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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to analyze the current relationship between applied anthropology and traditional scholarly anthropology. The field of applied anthropology has undergone very rapid growth and change in the last decade, with distinct subfields attaining an identity and mode of inquiry of their own. In the midst of this surge of new development, some anthropologists have noted that applied practices appear to be diverging significantly from traditional approaches. This thesis will attempt here to assess the ways in which practices are, in fact, diverging. The principal aims will be to:

1. define the relationship between applied research and traditional anthropology (i.e., basic, academic research), explicating historical causes for their divergence, as well as defining structural differences between them;

2. explore some of the methodological differences between various types of applied anthropology which emerge as the result of different practices and differing socio-cultural and institutional settings; and

3. investigate how applied anthropology relates to trends occurring both within and outside of traditional anthropology.
Applied Versus Traditional Anthropology

Applied researchers have been called upon to "use the special knowledge and insights of the discipline to serve the world in useful fashion" (Goldschmidt 1979:10). Indeed, every applied researcher from Foster (1969) onwards has incorporated in his or her definition of the field the notion that applied anthropology is "anthropology put to use" (e.g., Goldschmidt 1979; VanWilligen 1980).

From such an orientation, one might assume that (a) "anthropology" here refers to the body of theory and methods employed by traditional anthropology, and that (b) such methods and theories are adequate for solving problems of the world outside. Foster, for example, believed this to be the case, i.e., because anthropologists had training only in "pure" research, they were expected to "use the same concepts, methodology, and research methods in an applied assignment as in a theoretical analysis, and [to] apply the same scientific canons of accuracy, objectivity, and freedom from value judgments" (Foster 1969:45). But many applied anthropologists of the past decade often have found it necessary to abandon traditional field methods in order to accomplish the goals set for them. In addition, these researchers recognize that their work is not value free; the research tasks undertaken are, by their very nature, bound to societal values.

Does this mean that applied anthropologists are coming to reject the ethos and methods of traditional anthropology? The
answer to this question requires an understanding of both the common and divergent ground held between applied and basic, academic, scholarly anthropological activities. This understanding may be sought on two levels: an historical one and a social structural one.

In this first chapter I give a brief summary of the historical development and divergence of applied anthropology from traditional anthropology. Subsequent chapters will deal with structural and methodological differences between them.

Historical Background

The Beginnings to World War II

Implicit in the notion that applied anthropology is "anthropology put to use," is the idea that anthropology, as a formal study, preceded any attempts at "usefulness," that "applied anthropology somehow grew out of general anthropology" (VanWilligen 1982:17). But, VanWilligen's (1980) historical documentation of applied anthropology firmly establishes the fact that, since the beginnings of the discipline, anthropologists have been using what they know in some practical way. In fact, the name, "period of applied ethnology," is used to refer to anthropology's first 80 years (about 1860-1940). It is only since the end of this period that anthropologists have become concerned with the distinctions between basic and applied anthropological activities. There appears to be two reasons why this is so.
First, anthropology is a fairly new discipline. It is also one of the youngest of the social sciences—younger, for example, than economics, history, or psychology. Although some (Pandian 1985) trace the discipline's roots to the Renaissance period, and others even further back in time to Herodotus in the 5th century B.C., anthropology did not become a "professional" discipline until the end of the 19th century. It was not until that time (1883) that anthropology was first instituted at a British university. In America, the founding of professional anthropology is generally traced to Boas who began teaching at Clark University in 1889 and at Columbia in 1899.

Thus, anthropology has had a fairly short period in which to develop its formal theory. Only now, with its grounded body of theory and methods, is the discipline attempting to determine the relationship between its theory and application. Full agreement has yet to be reached on the question of whether or not application should be a testing of its general hypotheses.

Second, anthropology found it necessary, for political reasons, to dissociate itself from applied work in order to be accepted by the academic establishment. Early in its life, anthropology became involved with issues pertaining to the colonial experience. In historical perspective, this involvement can be seen as having been both a boon and a hindrance to the development of applied anthropology.

In 1843, the Ethnological Society of London became involved in supporting antislavery activities aimed at the protection of
aborigines. As a result, the society embroiled itself in the debate about whether or not the Negro belonged to the same species as that of the European. In 1863, a divergent faction of this society (the Anthropological Society of London) made public their position on this issue, declaring that the Negro differed "mentally and morally even more than physically from the European" (Reining 1970:5). This "scientific" position was made, however, "without the realization that their argument about the inequality of races was similar to the justifications used by white settlers for the 'dispersion' of the aborigines" (Reining 1970:5).

As a consequence of this stance, anthropology gained an image of radicalism and was denounced by many, including "political liberals who objected to the notion of inequality of men on the basis of social justice" (Reining 1970:7).

These events closely preceded anthropologists' attempts to gain for the discipline admittance to the universities. It was apparent that in order to accomplish this, anthropology would need to gain respectability by suppressing any further "radical" pursuits.

By 1871 the newly formed Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland eschewed any involvement in policy and concentrated instead on the development of a sound body of empirical knowledge or science. Thus, for a time, the practical value of anthropology was laid to rest in Britain.

Unlike the British, U.S. anthropologists gained political and scientific support quite early. The Smithsonian Institution, founded in 1846, gave intensive support to both archaeological and
ethnographic investigations. However, the Bureau of Ethnology, established by the government in 1879, was the single greatest sponsor of research (Ellen 1984). In supporting ethnographic investigations, the Bureau sought to "endeavor as far as possible to produce results that would be of practical value in the administration of Indian affairs." But, despite the large number of surveys and ethnographies that were to yield practical results, the Bureau's lavish research publications "were largely descriptive, and there is little evidence that they played any role in determining Indian policy" (Foster 1969:197).

There were, however, a number of early anthropologists who applied their knowledge to practical issues. Lewis Henry Morgan (1818-1881), a lawyer who took up the study of Indian kinship, acted on behalf of the Iroquois in defending their land rights. Henry R. Schoolcraft prepared a six volume statistical history of American Indians for U.S. Congress in hopes "that public presentation of the facts 'neither overrated by exaggeration nor underrated by prejudice' would lead to a less cruel policy toward native Americans" (Schoolcraft 1857:vii, cited in Partridge and Eddy 1978:11-12). In 1890, James Mooney spoke before Congress to testify that the American Indian Ghost Dance should not be interpreted as a signal of Indian warmongering, but as an Indian response to forced acculturation.

Although scholars such as these rose to defend Indian rights, applied anthropology was not perceived as a potential area for research. Applied activity remained for a long time separate from
the sphere of traditional scholarly activity.

Stewart (1983) believes this to be the result of academic teaching, tradition, and bias. Franz Boas (1853-1942), the major teacher of professional American anthropology for over 45 years was devoted primarily to "abstract" anthropology. Those who followed him (Kroeber, Lowie, Olson, Gifford and Steward, among others) were even less interested in application. Yet this later generation of teachers can be commended, for they "wished to produce independent scholars, not disciples" (Stewart 1983:191) and an abundance of applied researchers followed in their wake. Among these were W. Lloyd Warner who, teaching at Harvard and Chicago, later formed the Society for Applied Anthropology in 1941 with Radcliffe-Brown (teaching at the University of Chicago) and Malinowski (teaching at Yale).

By the turn of the present century, the possible uses of anthropology were considered again in Britain, this time as an aid to colonialism. Foster (1969) describes how, in recognizing the need for cultural information in order to successfully administer its subjects, the British government established academic departments in its main universities and gave anthropologists formal appointments with the express purpose of conducting ethnographic research which would be utilized to assist the administration of tribal affairs. Among these anthropologists were C.G. Seligman, E.E. Evans Pritchard, S.F. Nadel, N.W. Northcote, and R.S. Rattray (Foster 1969:186-188). These researchers undoubtedly acted as advisors and consultants to government but their published works,
like that of the American anthropologists who worked for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, were not always of an applied nature but were mainly basic scholarly publications. In other words, the principal publications resulting from this applied work did not necessarily address issues of socio-cultural change, nor did these anthropologists often write about methods for gaining cultural information that would be pertinent to government administration. Their formal research was generally tailored to the theoretical models then employed by the academy. As VanWilligen (1984:280) has stated: "It seems as if early applied work got converted to a more theoretical tone in order to have it fit better in the journals."

This practice may partially have been the result of a lingering conservatism within the discipline, an assumed necessity in order to gain scientific status. It was certainly a response to the roles assigned them. The colonial governments who employed these anthropologists generally were unable to conceive creatively of them as producing anything other than traditional ethnographies, assumed to be somehow relevant and transcribable to policy making. This trend can be seen in the formal publications resulting from work in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, as well as later, for the International Institute of African Languages and Cultures which was established after World War I (Foster 1969:186-193).

These anthropologists did publish their research, yet none of these publications indicate any of the applied aspects of their work here; no knowledge of the methodological insights, of role
expectations, or of the outcome of applied research was made available to mainstream anthropology at this time.

**Post World War II Trends**

Despite the existence of a Society for Applied Anthropology, as well as the optimism of those anthropologists involved in World War II efforts, applied anthropology continued to be "considered a lesser kind of anthropology. Like an aristocratic family going into trade to keep up payments, applied anthropologists were felt to be simplifying the complex wisdom of their craft and getting their hands dirty in service" (Angrosino 1976:2-3).

After their military-related efforts in World War II, anthropologists in America quickly removed themselves from public involvement. Mead (1975) attributes this partly to the political sympathies and ethical decisions made by anthropologists concerning the conduct of the war in Viet Nam. Interestingly, however, she does not commend anthropologists for their response, arguing rather that "If enough anthropologists had been willing to work on Viet Nam, we might have been able to do something that made some sense. But they had all withdrawn" (Mead 1975:14-15).

There was also another reason why many anthropologists turned their backs on applied research. Post-World War II affluence allowed U.S. anthropologists to pick and choose jobs. The academic appointments that they obtained often were tied to fashionable scholarly topics, such as kinship and marriage or
symbolism and cross-cultural cognition, which "paid off careerwise" (Mead 1975:15).

During the late 1960s, the tide of affluence began to recede. Recently, demographic trends and the current economic situation have resulted in declining university enrollments. This has forced some anthropologists to seek alternative careers. Professional anthropologists are now being graduated from programs which are designed explicitly to teach one or another kind of applied anthropology. In short, applied anthropology has emerged as a valid career in its own right and is no longer merely an adjunct to academe.

Mead (1975:13) has said that we "only do applied anthropology if somebody is going to apply it. We have to have a consumer." Such consumers began to emerge in larger numbers in the U.S. as a result of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. This act required 356 federal agencies to set guidelines for preparing Environmental Impact Statements (EIS). It also set an example for the individual states to follow. These mandates provided social scientists the opportunity to participate in constructing impact statements which are required for any proposed major action that may have significant impact on the environment or human life. The term "environment" was intended to specifically include social and economic factors as well as simply physical conditions or processes.

Social scientists were also recruited for work overseas when the United States Agency for International Development (USAID),
responding to Congress' New Directions amendments, established its "social soundness analysis" (USAID 1975). This legislation required that "the poor majority participate in 'the decisions that shape their lives', as well as in the benefits of assistance" (Hoben 1982:357).

Today, applied researchers are not waiting idly for recognition of their usefulness. They are organizing themselves and aggressively marketing their skills, particularly those working in the domestic sphere of applied research. For example, the Committee of Anthropologists in Environmental Planning had scheduled a session at the American Anthropological Association's Annual Meeting for 1985 to which representatives from major federal agencies, such as the Environmental Protection Agency, the Office of Surface Mining and the Department of Agriculture, were invited. The session's purpose was to "discuss ways in which [the major federal agencies'] environmental planning and review process could better address social concerns" (National Association for the Practice of Anthropology 1985).

Conscious of their direction, these most recent of applied anthropologists will perhaps fulfill the goal of their forebears, who over a century ago strove to aid "in the solution of the painful problems which human society and modern civilization proffer, and [to tend] to the bettering of the conditions of man in the aggregate all over the world" (from the Anthropological Society of London's Popular Magazine of Anthropology, 1866; cited in Reining 1970:5).
CHAPTER II

STRUCTURAL AND CULTURAL DIFFERENCES

The previous chapter was concerned with illustrating how applied anthropology's relationship to the discipline at large has been influenced, in large part, by externalities, such as evolving political events or changing economic factors. In this chapter I turn to a discussion of the ways in which traditional (or basic) anthropological research and applied anthropological research differ structurally, as the result of different basic assumptions and different situational constraints. The general findings discussed here are not limited to anthropology alone; they also appear to underlie differences between basic and applied research in other fields as well. Following chapters will describe specific kinds of applied activity and the reasons for their differing approaches and methods.

It is important at the outset to specify what is meant here by "applied research," for, although applied anthropology is often equated with applied research, the two are not synonymous. As Chambers (1985:140) points out, applied anthropology "encompasses both applied and basic strategies in so far as either has a direct bearing on problems of decision making." Thus, the question that concerns us here is: In what way does applied research differ from basic research?
Figure 1 provides the principal structural components of most research. These consist of:

1. The particular institutional environment within which the research is conducted.

2. The conduct or role assumed by the researcher while conducting research.

3. The ideology or value orientations which are implicitly or explicitly held by the researcher.

All three of these components interact in such a way as to produce a particular kind of goal.

Table 1 highlights some characteristic operational or procedural elements associated with each of these three structural components. As can be seen, basic and applied research differ not only in goals, but also in operational elements in each of the three components. This involves not only different aims, but also different problem orientation and selection procedures, as well as different beneficiaries of the research itself. It may be noted that this model incorporates, with modification, most of Foster's (1969) observations while utilizing VanWilligen's (1984) "domain of application" model. Similarly, while this model makes no attempt to deal with the ways in which application of research may or may not affect mainstream anthropological theory, this issue is addressed in the final chapter of this thesis.
Figure 1. The Components of Research: Interactive Model.
Table 1
The Structural and Cultural Components of Basic and Applied Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>CONDUCT</th>
<th>IDEOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Selection</strong></td>
<td><strong>Translator</strong></td>
<td><strong>End Goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Sponsor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Researcher's Domain of Application</strong></td>
<td><strong>Value Orientation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Beneficiary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bias Toward Directed Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>BASIC RESEARCH</strong></th>
<th><strong>APPLIED RESEARCH</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Researcher</td>
<td>Policy makers or Innovating Organizations or Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation, University</td>
<td>Policy makers or Innovating Organizations or Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Academe (other researchers, teachers, students)</td>
<td>Policy makers, Operational personnel of innovating organization or agency, People for whom is significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Applied researcher, Anthropological consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provider of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provider of Information. At times, Policy formulator and/or Initiator of Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presumably &quot;Value Free&quot; undesirable; change cannot be controlled</td>
<td>Shaped and constrained inevitable by public values and policy intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change is inevitable by public and it can be directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to theory. Continued research. Teaching</td>
<td>Ideally, operational success in achieving change or stability in real world</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Institutional Environment

Research Sponsorship and Selection

The research sponsor is part of the institutional environment within which research is undertaken. Research sponsorship is important not only because it determines who will formulate the research questions or decide what research is worth conducting, but also because it defines who will be the primary beneficiary of the research results and the entire research process. In basic, academic research the problem to be investigated is constructed by the researchers themselves. For the most part this research is classified as independent inquiry.

Applied researchers are employed forthrightly to solve the problems of policy makers, agencies, organizations, and private enterprise. Although these researchers may contribute to the "solution," the "problem" has already been chosen for them.

Research Beneficiaries and the Need for Translation

All researchers must express their research findings in ways that are meaningful to, and that will further the goals of, the research sponsor. Thus, it follows that basic researchers have no need to translate the results of their research into terms different from their own since the principal beneficiaries of the research are both themselves and other researchers, teachers or students.
The beneficiaries of applied research, on the other hand, are generally policy makers, agencies or private industry. Research results presented in a style or format relevant to academic audiences are often useless in achieving the goals of other groups. Rather, the applied anthropologist must extrapolate practical data from their research and present it in terms meaningful to policy decisions. For example, a report detailing Navajo kin relationships may be useless to policy makers who are concerned with implementing an agricultural extension service unless the report demonstrates (rather than asserts) its significance. Useful information here would include the fact that the matrilineal Navajos' work unit is not exclusively male but is comprised of women and children also and, furthermore, that particular family units have traditionally bonded together as cooperative working outfits.

Applied anthropologists have found that not only must they present information in such a way that it is both meaningful and relevant to a particular problem, but they must maximize its comprehension by using non-traditional (i.e., not "scholarly") formats for data presentation. The narrative text typical of traditional ethnographies is often simply too cumbersome in detail; it inhibits reduction of complex information into configurations readily understood by a decision maker (Miles and Huberman 1984). Practitioners can find ways to present qualitative information
clearly, without having to risk turning their "soft" data into false "hard" data.

Conduct

VanWilligen's concept of "domain of application" refers to "the intellectual operations by which applied anthropologists produce their products" (VanWilligen 1984:277). These products can be information, policy, and action, or a combination of all three. Since basic researchers are exclusively providers of information, they generally generate information with the view that it will not be used for specific policy decisions, but rather to support or disprove theoretical statements.

Although applied researchers also generate information, they most frequently do so with specific policy considerations in mind. As a result, their data collection process will reflect information needs that are pertinent to policy decisions. And when, as in some instances, applied researchers take on the additional responsibility of initiating action (e.g., as do "action" and "advocacy" anthropologists), their data collection process will reflect these information needs also.

It is clear that these intellectual or operational processes are related integrally to the product of research and the role of the researcher. Using the example of VanWilligen's (1984) own experience, a researcher responsible for formulating policy might be
the director of a community information program who, at the same
time, is responsible for securing information with which to direct
community policies. Their research would surely reflect this. The
products of their policy involvement and action will always be
linked to that of information in that "research produces
information, information informs policy formation, and policy guides
action" (VanWilligen 1984:278). But it is important to note that
this linkage also works in the reverse direction: action and policy
needs may affect the structure of research.

Applied researchers have not typically been policy makers or
initiators of action. However, examples of the latter are action
anthropologists who use intervention strategies and "activist"
anthropologists who are concerned with the protection of
indigenous people's rights and life styles.

In short, both basic and applied research are involved in the
production of information. But this process is further influenced by
policy needs in the case of application. Although applied
researchers may produce policy and, at times, act on the direct
behalf of those whom they are studying, their activity is still
fundamentally a research based activity.

Ideology

Value Orientation

Basic researchers strive to be "value free." This is not to say
that they do not recognize their own particular cultural values,
including those embedded in their theoretical perspectives. These values are inevitably brought to their research activity (e.g., Cesara 1982 and Pandian 1985, who urge an examination of the values inherent in the Western, Judeo-Christian cultural phenomenon known as anthropology).

The issue here is not what kinds of values the researcher holds, but whether or not, or to what degree, these influence the research process. All basic researchers strive to prove or disprove theoretical assumptions in an empirical (i.e., objective) manner. For these reasons, many rarely take on the role of advocate.

Of course, applied researchers also use scientific, objective methods. However, applied researchers are (or should be) quick to recognize that the research itself inherently possesses particular value orientations. This is so, according to Chambers (1985:141), because applied research derives "from those assumptions and perceptions of need which have been identified as having policy significance." The applied research problem and the resulting proposed actions "are almost invariably determined on the basis of societal values." And as Hinshaw (1980:512) makes clear, it is the decision makers who "choose means and ends of public policy, deciding who benefits and who bears the costs." In most instances the social scientist simply "contributes to clarifying alternatives and their implications." The applied researcher may not agree personally with all or any of the methods or actions undertaken by the agency hiring him or her, but he or she nevertheless
accepts the societal values which have given rise to such an institution.

Although applied anthropology is spoken of as value laden, the field by no means lacks an ethical stance. The Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA), in 1948, was the first group of anthropologists to formulate a written Code of Ethics (SfAA 1949). This has been successively revised and has made a wide impact: the traditionally academic American Anthropological Association did not pass a formal code of ethics until 1971 (Principles of Professional Responsibility) and only now is considering replacing this with an explicit Code of Ethics (Helm 1985).

Bias Toward Directed Change

There is one factor, often unmentioned, which represents a crucial point of divergence between much basic and applied research, particularly in the social sciences. This factor is the particular bias, held by each, concerning the role of directed change.

In traditional research, this bias stems from methodological considerations and ethical convictions. To those working in the tradition set by Boas, for example, the ethnographer's mission is to document those cultures that are under threat of extinction. In striving to capture the truth of the moment, the ethnographer attempts to avoid, to the best of his or her ability, altering the subjects' "natural" state. Thus, the traditional researcher often
takes caution not to over-exert his or her own presence, nor to introduce foreign elements which might bring about a change in traditional life ways.

Additionally, some anthropologists, respectful of their traditional subject matter, have developed a protective stance toward non-Western cultures. A "conservationist" ethos has arisen among some, which can be supported by many instances in which directed and non-directed change has brought more harm than good to undeveloped peoples. Such negative consequences have been well documented by anthropologists, e.g., for the Yir Yoront (Sharp 1952); for the Yanamamo (Davis 1977); for the Ik (Turnbull 1977); and for the subsistence level "victims of progress" worldwide (Bodley 1975).

Applied anthropologists are not insensitive to these issues. Indeed, they often have a more highly developed perception of "the culture of poverty" (to use Lewis's phraseology), as well as explicit mandates to insure that the "poorest of the poor" (to use USAID phraseology) benefit from their research. And, accepting the premise that change is inevitable, applied anthropologists believe that change can be "planned," "monitored" and "directed." Alinsky (1972:2, cited in Whisson 1985:136) attributes to applied anthropologists a more radical stance than this: a desire "to change the world from what it is to what they believe it should be." At present, they work toward these ends in the service of the
political units, community groups, agencies and institutions characteristic of today's developed world.

End Goals

Foster (1969) makes it clear that the "ends" of research (its outcomes) are very different for the theoretical anthropologist than they are for the applied. The traditional anthropologist will incorporate their new research data and theory into teaching and toward defining future research. Additionally, the traditional researcher maintains control of the research in all of its stages, being responsible for all aspects of its outcome (moral and ethical, as well as scientific).

For "the applied anthropologist, the ends of the research sequence are changes in human behavior which further modernization, technology and social development, and higher standards of living" (Foster 1969:52). These ends are, of course, an ideal. The pessimism underlying much debate about development stems from the very real negative consequences of past development efforts, particularly in the international sphere. Some anthropologists shun involvement here precisely because they do not have control of the ends of research in an applied setting. To remedy this, Pillsbury (1984), who has worked in international development, suggests ways in which anthropologists might better insure that their research results are incorporated in project design. But even domestically, most practicing anthropologists have worked as consultants and not
as decision makers; decisions pertaining to project design are made not by them but by those with the authority to do so, and with the power to transform the definitions of "costs and benefits" to serve their own purposes.

In summary then, applied anthropology may be said to be a research based activity, but one which utilizes applied research strategies which are shaped by values and roles emanating from an institutional setting different from that of basic research. These institutional characteristics and constraints direct applied research towards its specific goals. Although it is possible that some anthropological endeavors having purely scientific intentions may have applied effects, such endeavors are not "applied." For, applied research is an activity which is problem oriented and which, importantly, involves a particular a priori value stance about toward the possibility and desirability of directed change.
CHAPTER III

SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The previous chapter was concerned with analyzing the ways in which basic and applied research differ. This chapter will be concerned with (a) exploring specific types of activity within the broad field of applied anthropology and, (b) investigating the origins and methods of one specific type of applied research.

It has been noted that different kinds of applied anthropology incorporate applied research strategies to differing degrees (Foster 1969; VanWilligen 1976). That is, some research activities are more or less applied than others. For example, by referring to Table 1 in Chapter II, one might measure to what degree a particular kind of applied anthropology is involved in basic or applied research. Van Willigen (1976:82-83) has developed an informal set of categories with which to measure "applied types" of anthropology:

The anthropologist is himself involved in direct action.

The anthropologist supports direct actionists through professional activity such as research.

The anthropologist carries out research for a client.

The anthropologist does policy-relevant research.

The anthropologist participates in applied anthropology training programs.

The anthropologist more or less accepts applied anthropology; at least he doesn't express open hostility.
By using the above "folk concept of applied anthropology" which differentiates applied anthropological activities according to the **degree** of involvement in directed change, VanWilligen (1976:83-84) has identified six major models for applied action:

1. "The Applied Ethnology Model", typified by George Foster (1969) and the closest of all the models to pure, basic, academic research.

2. "The Research and Development Model", explicitly interventionist in approach and typified by the Cornell-Peru project (Holmberg 1965).

3. "The Action Anthropology Model", as carried out by the Fox project (Tax 1958) and highly focused upon the "culture" concept.

4. "The Community Development Model", where the anthropologist facilitates change, often in the role of consultant.

5. "The Clinical Model", where the anthropologist may provide cultural data for use in clinical areas (e.g., in nursing, psychology, migrant services).

6. "The Community Advocacy (or Action Research) Model", a "recent adaptation to the urban political scene in the United States" (VanWilligen 1976:84), whereby the anthropologist supplies data to community leaders for use in community development schemes.

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to describe all of these models in detail. Instead, I have chosen to focus on two kinds of
applied anthropology, perhaps best described as "Social Impact Assessment" and "development anthropology." The choice of these two provides scope for generalizations about applied anthropological practices in both the domestic and the international spheres. In addition, domestic Social Impact Assessment and international development anthropology provide a good contrast to traditional anthropology, in so far as both are further removed from it than other types of applied anthropology. The institutional settings, the assumptions or value stances, and the goals associated with both, however, are aligned to a greater degree with applied research than with basic research.

Definitions

Before any attempt is made to define Social Impact Assessment (hereafter simply referred to as SIA), it is best to acknowledge the confusion which presently exists over attempts to classify any "type" of applied anthropology. This confusion is the result of the very rapid increase of specialization within the field of applied anthropology. VanWilligen (1982:17) predicts that such specialization will increase to the extent that the term and concept "applied anthropology" soon will become outmoded, being too broad a concept to identify meaningfully the many different types of special activities. How, then, might Social Impact Assessment (SIA) be categorized?

The SIA Committee of the Society for Applied Anthropology
(n.d.) defines Social Impact Assessment as the "study of the potential effects of natural physical phenomena, activities of government and business, or any succession of events on specific groups of people."

SIA also fits VanWilligen's (1976:84) "Action Research Model," as it is:

An adaptation to the urban political scene in the United States. It stresses time effective research appropriate to the success of community actionists in improving the well-being of a specific community. [The] research supplies results in time to be used most effectively in a rapidly changing milieu [and often is] used to provide a factual base for community-controlled political strategies and for supporting data for writing proposals. [It] aims to serve the needs of the community through its leaders rather than through an external service or development bureaucracy.

The following discussion will focus on two distinguishing features of SIA: (a) its relationship to public policy science, and (b) its multidisciplinary nature and methods. Both are fairly new to the field of anthropology.

A Response to Policy Needs

In tracing the history of public policy in the United States, Chambers (1985:49-66) shows evidence for a rising public concern over issues of efficiency, cost-effectiveness and social well-being. These issues have led to more systematic public policy formulation and planning. During the past two decades, this concern was manifested in such events as Nixon's revenue sharing grants, the Planning Programming-Budgeting System (PPBS) for federal planning,
and the social indicators movement.

The single piece of legislation most often cited as a pioneer in this direction is the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). NEPA stipulates that an Environmental Impact Statement be submitted for any proposed federally funded project. The term "environment" used here denotes not only the physical environment, but the "human environment," including social and cultural "resources." Section 102 of this act stipulates that:

[All agencies of the Federal Government shall] utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and decision making which may have an impact on the environment; and... include in every recommendation or report on... major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, a detailed statement by the responsible official.

Although Congress has not established "social well-being" as a national planning objective or policy, "most federal agencies have been preparing regulations and guidelines for the preparation of social impact assessments" (Peterson and Jacobs 1977:2). In addition, Olsen, Melber, and Merwin (1981:43) note that:

The scope of environmental impact statements has expanded to incorporate all aspects of the social as well as the natural environment, including demographic, economic, social, political, and cultural conditions. Broadly conceived, social impacts are alterations in people's living conditions that occur in conjunction with a new policy, program, or project, and that 1) are in addition to all other concurrent changes produced by other factors, and 2) are seen by those affected as significant social events.

NEPA spurred the creation of further legislation at both the
federal and state levels (e.g., the Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act of 1972, the Clean Air Act of 1972, the Water Quality Act of 1974, and the National Historic Preservation Act Amendments of 1980). The result has been that Social Impact Assessment now is applied to a wide range of topics, such as: housing and urban renewal, rural development, energy development, highway and mass transportation, health and community services, water resources, planning and community development and land use management, architecture and buildings, and population displacement and relocation (Wolf 1981:xiv).

Thus, the formulation of national public policy is now based on an attempt to forecast the effects of planned human activity, including the probable socio-cultural effects of these actions. This change in the process by which government agencies make decisions has restructured the field of employment for applied anthropologists in the United States. At a time when academic employment opportunities are dwindling, social scientists are quick to fill the need for policy scientists. They are rapidly developing methods for researching the social impacts of a project—not only for government but for industry and private citizen groups as well. This situation has changed the anthropologist's role in government sponsored work; they are no longer hired as "ethnographically informed area experts" (VanWilligen 1982:17). Rather, public policy decision-making now requires specialists who are capable of
assessing the social impacts of a developmental project according to the guidelines for social assessment set by various agencies.

Public Policy

Applied work, by its very nature, reflects contemporary societal concerns. This fact has been illustrated for applied anthropology in Chapter I. Anthropologists were shown to have been concerned with racial determinism, U.S. policy regarding the American Indian, problems of British colonial administration, and the problems facing government during World War II. Anthropology's present involvement in policy making is no different—but for one exception: society (in the form of democratic government) has institutionalized a role for social scientists in the form of legislation requiring social science knowledge. In response, social scientists are re-examining this role.

Anthropologists, on their part, recently have begun to examine the nature of "public policy" (e.g., Hinshaw 1980; Cochrane 1980; Chambers 1985; and Weaver 1985). Political scientists, however, began to explore this area no later than 1950 (Lasswell and Kaplan 1950). The two disciplines vary little in their definition.

In the broadest sense, the term "policy" refers "to whatever is being done by some actor in a broad area of activity" (Ranney 1968:6-7). It has the following features: (a) it involves a desire for a particular "sequence of behavior" in (b) a particular "aspect
of the society or physical world; (c) it involves "a deliberate selection of one line of action" and (d) a "declaration of intent" (either publicly or more secretively) by the policy maker, as well as (e) an "implementation of intent" (Ranney 1968:6-7).

A public-policy is one which is held by "authorities [who] engage in the daily affairs of a political system [and who are] recognized by most members of the system as having the responsibility for these matters" (Easton 1965:212, cited in Ranney 1968).

Cochrane (1980:445) states that "policy can be distinguished from politics in that politics connotes a struggle for power with respect to specific decisions, whereas policy guides decision making for a general class of decisions."

Finsterbusch (1980:13) sees the complete policy process as involving four stages:

(1) formulation of policy alternatives,
(2) selection of an alternative for implementation,
(3) implementation, and
(4) evaluation and modification.

The stipulations for impact assessments set by federal and state agencies entails only the first and second stages, where it facilitates "decision making by determining the full range of costs and benefits of alternative proposed courses of action" (Finsterbusch 1981:2). However, the researcher's potential for policy assessment is greater than the formulation and selection of
alternatives. According to Cochrane (1980:446) only that research which pays sufficient attention to implementation should be termed a "policy study":

The acid test of a policy study is whether its advice works (Pressman and Wildavsky 1973). It is immaterial whether advice about land reform is called pure or applied, theoretically oriented or "reality oriented, as long as it is successfully implemented (C. Jones 1976). Therefore, one unique and necessary attribute of policy studies is that it encompasses implementation.

Because outcomes are an "essential part of the social assessment process," Singer (1984:3) believes that the "Monitoring-Management process" should not be ignored. Social Impact Assessment can serve here to (a) "meet the often varied objectives of diverse user groups" and (b) determine "information requirements, collection strategy (method), and analysis procedures."

In the implementation and monitoring stages, impacts are no longer merely potential, but actual, with the job being to determine "whether the measured changes result from the policy, exogenous factors, or some combination of both" (Finsterbusch 1981:11).

Policy and Policy Process

Ranney's (1968) distinction between policy content and policy process is useful when discussing Social Impact Assessment's role in policy development. Most of the activity as well as the formal methodology of SIA is focused upon the content of a policy, that is, with the various aspects of its subject matter, with its achievable goals, or with the formulation of alternatives. However,
an element not to be ignored (and one which is not encountered in basic scholarly research) is political dynamics. These may, in reality, have the largest effect upon policy decisions. In other words, one must be attentive not only to policy content and policy implementation, but to the policy process, as well: those "actions and interactions that produce the authorities' ultimate choice of a particular policy content over its rivals" (Ranney 1968:8). This frequently means focusing on the less tangible and less rational elements involved in decision making.

Borthwick (1980:449) highlights this when he states that "impact assessment, although usually focusing on specific administrative decisions, may implicitly examine a policy as well." He is alerting anthropologists to the possibility that their research conclusions may well be rejected by policy makers, not on empirical grounds, but because they may have an "ax to grind." Thus, effective policy science research (measured by whether or not one's policy recommendations are successfully adopted) is not only dependent upon good policy content research, but also involves the investigation of "how policies are made in legislative and administrative settings," a knowledge of "to whom, by whom, and in what manner the policy recommendations will be made" (Borthwick 1980:450). In other words, as Hinshaw (1980:509-513) urges, both policy makers and social scientists would benefit from "policy analysis" research, a study of the policy making environment, which most often entails the struggle for politics.
Methodology: A Multi-disciplinary Endeavor

Practitioners of Social Impact Assessment refer to SIA as a multi-method approach. In other words, SIA is not distinguished by any specific activist \"role\" which the anthropologist might play, nor by the investigation of any specific kind of subject matter, but by its body of methods. In principle, these should be applicable to many \"types\" of applied anthropology that are involved in planning and forecasting--including the \"topical specialization\" of Development Anthropology.

C. P. Wolf (1983:16), a sociologist who is responsible for some of the formalization of SIA methodology, states that:

SIA is a multidisciplinary approach, and its analytic tasks require assessors to draw selectively from the full range of social research methodologies and techniques. [This is so because] each impact situation has unique features, and general methodologies must be tailored to its dimensions. While no one best way has been (or can be) devised to fit all circumstances and cases, there is growing professional consensus and methodological convergence on what may be described as the \"main pattern\" of assessment steps.

This \"main pattern\" of assessment steps is shown in Table 2, along with some of the methods and techniques which may be utilized in each step. Methods are chosen which best fit the particular topic and level of the project being assessed.

These methods derive from various social science disciplines. This is so because SIA practitioners, like those involved in any problem-oriented research, utilize tools from any source that have
Table 2
The Main Steps in Social Impact Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEPS</th>
<th>ANALYTIC OPERATIONS</th>
<th>VARIOUS METHODS AND TECHNIQUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Scoping</td>
<td>Set the size and level (policy, program, project) of assessment; Determine impact boundaries.</td>
<td>Demographic analysis; Ethnographic research (used to inform the entire assessment process).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychosocial (attitudes) assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Problem Identification</td>
<td>Determine policy goals and objectives.</td>
<td>Delphi interviews; Community workshops; Jury panels; Community needs assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Formulation of</td>
<td>Develop &quot;reasonable&quot; alternatives to the-proposed course of action which &quot;serve the same general purpose of the</td>
<td>Social indicators model reflecting &quot;quality of life&quot;; Group Ecology Model; Computerized socioeconomic assessment simulation models (e.g. SEAH, CLIPS, SIMPACT); Demographic models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>project being considered.&quot; Include the &quot;do nothing&quot; alternative.</td>
<td>Relevance trees; Questionnaire surveys; Informant interviews; Demographic analysis; Historical analysis; Content analysis techniques for secondary data; Sampling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Profiling</td>
<td>Determine impact categories (health, safety, economic, social, legal, etc.); Determine the level of impact (family, community, regional); Assign measures or criteria for evaluation; Design the conceptual framework for the analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Projection/</td>
<td>Identify significant impacts of all alternatives, including &quot;doing nothing.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2-Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEPS</th>
<th>ANALYTIC OPERATIONS</th>
<th>VARIOUS METHODS AND TECHNIQUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI. Assessment</td>
<td>Measure and compare the impacts of the proposed project, the alternatives, and the no action option.</td>
<td>(Utilize assessment models chosen in Step IV.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Analysis and Evaluation</td>
<td>Analyze and evaluate the data by ranking and weighting preferences for alternatives.</td>
<td>Trade-off analysis; Lexicographic pruning; Mathematical formula weighting; Objective and subjective metrics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Policy Design</td>
<td>Suggest ways to modify the negative impacts of the selected policy alternative; Identify possible mitigation measures and their effectiveness.</td>
<td>Test assumed values of mitigation recipients and of institution through questionnaires and interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Policy Implementation and Monitoring</td>
<td>Measure what now are actual impacts against an established set of evaluative criteria; Provide feedback to policy makers; Re-evaluate public preferences; Determine needed revisions.</td>
<td>(Same methods as Step V.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Management</td>
<td>Devise an Impact Management Plan to assure that project continues to conform to social criteria.</td>
<td>Institutional needs assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

potential for revealing solutions. That is, the nature and scale of the problem being explored determines which methods are used.

It is curious that Weaver (1985), in his recent articles on anthropology and policy science, does not mention anthropologists' involvement in SIA, despite the fact that he provides a list of policy steps almost identical to those formulated by SIA practitioners. Weaver's conscious or unconscious omission may be due to the fact that those working in the field of Social Impact Assessment do not identify themselves with any single discipline. Rather, practitioners generally identify themselves with a common task (i.e., SIA) which does not dictate or limit utilization of the knowledge of a particular discipline.

Thus, anthropologists who publish in the Social Impact Assessment journal or in Westview Press's Social Impact Assessment series do not identify themselves as anthropologists any more than sociologists or political scientists publishing here identify themselves as such.

These social science researchers have established a larger common identity as problem solvers. Because the problems which they confront are multifaceted, they require multidisciplinary research. For example, Brown (1984:37) can state that "environmental planning is a priori an interdisciplinary activity" because 'environment' has been recognized as multidimensional, requiring the transcendence of the division of labor among traditional disciplines."
Bennett (1986: 367-368) believes that:

[Multidisciplinary approaches are really] combinations of specialists who acknowledge that the emerging historical reality of P-R [People-Resource] relations are too complex for any one field to grasp. ... The disciplines, though often acknowledging the need for information from a variety of sources, give the impression that the solution to P-R problems can be found within the context of single fields.

All this is not to say that anthropologists should abandon anthropological perspectives (e.g., the holistic approach) or all traditional anthropological methods (e.g., participant observation) when doing SIA. What it does mean, however, is that anthropologists often must put other perspectives, as well as their own, to service in pursuing solutions to complex practical problems.

In summary, SIA adapts several social science methods for use in the investigation of the potential social effects of proposed policies or projects; it does not limit itself to traditional anthropological approaches. Although SIA's primary focus is policy content; its success also depends upon insights gained on policy implementation, and upon knowledge about the policy process. As it is an aid to the decision-making process, and because it is involved in developing alternatives and choosing between them, SIA can be understood as participating in the more general activity of conflict resolution--this latter being a feature peculiar to the democratic environment in which SIA arose.

Being an applied activity, SIA seeks to aid in directing change. But it is important to note that this change is expected to occur within the context of existing values and existing social
institutions—within those same values and institutions which prompted the creation of SIA (i.e., "public demand" and federal and state agencies). In other words, SIA generally does not attempt to alter the present status quo; rather, it tends to serve it by aiding attempts at peaceful self-planned direction.

In addition, it can be said that institutional needs and the nature of the real world problems which SIA investigates are responsible for the shape of its methodology, which is public policy oriented and multidisciplinary in approach.
Although the term "development" can be used to describe many kinds of applied anthropology involved in the planning of social change (e.g., Social Impact Assessment), the term is most often used to characterize that type of work carried out by anthropologists in the sphere of international development. "Development anthropology" here will be used to denote this latter type of work.

In contrast to Social Impact Assessment, which is an "approach," or means, to forecasting the effects of planned activity, Chambers (1985) refers to development anthropology as a "topical specialization," a research activity identified primarily by its subject matter rather than by any particular methods which it utilizes. While both SIA and development anthropology have roots in the western political process, development anthropology focuses exclusively on the "less developed" regions of the world in such areas as agriculture, health and medicine, community development, and energy resources. Development anthropologists work to help insure that planned development projects meet their objectives and that these projects impact positively on the ordinary person.

Hoben (1982:349) states that development anthropology is "not characterized by a coherent or distinctive body of theory,
concepts and methods." However, a particular set of theories or assumptions concerning development itself is inherent to the institutional environment in which development anthropologists most frequently work—even if these theories are seldom made explicit.

Western development aid has been founded on the capitalistic or modernization theory which holds that internal factors, particularly peasant "tradition" and "irrationality," create the backwardness which impedes economic progress (Berger 1983; Hoben 1982:352). The Western institutions which fund development activities often do not perceive "development" as "a process of natural evolution or growth." Rather, these institutions view themselves as benevolent actors in a process which can be described as a "transformation" in which subsistence level peoples learn to adapt methods which increase their own and their nation's economic growth through technological transfer (Bodley 1975:125). Of course, individual anthropologists working in development situations may perceive the processes and causes of development differently. Nevertheless, the roles that they most often undertake are shaped by such a development paradigm.

This chapter will focus on theories pertaining to development only in so far as such theories influence the methods employed in development efforts. The main purpose is to demonstrate how new and emerging methods and techniques are shaped by institutional needs and constraints, as well as the goals of development work.
Institutional and Policy Contexts

Anthropologists, historically, have been interested in socio-cultural change, particularly among small scale societies in the non-Western world. In addition to their basic research endeavors, many of these anthropologists have sought to influence the direction of change. Some have done so as consultants or administrators for governments (e.g., Evans-Pritchard, Murdock, and Kimball), others have served as unofficial or quasi-official advocates of the people that they study (e.g., Tax and Holmberg). Although the recommendations of these anthropologists undoubtedly influenced governmental policy makers, the latter were not obligated to seek or heed anthropologists' advice. Only recently have development planners been required to incorporate social and cultural knowledge in designs for development in the less developed countries (LDCs).

Just as NEPA was a catalyst in the early 1970s for planned change in the United States, so have been the Amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act (1973) revolutionary in restructuring the ways in which U.S. development activities abroad have been designed. These amendments reflect the change in beliefs among Western proponents of development about how and why new technology is adopted.

Prior to 1973, U.S. foreign aid was conceived primarily in terms of technological assistance. It was carried out under the
premise that dollars, technology and Western expertise would strengthen the economic structures of the LDC's in much the same way that the Marshall Plan had rebuilt Europe's economy after World War II. However, this assumption was recognized as erroneous when technology alone failed to achieve these objectives; unlike Europe after World War II, most of the Third World did not have an established organizational infrastructure that was needed to implement such technology.

In searching for an explanation for the failures of foreign aid, social scientists referred to the current development paradigm which held that traditional values, institutions and practices are responsible for peoples' resistance to change. By the early 1950s, following social scientists' recommendations, the U.S. International Cooperation Commission (ICA) was willing to place anthropologists in their field missions in order "to facilitate the diffusion of improved technology" by overcoming such resistance. Unfortunately, these anthropologists were unable to alter the success rate of development projects at this time. Hoben (1982:353) sees this as due to the fact that the anthropologists' "role was too limited, that they were not given time to carry out adequate investigations, and that their advice was often not heeded." In addition, administrators "complained that anthropologists were too narrowly trained, were interested only in long term research, and were hypercritical Cassandras who made too few constructive suggestions."
The amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act (1973) (known as the New Directions or Congressional Mandate) is evidence that, by the early 1970's, the administration and Congress had become aware of certain other constraints to development in the LDC's.

[New Directions stipulates that] greater emphasis in policy and budgetary allocations be given to promoting more equitable income distribution and employment opportunities for the "poor majority", to agriculture and rural development, to food crops and to the use of more labor intensive "appropriate" technologies in agriculture and in capital projects such as road construction. [In addition,] the poor majority [are to] participate in the "decisions that shape their lives" (Sect. 102a). (Hoben 1982:357)

Such policy goals articulate new ideas about how development can best be accomplished. The important ideas currently are: (a) that a direct effort must be made to focus on the poor and women; (b) that rural development (i.e., a strong agricultural base) is essential to economic development (reversing the former urban bias in development strategies); (c) that new technology must be "appropriate"; and (d) that recipients or the intended beneficiaries of development should participate in these efforts.

These ideas reflect the doubts which had arisen concerning the success of the "trickle-down" theory of economic development. New Directions can be viewed as the beginning of a trend toward designing projects from a "bottom-up"approach, an attempt to insure that the poor majority are also the direct targets of development goals, and that these poor are participants and not merely passive recipients in the aid process. As will be seen below, these goals play an important part in the shaping of new and
emerging strategies for development.

In response to the New Directions mandate, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) established the requirement that each development project must incorporate a social soundness analysis in its design phase, together with an economic analysis, a financial analysis, an environmental impact statement, and an analysis of the project's impact on women (USAID: 1975). As a result, social science knowledge has become an institutionalized element of U.S. foreign aid, just as it has become an institutionalized element of domestic planning (see Chapter III, above). Anthropologists are now regular members of USAID development teams, and their social findings, unlike those of earlier anthropologists, are publicly documented and, therefore, less easily dismissed by administrators and bureaucrats.

Although social soundness analyses are not required by all public development agencies, most agencies do utilize social scientists in an attempt to prevent the monumental failures associated with past development projects.

Public Development Institutions

Public development agencies fall into two categories: national agencies and multilateral international agencies. The former are involved in bilateral aid negotiation (transferring grants and loans from one country to another), and include USAID, France's Ministry of Cooperation and Development, the Swedish International
Development Authority (SIDA), and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

The various approaches taken by bilateral agencies reflect the foreign policy objectives of their respective governments. For example, from its origin, United States foreign aid has been viewed as a means to garner political support as well as a way of halting the spread of communism. At any particular moment it will also reflect the ideology of the administration in power (e.g., Carter's Human Right's Act and Reagan's refusal to aid population control programs that utilize abortion). In addition, aid has frequently been used as a bartering chip for securing military bases in strategic Third World locations.

Sweden's approach to foreign aid reflects its neutralist position in world politics. A large amount of its aid is funneled through multilateral agencies while its bilateral aid allows host countries the decision making power in determining how these resources will be utilized.

The majority of multilateral agencies act as intermediators in the funneling of development aid loans or credits from one country to another. The World Bank Group, composed of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the International Development Association (IDA), and the International Finance Association (IFC) are the largest of these. Others include various organizations of the United Nations, such as, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Development
Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), the World Food Programme (WFP), and the World Health Organization (WHO).

Although multilateral international agencies are controlled by, and represent the values of, a number of different governments (including those of the LDCs), they have operated under the same widely accepted development paradigm as that of the United States—that is, with the assumption that less developed nations will experience economic growth (and political stabilization) through the development of their urban and industrial sectors and through monocropping for export. But by the early 1970s, these agencies too began to realize that successful development of the industrial sector did not "trickle down" to the rural poor. Indeed, such efforts often exacerbated the rural situation by decreasing agricultural productivity, by amplifying primal city phenomena, and by strengthening the position of the traditional elite, sometimes by creating a new group of development dollar elites.

Under McNamara's presidency, the World Bank began to hire anthropologists (mostly on a consultant basis) to appraise development projects which focused on the rural sector. Unfortunately, their employment of anthropologists was limited. Among the reasons given were the following:

1. World Bank economists questioned the credibility of a discipline lacking a "rigorous methodology" (Hoben 1982:357);
2. There was no institutional basis for the use of anthropologists (including an "absence of in-house capacity") (Husain 1976:75-76); and

3. Anthropologists were unaware of World Bank needs (Husain 1976: 75-76).

Private Voluntary Organizations

Private voluntary organizations (PVOs), or non-governmental agencies (NGOs) recently have increased their involvement in development. As the need for long-term solutions to poverty is recognized, the mission of many PVOs has changed from that of welfare and relief service to that of development agency.

There are over 400 PVOs in the U.S. The greatest amount of PVO funding, however, comes from a number of "Development Assistance Countries" in Europe, such as Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, and the Federal Republic of Germany. In addition, "hundreds of indigenous PVOs (IPVOs) have emerged in the developing world itself" (Gorman 1984:3). PVOs as a group exhibit a wide diversity in membership size and funding as well as management practices.

Most PVOs are non-profit and independent of governmental funding, although some, like the Catholic Relief Services and CARE, receive as much as 80% of their revenue from U.S. government sources. USAID has provided substantial funds for privately implemented projects. However, these government funds
are not stable as they are subject to the changing directions of U.S. foreign policy. For example, as when USAID "eliminated funding for an OEF program to improve the legal status of women in Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Honduras" (Charlton 1984:208).

Historically, PVOs have operated at the rural "grass roots" level, due in part to limited funding which forces projects to be limited in scope and highly directed or "targeted" to specific local groups. Because of this, many PVOs generally have operated in the context of a localized "social knowledge." Yet, the success rate of many PVO sponsored projects has not been dramatically higher than those of public agencies. Thus, PVOs, like public agencies, are calling for project evaluation (Ellis 1984; Smith 1984).

Public agencies and PVOs are some of the institutional contexts in which most development anthropologists work today. Understandably, U.S. anthropologists have made the greatest contributions in USAID, where they have been given an institutionalized formal role to play.

The following discussion of methods brings to light the importance of understanding institutional environments and their ideological orientations. Only with such knowledge can "appropriate" research methods be designed--i.e., methods that yield findings which are usable in specific project designs and implementations.
Development Methods

Table 3 lists the tasks and some of the various methods associated with each phase of an USAID development project. The anthropologist's role in each of these phases is to gather baseline socio-cultural information about the people for whom the project is intended, that is, the direct beneficiaries. The anthropologist will also identify and seek to understand the "at risk segments," since the success of a project depends equally upon mitigating against any negative consequences of a project. Such groups include those forced to resettle out of the project area as well as those migrating into a project area to satisfy newly created labor needs.

Background data will be required for all of these groups. The data must comprise: (a) demographic characteristics, (b) human groupings, and (c) subsistence ecologies (Partridge 1984). The general kinds of information which development anthropologists gather are initially similar to those obtained by basic anthropological researchers. But, as will be illustrated below, the means of acquiring socio-cultural information, as well as the ends to which this information is put, are often radically different in the two cases.

USAID's required "social soundness analysis" generally falls within the initial design phase of a project. Its function here is similar to that of the SIA practiced in North America in so far as both are "anticipatory research" which seeks to provide information
### Table 3

**Phases and Associated Tasks and Methods of an AID Development Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>VARIOUS METHODS &amp; TECHNIQUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Project Planning &amp; Design</td>
<td>Conduct social soundness analysis to predict impacts; Prepare project paper, with findings expressed quantitatively (include specific recommendations); Communicate findings to agency and staff.</td>
<td>Review literature of similar projects; Collect secondary data (if available); Use social indicators to collect baseline data; Conduct short field trips in interdisciplinary teams; Create hierarchical decision models; Solicit ITK; Conduct informal questionnaires and group interviews; Collaborate with local personnel; Seek participation of project beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Project Implementation &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td>Monitor social change in order to remediate problems encountered during implementation; Communicate findings to project team in the form of &quot;actionable&quot; recommendations.</td>
<td>Maintain communication between participant population, planners, and implementors; Conduct on-going participant observation; Conduct informal and formal surveys; Measure change in social indicators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Ex post facto Project Evaluation</td>
<td>Provide information on project implementation, impact, and effectiveness; Write draft report as member of interdisciplinary team; Quantify data and make development-specific conclusions.</td>
<td>Measure change in social indicators; Conduct short field trips in interdisciplinary teams; Interview project beneficiaries, managers, and personnel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to decision makers as early in the design or implementation process as possible. Indeed, some researchers are currently attempting to apply formal SIA methods to development planning in the Third World (Derman and Whiteford 1985).

Also, like SIA, many development researchers feel that they can make the greatest contribution when they are employed not only in the design phase but in the implementation and the ex post facto evaluation phases of a project as well. When anthropologists are retained as long-term consultants, they are in "a position to fully use their training in working out the overall implications of their recommendations" for a project (Epstein and Ahmed 1984:33). In the development situation, however, intra-agency dynamics generally work against employing individual social scientists for the duration of a project. Pillsbury (1984) discusses the possible difficulties involved in hiring project personnel as project evaluators. Not only are they often too close to events to remain objective, but their reputations and promotions may hinge on the stated success of a project. Thus, project evaluation is often perceived as being valid only if it is conducted by external evaluators, "persons external to project management or even to the implementing agencies" (Pillsbury 1984:44-45).

Ideally, projects should be designed to include both the long-term involvement of singular social scientists, as well as external evaluators. However, host countries (as well as some development research agencies) often have little interest in committing dollars
for extended evaluation. Even those development projects with the best intentions for careful design, monitoring and evaluation of projects are not capable of providing the time or the funds to support long-term field research. As a result, technological and social science consultants have but a few weeks to collect data and submit a draft report. This means that development researchers must adapt their research methodology to the conditions peculiar to particular development situations. These conditions include:

1. The need to produce accurate data within a time frame which is cost-effective.

2. The need for research which will produce information on how to design and implement programs which will generate "equitable distribution of benefits," including specific efforts to insure that the poor benefit also (Chambers 1980:2).

3. Research which yields relevant knowledge of use in formulating recommendations.

Much past development project research has been criticized by some (Chambers 1981; Green 1981) as employing "quick and dirty" methods. Such research methods may consist of short field trips which characteristically consist of canvassing only urban and roadside areas and which are undertaken usually in the less stressful dry seasons. The result is said to be a kind of "rural development tourism" where researchers do not take the time to discover or listen to people, particularly the poor who reside away from the main roads; nor do they perceive historical or
contemporary relationships between people and the environment or between people of different economic statuses. Having "seen" only the more influential and powerful, some researchers may unintentionally design projects which contain anti-poverty biases.

Conversely, traditionally trained scientists may be tempted to conduct conventionally "long and dirty" research (Chambers 1981), especially where little or no adequate secondary data exist (e.g., archive material, annual reports, existing surveys, government statistics). Formal benchmark surveys which entail long questionnaires can be not only "dirty" because they waste resources (i.e., are not cost-effective), but they because often do not generate enough information in early stages to be useful. Later, the mounds of data which they do produce may not explicitly entail the kinds of information needed by development planners. Indeed, information gathered over lengthy periods may quickly become outmoded.

**Rapid Rural Appraisal**

Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) is a growing set of methods recently devised to meet the three conditions of development work listed above. It attempts to avoid the extremes of research characterized as either "quick and dirty" or "long and dirty," neither of which regularly produces valid or adequate data. The RRA approach is comprised of methods and techniques for social analysis which, taken together, are "less rigid, less exhaustive, and more rapid" than the above methods, but which will often be "more
rigorous in relation to cost and use" (Chambers 1981:99).

The experience is that short-term and timely research can be rigorous if researchers are trained (or retrained in the case of most traditionally trained social scientists) to: (a) eliminate haste in those matters which are being investigated; (b) make a real effort to offset biases which blind one to the reality of the rural poor, of women, and of the seasons which bring the greatest hardships; (c) avoid the well-off, more powerful groups which frequently ask for the researcher's attention; (d) listen to people and treat them as teachers from whom one can gain valuable information; and (e) utilize more than one approach in order that information can be crosschecked and made more complete.

Some of the techniques used to meet these objectives are (Chambers 1981):

1. Search for and utilization of secondary data when available.

2. Learning of indigenous technical knowledge (ITK) in which rural people are listened to and are perceived as teachers.

3. Use of key indicators that have been locally validated (e.g., soil color for fertility, plant indicators, birth weight to calibrate mothers' health, housing to determine poverty or prosperity). These may be used as baselines with which to compare before and after evaluations.

4. Formation of two person teams, each consisting of one social scientist and one technician (agricultural, health, etc.)
which change composition daily in order to repair social scientists and technicians. Later, discussions between teams allow for a recheck of information.

5. Utilization of local people as researchers (e.g., farmers, students).

6. Engagement in direct observation or, where time does not permit, a recheck on the information which has been gathered.

7. Utilization of key local informants (those with the most knowledge in a particular area).

8. Use of group interviews. These allow for rapid accumulation of much information in a short period of time and have the added advantage of providing a situation that builds in cross-checking between interviewees, elevating the degree of uniformity of information acquired.

9. Use of guided interviews based on an agenda for certain data but without the use of pre-set questions.

10. Incorporation of aerial inspection and surveys. These, however, must not be used to replace indigenous technical knowledge.

11. Field work which avoids surveying exclusively along established roadways but, instead, regularly transects roads at intervals in order to gain access to a picture of life "behind the scenes."

It may be noted that the methods of RRA differ mainly from those of traditional ethnographic research in terms of: (a) the
amount of time spent in the field; and (b) the definition of what constitutes "useful information."

There is, however, one traditional kind of ethnographic information which increasingly is being sought by social scientists. This is the above mentioned ITK which is defined as the "indigenous technical knowledge" held by local people about local species (ethnotaxonomy), local marketing tactics, traditional health systems, etc.—that is, the logic and knowledge behind indigenous strategies for survival. Barker (1980) argues that methods more "appropriate" than survey questionnaires (which frequently discourage discussion, and which place the initiative for discussion with the interviewer) can be developed for soliciting ITK. Barker has illustrated this point by successfully adapting the rules for playing a traditional African boardgame in order to obtain Nigerian farmers' perceptions of weeds and pests.

Development researchers do not seek ITK in order to create strategies to overcome traditional beliefs. Rather, ITK is utilized in developing new technology in the hope that such technology will be better adapted to the needs of local farmers and, thus, will be adopted by them (Rhoades 1984; and Brokensha, Warren, and Werner 1980). This is what is meant by "appropriate" technology.

Research that builds upon ITK and that also seeks "user feedback" can be termed "adaptive research." In addition, adaptive research evaluates prototype solutions "under real world conditions to determine if these results still hold and/or how they must be
modified to be both practical and adoptable by users or producers" (Jacobs 1984).

The evaluation and monitoring which provides feedback from users to project staff during the implementation stage of an USAID project is called adaptive research, if project design is responsive to such feedback, which is to say, if project design is actually altered as the result of such research. But adaptive research strategies are also being employed in other kinds of development settings, particularly among research organizations that conduct on-going agricultural research in specific ecological zones, such as tropical or highland areas. Many of these organizations (e.g., those belonging to the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research) are advocating an adaptive research strategy known as "Farming Systems Research (FSR)."

**Farming Systems Research**

FSR attempts to insure that the local people who are the beneficiaries of research actually participate in project design. "Downstream" or "bottom-up" FSR begins with the farmer; it is the farmer's perceptions, constraints, or felt needs that are sought in formulating the research problem. Such a participatory approach exists as a complement to the "top down" design of conventional efforts.

In order to accomplish their goals, FSR utilizes the methodology of RRA, particularly the informal survey approach
conducted by interdisciplinary teams—typically composed of a rural development specialist, an anthropologist or rural sociologist, an agricultural economist and an agriculturalist. The open-ended nature of these surveys allows "farmers to define problems from their points of view [and emphasizes] conceptual clarity and discovery of patterns, not merely the collection of data to test pre-determined hypotheses" (Rhoades 1985:215). In addition, the interaction between both agronomist and anthropologist on an interdisciplinary team is not only more efficient (allowing very rapid assessment of cropping patterns and practices over a large area), but it facilitates the acquisition of a holistic perspective of the farm/rural household, an important goal of FSR. It allows for an understanding of an agro-ecological zone as "an association between a set of natural conditions (climatic, topographic, soils) and agricultural activity (farming or herding) and social organization (families, clans, local communities) utilized to exploit that environment" (Rhoades 1985:217-218).

FSR not only systematically solicits farmers' perceptions at the outset of the development process but goes several steps further; it tests the agro-economic success of new prototype technologies against that of traditional practices, with the final test of technology being "on farm" evaluation where farmers themselves test new technology under the constraints of their local situations. The difference in concerns and constraints between "on station" and "on farm" development research has been demonstrated
by researchers at the International Potato Center (CIP) in Peru (Rhoades 1984) and by researchers at the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT) in Kenya (Franzel 1984).

As a result of "on station" research, CIP workers in Peru built large potato storage facilities midway between farm and market in an attempt to eliminate potato spoilage and to separate storage and household areas. Farmers, however, ignored these facilities and continued to store potatoes at home. In a second attempt utilizing the FSR approach, researchers investigated the matter "on farm." They allowed farmers to define the problem, evaluated the ITK, and encouraged farmer trials. As a result, researchers discovered: (a) that families do not conceptualize storage and domestic space as separate, with the resultant advantage that potatoes stored in homes are protected from theft; (b) that slightly spoiled potatoes are valued for their sweetness, are used as animal feed, and are dehydrated for domestic consumption and; (c) that new seed varieties are capable of sprouting in traditional storage conditions. CIP workers, focusing on the farmer's problems, were able to develop new and successful ways to store improved seed potatoes under local farm conditions (Rhoades 1984).

Similarly, in highland areas of western Kenya, researchers explored possibilities for the use of higher yielding varieties of maize. Conducting "on station" extension trials, they concluded that, "regardless of the level of rainfall," yields from the new
composite variety of maize are higher than those from traditional varieties. However, adaptive research conducted "on farm" proved otherwise. Farmers' trials attest to the fact that the new variety gives a lower yield "except in seasons in which rainfall is very low." The difference here between "on station" and farmers' results appeared to be "due to a difference between management of the trials and farmer practice. Possible sources of variation include soil fertility, plant population, intercrops, and planting methods" (Franzel 1984:203-204).

Another feature of FSR is its use of a "systems" approach or perspective. Various individual subsystems (e.g., crops, livestock, off-farm) are regarded not as isolates, but as systems which overlap with other systems. This approach is an important one and constitutes a new tool in the arena of development work. It is a recognition that the goals and objectives of the farming household overlap with other subsystems, importantly, those of government and society.

In recognizing the relationships between these subsystems, successful development strategies are those which aid farmers in establishing "strong linkages with existing institutions that are specifically responsible for [governmental policy]" (Gilbert, Norman, and Winch 1980:4). It has been suggested that:

[This is done by encouraging small farmers to become involved with] a variety of organizations, some heterogeneous in membership such as local government, to encompass the whole community and provide a forum for expressing conflicting interests, and some homogeneous, particularly for disadvantaged groups, so they
have vehicles to pursue their otherwise neglected interests. (Uphoff, Cohen, and Goldsmith 1979:28-29, cited in Oasa 1985:224)

FSR is making an attempt to integrate the micro-level ("on farm" evaluation) and the macro-level development approach (concern with regional and national policies). Theoretically, this should insure more sustainable success for development efforts, since local efforts at innovation would have the support of government policy. But on a pragmatic level, FSR advocates express concern that in the real world, farmers inputs and interests are often not compatible with "broader macro and societal interests" (Gilbert, Norman, and Winch 1980:83; Oasa 1985), and some compromise or trade-off between local and national needs is a common feature of such development efforts.

Obstacles to Development Efforts

Government pricing and marketing policies frequently do not reflect the production circumstances and needs of the small farmer. Large-scale commercial farmers generally constitute a more powerful interest group and are better able to influence policy makers, but peasants rarely have powerful patrons to represent them. Furthermore, small farmers' success at increased food production often will hinge as much upon land reform and institutional supports as it will upon the introduction of new technology. Indeed, macro-level concerns generally not only determine whether individual farm households will benefit from
increased production, but also whether they will be granted the resources to produce at all.

Researchers who adopt a systems approach recognize the necessity of gaining macro-level support for particular innovations or changes at the local level. But, as Oasa (1985) and Schoepf (1983) argue, unless participatory approaches like FSR can actually affect the larger macro-level policies and trends, they exist merely as another form of "top down" development that will result in few, if any, positive effects upon the lives of the rural poor.

There are, however, real obstacles to taking such action. International development agencies sometimes operate with explicit imperatives to refrain from addressing issues involving redistribution of political power (unless, of course, it is in the interest of the donor country to do so). And, often, the governments and the elites of host countries are not amenable to accepting foreign aid which advocates change of their policies.

It is interesting to note here that among foreign aid donors, PVOs have been quicker to address the role of local political dynamics in development approaches in the Third World. Although PVOs technically are apolitical in nature in so far as they do not barter aid for favorable political or military arrangements and do not encourage economic dependency through aid loans, they tend to be more open about the political objectives and consequences of their activities. In a survey of U.S. and Canadian PVOs, Smith (1984) found that most make a distinction between a political
position which they view as unavoidable (especially where they are instrumental in securing power for the poor), and a partisan political position, viewed as harmful. As a consequence of this view, PVOs often take a deliberate position of open advocacy in relation to the poor. Although such a position is often effective, PVOs generally have no greater direct influence in the sphere of Third World government than do public agencies.

In an effort to encourage involvement of host countries and to strengthen internal government support for agricultural development, international agencies have provided assistance to national agricultural research stations in a number of countries. Unfortunately, as Ruttan (1983:1) notes:

> In too many cases, domestic economic and political support has failed to materialize. A period of rapid institutional development, supported primarily by external assistance, has often been followed by the decline or even collapse of research capacity as external project support has been phased out.

The question of how to effect developmental change at the national level is unresolved. Ruttan (1983:1) suggests two methods for building domestic support: (a) a "revenue sharing approach in which the size of donor contributions is linked to growth of domestic support for agricultural research," or (b) a "support consortium that would engage in joint planning and funding of the host country's agricultural research program."

Inherent to both suggested methods is the acknowledgement that development ultimately requires an active commitment on the part of the governments of recipient countries. As has been
demonstrated by the past failures of "top down" development efforts, such a commitment will need to embrace a participatory approach which will allow technology to be adapted to the unique physical, biological, institutional, and socio-cultural resources of each setting. New methods and techniques, such as Rapid Rural Appraisal and those of Farming Systems Research, hold promise for achieving this goal.

A Note about Women in Development

The development community has come to recognize that women play a hitherto unrecognized but integral part in the economies of developing nations. Earlier anthropological studies (Pala 1976) conducted in eastern, central, and southern Africa illustrate that during pre-colonial periods, the responsibility of agricultural production rested mainly with women. While men's activities consisted of clearing bush, women worked throughout the agricultural year; women's crops constituted the reserve food supply during scarcity; and women were the most likely to introduce new crops. In fact, the division of labor most often made men largely dependent upon women for food.

The introduction of a cash economy, and the attendant employment of men at wage labor away from their own fields, was the first factor responsible for creating a new balance in work roles. "As men become more involved in production for exchange (rather than for immediate consumption), the work the women do is
increasingly restricted to the domestic sphere" (Charlton 1984:25). And as political institutions in the LDCs become more complex, differentiation between public and private spheres become greater. Women, consigned increasingly to the private sphere, find themselves with little power or political influence (Charlton 1984). This change in women's roles has led to a deterioration of wealth, status and health for women as reflected in statistics on mortality, morbidity, employment, and literacy. Malnutrition and undernourishment in pregnant women, mothers and children are now widespread throughout sub-Saharan Africa (Pala 1976; Charlton 1984).

Technological approaches to development have also been responsible for widening the gap in income between men and women, as the introduction of technology and skills training programs almost everywhere have been directed to men only. Pala (1976) suggests several topics of research priority relevant to women's roles in development. These are: (a) new land tenure patterns and how these affect women's access to land; (b) labor allocation, time-constraints, and decision-making at the farm household level; (c) male out-migration; (d) the participation of women in agricultural training, marketing, and cooperative societies; (e) women's self-help groups; and (f) women in pastoral societies and marginal areas.

Many organizations and agencies now exist which regularly fund research on women and development, such as USAID's office of Women in Development (WID). In addition, the United Nations has established the UN Commission on the Status of women, with a
goal of increasing the proportion of women in professional positions in the UN agencies, even though "the proportion of women in middle-range and high positions continues to be relatively small" (Charlton 1984:22). Perhaps of greatest long-term significance in the establishment of a voice for women are the indigenous women's organizations forming throughout the LDCs, where women themselves are addressing the issues of their own health, education, and political power.

In summary, development researchers are working toward goals that reflect the values and assumptions of a democratic society and which, in some instances, are encoded in mandates pertaining to foreign aid. Current ideas about the development of the LDCs include the conviction that women and the poor must not only benefit from, but must participate in, the shaping of their own development. In addition, development of the agricultural sector is now seen to be a crucial factor in a nation's economic well-being.

In an effort to participate fully in the achievement of these goals, anthropologists are formulating methods which both respond to agency needs for timely, cost-effective and relevant information, and which are sensitive to the needs and desires of the intended beneficiaries.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

This thesis began by documenting the historical divergence between applied and traditional anthropology. Structural differences between basic and applied research were analyzed and found to be a result of differing ideological sets and institutional needs. Two areas of contemporary applied activity, SIA and development anthropology, were discussed in order to further examine the nature of applied research.

What conclusions can be drawn from these discussions concerning the similarities and differences between basic and applied anthropological research? What differences, if any, exist between the methods employed by different kinds of applied anthropology? In what ways does applied research relate to trends occurring both within and outside of traditional anthropology?

Structural and Methodological Divergence

The term "research," in and of itself, refers to an activity of objective data collection—this holds true for either basic or applied research. However, the methods and approaches used by these two kinds of research will differ to varying degrees. The reasons for this methodological divergence can be seen to lie in the differing needs and goals of the various social institutions which
support research. Applied anthropological research possesses the following characteristics which distinguish it from basic, scholarly anthropological research:

1. **Applied anthropology maintains a valuational posture toward the subject of its research.** Minimally, its ethical stance is directed toward actively aiding that which is perceived to be good and right for human beings, conforming, of course, to a Western European-North American model of ethics. Unlike basic research, the issue of values affects the practitioner's job at a number of levels: (a) it is reflected in the nature of the chosen research goal, (b) it often leads researchers to take on an advocacy role, and (c) it often determines the kinds of research questions asked (e.g., "Will the project leave women out of the new labor force?" "Do project plans provide for the projected need for sanitation and disease control facilities?").

2. **Much applied anthropology today** (specifically, that involved with SIA and development anthropology) is not only policy oriented, but is integrally involved in "public" policy in so far as it aims to aid the decision-making process at institutional or governmental levels. This is so inspite of the fact that, to date, anthropologist practitioners rarely take responsibility for, or have power over, policy decisions—due partly to their lack of training or knowledge of policy science.

3. **Although practicing anthropologists maintain a holistic approach, and often they utilize some traditional ethnographic**
methods (principally, participant observation, informant interviews, and questionnaires, etc.), these methods must be modified to a large degree in the applied setting. Such modifications are a response to specific needs of the supporting research institution, as well as a response to the need to create a particular kind of research product, one comprised of relevant information which is timely, cost-effective and useful in achieving specific goals of the project.

These methods, particularly when research is used to inform urgent policy decisions, generally have two characteristics. First, they tend to be tailored to meet cost-time constraints and, therefore, are designed to produce a maximum amount of needed information in a short period of time. Second, they focus on gathering restricted kinds of information relevant to a decision-makers problem. Indeed, Chambers's (1980 and 1981) experiences in rural development planning have led him to conclude that a strategy of "optimal ignorance" often is more appropriate than the overcollection of data, since such a strategy generally yields more knowledge which is relevant to the problem at hand. Chambers (1974:143, cited in Charlton 1984:39) states that "there is sometimes an ironical inverse relation between on the one hand the intelligence, knowledge and perceptiveness of the data collection designer and on the other the chances of the data ever being used."

4. Unlike basic research, most applied research problems are
identified not by the researcher, but either by the supporting research institution or by the research subjects themselves (namely, the direct beneficiaries of the intended research). This is so because "adaptive" research is guided by inputs from those who ultimately will make use of its product. The product, whether it be a policy or a new technology, promises to be more successful because it has been adapted to the specific needs and conditions of those for whom it is intended. (It may be noted that not all types of applied research involve adaptive research. Indeed, applied research generally is not adaptive if the research problems or constraints are defined solely or mainly by the investigators themselves.

Adaptive research has the potential to solve another difficult problem not addressed thus far. Because applied research holds values and assumptions which arise from the Judeo-Christian tradition, research may easily be directed toward designing innovations inappropriate to different cultural traditions (either abroad or among differing minority groups at home). Add to this valuational posture the cost-time constraint which often limits the amount and kinds of information gathered, and there is danger that researchers will be directed toward asking the wrong questions or omitting ones which are crucial to the success of a policy or project, or both. For example, Charlton (1984:39) notes that "For too long, both the overcollections of data and 'optimal ignorance' failed to accommodate women's needs because those needs were not
recognized as being important in the policy process. "Wrong" and "missed" questions are eliminated if the ultimate research users can participate in defining the problems or constraints themselves.

5. Applied research requires interdisciplinary or multi-disciplinary approaches, particularly as the problems addressed become increasingly more multi-faceted. The knowledge and methods of no one single discipline is capable of formulating the questions needed to solicit information about the physical, biological, and socio-cultural dimensions of a problem.

In discussing the need for interdisciplinary approaches to natural resource problems, Bennett (1986:346) goes so far as to state that

Disciplines do impede a collaborative and imaginative attack [on these complex issues] for the simple reason that they insist on training students in narrow channels, usually leaving more unorthodox approaches to the student himself, who often pays a high price for maverick behavior. [Additionally, universities] have not yet found a good or consistent way to train people in specialized expertise cast in some larger "interdisciplinary" framework.

Thus, those who are the pioneers in developing multi-disciplinary approaches are those who have the most pressing need for them. Those forecasting social effects in many areas (e.g., in the spheres of economics, mental health, and physical well-being) will turn to disciplines which are capable of providing the best methods to quickly elicit valid knowledge in these areas.

Practitioners in development have formulated techniques such as RRA, which depend for their success upon interdisciplinary
knowledge generated by the interaction of multidisciplinary team members. Interdisciplinary research has been developed and utilized by workers at such organizations as the International Potato Center (CIP) (Rhoades and Booth 1983) and the Guatemalan Institute of Agricultural Sciences and Technology (ICTA) (Hildebrand 1981).

Funding from external sources, however, has been successful in encouraging universities to support interdisciplinary training. For example, Cornell University's Program for Policies for Science and Technology in Developing Nations is supported by USAID. Similarly, as a result of the Iowa State University/USAID Title XII Strengthening Grant, ISU has established a Development Advisory Team (DAT) program that provides interdisciplinary team training to individuals from widely different disciplines. USAID's aim here is to train, for its own purposes, individual consultants in a common approach to development that includes skills not so much technical in nature as "sensible [to the] particular political, economic, social and cultural milieu" (Warren 1982:22).

The effects, if any, that such externally funded interdisciplinary programs will have on the university community in terms of encouraging academic interdisciplinary scholarship remains to be seen.

Appropriate Methodology

A comparative analysis of methods used in SIA and development anthropology provides insight into the reasons for the
increase of specialization within the field of applied anthropology. Such a comparison also illustrates why applied anthropology is expanding its ties to other disciplines and approaches.

Earlier general texts on applied anthropology (e.g., Foster 1969; Bastide 1973) provided very general methodological guidelines, or "do" and "do not" tenets concerning the methods needed to direct socio-cultural change. But as anthropologists acquire more experience with ever more diverse applied problems (including some within their own cultures), it becomes apparent that not all methods will be appropriate in all applied settings and, further, that methods will need to be responsive to the unique real-world problems which are under study. The various aspects (institutional, social, and political) of these problems largely will determine the form and choice of methods.

Specialized areas within applied anthropology will occur because different applied problems need research instruments and approaches which will be responsive to the needs and constraints of particular institutional, social and political environments. A comparative discussion of the approaches and methods utilized by SIA and by development practitioners illustrates this point.

Domestic SIA arose as a response to the needs of policy makers for predictions concerning the future social effects of proposed policies or projects (resulting in the creation of NEPA). Like SIA, recent development anthropology too is a response to
decision makers' needs for better planning in project design (leading to Congress' "New Directions" mandate).

This latter "social soundness analysis" has many likenesses to the SIA originally developed for use in North America. They both are "anticipatory" research; both emphasize local-level participation; both seek to fit economic and technological objectives to specific socio-cultural contexts; and they both provide "use knowledge" for policy decisions. It should also be noted that the steps of SIA are nearly equivalent to the phases of a USAID project, and that these both involve essentially the same tasks (see Tables 2 and 3), although the methods to achieve them may differ.

Although they share similar goals and tasks, there are limits to the success which SIA methodology will yield if applied forthrightly to most development activities. The reasons for this lie in the contrasting political climates of North America and Third World countries on the one hand, and differences in infrastructural support and data bases on the other.

SIA and development's social soundness analysis arose out of a particular ideological and political milieu which is both representative and democratic in nature. In this setting, local participation is an achievable goal as mechanisms exist for common people to affect public policy. If communication networks between a "community" and those in power are sometimes lacking, government policy (although not always individual political
factions) imposes no obstacle to establishing them. In fact, NEPA is government's attempt to do so.

With New Directions, U.S. Congress gave the poorest of the poor in the LDCs a voice, that they might participate in the "decisions that shape their lives." As illustrated in Chapter IV, the new development approaches—with their central aim of providing "bottom up" development—are a response to this directive. But, as FSR advocates acknowledge, the full effectiveness of the participatory approach also requires integration and support at local governmental levels. The reality of development settings, however, is that, even where local-level government support exists, it is often thwarted by national policy. Many elite-controlled Third World governments are eager to comply with foreign assistance strategies when the elites themselves will be the direct beneficiaries of these strategies. The powerful tend not to endorse, nor cooperate with, projects which threaten their own status.

Foreign aid (including that of the United States) is often delivered to countries which violate official U.S. "human rights" directives.

The majority of the [World] Bank's leading recipients, governments such as those of Indonesia, Brazil, Mexico, South Korea, the Phillipines and Colombia, are notorious for their neglect of policies helpful to the poor. ... Almost one quarter of all World Bank loans in FY 1979 were allocated to four governments widely recognized as systematic violators of human rights (Brazil, Indonesia, South Korea and the Phillipines). (Lappe, Collins, and Kinley 1980:30-31)

Ambitious USAID projects are carried out in both Indonesia and the...
Phillipines; these two countries also were among the top ten recipients of U.S. bilateral economic assistance in FY 1980 (Lappe, Collins, and Kinley 1980).

It follows that, although development practitioners may successfully activate local participation in project design, their efforts to present project alternatives will be thwarted if the larger socio-political environment is not receptive to supporting such alternatives. The social soundness analysis used in development remains a viable method to direct policy, but often only within the confines of the institutional organization supporting such research strategies (although its influence often may be thwarted here too, e.g., Morgan 1985). Until social analysis finds a way to influence issues of power distribution in these types of development situations, it will remain culturally relative, successful in achieving its goals only in arenas which are politically receptive.

Derman and Whiteford (1985:9) recently have supported this view:

[Social Impact Analysis (SIA) can and does] play an important role in the creation of equitable and productive development programs and policies [but only] when the SIAs are integrated into a political structure that includes participation of all segments of the society, and when there is an ideological commitment on the part of the government to give local populations a voice in the planning and implementation of any projects that will directly affect them.

Other aspects of SIA methodology also have been viewed as inappropriate in the cultural context of most development projects. Among these are, first, that SIA's utilization of "community" as a
unit of study is not always applicable to development settings where such a unit (in the sense of a group with the ability to sustain corporate action) may not exist (Schwartz and Eckhardt 1985; Oasa 1985). Second, that SIA often omits an historical perspective necessary for knowledge of long-term patterns which are unknown in many development situations (Wisner 1985). And third, that the secondary data (archival materials) which SIA relies upon for domestic analysis is often non-existent in many development settings; or that such statistics, when available, are notoriously unreliable (e.g., cattle censuses, where counting is associated with innoculations against disease). Furthermore, the accumulation of valid statistical knowledge is not always possible in the Third World, as certain statistics are actually uncollectible. For example, an accurate estimate of any one crop under acreage may be impossible due to intercropping (Hill 1985).

Such recognitions reinforce the view that applied research methods, like technology, must be transferred from one environment to another with extreme caution.

Related Trends

Applied anthropology, like any applied science, is an attempt to utilize a discipline's knowledge in solving practical social problems. Thus, the problems of applied anthropology reflect particular socio-cultural concerns. But basic research, too, will mirror the society that nurtures it. Gould (1981:21, cited in
Pandian 1985) puts it this way:

Science, since people must do it, is a socially embedded activity. It progresses by hunch, visions, and intuitions. Much of its change through time does not record a closer approach to absolute truth, but the alteration of cultural contexts that influence it so strongly. Facts are not pure and unsullied bits of information; culture also influences what we see and how we see it. Theories, moreover, are not inexorable inductions from facts. The most creative theories are often imaginative visions imposed upon facts; the source of imagination is also strongly cultural.

Kaplan and Manners (1972:197) would agree that during the course of anthropology's development, "the problems selected for study by anthropologists and the analytic framework within which they handled these problems were influenced by the political, economic, and ideological milieu in which they worked." However, they add that "the social and psychological sources of a scholar's ideas" do not necessarily make the theories themselves wrong or inaccurate. But, they point out that such theories should be tested cross-culturally on logical and empirical grounds.

Nevertheless, the problems on which a discipline focuses at any given point in time will result from the interaction of several factors, including: a discipline's past concerns, its social concerns and cultural ideas about how knowledge is gained, and its cultural values and the influence of new developments in other disciplines. To illustrate: anthropologists' classification of physical traits in humans was a response to the issue of "race," which itself had arisen from the establishment of the institution of slavery; the model used (of differentiating humans in biological terms) was
adapted from Linnaeus. Another more recent example of such influences is the pervasive utilization of general systems theory in basic anthropological research (viz. human ecology), as well as in applied anthropological investigation (viz. Farming Systems Research).

Finally, two additional issues shared today by both applied and basic anthropological research deserve special mention here. These are, first, the increasing concern for women and, second, the importance of social relevancy.

A Concern for Women

The feminist movement of the 20th century has not realized all of its aims, but it has successfully generated response from many sectors. As discussed in Chapter IV, development practitioners have become increasingly aware of the role of women in the LDCs. Academe, too, is responding to the concern for women.

At a time when the number of university positions are declining, there is a growing demand for scholars who have expertise in women's studies. Often, women's studies have been integrated into the university as an interdisciplinary program of study. Its long-term viability here is as tenuous as others like it (e.g., area studies, Black American studies and environmental studies) which receive little support or rewards in an institution structured around traditional disciplinary boundaries. However, women's courses are proliferating within disciplinary programs.
Within the humanities, feminist art and feminist literature have taken a strong hold.

In ecology, women's distinct perceptions and experiences of reality are challenging previous theory. This "eco-feminist" movement criticizes even the most recently advanced theory of "deep ecology" for not having gone far enough in exposing the Man/Nature duality, since it has failed to address the Man/Woman hierarchy which is an inherent feature of this (Salleh 1984).

In anthropology, researchers have long recognized that the gender of the fieldworker will limit the possibilities for identifying or collecting certain kinds of data. But more recently, some anthropologists have come to acknowledge that many topics (e.g., marriage and kinship) have been chosen and studied from a male point of view, that "most ethnographic data focuses on male cultural perceptions assuming them to be representative of the society as a whole" (Rogers 1978:143, cited in Ellen 1984:121).

With the recent cautions against generalizing male views across a whole culture, comes a surge of basic research which focuses on women. Ellen (1984:129) notes that some have advised caution in focusing "on female forms of power [which] may give the impression that women are relatively more powerful than they are." Concern has also been expressed that women-centered studies may create a sub-discipline.

But some women anthropologists perceive the study of gender-specific topics "as a necessary stage in the dialectic advance
towards a more integrated society" (Sharma 1981:37, cited in Ellen 1984:129). Calloway (1981, cited in Ellen 1984:129) would use the data from such studies to create a total "revision" of anthropology and society, a means "to see through the stereotypes of our society as these are taken for granted in daily life and deeply embedded in academic tradition." Both SIA and development anthropology are explicitly providing such data.

A Concern for Relevancy

The term "relevant" is used in development anthropology to describe that kind of knowledge which is pertinent and useful to the problem at hand (as opposed to the kind of information which might be academically useful, but useless from a decision-maker's point of view). The term "relevancy" also is commonly used in reference to applied anthropology in general, where the demand for relevance may be viewed as a "pressure for the increasing involvement of the social sciences in programs of social change" (Kaplan and Manners 1972:203).

But academic anthropology, too, is increasingly concerned about the relevancy of its research and such a concern implicitly involves an examination of the ethical dimensions of research. This concern, in part, is a reaction to accusations put to anthropologists by many of anthropology's traditional "subjects." Speaking of his experiences in Papua New Guinea, Strathern (1983:4) lists four chief accusations made against anthropologists:
1. That their work is demeaning to the people, since it is concerned with the category of 'primitive society'.

2. That their work is intimately linked to the colonial order.

3. That their work is exploitative, designed to secure them degrees and careers rather than to assist the people and nation in which their studies are conducted.

4. That their work does not lead to any practical results, because of its academic orientation and because of anthropology's pseudo-scientific claims to objectivity.

Although Strathern does not find all of these accusations to be valid in all cases, he does recommend making research "genuinely useful to the peoples and nations in which work is carried out." He believes that anthropologists can do this by serving as applied researchers in the countries where they do their formal research (although he staunchly supports long-term research as a desirable prerequisite to effective short-term applied studies). He argues that anthropologists should establish "long-term and multiplex reciprocity," they should "write directly for the people and countries they have worked in," and they should encourage "national scholars/indigenous anthropologists" (Strathern 1983:9).

Some anthropologists feel that research need not be applied in order to have relevance. Pelto and Pelto (1978:232), for example, suggest two main ways in which basic research could be made relevant. First, anthropologists can focus on a people's social problems "in a particular locale" (e.g., urban ghettos, mental health, community organization), or anthropologists can focus on "the effects of particular sociotechnological development." Second,
research can be aimed "at some crucial social issue—for example, human overpopulation or human aggression—which is studied through a series of investigations that may be carried out in a number of different locations." Pelto and Pelto feel that such research will be useful in the public domain. But the practical utility of such research can be questioned, since it is here that the researcher, and not the user of research, who is defining the problem to be investigated. In addition, the knowledge produced here is most often too general to be useful in addressing specific problems, and it is seldom cost-effective.

For Marxist anthropologists, anthropology will be relevant only when it becomes either "humanly radical or politically radical" (Wolff 1969). By this it is meant that anthropologists should approach a knowledge of humans from the viewpoint of their "worth, mana, power, grace, pneuma"—in other words, from their positive values—rather than from the premise that humans act so as to satisfy needs, which they regard as "a negative conception of good as amelioration or the correction of an undesirable state" (Lee 1948:72-73, cited in Wolff 1969:102). Anthropologists should become "politically radical" by embracing a political perspective, taking on such tasks as examining capitalist versus socialist production, capitalist versus socialist foreign aid in underdeveloped countries, or comparing "revolutionary and proto-revolutionary movements for what they can teach us about social change" (Gough 1968, cited in Wolff 1969:106).
Basic "relevant" research of the nature suggested above may, of course, shed some light on social problems themselves. However, as should be clear from the thrust of this thesis, "relevance" in applied anthropology entails a capability for transcribing data into operational terms that fit the facts of a particular problem or situation. These problems are identified by someone other than the researcher--by those who are directly affected by the research results. For research in applied anthropology to be relevant, therefore, it must be immediately useful. Or put differently, whereas basic research aims mainly to explain something, applied research derives its insights and understanding essentially by trying to solve practical problems. Thus, the relevancy of basic research should not be confused with the relevancy of applied research. The value of each is determined by the role which it plays. The aim of this thesis has been to clarify this and other roles of applied anthropology today.
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