09 February 2011

To: AAA Executive Board & Kathy Ano, AAA Liaison
From: George J. Armelagos, Awards Committee Chair

Re: report from the 2010 AAA Awards Committee

I. Actions at the Spring EB Meeting
The Awards Committee (George J. Armelagos, Chair, Ann Grauer, Mimi Nichter, Carlos G. Velez-Ibanez and Linda Zigenbein) met by teleconference on 4/24/2010, prior to the AAA spring EB meeting, to evaluate the nominations for the AAA/Oxford undergraduate teaching award, the Boas Award, the Anthropology in the Media (AIME) award, and to review and act on the recommendations of the Textor Prize. We also discussed recommendations from the SfAA for the Mead Award for 2010.

1) AAA/Oxford University Press Prize for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching of Anthropology in anthropology: Harald E. L. Prins and Andy Lass

2) Boas Prize for service to Anthropology: Ralph Bolton

3) Anthropology in the Media award (AIME): Roy Richard Grinker

4) The Textor Prize recommendation certified for 2010: Robert A. Rubinstein

5) The Margaret Mead Award committee was composed of George J. Armelagos, Peter J. Brown, John P. N. Massad, Chair, and Jennifer Weis.


New appointment: Linda Zigenbein completed her term. Marcy Hessling was appointed to fill this position.

Margaret Mead Award Committee Report 2010

The Margaret Mead Award Committee met by conference call on two occasions to review and deliberate the submissions and choose a final nominee to recommend for the award: Wednesday, July 7, and Monday, July 12, 2010. The following report provides details of the deliberation process and other business conducted during these meetings.
The 2010 Committee

George Armelagos
Peter Brown
Jennifer Weis
John Massad (Chair)

Deliberation Process

The Committee received the following works (15 books and 1 film on DVD):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad</td>
<td>Islamism and Democracy in India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boellstorff</td>
<td>Coming of Age in Second Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattelino</td>
<td>High Stakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>Out in the Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho</td>
<td>Liquidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juris</td>
<td>Networking Futures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karkakis</td>
<td>Fixing Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelty</td>
<td>Two Bits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leinaweaver</td>
<td>Circulation of Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moe &amp; Shandy</td>
<td>Glass Ceilings &amp; 100-Hour Couples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandian</td>
<td>Crooked Stalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>Sounds and Light of Devotion (film)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Raw Life, New Hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taussig</td>
<td>Ordinary Genomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilt</td>
<td>Struggle for Sustainability in Rural China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>An Uncertain Cure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee Chair (John Massad) conducted a quick review to pare down the list to the five strongest candidates. In particular, there were a large number of resubmissions from the previous year that had not been reviewed favorably at the time, and the intent was to provide guidance to the Committee members on those works that should receive the greatest focus in the first review. Committee members were strongly encouraged to conduct at least a quick review of all eligible applicants, if but to ensure that the Chair had not unduly biased the selection process.

The following books had incomplete submissions at this time, so they were shelved. No additional information was received, so they were not considered for the award: Juris (Networking Futures); and Taussig (Ordinary Genomes).

The following books were resubmissions from the previous year and were deemed inappropriate for the award by the Committee at that time: Boellstorff (Coming of Age in Second Life); Karkakis (Fixing Sex); and Leinaweaver (Circulation of Children). These books were placed on a low priority list for the first round of reviews; however, one
(Leinaweaver) was brought into consideration in the first conference call at the recommendation of a Committee member.

The following book is the rare case of dual authorship, and it was recommended that it not be considered: Moe and Shandy (Glass Ceilings and 100-Hour Couples). The Committee discussed whether a policy is necessary to address the case of dual authorship. The results of that discussion are included in the section on other business, below.

The Chair reviewed the following books and recommended that they be removed from initial consideration, as they do not meet the central criteria for the award: "meaningful and accessible to a broadly concerned public... broadening the impact of anthropology."

Ahmad (Islamism and Democracy in India)
Cattelino (High Stakes)
Ross (Raw Life, New Hope)
Tilt (Struggle for Sustainability in Rural China)
White (An Uncertain Cure)

They were briefly reviewed by the Committee, and two (Catellino and Ross) were considered in the first conference call at the recommendation of Committee members.

The following four books and one film were recommended by the Chair for careful consideration in the first round:

Gray (Out in the Country)
Ho (Liquidated)
Kelty (Two Bits)
Pandian (Crooked Stalks)
Ray (Sounds and Lights of Devotion - film)

After one round of rankings by email, no clear frontrunner emerged. The following books were discussed in detail in the first conference call on July 7, 2010:

Cattelino (High Stakes)
Gray (Out in the Country)
Ho (Liquidated)
Kelty (Two Bits)
Leinaweaver (Circulation of Children)
Pandian (Crooked Stalks)
Ross (Raw Life, New Hope)

After this initial discussion, the Committee agreed that the following three finalists had emerged:

Kelty (Two Bits)
Leinaweaver (Circulation of Children)
Pandian (Crooked Stalks)

The Committee then conducted a second review of these three books to determine which best met the criteria for the Margaret Mead Award.

In a second conference call held on July 12, 2010, the Committee unanimously agreed that Leinaweaver (Circulation of Children) was the sole nominee for the Margaret Mead Award. The Chair agreed to write the formal nomination letter with input from the Committee.

Other Business

The Committee was asked to consider two important questions that arose during the nominations process. The first regards nominations that are resubmitted from one year to the next. The second regards nominations that are authored (or produced) by more than one person.

**Resubmissions** - The Committee strongly agrees that resubmissions should be allowed from one year to the next. At times the top two or three nominations are very strong, and it would be possible that one on the non-winners could be the best submission the following year. However, this total number of nominations was quite large, due to a high number of resubmissions, some of which were not ranked high in the previous year. The Committee therefore makes the following recommendations for an internal change in procedure:

The report from the Chair each year should contain a ranked listing of the top three choices. Because this is an internal document, it would maintain the confidentiality of the review and deliberations process. In the following year, only those top three would be eligible for full consideration by the Committee. To assist in this process, the annual report from the previous year from the Committee should be distributed to the new Committee Chair with instructions to consider only those resubmissions that are listed in the top three from the previous year, to be forwarded to the other Committee members.

**Multiple Authorship** – The Committee strongly agrees that the spirit of the Margaret Mead Award (as well as the letter “a,” as in “a young scholar”) dictates that nominations from multiply authored works should not be allowed. We feel that since this award is to promote the exceptional work of a young scholar in the field that contributes to public discourse it is essential that the work be the product of an individual. We do not feel that a change in policy is required. Submissions that are authored (or produced by more that one person should not be considered for nomination.