   • uses clear and understandable visual aids
   • uses correct spelling and grammar
   • shows main points of chapter
   • coincides well with class component of report
   • submitted on time

Max Value: 25 points

Value assigned by evaluator: ______

Comments on evaluation:

II. In Class Presentation of Chapter
   • shows knowledge of subject; includes ability to answer questions from class members
   • wears appropriate dress
   • uses good communication skills; includes body language
   • includes a contribution from every member of the Team
   • gets the class involved
   • provides an outline with comments tying to class activities
   • shows creativity and enthusiasm
   • demonstrates timeliness and preparedness by all members
   • uses an appropriate length
Max Value: 25 points
Value assigned by evaluator: _____
Comments on evaluation:

Total points earned by Team _____
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Expectations for Global Meal Project

The Global Meal Project will involve each Team’s locating an informant who has a foodway different from the majority of those in the Team. This can be someone from a different ethnic background but can also include someone from a different generation or subculture (such as, for example, a vegetarian, meat eater, unprocessed food eater) who is willing to share his or her knowledge with the Team. The informant can include a member of the Team who is willing to share with the rest of the class; if the Team wishes to use a Team member as an informant, it needs to clear this with Dr. Johnson.

The Team will do an ethnographic study of the person’s foodways, with the focus on a particular recipe that the Team, or the Team in conjunction with the informant, will cook and present to the class as a whole.

On the day agreed upon by the class, the Team will present the food, along with a brief oral report about the summary of their ethnography to the class, and the Team will have their complete ethnography available on Blackboard.

The class will judge the presentation using a form similar to the one used for chapter and Contemporary Issues projects. The maximum value for the meal will be 150 points.
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Criteria for Evaluating Team Reports on Global Meal

Presenters’ Team # _____ and Title of Report ________________
(Note: Presenter Team will fill out Peer Evaluation form on each member’s contributions.)

Team # of Evaluator __________

Characteristics of the Team and its presentation (maximum 45 percent)

- shows knowledge of subject 5 10
  (includes ability to answer questions from class members)
- appropriate dress 5
- uses good communication skills 10
  (includes body language)
- every member makes a contribution 5
- report gets class involved 5
- creative and enthusiastic 5
- all members are on time and prepared 5

Characteristics of the material presented (maximum 55 percent)

- team gives clear outline of what the presentation will cover 5
- presentation is an appropriate length 5 10
- thorough coverage of topic 10 15 20 25 30
- shows adequate research 5 10

Comments on evaluation:

What was done well?