Sociocultural Anthropology in *American Anthropologist* (1901-2011)

Scholars examining the history of sociocultural anthropology in the United States (e.g., di Leonardo 1998; Moore 2009; Murphy 1976; Paterson 2001; Stocking 1976) often make generalizations about changes in the field in the past century. They note how certain research areas, topics, methods, and theoretical approaches have become prominent at certain times and then fallen out of favor. Despite an abundance of carefully-researched books and articles about the history of American anthropology, authors only occasionally (Charnley and Durham 2010; Chibnik1999; Chibnik and Moberg 1983; Erasmus and Smith 1967; Lewis 2009; Lutz 1990; Stern and Bohannon 1970) provide quantitative data about changes over time.

The lack of numerical data can contribute to disagreements about anthropological practice in the past. For example, many anthropologists writing in the 1990s (e.g., Keesing 1994; Turner 1993) argued that the field prior to 1960 or so usually ignored history and treated cultures as isolated units. In a response to such generalizations, Herbert Lewis (1998) showed that some American anthropologists in the first part of the twentieth century wrote about “acculturation,” colonialism, and globalization.1 Lewis asserted that many anthropologists urging anthropology to become more historical were ironically ignorant of the history of their own discipline. In the absence of quantitative data about publications, however, it is difficult to determine if the critics of past anthropological practice were for the most part right.

Even when generalizations are widely accepted, there may not be information about the extent to which they hold. The following are a few such summaries that have been made about trends in American anthropology:

(1) In the first part of the twentieth century, anthropologists from the United States mostly wrote about American Indians. Later on, such research became much less common.
(2) Prior to the large-scale entry of women into the field in the latter part of the twentieth century, studies of gender were uncommon.

(3) Quantitative methods, which were rarely used by American sociocultural anthropologists in the first half of the twentieth century, became common between 1950 and 1990, but now are less popular. While few would dispute such claims, questions about the magnitude of these changes cannot be answered without relevant quantitative data.

In this article, I provide numerical data about the contents of articles in sociocultural anthropology published in *American Anthropologist* (AA) between 1901 and 2011. I look at changes over time in research areas, topical coverage, and ancillary material (numerical tables, drawings and diagrams, photographs, maps). I also examine the extent to which the journal’s editor and the gender of authors influence the contents of articles.

There are obvious limitations in the extent to which articles in *AA* provide a window into changes over time in sociocultural anthropology in the United States. *AA* is only one of many venues for publications available for U.S.-based anthropologists. Moreover, from its inception *AA* has published articles written by scholars based outside of the United States. Nonetheless, I would argue that the content of articles published in *AA* provides a good, if imperfect, indicator of trends over time in sociocultural anthropology in the United States. Until 1974, *AA* was the only major journal published by the American Anthropological Association (AAA). Articles in *AA* have always had high citation rates; the journal also scores well on newer measures such as downloads and impact factors. Furthermore, the great majority of authors of *AA* research articles (86% of those examined here) were based in the United States at the time of publication.
I fully recognize that the broad-brush, often crude, analytic methods in this article are no substitute for careful historical studies of changes in American anthropology. The contents of topical categories such as “religion,” “economics,” and “expressive culture” coded as “present” or “absent” from articles have changed greatly over time. An example of such changes can be seen by looking at two articles from different time periods coded as including content “about religion.” A piece written in the first part of the twentieth century (Fewkes 1906) carefully describes ceremonies associated with Hopi shrines. Little attempt is made to interpret the meaning of these ceremonies. The approach taken in Fewkes’s article contrasts greatly with the one taken in a piece appearing a few years ago in AA, in which the author examines “how Pope John Paul II’s canonization of Juan Diego, the Indian to whom the Virgin of Guadalupe first appeared, was variously represented by sections of Mexican society as an acknowledgment of the indigenous element in Mexican Catholicism and thus a restitution of past wrongs; conversely as a final domestication of the Indian; and as an evangelical move against a resurgent Latin American Protestantism.” (Beatty 2006:324)

Counting these two articles as both being “about religion” obviously ignores significant differences in their content. Nonetheless, I would argue that such rough categorizations and counts are useful. Of the 78 articles in the database used for this article that were written between 1900 and 1919, 34 (44%) were coded as being about religion. Of the 121 articles in the database written between 2000 and 2011, only 26 (22%) were coded as being about religion. These counts, when combined with data from other time periods, clearly show a decline in emphasis in the AA on religion over the years. Without the numerical data, we would know less about the extent of this decline.
METHODS

My analyses are based on an examination of every research article related to sociocultural anthropology published in *AA* between 1901 and 2011 that was at least six pages long and appeared in years ending in 1, 3, 6, or 8. I decided to focus on sociocultural anthropology because the contents of some articles about archaeology, biological anthropology, and linguistic anthropology were sufficiently different from those on sociocultural anthropology that comparisons did not seem useful. However, the great majority of articles I looked at—including many pieces focusing on archaeology, biological anthropology, and linguistic anthropology—were sufficiently related to sociocultural anthropology that I was able to include them in my analyses. The sample was restricted to pieces at least six pages long because shorter pieces often were informative notes about specific topics rather than full-fledged “research articles.” I restricted the sample to four years out of each decade because I thought this would provide sufficient information about trends over time. The sample ended up including 875 articles, more than enough to allow me to make the comparisons I sought to make.

Each article was coded for the following:

1. Characteristics of the author(s) – number of authors, gender of first author, gender of second author (if applicable), place of residence of the author, institutional type of author (university, museum, government, other)

2. Content of the article – research area, whether or not the articles contained information about 21 different topics (e.g., social change, kinship and social organization, economics, legal systems)

3. Ancillary material (presence or absence of numerical tables, photos, maps, drawings and diagrams)
The most difficult coding decisions were about the presence or absence of information about particular topics in an article. The most important problem in this respect was determining how much information was necessary to conclude that an article contained material about a particular topic. I took an inclusive approach, coding “present” for any article including two sentences or more about a topic. Another significant problem was determining whether or not certain discussions in particular articles could be fit into my topical categories. For example, many articles about kinship and social organization that appeared in *AA* between 1930 and 1960 discussed “economics” only with respect to property rights given to members of particular lineages. Although I decided to code such articles as including material about economics, I could just as easily have chosen otherwise.

The codebook used in the analyses can be found in Appendix 1, along with detailed comments about coding procedures and problems. The codebook includes several categories (e.g. “socioeconomic type” – foragers, tribal agriculturalists, etc, “primary data source” – ethnographic, historical) that I eventually chose not to analyze because they proved not to be useful.

I restricted the sample to single-authored articles in my analysis of relationships between the gender of authors and the contents of their articles. Not too much information was lost by doing this. Of the 875 articles in the database, 754 (86%) are single-authored, 91 (10 percent) have two authors, and 30 (4%) have three or more authors.

Most of my analyses of changes over time are based on grouping of twenty year periods (1900-1919, 1920-1939, etc). The last period analyzed in these comparisons is shorter (2000-2011). These groupings cover fairly discrete periods in the history of American anthropology and allow for easily comprehensible presentations of trends in bar graphs. After constructing the
codebook and entering the data, I created a new category in which articles were grouped according to the journal’s editor. My principal motivation for this recoding was to more closely examine the content of articles published in *AA* in the 1980s and 1990s, where some editors were reputed to be more favorable to quantitative and “positivist” approaches than others.

**CHANGES IN RESEARCH AREAS OVER TIME**

Most articles in the database about sociocultural anthropology (74%) are based primarily on research carried out in one broadly defined geographical area. The remaining articles are theoretical discussions (17%), cross-cultural analyses (5%) and comparisons of two or more sites in different geographical areas (4%). The analyses that follow are based on the 645 articles in the database that are clearly about one geographical area.

Although it is well-known that sociocultural anthropologists based in the United States conducted most of their research among North American Indians in the first part of the twentieth century, the extent to which this areal focus persisted is not always emphasized in histories of the discipline. Figure 1 shows the percentage of articles in the database focusing on North American Indians in *AA* during different time periods. While the high figures for the proportion of articles about Native Americans in 1900-1919 (79%) and 1920-1939 (55%) may not be surprising, this figure remained high (38%) even during the period 1940-1959. The percentage of articles about Indians of the United States and Canada dropped significantly in the period 1960-1979 (16%) and has been considerably lower since then (7% in 1980-1999 and 5% in 2000-2011). Despite this decrease, Native Americans remain a group of considerable interest to anthropologists.

The focus in *AA* until recently on American Indians can be seen clearly via comparisons with the number of articles published about all other groups in the region. Of articles in the database published between 1900 and 1959, 154 (52%) were about American Indians compared with only
9 (3%) about other groups in North America. Even in the period since 1960, 36% of articles about North America in the database are about Native Americans. Articles about non-indigenous groups in North American have appeared only recently in significant numbers. Such articles comprised 19% of those focusing on one geographical area between 1980 and 1999. The rise of this figure to 33 percent during 2000-2011 clearly reflects a significant change in anthropological practice.

Another way of analyzing the figures on research areas is to examine the extent to which AA has focused on the Americas during different time periods. (See Figure 2). In the earliest years covered by the database, 86% of area-specific articles focusing on places in the Western Hemisphere. Starting around 1920, the journal began publishing more articles about other parts of the world. Even so, two-thirds of area-specific articles in the data based published between 1920 and 1939 were based on research sites in the Americans. In the middle of the century the journal became a bit wider in areal scope, with 58 percent of articles published between 1940
and 1959 focusing on the Americas (69% during 1940-1949, 50 percent 1950-1959). This trend became more pronounced during the 1960s and 1970s, with only 41 percent of area-specific articles covering the Americas. In recent years, AA has become more Americas-focused, with 51 percent of area-specific articles published between 1980 and 2011 covering the Americas (49 percent between 1980 and 1999 and 53 percent between 2000 and 2011). This increase can largely be accounted for by the striking increase in articles in recent years in articles about non-native groups in North America. (See Table 1.)

Table 1: Percentage of Articles about Different Parts of Western Hemisphere

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native North America</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-native North America</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico, Central America Caribbean</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen in Table 2, articles in AA about the Eastern Hemisphere have been relatively evenly split among Asia, Africa, Oceania, and the rest of the world (Europe and the Middle East). The attention to these areas, however, is wildly disproportionate to their relative populations. From this perspective, Asia is greatly underrepresented and Oceania greatly overrepresented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHANGES IN THE CONTENT OF ARTICLES OVER TIME**

Articles were coded according to whether they included information about each of 21 topics (see Appendix 1). The selection of topics was to a certain extent arbitrary. Some topics such as economics, kinship and social organization, medical anthropology, and religion are covered in almost all introductory courses in sociocultural anthropology. Other topics coded for presence or absence (e.g., tourism, migration, social movements) seem no more central to the field than some
topics that were not coded. Nonetheless, the codebook clearly included those topics most often examined in AA articles.

The analysis that follows focuses on the 16 topics most commonly covered in the 875 articles in the database. These topics are economics (coded as present in 38% of the articles), kinship, family, and social organization (36%), religion (31%), politics (30%), social change (28%), cognition and world view (25%), expressive culture (25%), ecology (24%), race/ethnicity (18%), gender (15%), medical anthropology (12%), globalization (12%), material culture (11%), legal anthropology (11%), warfare and violence (10%), and discourse (10%).

Table 3 and Figures 3 to 18 show the most common topics in included in AA articles in the database for each of six time periods. While the overall changes in topical coverage may not be surprising to those familiar with the history of American anthropology, the percentages in Table 3 and Figures 3 to 18 provide useful information about the extent of these changes.

Table 3: Most Common Topics in AA Articles during Different Time Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900-1919</td>
<td>expressive culture (56%), material culture (44%), religion (44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1939</td>
<td>religion (51%), kinship and social organization (42%), expressive culture (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1959</td>
<td>kinship and social organization (40%), social change (38%), race/ethnicity (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1979</td>
<td>economics (47%), kinship and social organization (46%), politics (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-1999</td>
<td>economics (38%), social change (33%), ecology (32%), cognition/worldview (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2011</td>
<td>economics (57%), politics (57%), social change (46%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3: Percentage of Articles with Information about Economics
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Figure 18: Percentage of Articles with Information about Discourse
In the first two decades of the twentieth century, articles in *AA* most often examined expressive culture (art, music, games, folklore, etc.), material culture and religion. Although these topics continued to be commonly included in articles published between 1920 and 1939, the most noteworthy development during this period was the increase in pieces about kinship and social organization. *AA* published many articles about social change (often phrased as “acculturation”) between 1940 and 1959. Kinship and social organization, religion, and economics were other popular research topics. Topical coverage between 1980 and 1999 was balanced with between 30 and 40 percent of articles covering each of the following topics – economics, social change, cognition and worldview, ecology, and kinship and social organization. The topical coverage in *AA* articles since 2000 suggests increased attention to contemporary world issues. The most common topics examined are economics, politics, social change, ecology, globalization, and law.

I present below a more detailed summary of the trends presented in Figures 3 to 18. Some topics have increased in popularity over time; others have decreased in popularity. The frequency of several topics has not changed much over time. One topic (kinship and social organization) has shown a curvilinear pattern of popularity.\(^6\)

The nine topics that have increased in popularity over time are economics, politics, social change, cognition/worldview, ecology, gender, globalization, legal anthropology, and discourse. The particular time when each of these topics became more prominent in *AA* varies considerably. The list that follows presents information of the percentage of *AA* articles about these topics in different time periods:

Economics - 17% before 1940, 43% in later years

Politics - 9% before 1919, 29% 1920-1999, 57% 2000-2011
Social Change - 7% before 1939, 34% in later years
Cognition and Worldview - 11% before 1939, 28% in later years
Environment and Ecology - 19% before 1959, 29% in later years
Gender - 12 percent before 1979, 20 percent in later years [perhaps less of a difference than some would guess]
Globalization - 8% before 1979, 23% in later years
Legal Anthropology - 8% before 1999, 29% 2000-2011
Discourse - 5% before 1979; 22% in later years.

Three topics appeared considerably more often in *AA* articles written in the first part of the twentieth century than in articles written more recently:

Religion - 48% before 1939, 26% in later years
Expressive Culture - 48% before 1939, 23% in later years
Material Culture - 32% before 1939, 6 percent in later years.

The proportion of articles in *AA* with information about three topics (race/ethnicity/medical anthropology, warfare and violence) has remained fairly steady over the years. The percentage of articles about medical anthropology in recent years (17% 1980-1999, 14% 2000-2011) might seem low, given that subdiscipline’s prominence in the field. The relatively low proportion of articles in *AA* about medical anthropology can be attributed in part to the existence of numerous other publications (e.g., *Medical Anthropology, Medical Anthropology Quarterly, Social Science & Medicine*) focusing on that subfield.

Emphasis on kinship, family, and social organization in *AA* has followed a curvilinear pattern over time. About one quarter of articles written between 1900 and 1919 contained information about this topic. This figure rose to more than 40 percent between 1920 and 1979, with more
articles including information about kinship, family, and social organization than any other topic. The number of articles about kinship and social organization then steadily decreased. Between 1980 and 1999, 31% percent of articles included material on this topic. This figure dropped to 19% for articles published between 2000 and 2011.

NUMERICAL TABLES

The use of quantitative methods by sociocultural anthropologists publishing in *AA* has varied considerably in different time periods. One measure of the importance of quantification in the journal is the percentage of articles with numerical tables. The proportion of such articles was low in the early years of *AA*, rose to about a third between 1960 and 1999, and since then has dropped to about a quarter. (See Figure 19.)

![Figure 19: Percentage of Articles with Numerical Tables](image)

In an article published in *Field Methods* (Chibnik 1999), I argued that the proportion of articles in a journal using quantitative methods is a rough indicator of the extent to which authors use “scientific” or “positivist” approaches. H. Russell Bernard, the longtime editor of *Field Methods*, disagrees:
Some methods result in words, others in numbers. Never use the distinction between quantitative and qualitative as cover for talking about the difference between science and humanism. Lots of scientists do their work without numbers, and many scientists whose work is highly quantitative consider themselves humanist. (Bernard 2011:21)

Although Bernard acknowledges the importance of humanist approaches, he is best known for his advocacy of scientific methods in anthropology. His comments should be considered in the context of Bernard’s practice as editor of AA during the 1980s. During his editorship, the percentage of articles in the database with numerical tables (57%) was far higher than for any other AA editor.

Between 1994 and mid-1998, AA was edited by Barbara Tedlock and Dennis Tedlock. At the inception of their term, the Tedlocks described their views about quantitative methods:

We envision a postmodern American Anthropologist, postmodern in the sense that it will not privilege any particular form of discourse as the sole means of legitimate anthropological communication…We have been asked whether we will accept work that is centered on quantitative methods. The answer is yes, but we must add that data never speak for themselves. Quantifications are only as good as the database on which they rest, and they require a persuasive interpretation, addressed to an audience that reaches beyond those who are easiest to convince. (B. Tedlock and D. Tedlock 1994:1).

During the Tedlocks’ term as editors, many scientifically-oriented anthropologists thought that articles from their perspective would be unwelcome in AA. The Tedlocks were succeeded as editors by Robert Sussman, who made it clear that he was sympathetic to quantitative research.
In a piece in *Anthropology News*, the Tedlocks were critical of some text that Sussman had put in *AA* about what kinds of contributions would be welcome:

…[The text] is a rather transparent attempt to reassert the hegemony of positivist over qualitative research. [Note their disagreement with Bernard about the appropriateness of this dichotomy.] In our opinion, anthropology will never realize its full possibilities in the post-Cold War era until the positivist camp gives up the idea that quantitative researchers are somehow second-class citizens, or that they should be treated as subversives. (B. Tedlock and D. Tedlock 2000:13).

The views of the Tedlocks about quantitative methods clearly affected the content of *AA* articles under their editorship. Only 5% of articles in the database published while the Tedlocks edited *AA* included numerical tables. The comparable figure under the editorship of their immediate predecessor (Janet Keller) is 45%; the figure under the next four editorships (Sussman, Fran Mascia-Lees and Susan Lees, Benjamin Blount, Tom Boellstorff) is 24%.

**EDITORS**

Many anthropologists think that the content of *AA* at any particular time is significantly influenced by the theoretical views of the journal’s editor. The obvious effects of the intellectual views of Bernard and the Tedlocks on the extent of quantification in *AA* during their editorship show that editors can wield significant influence on what appears in the journal. I therefore made diverse analyses in an effort to find other ways in which *AA* editors have affect the contents of articles. My efforts to do so were largely unsuccessful. In most case, the research areas and topic concerns of a journal of any particular editor resembled those of his or her immediate predecessors and successors.
This does not mean that editors have little effects on the types of articles that appear in *AA*. Editors have made significant changes over time in how manuscripts are reviewed and evaluated and have introduced new features to the journal. The amounts and types of direction and advice that are given to authors vary considerable under different editors. It may well be that articles are more readable and better organized under some editors than under others.

**ANCILLARY MATERIAL**

*AA* articles sometimes include maps, drawings, diagrams, and photographs. Eleven percent of the articles in the database have maps. This proportion has not changed much over the years. The proportion of articles with drawings or diagrams (21%) has also not varied much over time. However, this is to a certain extent a result of my analysis, which lumped together drawings and diagrams. Before 1930 or so, there were many drawings (often of material culture), but relatively few diagrams. Since then there have been many fewer drawings than diagrams.

The number of photos in *AA* has varied considerably over time. (See Figure 20.) In both the earliest (1900-1919) and latest (2000-2011) time periods analyzed, over 20% of articles included photographs. The proportion of articles with photos in between these periods was much lower at other times. Only five articles in the database between 1940 and 1979 included photos. Perhaps the paucity of photographs during these years can be attributed to policies of the publishers of *AA*. 
Until quite recently, the great majority of articles in AA were written by men. (See Figure 21.) Prior to 1980, only 13% of single-authored articles in the database were written by women. This figure rose considerable in the 1980s (33%) and 1990s (39%). However, it is only in this century that the number of male and female authors in AA has become approximately equal (52% female authors during 2000-2011).
I compared the research areas and topics included in articles written by male and female authors. Because female authors are concentrated in recent years, it was necessary to control for the time period in which articles were written. In articles written before 1960, I found no significant differences in the content of articles written by men and women. In more recent years, the only striking difference was in the extent to which men and women wrote about gender issues. Of the 119 single-authored articles in the database since 1960 written by women, 34 (29%) discuss gender. Of the 280 single-authored articles written by men during these years, 33 (12%) discuss gender. I found only two other minor (though statistically significant at the .05 level) differences between men and women in the content of single-authored articles written since 1960. Women were somewhat more likely than men to write about research among non-native groups of North America. They were also a bit more likely than men to include material in their articles about medical anthropology.

CONCLUSIONS

Summarizing the many changes over time examined in this report is not an easy task. Changes in the content of journal articles did not occur in lockstep. For example, economics became a common subject of articles starting in the 1920s, social change in the 1940s, and discourse in the 1980s. Furthermore some topics (kinship, family, and social organization) and methods of data presentation (numerical tables, photographs) have fluctuated in popularity.

Nevertheless, overall trends over time in the contents of *AA* articles in sociocultural anthropology can be roughly outlined. From 1900 until 1929, the journal was dominated by studies of American Indians focusing on expressive culture, religion, and material culture. Although research on Native Americans remained prominent in the journal until around 1960,
later articles about American Indians most often examine sociocultural change ("acculturation"), economics, ecology, and kinship and social organization.

The period from 1930 to 1980 might be characterized as one in which most articles examined the applicability of anthropological theory to field situations in rural areas and towns in most parts of the world. Examinations of kinship and social organization were especially prominent in the journal during this period. Studies of non-indigenous groups in the United States and Canada remained uncommon in *AA* during this period.

Theoretical and methodological approaches in articles published between 1980 and 1999 varied markedly. Many articles took scientific approaches, commonly making cross-cultural comparisons and using quantitative data. However, this was also the period in which "postmodern" critiques of prior anthropological practice flourished. Numerous *AA* articles (especially under the editorship of Barbara Tedlock and Dennis Tedlock) took avowedly humanist, critical approaches. Many articles were experimental in form and emphasized close examinations of discourse. The pace of change in the content of articles in *AA* seems to have accelerated in recent years. Since 2000 there has been a considerable increase in articles examining how large-scale political, economic, and cultural changes are playing out in local communities. Many more articles than previously focus on urban areas, especially in North America.

Despite the limitations of my methods and categories, I think that the data analyzed here provides useful information for anyone wishing to summarize trends in American anthropology. The raw data (in Excel form) and another copy of this report can be found on my website [http://clas.uiowa.edu/anthropology/people/michael-chibnik](http://clas.uiowa.edu/anthropology/people/michael-chibnik) in the section called "research interests."
NOTES
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1. Lewis also points out in this article that European anthropologists prior to 1960 also frequently wrote about acculturation, colonialism, and globalization.

2. In 2012, 889,473 AA articles were downloaded from AnthroSource. The total number of downloads from the 27 other publications of the American Anthropological Association (including American Ethnologist, Cultural Anthropology, and Medical Anthropological Quarterly) was 939,824. (These data come from a table sent on May 30, 2013 to editors of AAA journals by Oona Schmid, AAA director of publications.). AA had only the thirteenth highest impact factor among “anthropology” journals for the period January 1, 2000 through February 20, 2011 (http://archive.sciencewatch.com/dr/sci/11/jun12-11_1D/), downloaded June 1, 2013). However, the 12 journals ranked higher included four from biological anthropology (where citation rates are generally much higher than in other anthropological subfields), three from what are arguably not “anthropology” journals (Social Networks, Human Ecology, Human Nature), and one from a publication (Annual Review of Anthropology) that comes out only once a year. Furthermore, impact factor measures citations per article. AA published more articles during the period considered than the remaining higher ranked journals (Current Anthropology, Journal of Anthropological Archaeology, Cultural Anthropology, Medical Anthropology Quarterly). AA had a greater number of total citations during this period than all but one of these journals (Current Anthropology). It should also be noted that measurements of impact factors considers citations from only a limited set of journals and do not consider citations in books.
3. This figure is an imperfect measure of “nationality” because authors’ residences at time of publication is occasionally misleading about their background. People may be writing from the field or from temporary teaching positions away from home. In cases of articles with multiple authors, the place of residence of the first author was counted in the calculation of this figure.

4. These time periods are a bit misleading because my database only includes articles from four years in each decade. The data on “1900-1919,” for example, is actually from 1901, 1903, 1906, 1908, 1911, 1913, 1916, and 1918.

5. The number of articles in the database from each twenty-year period (and 2000-2011) varied considerably. Because I thought this might affect the overall measures of popularity reported in the text, I controlled for the variability in numbers of articles by calculating a different measure. I added the percentage of articles including information about a particular topic from each time period together and divided by 6 (the number of time periods). For example, if pe is the percentage of articles about economics, I calculated \((pe_{1900-1919} + pe_{1920-1939} + pe_{1940-1959} + pe_{1960-1979} + pe_{1980-1999} + pe_{2000-2011})/6\). The figures resulting from this calculation were only slightly different from those reported in the text.

6. I calculated a “diversity” measure that counted the number of the 16 topics covered in each article. Over time, the mean diversity of *AA* articles has increased somewhat. This partly explains why there are more increases than decreases in the popularity of different topics.

7. Between 1916 and 1938, many of these articles were written by Elsie Clews Parsons.
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APPENDIX 1 – CODEBOOK

I have put below the codebook used in data analysis with comments about certain coding issues. Note that I did not code for issue and page numbers. Although particular articles can usually be determined by looking at the codes for each case (the identification numbers within each year are in chronological order), doing this would be much easier if I had coded for issue and page numbers.

ID

YEAR (4 digits)

NAUTHORS -- number of authors

Note that in the 26 cases with more than two authors, I do not have data on the gender of all authors,
SEXAw -- sex of author #1  1 male  2 female  3 unable to determine

SEXAw -- sex of author #2  1 male  2 female  3 unable to determine

PLACEA -- area first author is from 1 U.S.  2 Canada  3 Great Britain  4 Europe  5 Latin America  6 other

Most of the authors with a place coded 6 are from Australia and New Zealand.

INSTA -- first author’s institution type  1 university  2 museum  3 government  4 other

The Smithsonian Institute was coded as “3” (government).

AREA   Geographical area 1 Native North America (“Indians” of United States and Canada)  2 Non-Native North America  3 Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean (Mexico, Central America above Colombia, and the West Indies)  4 South America (South America below Panama)  5 Oceania (Australia, New Zealand, Polynesia, Micronesia, and Melanesia)  6 Africa (all nations in sub-Saharan Africa south of Morocco, Algeria, Libya, and Egypt)  7 Asia (All mainland nations from Afghanistan east to Korea, Indonesia, the Philippines, Taiwan, Japan, and the Asian cultures of the former Soviet Union)  8 Middle East (All nations of northern Africa bordering on the Mediterranean, extending from Gibraltar through Egypt, all predominantly Arab nations on the Mediterranean and Persian Gulf, and Israel)  9 Europe (Western and Eastern Europe including the non-Asian cultures of the former Soviet Union)  10 two or more geographical areas (but not cross-cultural studies)  11 cross-cultural studies (comparisons of large number of culture groups)  12 not areally based

The only significant problems with codes 1-9 were articles about Madagascar (coded as 7 –Asia) and parts of the former Soviet Union (where I was usually eventually able to unambiguously place in either 7 Asia or 9 Europe). Articles about Hawaii were coded as 5 – Oceania.

SPECGROUPS  1 State-level Latin American Indians (Maya, Quechua-speakers, etc.)  2 Australian aborigines and Maori  [leave blank otherwise]

This category was difficult to code and was not used in analyses.

SCTYPE  1 foragers  2 “tribal” agriculturalists  3 rural people in state societies  4 town and city dwellers  5 combination of previous, other or not applicable

This category was difficult to code and was not used in analyses.

STUDYTYPE  1 one community  2 multi-sited  3 other or not applicable

Most articles did not provide sufficient information to allow coding. This category was not used in analyses.
PRIMARYDATA  -- primary data source  1 ethnographic 2 historical  3 ethnographic and historical 4 other

Coding this category was not always straightforward. This category was not used in analyses.

The next set of questions are about whether an article includes information on the following topics 1 yes 2 no

COG  cognitive anthropology (e.g., classification systems, schema, rules, mental maps)

Discussions of world view and ideology (including analyses of symbols) were coded as 1 yes for this category (mostly because there was not always another more suitable category).

DEV  “development,” socioeconomic change

Any article with significant amounts of information about change was coded as 1-yes.

DISC  discourse

Any article including an analysis of text (whether written or oral) was coded as 1-yes

ECOL  ecology and the environment

Some articles coded as 1-yes included only a paragraph about food-getting methods; others focused much more on this topic.

ECON  economics

Articles including information about property rights were coded as 1 –yes, as were articles including information about division of labor.

EDU  education (formal)

There were not many articles that mentioned this topic.

ETHNIC ethnicity, “race”

There were many articles (especially in the first part of the twentieth century) discussing (1) the changing geographical boundaries of named ethnic groups; and (2) how named ethnic groups differed from their neighbors. These articles were coded as 1-yes. Such articles were more common than those directly discussing “race” and “ethnicity.”

EXCUL expressive culture (art, music, dance, folklore, literature)

Articles about games and sports were coded as 1 –yes.
FAM  marriage, family, child-rearing, kinship, social organization

The many articles about kinship terminology were coded as 1-yes (even if they were primarily linguistic).

GEND  gender

Any article that compared males and females in any way (including the division of labor) was coded as 1 –yes.

GLOB  globalization and transnationalism

Articles about colonialism and “culture contact” were coded as 1 – yes.

LEGAL  law, legal systems

Articles about nonstate societies discussing punishments for culturally disapproved behavior were coded as 1 –yes.

MAT  material culture

Any article which explicitly discussed the making of material objects was coded as 1-yes.

MEDIC  medical anthropology

Most articles in the first half of the twentieth century coded as 1-yes included information about shamanism.

MIGR  migration

Articles coded as 1-yes included information about either internal migration (within a country or culture area) or external migration (between countries or culture areas)

POL  politics

Any article about power differentials (except for those according to age and gender) or conflicts over control of resources was coded as 1-yes.

REL  religion

Most articles discussing rituals and ceremonies in non-state societies (whether or not overtly “religious”) were coded as 1-yes.

SOCMOV  social movements
Until recently, there were few articles about this topic. Most articles about this topic in the first part of the twentieth century were about American Indian revivalist movements such as the Ghost Dance.

TECH technological change

Although there were many articles about material culture, only a small fraction of these discussed technological change.

TOUR tourism

Tourism has only occasionally been discussed in AA articles.

WARV warfare and violence

Coding this category was straightforward.

NUMTABLES numerical tables  1 yes  2 no

PHOTOS  1 yes  2 no

There were certain periods when AA articles did not include photos.

DRAWINGS AND DIAGRAMS (other than maps)  1 yes  2 no

Before 1920, most articles coded 1 included drawings of material objects. After then, most articles coded 1 included diagrams (often related to kinship)

MAP  1 yes  2 no

Articles coded 1 included those that provided diagrams of the spatial organization of events.