

**ANTH 529:  
INTERNATIONAL NGOS AND GLOBALIZATION**

Fall 2015  
Tuesdays 2-4p  
Founder's Café  
Assoc Prof Mark Schuller  
mschuller@niu.edu  
Office Hours – T/Th 9:00 – 10:30a  
Or by appointment  
518 Grant Tower South

This course offers an orientation to critically engaged scholarship on international NGOs, beginning with an analysis of the historical development of various entities that could be defined as INGOs. The latter half of the 1980s saw a shift in international donors' funding, policies, and priorities, associated with the advent of neoliberal globalization. INGOs grew exponentially as a result of these shifts. At the same time, INGOs have been increasingly playing governance roles, in many cases displacing governments at the same time that their management has become increasingly professionalized. While these changes – the “NGO boom” – present growth opportunities for INGOs, they also represent challenges to their relationships with what is called the “grassroots,” poor and marginalized communities. Ethnographic analyses are essential to charting and theorizing how INGOs manage this delicate balancing act. This course should be of particular interest to students interested in exploring a career in the still-growing nonprofit / INGO sector

**LEARNING OBJECTIVES:**

Upon completing this course, students will:

- Have a historical understanding of the changes within INGOs, particularly since neoliberal globalization
- Sharpen their analysis of INGOs as a system and a structure
- Demonstrate a nuanced analysis of various aspects of INGOs: their work, their relationships with multiple understanding
- Assess the challenges currently facing an INGO
- Apply these theoretical, ethnographic, and historical tools in a critical analysis of a particular INGO

**COURSE READINGS:**

Nearly all readings are on Blackboard. There is one required reading that is available at the Bookstore:

Bernal, Victoria and Inderpal Grewal, eds. 2014. *Theorizing NGOs: States, Feminisms, and Neoliberalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press

**COURSE OUTLINE:**

**Week 1 – History of INGOs**

Tuesday, August 25 – introduction to course

Thursday, August 27 – (Charnowitz 1997; Davies 2014)

### **Week 2 – Types of INGOs**

Tuesday, September 1 – (Salamon and Anheier 1992)

Thursday, September 3 – (Schuller and Lewis 2014, , Bernal and Grewal - introduction)

### **Week 3 – Humanitarian Aid**

Tuesday, September 8 – (Barnett 2011; Bornstein and Redfield 2011)

Thursday, September 10 – (Acuto 2014; Donini 2012)

### **Week 4 – “Development”**

Tuesday, September 15 – (Mosse 2013)

Thursday, September 17 – (McMichael 1996; Clark 1991)

### **Week 5 – Globalization**

Tuesday, September 22 – (Wallerstein 2004)

Thursday, September 24 – (Bello 2004; Sassen 1998)

### **Week 6 – The “NGO Boom”**

Tuesday, September 29 – (Macdonald 1995; Agg 2006)

Thursday, October 1 – (Alvarez 1999)

### **Week 7 – Changes to NGOs**

Tuesday, October 6 – (Ferguson 1990; Petras 1997)

Thursday, October 8 – (INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence 2007; Nagar 2006)

### **Week 8 – Women’s NGOs and Activism: Possibilities**

Tuesday, October 13 – Bernal and Grewal, Chapters 1 and 2

Thursday, October 15 – Bernal and Grewal, Chapters 4 and 9

### **Week 9 – Women’s NGOs and “Development”**

Tuesday, October 20 – Bernal and Grewal, Chapters 3 and 7

Thursday, October 22 – Media analysis training – Founders 202

### **Week 10 – Limits and Possibilities to the NGO form**

Tuesday, October 27 – Bernal and Grewal, Chapters 8 and 10

Thursday, October 29 – Bernal and Grewal, Chapters 11 and Conclusion

### **Week 11 – Ethnographic Assessments of NGOs**

Tuesday, November 3 – (Lewis 2014; Markowitz 2001)

Thursday, November 5 – (Schwittay 2014)

### **Week 12 – Governance**

Tuesday, November 10 – (Ferguson and Gupta 2002; Jackson 2005)

Thursday, November 12 – (Lashaw 2013; Barnett 2013)

### **Week 13 – NGO Worker perspectives**

Tuesday, November 17 – Library research training – Founders 297

Thursday, November 19 – (Hindman 2013; Yarrow 2008)

### **Week 14 – Interrogating the Role of Intermediaries**

Tuesday, November 24 – (Richard 2009; Schuller 2009)

Thursday, November 26 – Thanksgiving holiday, no class

**Week 15 – Case Study: Haiti Earthquake**

Tuesday, December 1 – (Schuller forthcoming (2016), - sections)

Thursday, December 3 – (Schuller forthcoming (2016), - sections)

**STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES:**

**1) Learning contract**

By **Thursday, August 27**, the second day of class, at **9 a.m.**, each student is to upload a learning contract onto Blackboard. Each contract is to include the following:

- Learning goals for the class
- Self-responsibilities in meeting these goals
- Expectations of me in helping to fulfill these goals
- Acknowledgment of having read and understood the syllabus
- Places for signatures

These will be returned to the student at the end of the semester, which could be used in helping evaluate individual progress towards goals. *There is no point value for turning this in as this is the baseline for communication and accountability. Failure to do so, however, will result in one point being taken off for each day it is late.*

**2) Briefs**

Students will write 14 critical reading briefs. Students will turn in a brief for **ALL** of the week's readings. These are due **AT THE BEGINNING OF CLASS ON TUESDAY. NO EXCEPTIONS.** This is designed not only to keep students reading, but also to help students gain practice at critical reading skills. The appendix on this syllabus lists 7 general reading questions. For the first three weeks, students will focus on the first 2 questions, identifying the main argument. For weeks five and six, students will answer the first 3, including understanding the logic and structure of the argument. During week seven, question 4, identifying the methodology used or implicit in the reading, will be added. During week nine, I add question 5, asking students to apply the main argument in an example. During week eleven, I add question 6. Students write a well-formulated question or critique of the work. During week thirteen, I add question 7, asking students to imagine themselves as the authors. How would students respond to the critique, or write an analysis that would not be critiqued in the same way?

Each brief is worth 5 points, for a total of 70 points possible

**2) Final paper**

**Option One: Publishable article**

There will be one final paper, assembling the theoretical tools in the course to analyze a particular INGO. In week 7, in consultation with me, students will identify an INGO to study. One consideration is the availability of written information (in the form of website, annual reports, issue briefings, and ideally independent scholarship). Students will first identify a problem, and search out the relevant literature and internet locations where the problem is discussed. Students should deconstruct the way that knowledge is produced about the issue selected, discussing the epistemologies and biases involved. They are expected to employ at least two alternative and distinct critical approaches learned in class to deconstruct the narrative. Students will research

potential journals to submit their papers, including submissions guidelines, and follow these guidelines, including word length (usually 8,000-10,000 words) and style.

Assignment	Points toward Final Grade	Due Date Emailed to Prof.
1. Bibliography	5	October 27
2. Select target journal – policies and guidelines	5	November 3
3. Draft thesis statement	5	November 10
4. Outline of final paper	10	November 22
5. Final version of paper	15	December 8

### Option Two: Research proposal

All MA students in anthropology have to submit a formal research proposal before conducting their original research. The proposal should be detailed in its scope, clearly define a research question, situate it within the literature, and outline in as much detail as possible the methodology: define population, sampling strategy, specific methods, and timeline. Follow the guidelines for research proposals in the department website. Blackboard will also include a recently-funded NSF proposal as another model.

Assignment	Points toward Final Grade	Due Date Emailed to Prof.
1. Research questions	5	October 27
2. Outline of literature review	5	November 3
3. Outline of methods	5	November 10
4. First draft	10	November 22
5. Final draft	15	December 8

Notice that the total is 110 points. This is deliberate. The reasoning behind this is to offer you peace of mind that having a bad week or having an emergency will not adversely affect your grades. In addition, students who don't have a crisis can benefit from specific feedback and hence know how to improve, and to challenge themselves, without worrying about their grades. In my experience students want to be challenged, offered specific feedback and a real assessment (with the system of grading, this is how you expect to be evaluated), but are concerned about grades. Some of you will go onto law school, professional school, or graduate school. This system of free points takes care of this concern while still allowing me to offer you constructive criticism, helping you grow, learn, and develop. **This also means that there will be absolutely no exceptions to turning in late work, so there is no need to ask.**

## GRADING SCALE:

A	>93.3%
A-	90-93.3%
B+	86.7-89.9%
B	83.3-86.6%
B-	80-83.3%
C+	76.7-79.9%
C	73.3-76.6%
C-	70-73.3%
D+	66.7-69.9%
D	63.3-66.6%
D-	60-63.3%
F	<60%

## CLASS PARTICIPATION:

I am a firm believer in learning by doing, and I am also an advocate for making connections between what you are learning and the outside world. As much as possible, this will be an active discussion class. This is your chance to get the material under your skin, to try out concepts, to discuss, make arguments, listen, encourage learning, with the concepts covered in the readings. I expect that students will come to class prepared, having read the assigned materials *in advance* and bringing these materials with you to class. I may offer some prepared discussion (“lectures”) but these will offer context and theoretical background. These will **NOT** summarize readings as I expect that you will have read them in advance. Intended for enhancement and enrichment, these will make sense if you complete the readings.

Discussion participation is not about how often you open your mouth but on how you are contributing to the learning of others. We are going to be together for fifteen weeks, building a learning community. We aren’t put on this earth alone; communities are central to people’s individual survival and growth, not to mention collective social movements for progress. So let’s keep this community in mind and model the world we want to live in. Here are some tips on building this community:

1. **Respect everyone.** Look around; there are many differences that you can see (and many you can’t) - this community is diverse and inclusive.
2. **Listen, not just speak.** People can say things that you hadn’t thought of.
3. **Come to class on time.** It affects everyone when people walk in late.
4. **Do your readings.** Don’t cheat your classmates on your perspectives.
5. **Ask questions** when you don’t know something. Chances are, you aren’t the only one who is unsure of something.
6. **Be a good participant:** don’t interrupt, don’t have a private conversation, etc.
7. **Put the cell phone away:** unless there is an emergency wherein you must get a call/text that you must let me know at the beginning of class, put away the cell phone and turn them off. It is distracting to your peers and to your professor, taking away from other students’ learning experience. *Use of cell phone during class is treated as an absence.*

**POLICY ON ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION:**

In order to help build this learning community and help contribute to the learning of others, students are expected to attend all classes and to be on time. Lateness for class will be incorporated into the final grade. Participation includes preparing for class by completing assigned readings, participating in class discussions in an informed manner, moving the class forward by asking questions or making comments, and actively completing in-class exercises. It also means that students aren't being disruptive to others' learning.

***STUDENTS ARE GRANTED TWO ABSENCES WITHOUT AFFECTING THEIR GRADE. FOLLOWING THIS, EACH ABSENCE COSTS A THIRD A LETTER GRADE.***

**ACCOMMODATIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES:**

Northern Illinois University is committed to providing an accessible educational environment in collaboration with the Disability Resource Center. Any student requiring an academic accommodation due to a disability should let his or her faculty member know as soon as possible. Students who need academic accommodations based on the impact of a disability will be encouraged to contact the Disability Resource Center if they have not done so already. The Disability Resource Center is located in the 4th floor of the Health Services Building, and can be reached at 815-753-1303 [v], 815-753-3000 [TTY] or email at [drc@niu.edu](mailto:drc@niu.edu). Also, please contact me privately as soon as possible so we can discuss your accommodations. The sooner you let us know your needs, the sooner we can assist you in achieving your learning goals in this course.

**PLAGIARISM POLICY:**

Plagiarism is any use of another person's words without giving credit to the original author. This includes the use of materials from books, magazine or journal articles, newspapers, or on-line sources. Plagiarism includes the use of others' writing with minimal alteration of the text. Unless you specifically show what has been written by another author, you are stealing their work. NIU has a zero-tolerance policy for plagiarism. Any plagiarism will result in the total number of possible points for an exam, quiz, or assignment taken off the final score. These cannot be made up.

## COURSE BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acuto, Michele. 2014. "Introduction: Humanitarian Puzzles." In *Negotiating Relief: The Politics of Humanitarian Space*, edited by Michele Acuto, 1-9. London: Hurst and Co.
- Agg, Catherine. 2006. Trends in Government Support for Non-Governmental Organizations: Is the "Golden Age" of the NGO Behind Us? Geneva: United Nations Research Institute on Social Development.
- Alvarez, Sonia E. 1999. "Advocating Feminism: The Latin American Feminist NGO 'Boom'." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* no. 1 (2):181-209.
- Barnett, Michael. 2011. *The Empire of Humanity: a History of Humanitarianism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- . 2013. "Humanitarian Governance." *Annual Review of Political Science* no. 16:379-398.
- Bello, Walden. 2004. *Deglobalization*. London: Zed Books.
- Bornstein, Erica, and Peter Redfield. 2011. *Forces of Compassion: Humanitarianism between Ethics and Politics*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research Press.
- Charnowitz, Steve. 1997. "Two Centuries of Participation: NGOs and International Governance." *Michigan Journal of International Law* no. 18 (2):183-286.
- Clark, John. 1991. *Democratizing Development: the Role of Voluntary Organizations*. West Hartford, Conn., USA: Kumarian Press.
- Davies, Thomas. 2014. *NGOs: a New History of Transnational Civil Society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Donini, Antonio. 2012. *The Golden Fleece: Manipulation and Independence in Humanitarian Action*. Sterling, VA: Kumarian Press.
- Ferguson, James. 1990. *The Anti-Politics Machine: "Development," Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferguson, James, and Akhil Gupta. 2002. "Spatializing States: Toward an Ethnography of Neoliberal Governmentality." *American Ethnologist* no. 29 (4):981-1002.
- Hindman, Heather. 2013. *Mediating the Global: Expatriate's Forms and Consequences in Kathmandu*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence. 2007. *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-Profit Industrial Complex*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Jackson, Stephen. 2005. "'The State Didn't Even Exist': Non-Governmentality in Kivu, Eastern DR Congo." In *Between a Rock and a Hard Place: African NGOs, Donors, and the State*, edited by Jim Igoe; Tim Kelsall, 165-196. Durham, N.C.: Carolina Academic Press.
- Lashaw, Amanda. 2013. "How Progressive Culture Resists Critique: the Impasse of NGO Studies." *Ethnography* no. 14 (4):501-522.
- Lewis, David. 2014. *Non-governmental Organizations, Management and Development*. London: Routledge.
- Macdonald, Laura. 1995. "A Mixed Blessing: The NGO Boom in Latin America." *NACLA Report on the Americas* no. 28 (5):30-35.
- Markowitz, Lisa. 2001. "Finding the Field: Notes on the Ethnography of NGOs." *Human Organization* no. 60 (1):40-46.
- McMichael, Philip. 1996. "The Development Project (Late 1940s to Early 1970s)." In *Development and Social Change*, 15-43. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge.
- Mosse, David. 2013. "The Anthropology of International Development." *Annual Review of Anthropology* no. 42:227-246.
- Nagar, Richa and Sangtin Writers. 2006. *Playing with Fire: Feminist Thought and Activism through Seven Lives in India*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Petras, James. 1997. "Imperialism and NGOs in Latin America." *Monthly Review* no. 49 (7):10-17.
- Richard, Analiese. 2009. "Mediating Dilemmas: Local NGOs and Rural Development in Neoliberal Mexico." *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* no. 32 (2):166-194.
- Salamon, Lester M, and Helmut K Anheier. 1992. "In search of the non-profit sector. I: the question of definitions." *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* no. 3 (2):125-151.
- Sassen, Saskia. 1998. *Globalization and Its Discontents: Essays on the New Mobility of People and Money*. New York: The New Press.

- Schuller, Mark. 2009. "Gluing Globalization: NGOs as Intermediaries in Haiti, 2007 APLA Student Paper Competition Winner." *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* no. 32 (1):84-104.
- . forthcoming (2016). *Humanitarian Aftershocks in Haiti*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Schuller, Mark, and David Lewis. 2014. Anthropology and NGOs. In *Oxford Bibliographies in Anthropology*, edited by John L. Jr. Jackson.
- Schwittay, Anke F. 2014. "Making Poverty into a Financial Problem: from Global Poverty Lines to Kiva.org." *Journal of International Development* no. 262 (4):508-519.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel Maurice. 2004. *World Systems Analysis: an Introduction*, John Hope Franklin Center. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Yarrow, Thomas. 2008. "Life/history: personal narratives of development amongst NGO workers and activists in Ghana." *Africa* no. 78:334-357.



## APPENDIX: CRITICAL READING QUESTIONS

- 1) What new things did you learn (*information – facts*) after you read each article/ chapter for this week? Write a list of everything you learned. Can be bullet points/ keywords, but detailed. Place page numbers next to the information.
- 2) What was the author's *main argument*? Write a short and pithy synthesis. Two to three sentences should suffice, provided they are detailed, organized, and well structured.
- 3) What was the *structure* of the study? What was the overall logic? What evidence did she/he use? In what order? You should be able to reproduce some kind of outline.
- 4) What *methods* did the author use to gain this information? (or, if not appropriate, what *assumptions* did the author make or taken-for-granted understandings did the author appeal to?)
- 5) Apply the main argument (question 2) with an *example*: explain the theory/ ideas by using them in another situation. The example needs to have sufficient detail to explain, and the link between the example and the theory needs to be clear.
- 6) AFTER ALL THIS, what questions or *critiques* do you have for the study itself? What mistakes, logical flaws, omissions, or incomplete analyses are in the argument? What information or evidence is missing?
- 7) Is it possible to do a similar study while *avoiding the same critique*? If so, how? If not, why is it not possible?