Applied Anthropology

Chapter · January 2005

CITATIONS
4

READS
32,680

2 authors:

Satish Kedia
The University of Memphis
244 PUBLICATIONS **1,601** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

Linda A. Bennett
The University of Memphis
87 PUBLICATIONS **1,941** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGY

Satish Kedia and **Linda A. Bennett**
Department of Anthropology, The University of Memphis, USA

Keywords: Advocacy, applied work, careers, collaboration, domains, ethics, focus groups, globalization, history, local practitioner organization (LPO), participatory action research (PAR), policy research, practicing anthropology, professional frameworks, rapid assessment procedures (RAPs), stakeholders**.**

Contents

Summary

Applied anthropologists employ knowledge, concepts, and methods from their discipline to address contemporary social, economic, or health problems facing communities or organizations by facilitating positive change. In this chapter, we trace the growing public recognition of applied anthropology and its use from ancient times to the present, from colonial powers establishing trade and conquering indigenous populations to practitioners working to preserve at-risk cultures and empower communities for self-determined positive change. We then discuss typical applied anthropology careers in terms of employers, domains of application, and roles. We describe typical methodologies employed by applied practitioners, from traditional ethnographic techniques to innovative methods incorporating advanced technologies for more efficient work practices. In a brief section, we elaborate on the inevitability for applied anthropologists to work collaboratively, particularly as research foci and methodologies demand interdisciplinary work and active participation from the study population. Also discussed is the need for applied anthropologists to develop a professional framework and adhere to ethical guidelines. In conclusion, we argue for the importance of applied anthropology in current times and its future as a recognized subfield that is central to anthropological endeavors in meeting the challenges of a global twenty-first century.

1. Introduction

Applied anthropology diverges in scope from traditional anthropology in its use of the discipline's knowledge to address contemporary social, economic, or health problems facing communities or organizations. Practitioners draw upon a wide array of research methods and theoretical approaches to empower individuals to collectively address real-world problems and ensure the survival of at-risk groups. Although anthropology is traditionally divided into four subfields (cultural, biological, archaeological, and linguistic), many experts see applied as a fifth subfield, reflecting its growth in professional realms and scholarly activity. In fact, a convincing argument has been made that applied anthropology is integrated within each of the four traditional subfields. The continuing debate over the place of applied anthropology serves to signify its importance and further substantiate the view that applied anthropology does constitute a valid subfield of the discipline.

This chapter discusses the history of applied anthropology from its beginning to its establishment as a subfield of anthropology. It explores careers by looking at employers, domains of application, and roles and then delves into the traditional and innovative methodologies, the collaborative aspects of applied work, the necessity of a professional framework, and research ethics. Finally, it comments on the current trends that will directly affect the future of applied anthropology.

2. Creating a Subfield

2.1. Prior Disciplinary Status of Anthropology

Applied anthropology is historically tied to basic anthropology and even predates written history. In ancient times, anthropological knowledge was commonly used to inform foreign policy and to facilitate conquest and administration of captured areas. As early as 3100–2900 BCE, Egypt sent representatives to establish trade with the Sudanese and later (ca. 1200–800 BCE) with the Phoenicians. In turn, the Phoenicians shared their knowledge of the peoples of the Mediterranean Sea, the Atlantic Ocean, and the African coast with their economic empire. In Greece, Herodotus (ca. 490–420 BCE) studied the cultures of the Mediterranean basin on behalf of his government to determine appropriate foreign policy.

Throughout history, rulers applied their knowledge of other cultures to ease war efforts and maintain central rule over conquered nations. At its peak, the Persian Empire stretched from India to Greece, from the Caspian Sea to the Red and Arabian Seas, while Alexander the Great (ca. 356–323 BCE) established trade routes between Greece and India. The Roman Empire (27 BCE–476 CE), eventually stretching from southern Scotland to southern Egypt and reaching from the Euphrates River and Caspian Sea to the Atlantic Ocean, exchanged diplomats with China, which in turn established global trade routes as far as the Middle East by about 600–900 CE. Circa 930 CE, the country now known as Iceland was settled by Norwegian Vikings, who were later convinced by Eric the Red to colonize Greenland based on his findings from earlier explorations. In the 1090s CE, many negotiations and technological exchanges facilitated the Crusades, which were initiated from failed diplomatic attempts to establish safe passage for pilgrims from Byzantium to the Holy Lands.

From the 1300s through the 1600s, European nations attempted to expand their colonial holdings and discover new resources, sponsoring explorers such as Marco Polo (Italy), Vasco da Gama (Portugal),

John Cabot (England), and Christopher Columbus (Spain). Cultural and geographical knowledge acquired by such men was used to advance imperialist efforts. For example, Jacques Cartier mapped the St. Lawrence River in 1535 with the help of local guides and established the means by which his native France was able to build an economic and political stronghold in Canada.

Though not yet a formal discipline, anthropological work increased in practice with the spread of colonialism in the 1700s. Much applied anthropological work that investigated new colonies and resources was performed in the guise of the recognized scientific field of ethnology. In North America, Father Lafitau, a missionary to New France in 1711, conducted ethnographic studies of the indigenous population, later transmitting the knowledge of ginseng to his home country so that it might be able to capture this market of growing interest in Europe. In 1768 James Cook of Britain's Royal Navy undertook a scientific expedition to Tahiti. This voyage eventually led to other expeditions in New Zealand and across many Pacific islands, resulting in observations that Polynesians had culturally influenced and/or inhabited most of these islands long before any European had such seafaring capabilities.

Applied anthropological work progressed with the imperialism of the 1800s but continued to be empirically based as ethnology remained the disciplinary stamp of such professionals. During this period, ethnology was part of foreign-service training among colonial officers and such expertise was sought in government staff and consultants. Britain used Francis Buchanan in 1807 to inform administrative policy on the Bengal in India, while the U.S. government employed Henry R. Schoolcraft, the founder of the American Ethnological Society, to advise on its domestic agenda regarding Native Americans.

An early American anthropologist, Lewis Henry Morgan, bridged more traditional anthropological study with the application of knowledge on behalf of a Native American group. Morgan, considered one of the pioneers in cultural field studies, shifted from conducting scientific studies of American Indian groups to applying his anthropological knowledge as the representative of the Seneca tribe in Washington DC during the tribe's land disputes with the Ogden Land Company from 1821 to 1856. Generally though, anthropological work in the USA during the mid to late nineteenth century centered on informing federal Native American policy, as exemplified by the applied research performed at the Smithsonian Institution's Bureau of American Ethnology (BAE), created in 1879.

During the same time period in Britain, the field of ethnology split, with some professionals wishing to apply their knowledge directly to humanitarian issues of the day, which helped anthropology develop into a recognized discipline. The Anthropological Society of London, founded in 1863 as a group divergent from the Ethnological Society of London, provided the field with a disciplinary infrastructure honed in applied premises. The first anthropology courses were taught in the 1880s at Oxford, where a diploma program in 'applied anthropology' was established in 1906.

The growing number of professional associations and the body of literature from government-sponsored and a few privately funded projects added to the discipline's scholarly status in the USA. In 1888, the Anthropological Society of Washington established the *American Anthropologist*, a journal that later fell under the auspices of the American Anthropological Association (AAA) when it was founded in 1902 to consolidate several national and regional anthropological societies. James Mooney coined the term 'applied ethnology' in a 1902 BAE report. Policy research institutes in the USA such as the BAE were among the first to hire anthropologists for applied work. In addition, private funding led to projects such as the study of housing conditions for the poor in Washington D.C. by the Women's Anthropological Society of Washington in 1896. Still, until after World War II, Western

applied anthropology continued to perceive human culture in teleological terms and fieldwork primarily focused on 'less developed' societies and indigenous populations.

2.2. The Basis for Contemporary Applied Anthropology

At the turn of the twentieth century, anthropological work in the West remained value-implicit in perspective, devoted to the principles of objectivism and positivism from its basis in scientific ethnology. Research tacitly sanctioned a Eurocentric perspective, with applied anthropologists serving mainly as consultants to colonial powers. World War I brought changes to anthropology, which, though still an empirically based discipline, began expanding in scope as contemporary tragedies and social and cultural upheavals demanded more attention. Even as anthropology thus grew, it did not fully develop as a discipline outside of France, Great Britain, and the USA until after World War II, though professional communities in these countries maintained contact with anthropologists working in Germany, Eastern Europe, Russia, South Africa, India, and Australia.

Transformations occurring in anthropology during the early twentieth century set the stage for more extensive use of practitioners. This expansion is exemplified through the career of British anthropologist Gertrude Bell. She became fluent in Arabic and studied Arab archeological sites in Jerusalem from 1899 to 1900. British Intelligence used her expertise during World War I to mobilize Arabs against Turkey. By 1921, Bell, as British representative to Iraq, helped establish the reign of the first king of Iraq and became renowned among Arab people. Within a few years, she was appointed the nation's director of antiquities. Bell's professional career mimics the slow transition of anthropology as a discipline, from a researcher of indigenous people, to a colonial tool at the disposal of Western nations, to a facilitator of self-determined nationalism and a cultural preservationist.

In France, anthropology had become an elitist discipline in the early twentieth century, part of salon discussions concerning sociology, philosophy, history, psychology, and linguistics. While this and war delayed the growth of anthropology as an independent field, applied work was visible in Arnold van Gennep's studies of homeland rural areas in France, constituting what was perhaps the first use of "backyard anthropology." Meanwhile, England's A.R. Radcliffe-Brown advocated using anthropology to help abate caustic racial strife in South Africa from 1920 to 1925, and Meyer Fortes foretold the subfield of nutritional anthropology with his research for the 1935 British International African Institute's Diet Committee. Additionally, E.W.P. Chinnery, labor advisor to New Guinea Copper Mines Ltd. in 1924 and Government Anthropologist in New Guinea from 1924 to 1932, developed an anthropological training program at the University of Sydney, sending students to a post in New Guinea for two years of practical training; and Gordon Brown, originally from Canada, published one of the first applied anthropology texts, *Anthropology in Action*, in 1935. Written in collaboration with British government official A. McD. Bruce Hutt, this empirical study of the African Hehe people of Tanganyika (now Tanzania) resulted in the administration's increased awareness of how systematic ethnographic inquiries could have immense practical value in fully understanding the cultural aspects of a people. Yet even with these examples of anthropological work conducted, the two disparate factions mentioned earlier along with wartime efforts stymied significant growth in the discipline, resulting in there being only about 20 professionally trained anthropologists in the British Empire as of 1939.

Anthropology in the USA focused on policy, research, and consulting during the post–World War I era. New Deal programs and projects addressing the vast economic and social problems created by the 1930s' Great Depression required anthropological expertise; as a result, most opportunities for employment in this period were found in federal government and private business organizations.

Native population issues, land tenure, migration, nutrition, education, and economic/resource development for American Indians or rural Americans remained at the forefront of anthropological work. Consistent with this pattern, the Applied Anthropology Unit of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), created by John Collier in the mid 1930s, promoted anthropology as a practical endeavor. Simultaneously, private industry sought to improve productivity through anthropological studies of employee behavior, such as W. Lloyd Warner's Hawthorne Experiments at Western Electric from 1924 to 1932. This expanded use of applied anthropology (and sociology) and additional applied methodologies reflect the changes leading up to and through World War II, which brought substantial changes to the discipline when, for the most part, anthropologists worked as liaisons and consultants in support of their governments' war efforts. According to Margaret Mead's "Applied Anthropology: The State of the Art" printed in the AAA's *Perspectives on Anthropology, 1976*, in the USA over 95% of the AAA membership served in these capacities. Many worked in Japanese–American internment camps or as cross-cultural trainers of officials and military personnel assigned to recaptured areas. Such applied work became prevalent enough to merit the establishment of the Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA) and its flagship journal *Human Organization* in 1941, while applied medical anthropology was founded in the work of George Foster at the Smithsonian Institute of Social Anthropology, created in 1943.

World War II did not, as it might seem, halt anthropological work in other nations that were more directly impacted by combat conditions. For example, France and Britain during this time saw the publication of the first evaluation of imperialism's effects on culture in Maurice Leenhardt's study of the Kanak in New Caledonia conducted in the early 1930s. Paul Rivet, a French anthropologist who along with Marcel Mauss created the Institut d'Ethnologie at the University of Paris in 1925, founded research institutes in Mexico and Colombia in the early 1940s. However, most anthropologists occupied researcher, teacher, and consultant roles until the end of the war, when several key changes took place―most notably, the creation of the United Nations International Children's Fund (UNICEF) in 1946. This non-governmental organization (NGO), dedicated to improving children's lives by influencing decision makers and partnering with grassroots groups, was the first of the global organizations that would become a major source of employment for applied anthropologists.

In 1948, the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES) was founded to network the growing number of anthropologists worldwide and to act as a forum for scholarly and practical undertakings. Following this milestone came a period of theoretical development and scholarly expansion in applied anthropology that would last from the 1950s until the 1970s. During this period, the discipline initially considered applied anthropology as primarily academic research, intended to inform policy, program administration, and intervention or development initiatives mainly within the subfield of cultural anthropology. Simultaneously, anthropological theory and scholarly pursuits grew with the advancement of specializations, such as urban anthropology, human and cultural ecology, medical anthropology, development anthropology, and local/regional studies. Furthermore, economic anthropology broadened, and Marxist perspectives emerged within the discipline. In short, the post–World War II era witnessed a significant expansion and specialization of anthropology.

In the USA, anthropologists were suddenly in demand as university professors when the 1944 G.I. Bill sent waves of returning veterans to college with education subsidies. The Baby Boom (1946–1964) kept enrollment high in anthropology departments in postsecondary institutions and increased the need for academic anthropologists. Simultaneously, opportunities for anthropologists to work as liaisons and consultants for the federal government decreased as the USA recuperated from the Great Depression and began focusing on the external funding needs of other nations' war recovery efforts after World War II. The war had a deep and lasting impact on generations, with the death of more than fifty million

worldwide, genocidal atrocities, land and infrastructure devastation, the displacement of peoples and realignment of nations, the advent of nuclear weaponry, and the effects of the A-bomb on the Japanese. The resulting confusion and suspicion would lead to the Cold War but also to the desire to ameliorate the world's ailments and take action when social and economic blights were discovered, particularly in areas still under waning colonial influence.

By the 1950s, the detached positivism of the discipline had begun to be supplanted by value-explicit research, initially seen in the rise of action anthropology. Sol Tax's work in Iowa with the Fox Indians in facilitating the tribe's self-determination employed a dual action/research approach that, with the 1960s' social consciousness movements, eventually piloted new domains. These included research and development, community development, collaborative research, and culture brokerage, all components of contemporary applied anthropology. In 1952, the first applied anthropology unit at a U.S. university was founded, the Bureau of Applied Research in Anthropology (BARA) of the University of Arizona. Originally called the Bureau of Ethnic Research, BARA was and is dedicated to solving the socioeconomic problems of various communities. These expanding applied anthropological endeavors, coupled with emerging ethical problems associated with community intervention, helped reframe the long-standing view of applied anthropology as just a tool of colonialism.

Early key ethical debates emerged in the work of applied anthropologists following World War II. The Vicos Project of the 1950s, led by Allen Holmberg of Cornell University in collaboration with other anthropologists, involved direct intervention in hacienda labor strife and technological development, with anthropological researchers also acting as development managers. This direct intervention sparked memories of colonialism's ethnocentric use of anthropologists and led to heated debates in the USA. Dubious military uses of social scientists by the USA in the Vietnam Conflict and in Project Camelot of 1964 in South America (more fully described in the section on "Ethics") only fueled the controversy. These events led to the creation of professional ethical guidelines by anthropological associations and to continuing scholarly advances by more clearly defining the goals and means of applied anthropology.

2.3. The Budding of a Subfield

As the Vietnam era came to a close, many anthropologists in the USA started questioning the involvement of social scientists in the war, which resulted in new areas of inquiry. At that time, anthropologists began to espouse the value of advocating for marginalized cultures and communities, as well as venturing into decision-making themselves, rather than simply informing policy. By the late 1970s, the door for applied work was significantly opened by a decline in the academic job market. As the last of the baby boomers graduated from college, the number of master's or doctoral anthropologists outnumbered the positions available in higher education. Additionally, economic and social changes in the late 1980s influenced postsecondary institutions to hire more part-time and adjunct rather than full-time tenure-track faculty. According to a 1999 AAA survey of departments, only half of American anthropology faculty were full-time and tenure-track, while a U.S. Department of Education study that same year revealed that only slightly more than one-third were tenured. Consequently, over the last twenty to thirty years in the USA, almost half of anthropology's new doctoral and most master's level graduates have taken positions outside academia, with a majority finding employment in government and private sectors. A few observers, such as Bushnell and Cochrane, likened the new potential for anthropologists to that of medical practitioners—social scientists who apply their knowledge to practical endeavors. While some anthropologists with a doctorate have taken applied/practicing jobs due to the lack of opportunity in postsecondary

institutions, many have intentionally chosen such positions because of the typically higher salaries and the lower level of pressure to publish research than those employed in academia face.

Applied anthropology gained larger audiences with the emergence of practicing anthropology, the result of four key changes in the postwar era: a renewed emphasis on policy research mandated by the increasing volume of federal and state regulation; a greater spotlight on accountability and cost-effectiveness leading to more demand for program evaluation; the founding of the first degree programs to prepare anthropologists for non-academic careers at the University of Arizona, the University of Kentucky, and the University of South Florida; and the establishment of several professional journals and associations for practitioners.

SfAA's journal, *Practicing Anthropology*, was launched in 1978 to provide an avenue of communication for those anthropologists working outside academia. Founded in 1975, the Society of Professional Anthropologists (SOPA), although lasting less than a decade, helped spawn similar local practitioner organizations (LPOs) such as the Washington Association of Professional Anthropologists (WAPA) in 1976 and regional societies like the High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology (HPSfAA) in 1980, as well as the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology (NAPA), a section of the AAA created in 1983. The IUAES expanded its networking to specifically handle applied work via the 1993 adoption of a Commission on Anthropology in Policy & Practice, led by representatives of anthropological groups from the USA, France, Great Britain, Mexico, Canada, the USSR, and other nations.

The tendency to call non-academic applied work 'practicing' anthropology was initiated in the 1970s, partly due to the name of the SfAA's major periodical, *Practicing Anthropology*, and partly due to the founding of NAPA. Similarly, many of the LPOs created at the time used 'practicing' or 'professional' in their names. In contrast, the term 'applied' anthropology has been used to describe anthropological work that attempts to positively impact people and communities since the early days of ethnology, even prior to the acknowledgement of anthropology as a distinct discipline. Scholarly debate over the distinction between 'applied' and 'practicing' anthropology persists, even though these terms have been used interchangeably by many anthropologists to describe those professionals using anthropological knowledge to study people and facilitate positive change by influencing policy or decision makers for the betterment of a community or group.

Others may say this research-based focus defines applied, but that practicing is broader, incorporating any non-academic anthropological work, though this simple difference would not merit consideration of either as a subfield of the discipline. Many distinguish the two by sector of employment, with applied designating the university-employed and practicing the business- and agency-employed. Increasingly, however, anthropologists move back and forth between academic and non-academic settings, especially the substantial number of university faculty holding adjunct and/or non-tenured positions. The present discussion uses the term 'applied anthropology' to encompass the work of anthropologists addressing real-world problems from both academic and non-academic positions.

In a 1980 discussion about the use of applied versus practicing in terminology and job definitions, Robert Hinshaw contended that practicing work was necessarily collaborative. Erve Chambers countered in 1985 by describing practicing as distinct in its collaborative inquiry, knowledge transfer, and decision-making, while classifying it as an aspect of applied work. In 1993, Shirley Fiske asserted that the two were indeed interchangeable, with both serving as testing grounds for theory produced by the traditional anthropology subfields. By 1996, Chambers assessed these three dominant views and implied that the discipline would probably define applied work as supplying research and information

useful to others for generating change, whereas practicing work involved more direct intervention by making any useful anthropological knowledge and skills easily accessible, extending well beyond social-scientific inquiry. Despite the lack of agreement with regard to terminology and job definitions, both practicing and applied have become recognized within anthropology through their solid professional accreditation and substantive scholarly activities.

In 2000, in response to the growing trend toward educating master's and doctoral students explicitly in practicing and applied anthropology, the Consortium of Practicing and Applied Anthropology Programs (COPAA) was founded to network these multiplying university programs, at least twenty-five undergraduate and graduate programs in the USA alone. Today the AAA, NAPA, and SfAA are expanding committees and forums to appeal to the increasing number of non-academically employed anthropologists, and the discipline has been compelled to realize the value of embracing these non-traditional fields. Still, even as applied gravitates toward becoming a fifth subfield of anthropology, many practitioners continue to feel that a history of colonial and wartime misuse has resulted in their being stigmatized by other professionals in the discipline.

3. Developing Careers

3.1. Employers

Governmental agencies, transnational and international corporations, NGOs, and nonprofits require a deeper understanding of increasingly diverse cultures and a greater accountability to compete for funds and sustainability as never before. In fact, a majority of applied anthropologists are currently employed by government, state, or municipal agencies; NGOs, international research groups or policy institutes; and institutes of higher learning. Many find work for nonprofit or charitable groups, private consulting firms or corporations, and grassroots, advocacy or consumer groups.

Governmental agencies such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund draw upon applied anthropologists' abilities to inform policy and program development and to evaluate program efficacy in order to support funding requests. NGOs, such as Oxfam-UK, World Vision International and UNICEF, and nonprofits use anthropologists in a similar capacity. In academia, anthropologists serve as faculty and as directors or researchers in units dedicated to applied anthropological endeavors for advancing university goals and scholarly activity, recruiting students, obtaining funding, and maintaining a local community presence.

Private consulting firms that employ applied practitioners are mainly contracted by governmental divisions and other groups whose needs do not require a permanent anthropologist. Likewise, many corporations hire consultant anthropologists for myriad tasks from labor and community relations to facilitating resource and economic development, designing products, increasing productivity, and educating employees. Applied anthropologists also work with advocacy groups to seek social justice for people with limited voice in social, economic, and political arenas. In these efforts, they work through grassroots movements and consumer groups to more effectively change pertinent policies of governmental agencies and industries alike.

3.2. Domains

Well before its scholarly acknowledgement by the discipline, applied anthropology focused on several standard domains: agriculture, health and medicine, housing, social services, political-economic

development, displacement and resettlement, business and industry, education, nutrition, environment, and aging. However, demographic shifts, technological advances, increasing migration, and globalization that were characteristic of the last quarter of the twentieth century have resulted in new types of employment settings for anthropologists and have triggered a metamorphosis of the discipline of anthropology itself as the domains of application have expanded. At the same time, anthropologists as a whole have gravitated toward a greater variety of applied settings in the face of major global changes, especially since the end of World War II. A good example of this transformation is seen in the formation of the IUAES. Currently comprising members from six continents, the IUAES fosters subfield growth through its twenty-seven commissions, whose varied foci reflect the significant changes in anthropology that have taken place over the last half century. Some of these commissions include Folk Law and Legal Pluralism, Food and Food Problems, Cultural Dimensions of Global Change, Human Ecology, Medical Anthropology and Epidemiology, Peace, Tourism, Urban Anthropology, Urgent Anthropological Research, Indigenous Knowledge and Sustainable Development, Ethnic Relations, Children, Youth and Childhood, Migration, and Human Rights.

Other trends include the growth of backyard anthropology, which involves working within home societies rather than in third world societies. This field of research developed from earlier ventures to address the challenges of growing ethnic communities but has since expanded to encompass problems facing rural youth who migrate to urban areas and, conversely, the greater number of retirees moving from urban areas to more rural settings. In the USA, the waves of retiring baby boomers has led to renewed interest in aging research, as greater attention is paid to their social and cultural adjustment and healthcare needs. The recent surge of ethnic communal identity across the globe has resulted in the need for more policy research focusing on the expanding local immigrant and ethnic communities in the USA and on demographic and political shifts in the Middle East, Eastern Europe, France, southern Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

Both applied and traditional anthropological work settings have been drastically altered by the expanding influence of globalization in business/industry and government, changing the funding sources and study populations worldwide. Large multinational corporations and organizations are increasingly involved in business in several countries at once, requiring an understanding of multiple cultures, societies, and economies to be successful in their endeavors. These trends have led to several new applied domains, such as the development of energy sources with a greater awareness of environmental impact and limited natural resources; the management of fisheries for improved sustainability; and the analysis of the geopolitical dimensions of environmental change as well as the political economy of regions. Additional areas include evaluation and assessment of policies and programs, the analysis of transportation and water resources projects, and study of the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

As a reflection of this expansion in domains, the NAPA website lists the following areas in which its members are employed: agricultural development, business, computer science, community development, cultural resource management education and training, environment management/policy, government, information technology, law enforcement and forensics, legal practices, medicine, museums, organizational management, nonprofits, and social services. In addition, the website lists many specialized areas within these domains, such as product design, project management, program management, and research and development; database design/development, software design/development, and user interface design; local/regional/federal agencies, military, and international policy; human factors engineering, localization and globalization, and network design/administration; healthcare and public health; curation; program managers; and grant writing, management, and policy.

3.3. Roles

The skills of an applied anthropologist are marketable in a variety of domestic and international work settings. Very often applied work is generated by potential employers and is not initiated by the anthropologist. Although practitioners find employment in a vast array of fields, most job titles and announcements do not explicitly specify 'anthropologist' and often are applicable to other types of social scientists. It is thus important for future anthropologists to understand the roles practitioners occupy and some of the terminology used to describe such positions. The most common job titles of applied anthropologists reflect multiple responsibilities: policy researcher and research analyst; evaluator, impact assessor, needs assessor, cultural broker, advocate, public participation specialist, counselor, consultant, expert witness, and administrator or manager. Typically, the successful applied anthropologist assumes a number of roles simultaneously.

Serving as policy researchers, applied anthropologists generate data for analysis and policy development at the local, state, or federal level without actively participating in policy or program implementation. Similarly, applied work frequently involves research analysis for program evaluation or monitoring to assess program efficacy and/or weaknesses rather than directly informing policy for new projects. As evaluators or assessors, applied anthropologists monitor existing programs or development projects to determine effectiveness and to assess impacts on communities and the environment, but they may also serve as planners who design programs and projects. From the positions of researcher, research analyst, evaluator, and assessor, practitioners wishing to have a greater impact on policy development may progressively assume implementation and decision-making roles as they acquire the means and experience necessary to perform such tasks. As more applied anthropologists participate in the entire process of policy development, both their careers and the discipline as a whole are enriched.

Applied anthropologists may also serve as communication facilitators between policy makers and communities. For example, cultural brokers stress positive connections between programs or organizations and the communities they impact. In such cases, the communities may have limited experience dealing with existing power structures, and practitioners can encourage better communication between the two groups to ensure more equitable outcomes. In another role, applied anthropologists function as 'co-culture' mediators addressing intercultural conflicts. In this role, practitioners are change agents acting as catalysts for the betterment of communities or organizations. Advocacy or action work in local and global settings involves assisting under-represented groups to advance equity and social justice. Historic, cultural, and biological preservation may be part of this endeavor. For example, applied anthropologists can advocate for environmental justice, while providing people with the tools to protect their lifeways via a program of sustainable development. Such work is no longer as influenced by imperial and Eurocentric interests and seems ever more pressing, considering the continued deterioration of natural resources and resulting loss of virgin forests, rainforests, coral reefs, and animal species that provide the basis for many cultures' social and economic viability.

As public participation specialists analyzing participation patterns, community-based needs, livelihood diversification, and commodity production, applied anthropologists manage development and ensure sustainability without damaging the culture or ecology of a community. These specialists are called upon for expert input in the planning process and convey their knowledge to the public, often using media and public meetings as educational forums. Such applied anthropologists facilitate community

self-determination by empowering members through education and organization to take action on their own behalf as representatives of their community's interests.

Some anthropologists develop prevention campaigns specific to a population in a public-interest effort to inform the people concerned. Originally developed in the 1960s, media anthropology had gone into decline but is again becoming popular with the public's increasing need for greater accessibility to such information and with the availability of new venues for information dissemination. Advances in communication and technology have led to the globalization of information and more efficient means for providing individuals with research results. Perhaps nowhere is this more evident than in the positive impact of educational materials produced to inform individuals worldwide about HIV/AIDS.

The expansion of the discipline into new arenas has resulted in truly novel roles, such as counselor or therapist, referred to by Marietta Baba and Mark Nichter as "hybrids." These positions connect to other disciplines, psychology/psychiatry in this case, and require additional training and/or education. More specialized roles that an applied anthropologist may take for a limited time include serving as an expert witness to testify in court on behalf of a community, as a cross-cultural trainer of others in anthropological methods, and as a long- or short-term consultant.

Although still a minority, an increasing number of applied anthropologists are employed as administrators and managers. When applied work intensified in the early 1970s, many practitioners developed careers that led to positions of power. Sometimes they advanced in a natural progression from their research and policy roles to such positions. In other instances, they came to occupy high-ranking jobs as key decision makers, a testimony to the success of anthropological approaches and reflective of the history of the field. Change is inevitable and will continue to affect the roles an anthropologist may play, but, invariably, the need for applied work will continue to expand, especially with the rise of multiculturalism and mega-urbanization in a global economy.

4. Growing Methodologies

4.1 Traditional Techniques

While applied anthropologists typically work under time pressure, they still use ethnographic research methods that involve the systematic and holistic study of communities by directly participating in the cultures being studied. This requires proper documentation, interpretation, and use of secondary data. As researchers, applied anthropologists are expected to have a solid foundation in data collection and analysis. Collecting data may involve directly observing, learning the local language, interviewing, using other research techniques, and recording and coding data. Anthropologists in applied roles frequently also collect quantitative data by employing a variety of innovative techniques.

4.2. Innovative Practices

With the increased demand for the expertise of applied anthropologists as well as major advances in technology, the research methods have become increasingly sophisticated and time-efficient. Applied work is usually conducted at the request of an individual or agency requiring expeditious answers to questions affecting significant decisions about projects and programs. While in most academic research the principal investigator determines the scope and length of the study, in applied work, time constraints are typically set by others. Since traditional anthropological techniques are usually long-term and expansive, practitioners have developed a variety of innovative methodological tools that are

conducive to the shorter research times often required by applied work. For quantitative data, such tools include speedier survey methods and more user-friendly access provided by statistical software such as SPSS and by computer-aided analysis through aerial photographs, satellite imagery, and Geographic Information Systems (GIS).

One of the methodological strategies used to meet short deadlines is called rapid assessment procedures (RAPs). These strategies also serve as exploratory research for planning or a basis for long-term research. Many RAPs are based on ethnographic techniques tailored to the needs of short-term applied projects. Specific techniques within RAP include rapid ethnographic assessment procedures (REAPs); focus groups; semi-structured, dynamic, and iterative interviews; imaginative selection of key informants, as in chain-interviews; selective sample interviews and surveys instead of random sampling; streamlined surveys; subject's self-assessment and self-definition; sondeo techniques; spatial mapping; decision-making modeling; ethnocartography; multi-scalar research; sorting and ranking; social network analysis; regionally placed teams for real-time ground-proofing of data; techniques specific to a substantive area or particular to a given job; and participant role-playing or other innovative forms of direct observation and study population participation, such as participatory action research (PAR).

One of the more widely used techniques for RAP is 'focus group' interviewing. For decades, marketing specialists have used focus groups to discern the desires, likes, and dislikes of a target group and thus improve the likelihood that consumers will purchase certain products over others. Increasingly, social scientists are using focus group research, as evidenced by the growing number of scholarly journal articles by sociologists, psychologists, and anthropologists employing this technique. Researchers using this method recruit 6-10 individuals as typical representatives of a particular community to discuss a given topic. For example, a focus group of parents with adopted children would be selected in a way that would permit extrapolation of the results to a wider population of such families. A moderator directs conversation toward the topic at hand while allowing for a broad discussion of other pertinent issues. For social scientists, focus group research allows for quick access to input on a selected topic from a variety of stakeholders, though it does not replace in-depth interviewing and other methods, which may yield additional insights.

Practitioners must also be familiar with field-specific methods since techniques can vary by domain. This is the case with rapid rural appraisal (RRA), which uses rapid and reliable ethnographic practices and survey methodologies such as iterative and dynamic interviewing to obtain information from those working in agricultural settings. PAR necessitates sustained partnerships with local communities in order to instill a sense of self-determination and empowerment through initiating a cycle of collective action and reflection by using anthropological methods. PAR requires dynamic engagement of collaborators who benefit the community by transforming it through investigating, analyzing, and educating. Although aspects of the methodology required may appear to be similar to traditional techniques, successful PAR requires practitioners to have training specifically in participatory arenas that require a different perspective than standard fields of study.

Critics note that many anthropologists do not feel it necessary to become trained in RAP methods in order to be qualified to employ them because of their similarity to traditional methods, but these techniques do differ, and their effectiveness relies on proper use. Another criticism is that because RAPs do not incorporate random sampling, generalization of results to wider populations typically cannot be made. However, there are methods for increasing reliability and applicability of RAP data, such as triangulation, which combines multiple methods to prove similar results. Generally, effective

and appropriate use of these new technologies and methodologies mandates additional training, for which experience is no substitute.

4.3. Collaboration

Conducting ethnography, though seemingly an independent enterprise, involves working with various stakeholders to study certain issues in the context of a community. Social realities of a community can have a profound impact not only on the histories and lives of the local people but also on the professional conduct of anthropologists in the field. In addition, new job conditions have made anthropological work increasingly interdisciplinary, often entailing a team of additional social scientists, biological or physical scientists, public officials, other professionals, and members of the study community. For example, urban anthropology is multidisciplinary—involving anthropologists, city planners, sociologists, architects, and other professionals.

Community-researcher partnerships are common in applied work, which inherently involves interaction with the study population as well as those who have a stake in the research results. In community development work applied anthropologists work in tandem with residents in the community, local scholars or experts, and civic leaders. They may also collaborate with other stakeholders such as funding agencies, technical assistants, and publishers to achieve a common goal. Many academically employed applied anthropologists collaborate with colleagues in their institutions, various funding agencies, and policy makers through university-based institutes and centers. Working collaboratively poses major challenges for all researchers, not just applied anthropologists, and requires practice and training to discern those social and cultural constructs that influence their partners' abilities and communications.

4.4. Professional Frameworks

Applied anthropologists require specialized education and skills as well as the support of other professionals to perform tasks that invariably change with employment conditions. Training in applied anthropology must build upon traditional anthropological knowledge and involve both common and innovative methodologies. Specifically, students must learn quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis methods to design empirical research that either tests a given hypotheses or answers a research question. Although there are job opportunities for those who hold an undergraduate anthropology degree and possess solid research and sophisticated data analysis skills, most applied anthropology work requires advanced education beyond the baccalaureate.

To increase employment possibilities, students should select an area of specialization while working toward a graduate degree by choosing electives and, potentially, additional degrees in substantive fields. Garnering an appropriate educational background that prepares them for the demands of interdisciplinary and collaborative work elevates anthropology students' chances of finding a job. Learning innovative and specialized techniques for a chosen field, as described earlier, is critical in graduate school. However, through continuing education, it is possible to acquire or enhance skills following the completion of a degree program. Affiliated professional meetings host workshops as well as provide opportunities for honing expertise with new practices, a part of professional growth.

Finding a mentor already working in a chosen field either inside or outside academia can help a student in a number of ways: in the selection of areas of concentration and coursework outside anthropology that will be beneficial in seeking employment; in the establishment of a network with faculty and other professionals to initiate and complete research projects, find employment, and locate funding; and

perhaps most importantly, in the enhancement of skills conducive to professional development. Most applied work requires expertise in oral and written communication to collaborate effectively with others, produce and disseminate information, and secure sources of financial support. Delivering presentations at professional conferences, writing term papers, assisting with faculty research projects, and completing practicums can help students acquire such abilities. Additional courses in publishing, website design, and public speaking may be taken to expand a repertoire of skills in order to best compete in the job market. The combination of such intensive educational preparation with extensive field experience will help the novice applied anthropologist develop a successful and lasting career.

Once an applied anthropologist is working professionally, practical guidance will help to ensure future success. Applied work demands diplomacy and field-specific knowledge to meet the new challenges of conducting research in the twenty-first century. Today, anthropologists rarely journey as unfettered individuals to remote areas; rather, they work with multiple collaborators across national boundaries in varying economies and political structures and are typically monitored by at least one agency. In light of this, contemporary professional applied anthropologists will benefit from a close familiarity with the information relevant to succeed in their work, such as:

- lists of practitioners in the same field who can assist in networking and provide critical personal references,
- lists of practitioners in the same field who can provide key citations for a topic,
- a current bibliography of relevant books and journal articles,
- a list of newsletters and other trade publications relevant to a chosen field,
- lists of international/domestic agencies and organizations/businesses that are important in the field for possible employment,
- field-specific training program information for future education,
- information regarding domain-relevant professional associations for further networking and available helpful forums,
- copies of domain-relevant laws to ensure that work is successful and not impeded by a failure to comply, and
- copies of current professional association ethical guidelines.

4.5. Ethics

Ethical behavior and professional integrity are extremely important for applied anthropologists, since their work tends to have a long-lasting and significant impact on the lifeways and ecosystems of the populations they study. Rules and standards that establish codes of conduct for anthropologists are found in the ethical guidelines of associations such as the SfAA, AAA, NAPA, and other professional organizations who developed them often in response to the questionable actions of certain individual anthropologists. During the early decades of anthropology's emergence as a discipline, some anthropologists pursued direct humanitarian agendas. Franz Boas, considered the father of American anthropology, developed the concept of cultural relativism in his 1907 research on immigrant children in the USA as a means to counter widespread eugenic and racist views. This approach espouses the view that all cultures are equal with regard to morality and ethics and that anthropologists should refrain from applying their own cultural belief systems in understanding the people they study. Many of Boas' students, including Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict among others, promoted cultural relativism to the extent that it would become integral to anthropological work.

In 1919, Boas instigated much debate within the discipline through his letter to *The Nation*, "Scientists as Spies," in which he criticized anthropologists supposedly conducting research during World War I while actually performing covert espionage. World War II brought additional attention to anthropological endeavors sometimes performed without a clear understanding of their possible impact. A particularly notorious incident took place in the Pacific where American anthropologist Cora Du Bois was studying the Alor as the war escalated. The Alorese had not previously encountered Americans, but because of the favorable impression they had formed of Du Bois, many expressed support of the Allies after she departed and, consequently, were slaughtered by the Japanese when they occupied the Indonesian island. During the postwar era, social scientists who had participated in their countries' war efforts were accused by some colleagues of being naïve in those activities and/or a tool of imperialism.

In fact, World War II atrocities strongly affected the status of many in the sciences, particularly when the Nuremberg trials of 1945–1949 uncovered the Nazis' horrific violations of basic human rights in the course of conducting their so-called 'scientific endeavors.' One result of these discoveries was the creation of the first professional code of ethics in anthropology, originally developed by the SfAA in 1949 (*Ethical & Professional Responsibilities*, available at sfaa.net/sfaaethic). Another was the World Medical Assembly's adoption of the Declaration of Helsinki in 1964, which established guidelines for the treatment of human subjects participating in scientific research. Soon after, in the USA, Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) were initiated to ensure that people involved as subjects in research were treated ethically and given the protection of confidentiality.

Another critical milestone in the development of ethical standards for research occurred in 1964. What became known as Project Camelot was seen by many anthropologists as an extreme example of how some governmental agencies abused anthropological expertise and knowledge in the pursuit of state interests. The project was an attempt by the U.S. military to control the politics of South American governments through counterinsurgency efforts disguised as studies of change in these third world countries. Many social scientists, including applied anthropologists, recognized that interference in the political and economic life of nations was a questionable research activity, and the project was terminated. This incident was highly instrumental in the AAA's development of an ethics committee in 1970 (case studies, committee reports, and the *Code of Ethics* are available at aaanet.org/committees/ethics/ethics.htm).

The U.S. conflict in Vietnam saw social scientists again involved in military efforts under the pretext of performing research. As the war diminished in the mid 1970s, it was discovered that social scientists ostensibly conducting fieldwork in Thailand were performing covert operations for the U.S. government. This led to intense debate within the discipline and subsequent revision of ethical guidelines. Another key influence was the passing of the U.S. National Research Act of 1974, which established the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research in response to the Tuskegee Syphilis Study. The commission identified basic ethical guidelines for ensuring the proper conduct of researchers using human subjects and required the implementation of informed consent in such research.

Even in the twenty-first century, ethical issues in anthropological work continue to surface. Patrick Tierney's book, *Darkness in El Dorado: How Scientists and Journalists Devastated the Amazon* (2000), sparked heated debate within the AAA over the conduct of James V. Neel and Napoleon Chagnon's research group in studying the Yanomami during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Tierney's allegations were sufficiently injurious and drew such extensive negative public attention to the discipline that the AAA initiated an El Dorado task force to examine the case. Although some

remediation was mandated by the task force, whose findings are still controversial, the main result was a renewed emphasis on informed consent.

Cases like El Dorado underscore the importance of securing informed consent in all anthropological work. Once reported, the findings of applied research remain largely outside the control of the anthropologist as the legal status of such materials as personal property is unclear. Practitioners should keep in mind that their findings can readily be appropriated and published in a variety of venues and that their fieldnotes may be potentially subpoenaed by a court of law when the researcher may become purview information about illegal activity during the course of the research. Also, because of the wide variety of anthropological work, ethical considerations may vary considerably. For instance, an anthropologist working for a corporation on a project to improve productivity may inadvertently supply information to employers that is used to fire personnel or make their jobs more difficult. Therefore, anthropologists need to thoroughly examine the potential impact of their findings and recommendations on people's lives while keeping in mind the needs of the funding agency and the study population. The 'correct' ethical position is often debatable, and the 'best practice' is not always clear-cut. Balancing the interests of various stakeholders is part of what makes applied work all the more challenging and dependent on a strong ethical commitment.

Since the relationships between applied anthropologists and the people they study have changed substantially with the advent of participatory and action research, the anthropologist must have the ability to make sound professional judgments, often with minimal time for reflection. They must work diligently to maintain subject confidentiality, especially since information is so much more easily obtained and disseminated given the relatively easy access to technologically advanced information systems. Applied anthropologists must dissect words, make informed choices, and assess possible impacts to ensure that research is performed ethically and contributes not only to the advancement of their own career but also to the positive status of the discipline. A single instance of mishandling ethical issues can damage the reputation of all applied anthropologists. Building a professional framework with knowledge of contemporary ethical guidelines and field-related laws offers practitioners a substantial foundation for appropriately responding to a sponsor's demands and making sound and ethical decisions. Additional professional guidance can be obtained from scholarly sources, such as Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban's *Ethics and the Profession of Anthropology*, and from ethical institutions and organizations, such as the online Ethics Resource Center (www.ethics.org). While ethical judgments are not always immediately apparent in applied work, serious consideration of ethical issues is an important aspect of any such work.

5. Emerging Inclinations

Some anthropologists view applied work as an integral part of the entire discipline of anthropology, diffused throughout all four fields, but its substantial, growing status and increasing visibility in online and printed publications has and will continue to build a solid recognition of applied anthropology as a distinct field. Cross-fertilization with other social sciences, as collaborative and multidisciplinary work increases, will become ever more representative of mainstream anthropology, offering further support in establishing applied anthropology as a subfield. In the future, applied anthropologists should expect to find broadened acceptability within the discipline, increased community involvement in their work, heightened collaboration and interdisciplinary efforts, and continuous expansion of the domains of application and applied methodology.

The public anthropology movement, in which practitioners focus efforts on taking work outside universities and into the community, will probably continue to expand and eventually be encompassed by the discipline as a whole. This movement reflects the greater involvement of subjects in the planning and implementation of research and requires that applied anthropologists change their perspective to express the voice of those being studied, rather than that of the researcher. In addition, applied anthropologists need to make greater efforts to convey their knowledge to lay people and participate more in public discourse.

Applied anthropologists working outside academic settings have tended to publish the results of their research less often than their academic counterparts. The venues for publication, however, have expanded a great deal. In addition to *Human Organization*, the flagship journal of the SfAA, relevant applied and practitioner publications include *Practicing Anthropology*, *NAPA Bulletins*, and the *High Plains Applied Anthropologist*. Technology has also increased the availability of relevant literature on applied work through publication on websites and through online resources for electronic versions of myriad publications, such as the AAA's *AnthroSource* (www.anthrosource.net). In turn, this has multiplied opportunities for communicating findings and the development of new theoretical perspectives and methods, as well as for utilizing new forums that bypass more traditional anthropological journals, which have historically shied away from publishing applied work.

Globalization trends and advanced technologies are altering every scholarly and practical sphere of the discipline of anthropology, resulting in a greater awareness of the impact of consumer societies, industrial cooperatives, credit unions, and emerging free-market economies on nearly every aspect of people's lives. One topic of increasing interest concerns the sustainability of natural resources as such resources dwindle or become more difficult to access. A greater understanding of environmental and ecological impacts is necessary as development pervades every continent, even those areas formerly considered uninhabitable. The effects upon traditional cultural patterns of a nexus of factors, including commercialization, mass communication, transportation, and marketing, are also of great interest. For example, junk and fast food are replacing more healthy diet choices around the world, thereby advancing concerns about globesity, the trend toward greater body fat indexes evident in communities in both industrial and non-industrial nations.

The entire discipline is being forced to recognize the permeating effects of global changes and the increasingly applied nature of anthropological work with emerging areas of interest, including mega-urbanization, migration, the resurgence of ethnic identity movements, and the expansion of religious fundamentalism. Innovative practices and new fields of study incorporated by applied anthropologists to meet the challenges of a global twenty-first century will stimulate the discipline to embrace such work on levels never before seen. In preparation for this, applied anthropologists must hone their skills in diplomacy, collaboration, and oral and written communication to raise the stakes for disciplinary recognition and to make the scholarly engagement of applied work more relevant.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank John van Willigen, Heidi Kenaga, and Margaret Kedia for their insightful comments on the earlier drafts of this document. Appreciation is also due to Julie Grady for her valuable assistance with the literature review and copy-editing on this manuscript.

Glossary

AAA: American Anthropological Association, the national anthropological organization in the USA, founded in 1902.

BAE: Bureau of American Ethnology, created in 1879 as part of the U.S. Smithsonian Institution.

BARA: The Bureau of Applied Research in Anthropology, originally called the Bureau of Ethnic Research, the first applied anthropology unit at a U.S. university, founded in 1952 at the University of Arizona. BARA is dedicated to solving the socioeconomic problems of communities.

BIA: The Bureau of Indian Affairs of the USA, created by John Collier in the mid 1930s to promote anthropology as a practical endeavor.

COPAA: The Consortium of Practicing and Applied Anthropology Programs, founded in 2000 to network academic programs with a commitment to educating master's and doctoral students explicitly in applied and practicing anthropology.

HPSfAA: The High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology, a regional society founded in 1980.

IRB: Institutional Review Board.

IUAES: The International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences, founded in 1948 as a forum for scholarly and practical undertakings by the growing number of anthropologists worldwide.

LPO: Local practitioner organization.

NAPA: The National Association for the Practice of Anthropology created in 1983 as a section of the AAA.

NGO: Non-governmental organization.

PAR: Participatory action research is a type of rapid assessment procedure (RAP) that requires dynamic engagement of all collaborators and sustained partnerships between the anthropologist(s) and the local community involved.

RAP: Rapid assessment procedures are methodological strategies used to meet short deadlines that also serve as exploratory research for planning or a basis for long-term research and are often based on ethnographic techniques tailored to the needs of short-term applied projects

REAP: Rapid ethnographic assessment procedures.

RRA: Rapid rural appraisal uses rapid and reliable ethnographic practices and survey methodologies to obtain information from those working in agricultural settings

SfAA: The Society for Applied Anthropology, founded in 1941, is the key international organization for applied anthropologists, especially for those in the USA.

Sondeo techniques: Rapid reconnaissance or rapid appraisal methods for situational assessments used to obtain more insights and information in less time than a formal survey for a good sense of the situation. Such techniques are still emerging but have been employed in many farm case studies and community development projects and have been mentioned by Cernea among other well-known practicing anthropologists as a sound method for inquiry.

SOPA: The Society of Professional Anthropologists, founded in 1975; although it lasted for less than a decade, it helped spawn other similar LPOs.

SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

UNICEF: The United Nations International Children's Fund, an NGO created in 1946 dedicated to improving the lives of children globally by influencing decision makers and partnering with grassroots groups.

WAPA: The Washington Association of Professional Anthropologists, an LPO founded in 1976.

Bibliography

Cassell, J. and S.E. Jacobs, eds. (1987). *Handbook on Ethical Issues in Anthropology, AAA Special Publications 23*. Washington DC: American Anthropological Association. [Although this handbook on ethics is somewhat dated, this does not preclude its usefulness in contemporary endeavors as it imparts excellent advice for applied anthropologists to consider.]

Chambers, E. (1996). Practicing anthropology. *Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology*, ed. D. Levinson and M. Ember, 1009–1014. New York: Henry Holt and Company. [This entry discusses the recent debates regarding practicing versus applied anthropology in the United States.]

Doyle, W.R. (2004). *A Report on the Field of Anthropology in the United States*. New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation. Retrieved February 4, 2005, from http://www.wennergren.org/news-doyle-report.pdf. [This report contains information on degrees, demographics, and comparisons among the social sciences in the United States.]

Eriksen, T.H. and F.S. Nielsen. (2001). *A History of Anthropology*. Part of the Anthropology, Culture and Society series, ed. T.H. Eriksen, K. Gardner, and J.P. Mitchell. Sterling, VA: Pluto Press. Available in part at http://www.anthrobase.com/Browse/home/hst/. [This book offers a detailed and thorough history of anthropology internationally.]

Ervin, A.M. (1990). *Applied Anthropology: Tools and Perspectives for Contemporary Practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. [This book represents one of the important resources for applied anthropology students.]

Fiske, S. and E. Chambers. (1996). The inventions of practice. *Human Organization* 55 (1): 1–12. [This article debates the ways scholars view practicing and applied anthropology.]

Kedia, S. (2005). Practicing anthropology. *Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, ed. H.J. Birx. [This essay on the field of practicing anthropology offers much historical context and discusses the differences between practicing and applied, as well as myriad career roles, practical and professional skills.]

Kedia, S. and J. van Willigen, eds. (2005). *Applied Anthropology: Domains of Application*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group. [This book offers a thorough commentary on contemporary applied anthropology practices, detailed in a set of individually authored chapters on domains of application and future trends. An introduction offers historical information and a conclusion discusses future trends.]

Schensul, J.J. and M.D. LeCompte, eds. (1999). *Ethnographer's Toolkit*, 7 vols. Walnut Creek, CA.: AltaMira Press [A seven-volume book set that thoroughly covers ethnographic techniques for field researchers.]

van Willigen, J. (2002). *Applied Anthropology: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. Westport, CT.: Bergin and Garvey. [This book comprises a description, history, and essential aspects of applied anthropology.]

van Willigen, J. (1987). *NAPA Bulletin 3−Becoming a Practicing Anthropologist: A Guide to Careers and Training Programs in Applied Anthropology*. Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association (AAA). [This NAPA Bulletin offers realistic guidelines for professional conduct and becoming successful in an anthropological career.]

Biographical Sketches

Dr. Satish Kedia is an Associate Professor of Anthropology and Director of the Institute for Substance Abuse Treatment Evaluation (I-SATE) at The University of Memphis. He received his PhD with a concentration in Applied and Medical Anthropology from the University of Kentucky in 1997. The same year, he received a certificate in Medical Behavioral Sciences from the Medical School at the University of Kentucky. Dr. Kedia's research interests include the health impacts of development projects, alcohol and drug abuse evaluation, caregiving and compliance issues associated with HIV/AIDS and cerebral palsy, and pesticide use and integrated pest management. Over the last twelve years, he has conducted fieldwork in India, the Philippines, and the USA. His research in India focuses on health impacts of involuntary resettlement among the Garhwali in the central Himalayas. Since 1998, he has also been doing extensive applied work with the Bureau of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services at the Tennessee Department of Health, conducting statewide program evaluation for substance abuse treatment and disseminating findings in numerous formats. Dr. Kedia has published fifteen journal articles, book chapters, and encyclopedia entries and more than thirty evaluation and policy reports. Most recently, he co-edited and contributed to *Applied Anthropology: Domains of Application*, a collection of contributions by several applied anthropologists discussing their given field of interest.

Dr. Linda A. Bennett is a Professor of Anthropology and Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at The University of Memphis. She completed her PhD in Anthropology at American University in 1976. Past president of the SfAA, NAPA, and WAPA, and co-founder of the Alcohol & Drug Study Group of the Society for Medical Anthropology, Dr. Bennett is currently a member of the Executive Board of the AAA. In collaboration with other leaders in applied anthropology programs in 2000, Dr. Bennett founded the Consortium of Practicing and Applied Anthropology Programs (COPAA). She is co-editor of *The American Experience with Alcohol* (1985), co-author of *The Alcoholic Family* (1987), editor of *A Russian-English Language Guide for Adopting Families*, and author of *Personal Choice in Ethnic Identity Maintenance: Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes in Washington, D.C.* (1978). Dr. Bennett has conducted fieldwork in medical anthropology in the former Yugoslavia, especially Croatia, and in the USA. She has also performed ethnic identity research in Washington DC and Pittsburgh. Recently she has worked on a collaborative study of rituals and routines in Memphis, Tennessee. At The University of Memphis, she received the Meritorious Faculty Award in the College of Arts and Sciences (1999) and the Board of Visitors' Eminent Faculty Award (2003).