

**HOW FAR HAVE WE GONE WITH *BEING APPLIED?*
FROM *NÁRODOPIS* TO *ANTROPOLÓGIA*, CURRICULA
HETEROGENEITY AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT IN SLOVAKIA**

HELENA TUŽINSKÁ

Comenius University, Faculty of Philosophy
Department of Ethnology and Cultural
Anthropology
818 01 Bratislava 16, Gondova 2
Slovakia

UDC / UDK 39:[316:572]

39:378

Review article

Pregledni znanstveni rad

Accepted: August 24, 2008

The author discusses a gradual change reflected in the design of the ethnology curricula at the Comenius University in Bratislava during the period of 1989–2007. Examination of curricula shows how the course of study has been subject to an altering demand of both social science discourse, and politics and the labor market. The author considers the interplay of ethnological curricula heterogeneity, teaching methods and limits of further public engagement. The data also call into question European standardization of university teaching. This particular curricula analysis serves as a case study for much wider debate in the Central European region.

Key words: *discourse in ethnology and anthropology, curricula heterogeneity, public engagement*

FROM *NÁRODOPIS* TO *ANTROPOLÓGIA*

The ethnology/anthropology debate seems to have been running for a long time already and I am not going to prolong the constant comparison. Though various paradigms within European ethnology and social and cultural anthropology might be incompatible, we all share the concern for existence of human culture. Therefore, I would like to focus on the alarming issue of minimal public engagement in ethnology and cultural anthropology, which happens to be in sharp contrast with most of the implicit agenda of our

study subjects¹. Nevertheless, there is a link between three widely discussed areas: ethnology/ anthropology debate, curricula heterogeneity, and public engagement of these disciplines. Following the example of the history department's curricula I propose the following: (1) etymology of subjects' titles indicate the presence/absence of theoretical paradigms, (2) adoption of European Credit Transfer System standardization, which made teaching more inflexible and (3) the challenge for applicability of what is taught lies in the way it is taught.

An analysis of paradigmatic change in university teaching is possible only at the oldest of ethnology departments in Slovakia². Although *národopis* was taught at Comenius University since 1921, an independent department was established only in 1969. Continual change of the subjects might be seen as most radical after the fall of communism. Not only was there an increase in new research topics, but access to foreign literature has also increased, as well as its incorporation into teaching. However, the study programs in the period from 1989 – 2007 reveal some of the repeatedly faced challenges.

A century ago the common discourse of many ethnographic traditions was backed up by attempts to collect all possible validation of a nations' specificity. Consequently, such core points – *collection, description, preservation, evidence of nation's history and memory, specificity of folk culture*, etc. was the bottom line of most of the curricula of the ethnological

¹ For a detailed historical overview of teaching anthropology in Slovakia see Botíková 2002 and Bitušíková 2004. For research topics after 1989 at the Slovak Academy of Sciences see Kiliánová 2005a. A variety of themes were both topical and broad - on ethnicity and nationalism, particular ethnic groups, social memory and stereotypes, tradition and identity, mentalities and myths, values, urban research, social transformation processes, but most of them had no connotation with applied science.

² The relatively recent decentralization of university educations in Slovakia resulted in a multiplication of ethnological departments. At the present there are several universities in Slovakia where one can study ethnology and/or cultural anthropology as separate bachelor or master degrees: Katedra etnológie a kultúrnej antropológie Univerzity Komenského v Bratislave, Katedra etnológie Univerzity sv. Cyrila a Metoda v Trnave, Katedra etnológie a etnomuzikológie Univerzity Konštantína Filozofa v Nitre, Inštitút kultúrnych štúdií Univerzity Komenského v Bratislave. Several ethnological courses are also taught as optional within humanities at the universities in Banská Bystrica and Prešov.

departments in our geopolitical area. How were these fields of interest translated into syllabi? Looking back, the core of study was an overview of evolution and systems of folk culture, in our case Slovak folk culture in Slavonic and European contexts (see Droppová 1991).

If we take a critical look at the present situation in ethnology - anthropology in Slovakia, it seems that the term anthropology (social and cultural anthropology) is kind of taboo among the Slovak scholars (Bitušiková 2002:142).

Perhaps this is not as accurate for scholars today as it is for the public.

The conservatism and traditionalism of the Slovak ethnologists has further consequences. Unlike *národopis* plus ethnography or folkloristics, social and cultural anthropology for anthropology in Slovakia has no public image, no one carries out 'public relations' on its behalf (Bitušiková 2002:144).

Most often the ethnologists have been in some way connected with the historical past of the folk customs. To some extent media both reflect and sustain the image of the ethnologist/anthropologist as an expert on traditions. Perhaps there are not yet any anthropologists engaged enough to reshape this view.

However, not all Slovak ethnologists agree that they "were never subjected to pressures to change their methodological foundations and epistemology or even to adopt a different interpretation of 'folk culture'" (Podoba 2005:251; for more details see Podoba 2005 and Kiliánová 2005b). Jakubíková suggests that it is necessary to abandon the descriptive level and to overcome the tendencies to positivism, particularity, and the romantic image of folk cultures and village life (Jakubíková 2000). In academia (Kiliánová 2005a) the change is visible: we do concentrate also on the research of the issues concerning our society. Yet the "hunger for tradition" remains, not just in the public or media, but also amongst prospective students. The following section describes encyclopaedic courses on folk traditions which used to be regarded as the core of the ethnological curricula.

MONOGRAPHICAL DIVISION: TEACHING OVERVIEWS AND PARTICULARS

In the following text we could trace all kinds of subjects from the original departmental name of "ethnography and folkloristics" and those typical for the current name of "ethnology and cultural anthropology". One should not forget that in the departmental history it was folkloristics, which was taught by leading figures of our discipline (Hlôšková 2003). For more details of the historical development of the department in general see a complementary overview (Botíková 2002).

For Bratislava's ethnology department, Slavistic ethnography and folklore studies in Central European contexts were characteristic. In recent history the scope has broadened with migration and ethnic studies, urban ethnology, modern folklore, gender studies, symbolic anthropology, protection of cultural heritage, and visual anthropology, e.g. documentary studies. Curricula have undergone several changes over the last 18 years and many of the courses were also inspired by newly translated literature and academic exchange.

Currently, state exams for a bachelor's degree consist of a set of questions sectioned into *Review of Slovak Folk Culture, Methodology and History of Ethnology, and Ethnic Issues of Central Europe*. Sections at the magisterial level of state exams reflect some of the changes in the orientation of the department: *Cultural Anthropology, Comparative Ethnology, Review of Nations of the World*.

During the period from 1989 - 2007 the teaching framework included all possible aspects of folk life, taught as *Material, Spiritual, Social and Artistic Culture* (e. g. folklore). In 1993 they were renamed as *Overviews of Folk Culture I, II, III, and IV*. In 1999 *Material Culture* was renamed back to its original name, *Social Culture* was renamed as *Community and Family*, *Spiritual Culture* became *Custom's Traditions*, and *Artistic Culture* was specified as *Types and Genres of Folklore*. Data used during the lectures came primarily from the ethnographic research of the lecturers who were also co-authors of the *Atlas and Encyclopaedia of Folk Culture of Slovakia*. Similarly, the character of folk culture overviews was encyclopaedic.³

³ It is beyond the scope of this article to specify the content of all of the mentioned courses. However I believe the titles are more than succinct. In some cases the content of the renamed courses changed minimally.

The focus on the ethnographic data was also present in the 3rd and 4th year of magisterial studies. Teachers had more space to analyse the outlined data from *Overviews* and were able to teach *Special Problems of Material Culture*, *Special Problems of Spiritual Culture*, and *Special Problems of Folklore*. Later on, *Special problems* were renamed as *Selected Problems* (of a respective field).

Apart from devoting more attention to the selected problems, since 1993 several courses emerged: *Museology*, *Folk Architecture*, *Folk Costume*, *Special Problems of Folk Etiquette*, *Special Problems of Folk Diet*, *Ethno-cultural Aspects of the Family*, *Special Problems of General Ethnology* and *Current Folklore Theories*.

COMPARATIVE APPROACH AND SOURCING ANTHROPOLOGY

For many decades, the comparative approach within Slavonic studies was dominant in ethnology. Not surprisingly, after 1989 the teachers often drew inspiration from historical anthropology. On the other end of the anthropological spectrum there have also been strong impulses from cognitive sciences.

In the period from 1989 - 1993 most of the courses reflected the dominant research topics in comparative ethnic studies. The majority of them are also taught today: *Slavonic Ethnology*, *European Ethnology*, *Folklore of Slavonic Nations*, *Folklore of European Nations* and *Ethnic Processes*. As far as external lecturers were available, there were also semi-selective courses on *Ethnomusicology*, *Ethno-choreology*, *Slavonic Linguistics*, *Ethno-cultural Evolution of the Roma*, *Film and Document*, *European Mythology*, and *Political Anthropology*.

In line with the topical research interests of Slovak ethnologists, new courses were added in 1994: *Ethno-cultural Groups*, *Slovaks Abroad*, *Urban Ethnology*, *Visual Ethnology*, and in 1997 *Social Culture of Jews*. Since 1997 more impulses from anthropological literature were incorporated into the teaching framework, namely in courses on *Cultural Anthropology (non-European)*, *Symbolic and Feminist Anthropology (Selected Problems)*, *Belief and Knowledge*, and *Social Anthropology*, which was previously called *Special Problems of Social Culture*.

One might notice that since 1999 curricula included research topics which were restricted before 1989 or/and unpublished during the communist era, and that these have been reflected in the courses: *Confession and Religious Teaching in Slovakia*, *Social Functions of Diet*, *Religious Ethnology and Ethno-medicine*, *Oral History*, *Anthropology of Art*, *We and the Others – Social Memory and Mental Images*, *Modernisation Processes from the Ethnological View*, *Shamanism and Primary Religious Systems* and *Structure of Myth in the concept of C. Levi-Strauss*. The courses *Socio-cultural Anthropology and Religion*, and *Introduction into Cognitive Anthropology* were optional and available just for one year (2001), and some of previously semi-selective courses were cancelled due to the lack of external lecturers. In 2005 new courses on *Gender Studies* and *Applied Ethnology* were introduced. Since 2008 all new subjects also include non-academic expertise such as *Applied Anthropology*, *Community Studies*, *Urban Studies* and *Migration Studies*.

One may raise the question, how do we ensure a cumulative building of knowledge from one small course to another? It is precisely the point that students shy away from accumulation of material data. Sources of information are still more available and the reluctance to details without a thrilling context is obvious. The question points elsewhere: what thread could link all the courses into an explanatory framework and therefore offer a meaningful reason to invest in this particular study.

SHIFT IN THE FIELDWORK METHODS, ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORIES, AND GENERAL PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS

The core courses in ethnology have also undergone changes towards anthropologisation of its contents.⁴ Until 1994 the course on fieldwork methods was named *Methods and Techniques*, later *Methods and Techniques of Ethnological and Folkloristic Research*. The course was designed as a

⁴ At this point I would present an example of the courses I myself taught shortly after graduation from the department as a doctoral student. Since 2005 as a lecturer: Fieldwork Methods, Introduction into Ethnology, Introduction into Folklore Studies, Text seminar in anthropological theories. An accent on applied anthropology was more present beginning in 2005 when I started to work in nongovernmental sector with asylum applicants as a workshop facilitator and researcher.

preparation for an obligatory praxis with a minimum 10-day participant observation and semi-structured ethnographic interviews. This fieldwork resulted in the students' annual paper both in the first and second years of their studies. In the 1990s it was based on the classical qualitative research techniques. Since 2005 the course has incorporated James Spradley's participant observation, ethnographic interview techniques and Bernard's research methods in anthropology.

Although the titles of the introductory courses in ethnology and folklore studies were relatively stable, its scope has been modified since 2002. Approaches used in Conrad Phillip Kottak's *Cultural Anthropology*, Robert F. Murphy's *Introduction into Cultural and Social Anthropology*, and Zdeněk Salzmänn's *Introduction into Linguistic Anthropology* were incorporated into teaching.

The course on important personalities in the history of ethnological thought was set anew in 1994, called shortly thereafter *Theory and Methodology*. Due to a shortage of teaching hours, it has had the character of an overview: each lesson is devoted to a different paradigmatic school. To include more reading for the students, it was widened in 2001 to include a *Text seminar*. Students asked that the course be shifted from the 3rd to the 2nd year of study, which was done in 2005. Nevertheless, devoting only two terms for review of anthropological theories has been repeatedly reported to be insufficient, especially when there is no other course on the philosophy on science.

The following comment on the situation after the collapse of communism could be regarded as succinct with the exception of several outstanding students' research: "courses in history and theory of social and cultural anthropology were a part of the theoretical education of an ethnography-ethnology student at the university, but they have found no (or only a little) reflection in research" (Bitušíková 2002:141). One might hardly expect the opposite. Part of the problem was the incompetence of lecturers to teach students the theories and paradigms with which they had had no experience. No "school" with its relevant academic literature was available.

Another key problem has even decreased the possibility of becoming sufficiently skilled in social science theories. Apart from learning *History of Ethnography and Folklore Studies*, students used to have obligatory courses

on history and philosophy in what was called *Common Grounds* – for all students attending the Philosophical Faculty. Since 1999 with the economic transformation and new accreditation processes of all departments it has become a burden for any department to offer general courses for other profiles. Students currently have the option of studying some courses in history and philosophy, but they do not have to pass a complete two-year course on both subjects. This situation results in insufficient preparation to follow anthropological theories as well.

ETHNOLOGISATION, EU STANDARDISATION, AND OPEN STRATEGY

In the years from 1991 - 1999 ethnology was taught in combination with linguistics, archaeology, history, aesthetics, cultural studies, comparative religions, and other social sciences or humanities for all 5 years. Study consisted of ten teaching hours in each discipline per week. After the preparatory phase for the Bologna process standardisation, the space for combinations has been limited to a much smaller number of selective courses. When this focus on specialisation in ethnology happened, students could not select a "major" or "minor" in ethnology any more. Paradoxically, the European Credit Transfer System has limited the scope and number of subjects the student may choose to study outside of their major.

Consequently, the obligatory courses on ethnology multiplied. Thus, from the pedagogical point of view, one of the obstacles teachers faced was the structure of teaching units. To offer a whole range of subjects and at the same time, to obtain 30 credits per semester, the subjects have been allocated 45 – 90 minutes per week and consequently the units have had a low number of credits. In-depth courses were virtually impossible. Emphasis has been given rather to students' attendance and obligatory readings. The students also expressed unwillingness to read texts in foreign languages, mainly in English and German, most of which have not been translated into Slovak⁵. The students would also welcome a smaller number of courses

⁵ Reluctance to read in different languages is also the case of other Slavonic languages. The predominance of English and German texts obviously results from historical and geopolitical reasons.

with higher credit donation. The change from one or two-hour course to three hour course would also allow the teachers to develop the topics more consistently and concentrate further on problem solving, rather than content driven lectures.

Regarding teaching methods, adaptation of ECTS should not be an obstacle. However, the administration of regular accreditation processes requested evidence for the need to teach anthropology. As a consequence of the change to the department's name, all courses which had previously used the term *národopis*, modified to *etnografia*, later *etnológia*, and some to *antropológia*. To name a few, Folk Art became Anthropology of Art; Special Problems of Social Culture became Social Anthropology; Film and Document was titled Visual Anthropology. In some cases ethnologisation and anthropologisation in the subjects' titles might not necessarily mean a substantial change to the content.

The only unchanged course names during the 1991 – 2007 period were Excursion and Fieldwork praxis. Perhaps it was also because these were not courses per se, as they presented training concerning experience, with no fixed syllabi.

Some other features of the titles suggested possible methodological indistinctness: Special/selected problems of any part of folk culture lacks suggestion of the ways in which it is interpreted. Some of the core courses had shortened titles – e.g. Methods and techniques, Theory and methodology. It seemed the subject was a self-evidently all-encompassing course on the relevant data. It is obvious that it is impossible to lecture on all methods or theories even in social sciences. However, the absence of specification of the techniques or the theories in question may have another reason: it is a strategy to remain flexible in an exhaustive administration of the European Credit Transfer System.

The effects of the Bologna process on the curriculum are strenuous. It is pointless to mention the endless administration which made us volunteer to fill out Excel sheets. Regarding thinking in credits per se: it is vital for exchange programmes to have them transferable, although they always have a different value at a single department not to mention a foreign university. These value systems also crept into the level of courses. Subjects were entitled to hierarchy of obligatory, semi-elective and elective as a kind of commodity.

Moreover, the faculty management started to require not only a record of former students' employment, but also gave the department a score of those "employed in the field". A discussion about the job title ethnologist or anthropologist in practise elsewhere than in academia, museums and cultural centres does not influence the budgetary politics of the government. It is a rather common trend that we are

under pressure to demonstrate the applied significance of our intellectual endeavours, because politicians and policy-makers are demanding that university personnel engage in more activities benefiting society (Kedia and Willingen⁶ 2005:351).

To make this work efficiently, one would need to set up anew a coherent structure of subjects which incorporates this challenge without losing the academic freedom. It is needless to say that changing curriculum while keeping the study continuum might take several years at given circumstances.

What remains a constant challenge is "in-depth" teaching. I propose that short lessons limit us from immersing in action, even inclusion of more imaginative teaching techniques. If a topic is allocated sufficient time, it calls for application or at least for a relevant workshop. It is a well-known fact that people learn little by listening, more by seeing, but most by creation or simply doing. Thus the mode of teaching is closely linked to applicability of the accumulated knowledge.

Furthermore, teaching for action / learning to be active is a process which also presupposes cooperation of academia with external institutions. Students who are prepared to reflect and discuss contemporary issues may engage in a supervised research of current topics such as social responsibility, community studies, marginalized groups, etc. Surely it requires a whole range of other favourable conditions, but one chooses his very own starting point. It follows that the ethno/anthro engagement begins in the classrooms by creating various models of practically solvable problems. Moreover, like learning to drive by driving, it requires collaboration with various stakeholders and participation in interdisciplinary teams.

⁶ Kedia and Willingen also mentions that funding agencies alike require researchers to document the pertinence, scope, and impact of their proposed activity in practical terms.

THE CHALLENGE FOR ETHNO / ANTHRO ENGAGEMENT

A full-fledged engagement in the debate on applied anthropology itself would need more exploration into abundant and topical literature mainly by American anthropologists. It is beyond the scope of this article, nevertheless this source for our curricula development is more than an inspiration. It seems that demand for "being applied" becomes indispensable, as it equips "graduate students with skills appropriate for the real world and it will require the communication of applied anthropologists' skills and abilities to an audience beyond the discipline and its limited community of practitioners." (Kedia and Willingen 2005:351)

According to Soukup, applied anthropology is defined as a "practically oriented area of anthropologists' work, in which they use anthropological knowledge, theories, methods and techniques towards the management or influence of the processes of socio-cultural change" (2004:563).⁷ "The main difference in comparison with academic anthropology is therefore not in fieldwork methods, but derives from different goals" (2004:564). There are four main sub-disciplines: adjustment anthropology (transcultural communications and interpersonal relationships), administrative anthropology (pursuing interests of the West in developing countries), advocate anthropology and action anthropology (enhancement of the interests of a developing country or researched community) (Soukup 2004).

Although none of the above mentioned subfields are taught in Slovakia per se, in the selected courses ethnologists working from outside academia are invited to explain their management strategies. Understandably being in very small numbers they do not represent any kind of a community similar to those of other "guilds" like lawyers, doctors or architects. On top of that, the notion of "being applied" represents both traditionalist and post-modern notions. Even the most frequent association of an ethnologist, that he has something to do with old customs, also leads to practical ends.

⁷ In the words of Sanday, public interest anthropology employs "an approach that merges theory, analysis, and problem solving in a commitment to positively impact human lifeways, with a focus on conveying the anthropological perspective to the masses for consumption and debate." (Kedia and Willingen 2005:344)

There were also pragmatic arguments for such a choice (to concentrate on folkloristics), because specialists were still required for folklore groups, houses of culture, folklore festivals, and even to work in the mass media. Folklore in all its forms and functions played an important role in Slovak mass culture until the end of socialism in 1989" (Kiliánová 2005b: 266). "Mir scheint, dass auf die Frage 'Was sollten die Folkloristen tun?' sich dieselben modifizierten Antworten wiederholen. Es genügt, sie nur mit konkreten Analysen neofolkloristischer (postmoderner) Erscheinungen zu füllen" (Leščák 2003:29).

At the moment, the demand for a skilled folklorist or expert in ethnology is no less than for a proficient anthropologist.

Whatever the choice, the challenge to engage students of ethnology into projects dealing with current social and cultural issues during their studies does not necessarily appeal to all of them. On the contrary, as if in the waves, there are generations of students interested in the very conservation of the culture of their ancestors.⁸ I was amazed by the increased interest among incoming students in the ethnographic details of folk culture shortly after 2000. After a generation hungry for anthropological theories, they demanded a solid immersion into the rural past.⁹ In the present, some of them participate in revitalization movements of folk culture similar to that of 19th century.¹⁰ Another stream heads to the more recent anthropological approach of interpretation, explanation and use of current fieldwork material.

However distinct with preoccupation of a different historical time, what both these trends share in common is a call for public engagement of our disciplines. Or let us go further to the grounds: the turn happens much sooner than after having a diploma, it stems from the change of curricula. Regarding its limits, it does not depend only at the choice of discipline's paradigm, but on the academic orientation of the teachers and a broader

⁸ In several cases these were students who never went outside of their native city, never saw a farm with livestock or saw them only once from a distance.

⁹ As of 2002, the first year students did not experience a single year of socialist schooling. In 1989 they were 5 years old. In the year of foundation of the Slovak Republic in 1993 they were at the age of 9, a psychologically crucial period for the formation of a world view.

¹⁰ A few were also members of neopagan communities.

political discourse. In case the staff offers a plethora of ethnological subjects which are a product of a past state of affairs, it is too exhausting to ever be flexible. Nevertheless, a relevant curriculum offers applicable skills not depending so much on the context of taught data, and addresses universal human needs in one way or another.

To be publicly engaged presupposes that one is aware of the central messages ethnology and anthropology may offer the society. Consequently, paradigm choice is the bottom line of each curricula. And it is students who ask first, sooner than the public does. Public engagement of social scientists is a problem both for ethnologists and anthropologists, especially if we are not satisfied with a common remark: "Oh, that is so interesting, but what is it for?" I hope that the old joke about rich young ladies studying ethnology at their leisure just for the lavish entertainment is already out of fashion. Avoiding public responsibility in a discipline which primarily study humans is a kind of paradox. Emerging trends in applied anthropology show that "anthropology can help empower individuals, transforming the study population from an object to be known to a subject who can control"(Kedia and Willigen 2005:349).

What capacities do we, in our geopolitical space have for popularization of ethnology and anthropology other than having know-how about traditions assisting folk festivals? Where is the room for public presentation of the research results elsewhere than in academic journals?¹¹ What else of our work is well known? What will be popularized? The limited engagement of our disciplines may suggest a missing thread.

The point is not that "being applied" for an ethnologist may methodologically differ from the notion of an anthropologist.¹² Rather the scientific community as such¹³ is unnecessarily disintegrated and often

¹¹ According to the new criteria on academic rating of publications, the publishing of one's article in a popular newspapers counts for nothing.

¹² Research methods are what joins these two disciplines: participant observation and ethnographic interview are in case of doing anthropology indispensable, apart from the whole variety of methodological tools specific for applied anthropology, eg rapid assessment procedures, quantitative surveys, cognitive methods, etc. (Kedia and Willigen 2005:13)

¹³ I mean ethnologists and anthropologists also outside Slovakia, if we may call ourselves a community.

polarized. Ironically incompatible agendas with specific aims and objectives may signal a need for what could be the central message of both disciplines: "What does it mean to be human?" Perhaps because the reason is that ethnologists are still deeply rooted in or flooded with researching issues of rather national or international importance. A statement that what we may change is being engaged in solving issues of social and cultural relevance may sound obvious. As it was demonstrated in this paper, to convey what is worth learning is more than having a course's clear purpose: it is also a matter of teaching methods and mutual coherence of courses. Regarding the matter whether we have to pay attention to its practical side, curricular history implies that applicability is intrinsic to university. A verb "to apply" has synonyms such as to use, to practice, to go for, to give, to hold, to lend oneself. All of these are essential features of creative teaching, when a teacher is more of a facilitator who assists students in being applied.

REFERENCES

- BITUŠÍKOVÁ, A. 2002. Anthropology as a Taboo: A few Comments on Anthropology in Slovakia. In (P. Skalník, ed.): *A post-communist millennium: the struggles for sociocultural anthropology in Central and Eastern Europe. Prague studies in sociocultural anthropology* 2:141-146.
- BITUŠÍKOVÁ, A. 2004. Teaching and Learning Anthropology in a New National Context. The Slovak Case. In (D. Dracklé, I. Edgar, T. K. Schippers, eds.): *Educational Histories of European Social Anthropology*. Berghahn Books.
- BOTÍKOVÁ, M. 2002. O dejavnostih i prispevkih Katedre za etnologijo na Univerzi Komenskega v Bratislavi. *Glasnik S.E.D.* vol. 42 (1-2):23-26.
- DROPOVÁ, Ľ. 1991. K systému a programu štúdia národopisu na Filozofickej fakulte Univerzity Komenského. *Národopisné Informácie* 1:5-13.
- ERVIN, A.M. 2005. *Applied Anthropology. Tools and perspectives for contemporary practice*. Pearson.

- HLOŠKOVÁ, H. 1995. L'enseignement de l'ethnographie aux universités en Slovaquie. (L'histoire et la présent). *Acta ethnographica Hungarica*, 40:417-427.
- HLOŠKOVÁ, H. 2003. Teaching Folkloristics at Universities in Slovakia. In (Z. Profantová, ed.): *Traditional Culture as a Part of the Cultural Heritage of Europe*. Bratislava. 45-54.
- JAKUBÍKOVÁ, K. 2000. Medzi národopisom a antropológiou. Čo robíme, čo potrebujeme a ako to nazývame. In (O. Elschek, ed.): *Etnológia verzus antropológia? Ethnologia Actualis Slovaca* UCM Trnava, vol 1 (1):11-17.
- KEDIA, S. & J. WILLINGEN, eds. 2005. *Applied Anthropology. Domains of Application*. Praeger.
- KILIÁNOVÁ, G. 2005a. Ethnology in Slovakia at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Reflections and trends. In (G. Kiliánová, K. Kostlin, H. Nikitsch, R. Stoličná, eds.): *Ethnology in Slovakia at the beginning of the 21st century. Reflections and Trends. Etnologické štúdie 9, Europäische Ethnologie 27*:16-35.
- KILIÁNOVÁ, G. 2005b. Continuity and Discontinuity in an Intellectual Tradition under Socialism: the 'Folkloristic School' in Bratislava. In (C. Hann, M. Sárkány, P. Skalník, eds.): *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies. Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe. Halle Studies in the Anthropology of Eurasia*, vol. 8:257-272.
- LEŠČÁK, M. 2003. Neue Situation und alte offene Fragen der Folkloristik. In: (Z. Profantová, ed.) *Traditional Culture as a Part of the Cultural Heritage of Europe. Etnologické štúdie 8*:27-31.
- PODOBA, J. 2005. On the Periphery of a Periphery: Slovak Anthropology behind Ideological Veil. In (C. Hann, M. Sárkány, P. Skalník, eds.): *Studying Peoples in the People's Democracies. Socialist Era Anthropology in East-Central Europe. Halle Studies in the Anthropology of Eurasia*, vol. 8:245-256.
- SOUKUP, V. 2004. *Dějiny antropologie*. Praha: Karolinum.

KOLIKO SMO ODMAKLI S *BITI PRIMIJENJEN?*
OD *NÁRODOPISA* DO *ANTROPOLÓGIE*, HETEROGENOST
KURIKULUMA I JAVNO UKLJUČIVANJE U SLOVAČKOJ

Sažetak

Članak se bavi razlikama između ciljeva etnografije i antropologije, utjecajem koji oni imaju na kurikulum, te njihovim mogućim posljedicama na javno mišljenje. Naime, heterogenost kurikuluma i inzistiranje na primijenjenoj znanosti otvaraju prostor za širu raspravu o *identitetu* naših disciplina. Kako su produkcije etnologije i socijalne i kulturne antropologije bile razmjerno različite, tvrdim da bi se trebalo raspravljati o tzv. sinkronizacijskim procesima obiju disciplina. Većina etnološke literature iz srednje i istočne Europe slijedila je iste postavke kao europska etnologija, također i kao neke od škola kulturne antropologije na Zapadu. Istovremeno, različiti teoretski pristupi unutar antropologije bili su inkompatibilni s europskom etnološkom tradicijom bez obzira na geografski položaj pojedinih odsjeka/instituta. Stoga su različite škole unutar antropologije sličnije paralelnim pravcima koji se nikada ne sijeku, a takva mnogostrukost se može primijetiti i prilikom analize kurikuluma.

U posljednjih nekoliko godina, u kojima općenito primjećujemo mnogostrukost paradigmi u društvenim znanostima, postoje i sve veće razlike u kurikulumima, ponekad i unutar istog odsjeka. Bez obzira na to, postupne promjene u transformacijskim procesima prema istraživanju sadašnjosti i prema istraživačkim temama koje ne bi mogle biti izučavane tijekom komunističkog razdoblja, zapravo ne predstavljaju značajniji metodološki pomak. To možda jest proširivanje sadržaja istraživanja, ali nikako nije promjena temeljnih postavki, što je prepušteno pojedinim predavačima i njihovoj teoretskoj orijentaciji koja oblikuje tumačenje podataka. Fascinacija kompleksnim detaljima može biti samo dodatak konkretnom antropološkom tumačenju, ali u doba dostupnosti svih vrsta podataka njihovo detaljno izučavanje samo zbog njihove nekadašnje važnosti studentima je potpuno nezanimljivo. Ono po što su studenti došli na studij sasvim izlazi iz okvira rasprave "etnologija i/ili antropologija".

Etnologija i kulturna antropologija imaju sukladne, ali i suprotne povijesti i ciljeve. Biti svjestan ciljeva kurikuluma predstavlja izazov, kako za

predavače, tako i za studente. Potraga za dosljednim kurikulumom potraga je za zajedničkom porukom koju želimo prenijeti. Potraga za profilom studenata jest posljedica potrage za identitetom naše discipline i njezinom mogućom uporabom. Dvije se vrste tumačenja dopunjuju – jedno komparativno i povijesno, drugo općenito, koje vrijedi za sve ljudske kulture, bez obzira na stalne povijesne mijene. Postupna sustavna promjena kurikuluma ne može se desiti samo putem promjene pristupa iz onih koji su bili orijentirani na sadržaj u one koji su orijentirani na primjenjivost, već i putem važnijih tematskih, teoretskih i metodoloških modifikacija uključenih u predavanja. Mogućnost discipline da javno djeluje jest ono što zanima studente. Ako je naša osnovna poruka *moći postavljati pitanja kao što je "što to znači biti čovjekom?"*, tada se moramo upitati i koliko smo odmakli *s primijenjenošću?*

Ključne riječi: diskurs u etnologiji i antropologiji, heterogenost kurikuluma, javno uključivanje

