WHEATON COLLEGE
Student-Initiated Connection Proposal

Connections Learning Outcomes: As a result of connections students will be able to:
1. Understand how different academic disciplines analyze topics and solve problems
2. Apply methods or concepts from more than one discipline when analyzing topics or solving problems
3. Communicate using more than one different disciplinary perspective
4. Identify other disciplinary connections both in and outside the classroom

DIRECTIONS for structuring and submitting a Self-Initiated Connection Proposal:
The final date to submit the proposal is the "last day to drop a course without record" deadline of the semester in which you
plan to take the last course of the Connection. Refer to the academic calendar on the Web for the specific date this semester.
> A proposed two-course Connection must link courses from at least two different Areas, a three-course Connection must link
courses from three areas. The six areas are: History (ARHS), Creative Arts (ARCA), Humanities (ARHM),
Social Sciences (ARSS), Natural Sciences (ARNS), Math/CS (ARMC).
> One single course cannot be used in two Connections.
> You cannot use English 101, Writing, or First Year Seminar, in a Self-Initiated Connection.
> When including an Independent Study in your proposal, you must also submit a statement that includes a full description of
the Independent Study, plus the reading list. It is the responsibility of the student to provide this information.
> Attention Seniors: Proposals may not be submitted in your final semester.

Student Name: Molly Louie
Date: 3/23/17
Wheaton ID: W00378136
Class Year: 2019
Title of Your Proposed Connection: Theory and the Marvelous

1. Attach the syllabi from all courses included in this Connection.
2. In a brief essay, identify the inter-connection you have found among these courses. Your essay should address the
Connections Learning Outcomes found at the top of this page.
3. The faculty teaching each course must read your essay and approve this proposed Connection in the box below.
4. Submit this form, the accompanying essay, and the syllabi to the Committee on Educational Policy, care of the Office of the
Provost, Park Hall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Semester Taken</th>
<th>Faculty Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Example)</td>
<td>SOC 230 Race and Ethnicity</td>
<td>ARSS</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>Please print your name and sign below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 301 Theory in Anthropology</td>
<td>ARSS</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>&quot;I have read this proposal and approve it.&quot; Print Name: Nicole Bourgoise Signature:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER 298 Monstrous and the Marvelous</td>
<td>ARHS</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
<td>&quot;I have read this proposal and approve it.&quot; Print Name: Signature:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Approved Chair, Committee on Educational Policy Date
cc: Registrar revised 08/2015
I am writing to propose a student-initiated connection between Theory in Anthropology (ANTH 301) and Monstrous and the Marvelous (GER 298). While both classes do explicitly discuss folk tales, I believe that the connection between the two also runs deeper. The attitudes and methods of analysis for each reading that are encouraged in both classes complement each other and are helpful in the other class.

In the most basic sense, the readings I have done for each class complement each other. For Monstrous and the Marvelous, I read Vladimir Propp’s Thirty One Functions, which, although not required reading, was discussed in comparison with Levi-Strauss’s ‘mytheme’ version of story analysis in Theory in Anthropology. While discussing in Anthropology class the two methods, I found it very valuable having had more concrete experience with Propp’s method as well, and I understood both methods better. Both classes involved applying these methods in other stories, Star Wars for Levi-Strauss and several versions of Little Red Riding Hood for Propp.

There is overlap in more than just content. In Monstrous and the Marvelous, we started out by asking questions about what a folk tale actually is, what they mean, why they were collected when they were collected and why it is important to know these things. These are questions that are especially similar to the questions you learn to ask in Anthropology. As the course progressed, I found that we spent more time looking at folk tales and songs individually, focusing on each story on its own, although many of the questions we asked were the same. As we read each story we are mindful of where it came from and what that might mean, especially if
it came from the Brothers Grimm about whom we have read the most. Monstrous and the Marvelous presents a more focused view of specific folk tales than Theory in Anthropology. Each story is analyzed not just in the context it was created but also in relation to other versions of the same base plot. We also discuss each version in itself closely as one might a short story for an English class, and consider what is actually occurring in each folk tale or song, as sometimes it isn’t entirely clear.

On the other hand, Theory in Anthropology focuses more on anthropological writings that outline different methods of thinking and ideas, rather than applying those ideas in the practical way that I do in Monstrous and the Marvelous. Still, in Theory in Anthropology, we ask questions between readings that postulate what other authors whose works we have read would think of given arguments, and try to be conscious of how the environment and perspective from which the author writes might alter what they believed.

I am distinctly grateful that I ended up taking these courses at the same time because they have both been so helpful to the other. Because of these reasons, I feel that a connection between Monstrous and the Marvelous and Theory in Anthropology makes a lot of sense.