

Bioarchaeology and forensic anthropology as unique expertises

Nicholas V. Passalacqua¹; Marin A. Pilloud²; and Derek Congram³

¹Anthropology and Sociology Department, Western Carolina University; ²Anthropology Department, University of Nevada, Reno; ³International Committee of the Red Cross, Colombia

The practice of Bioarchaeology or Forensic Anthropology require unique contributory expertise

SPECIALIST EXPERTISES	UBIQUITOUS TACIT KNOWLEDGE			SPECIALIST TACIT KNOWLEDGE	
	Beer Mat Knowledge	Popular Understanding	Primary Source Knowledge	Interactional Expertise	Contributory Expertise
	Knowledge that is easily accesible (i.e., ubiquitous)			Exclusive knowledge that must be acquired via interactions and enculturation with practicing professionals	
	Knowledge of very superficial facts about a topic such that you might find on a beer mat/coaster	Knowledge based on popular non-fiction books and the general media	Knowledge based on engaging with the primary literature.	This represents having enough expertise about a discipline to interact with its contributory experts performing their work, but lacking the technical knowledge to perform it yourself.	This represents having enough expertise to contribute to a discipline through its technical and scholarly practice
	Note that literature still only provides “a shallow or misleading appreciation of science in deeply disputed areas” (Collins and Evans 2007:22)			“Scientists themselves tend to have contributory expertise in their narrow specialism and interactional expertise in cognate specialisms.” (Collins 2004:141)	

The only way to develop contributory expertise is through enculturation. Lacking enculturation at the level of contributory expertise leads to overconfidence and poor performance. Collins and Evans (2007:69)

Conclusions

Within this model, both bioarchaeology and forensic anthropology share many lower-level expertises, representing what Collins and Evans refer to as primary source knowledge. However, as specialization increases, there is decreasing overlap in expertise. These distinctions in knowledge area and expertise are important, as without the appropriate the appropriate amount of expertise, practitioners perform tasks inappropriately and/or incorrectly.

Model of expertise and explanations from:

- Collins H. (2004b). Interactional expertise as a third kind of knowledge. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 3(2),125-143.
- Collins H. (2013). Three dimensions of expertise. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 12(2),253-273.
- Collins H. (2018). Studies of expertise and experience. *Topoi* 37(1),67-77.
- Collins H., and Evans R. (2007). *Rethinking expertise* University of Chicago Press. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Collins H., and Evans R. (2015). Expertise revisited, part I—Interactional expertise. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A* 54,113-123.
- Collins H., Evans R., and Weinel M. (2016). Expertise revisited, part II: Contributory expertise. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A* 56,103-110.
- Collins H. M., and Evans R. (2002). The third wave of science studies: Studies of expertise and experience. *Social studies of science* 32(2),235-296.

Example of levels of expertise between Bioarchaeology and Forensic Anthropology

