2

The Development of Applied
Anthropology

This chapter interprets the history of the development of applied anthropology as it is currently practiced in the United States, with some reference to developments in other countries. The sequence of development is divided into five periods, which are defined on the basis of interpretations of the different kinds of practice done by applied anthropologists. In addition, the chapter also comments upon changes that are occurring in contemporary applied anthropology. This chapter is based upon the review of materials in the Applied Anthropology Documentation Project, as well as such published sources as Eddy and Partridge (1978b), Goldschmidt (1979), Spicer (1977), Mead (1977), and van Willigen (1991).

Awareness of history does much to reduce the antipathy that exists between theoretical and applied anthropologists. Historic awareness teaches a number of important points, perhaps most important among them, that the theoretical realm is historically based on application. While this is increasingly recognized, many continue to view theoretical anthropology, inappropriately, as the genitor. The fundamental reason for this is that applied anthropology tends not to be published in traditional formats and therefore exists primarily as "fugitive literature" (Clark and van Willigen 1981). Thus, while we are continually made aware of the historic development of theoretical anthropology through the literature, the historic development of applied anthropology and its relationship to the formation of the discipline is muted by the lack of documentation. This problem is especially acute in the earliest phases of the history of the field. While some of the experiences from the past are no longer applicable in new contexts, many current activities would benefit from knowledge of the past. To paraphrase a comment made by Karl Heider in a discussion of the history of the ethnographic film, those who don't understand the history of applied anthropology will be lucky enough to repeat it (Heider 1976). George Foster expresses clearly the importance of understanding history: "Current forms and place of applied anthropology

within the broad discipline can be fully appreciated only with knowledge of the several stages of its development'' (1969:181). This chapter attempts to define the ''several stages.''

From my perspective, there are five stages: the predisciplinary stage, the applied ethnology stage, the federal service stage, the role-extension, value-explicit stage, and the policy research stage. The scheme as presented is additive. That is, general patterns of practice that emerged in earlier periods are continued in subsequent stages. The discussion of each stage includes the identification of the rationalization for the dating of the stage, a discussion of the primary patterns of practice with some examples, and a discussion of those external factors that seem to be relevant for the formation of the key patterns of practice. In reading this chapter it is important to keep in mind that the discipline is also changing. Especially significant among these changes is the radical change in the scale of the discipline.

THE PREDISCIPLINARY STAGE (Pre–1860)

If we consider early historic sources that deal with cultural interrelationships, we find recognition of the usefulness of cross-cultural data to solve problems identified in an administrative or policy context. This is most common in contexts of expansive political and economic systems. In the case of early recorders of cross-cultural description, such as Herodotus (circa 485-325 B.C.), or Lafitau (1671-1746), their basic motivation was to provide information for some practical purpose. Virtually all proto-anthropology of the predisciplinary stage was representative of a kind of applied work. Most frequently, as in the case of Herodotus, the research was done to gather data about potential enemies or colonial subjects. In the case of Lafitau, the purpose was to inform plans for trade and marketing expansion. Later, it is possible to find examples of proto-anthropology being used to provide research data to support certain philosophical or theological positions. Although Thomas Aquinas (1225-74) wrote about kinship and incest rules, he was attempting to support current church marriage laws (Honigmann 1976:2).

There are very early cases where cross-culturally informed administrators used their knowledge to facilitate better ''culture contact.'' During the Middle Ages, Pope Gregory urged his missionaries to the Irish to link Catholic saints' days to pagan Irish ceremonies and to convert animal sacrifices to forms more appropriate for newly converted Catholics (Honigmann 1976:45). Later, the most typical activities of the period included individuals appointed to carry out basic cultural research to assist in the administration of an area. A very early example of this is Francis Buchanan's appointment in 1807 by the East India Company to study life and culture in Bengal (Sachchidananda 1972). With increasing cross-cultural contact in the colonial period, more and more concern over the welfare of native populations developed. This can be observed in the establishment of such organizations as the Aborigines Protection Society, founded in London in 1838;

(Keith 1917; Reining 1962). The society was concerned with both research and social service for native populations.

In the predisciplinary stage it is possible to point to a number of examples of social reformers, ministers, and administrators who were able to make use of cultural knowledge in order to carry out the tasks at hand. This includes such documented cases as the work of Hinrich Rink, who served as an administrator for the Danish Government of Greenland. Rink, trained as a natural historian, contributed to the early development of self-determination among Greenland natives in the 1860s (Nellemann 1969).

There are a number of North American examples of early usages. Perhaps the earliest documented is the ethnological work of the Jesuit priest, Father Joseph Lafitau. Posted to New France as a missionary, Lafitau set about to document life in the Northeast. This resulted in the publication of *Customs of the American Indians Compared with the Customs of Primitive Times* (1724). While this is framed as a theoretical work, he did engage in various practical studies. One such inquiry was his quest for ginseng, a medicinal herb in the woodlands bordering the St. Lawrence. Introduced from Asia to Europe by a fellow Jesuit, ginseng became much sought after in European markets. Lafitau attempted to find the plant in North America. To do this he sought the help of Mohawk herbalists, whom he interviewed about native plant knowledge and other topics. This inquiry seemed to lead him to more general research, which contributed to his compendium on customs. He did find ginseng and became well known for this (Lafitau 1724; Fenton and Moore 1974).

An interesting example from the United States is the work of Henry R. Schoolcraft, one of the founders of the American Ethnological Society. Schoolcraft was retained by the United States Congress to compile *Information Respecting the History, Condition and Prospects of the Indian Tribes of the United States* (Schoolcraft 1852-1857). This imposing six-volume set is nothing if not a policy research report. It was prepared with the explicit purpose of providing reliable information upon which to base United States Indian policy. Schoolcraft started his career as an American Indian specialist as an administrator. His professional identity as an ethnologist emerged with the development of the discipline; his career paralleled changes that occurred within applied anthropology. The missionary work of William Duncan among various Northwest Indian groups serves as an example of the impact of a cross-culturally informed change agent. Working in the 1860s, Duncan made significant efforts in the area of social reform (Barnett 1942).

In this period there were some examples of the development of ethnologically informed training programs for colonial officers. Great Britain started such programs in 1806, and the Netherlands offered such programs by 1819. There is no evidence for such developments in the United States.

To summarize, contemporary anthropologists have rather little to learn about the methodology of application from the predisciplinary stage. Documentation is poor, and therefore it is difficult to develop a sense of the nature of the

approaches used. The one important lesson to be learned is that anthropology in its prototypical stage had an important applied component. This contradicts the idea that applied anthropology somehow grew out of general anthropology. Later it becomes clear that the foundation of general anthropology is application and practice. The most objective view would suggest that the proto-anthropologists, for the most part, did their general interest work on the basis of what were applied research assignments. This stage ends with the emergence of anthropology as a distinct discipline. Here we use 1860 as a starting point, following Voget's view of the history of the discipline (1975:115).

THE APPLIED ETHNOLOGY STAGE (1860-1930)

With the emergence of anthropology as a distinct discipline, the basic style of applied work typical of the next seventy years is manifested. Typically, the applied anthropologists of this stage worked as training or research specialists in support of government or private foundation-supported administrative programs. For the most part, these efforts supported the establishment of direct administrative control over native populations in internal and external colonial settings. Later in the stage, applied anthropologists carried out the same pattern of activity in the context of development programs. It is important to emphasize. that the anthropologist's role tended to be limited to providing data for policy making and problem solving. Very rarely were anthropologists involved as administrators or change agents. There were a number of administrators that became anthropologists, however.

The ethnology phase is very long, and is marked by significant changes in anthropology itself. This stage covers the transition from the dominance of classical evolution theory to the structural-functionalism and historical anthropology of the 1920s. The other significant process that occurred between the beginning and end of this period was the institutionalization of the discipline. That is, the basic infrastructure of a scientific discipline was formed. Professional associations were organized, degree programs were established, academic departments were formed as a body of knowledge grew and accumulated.

A fundamentally important fact that is not acknowledged in the literature on the history of anthropology is that applied anthropology served as the foundation for the development of much disciplinary infrastructure. This can be seen in four contexts. The earliest learned societies in anthropology developed out of associations that were primarily concerned with application and social reform (Reining 1962, Keith 1917). The first organizations that hired anthropologists in the United States were policy research organizations (Powell 1881, Hinsley 1976). The first academic department of anthropology at Oxford University was established on the basis of a justification to train colonial administrators, that is as a kind of applied anthropology training program (Fortes 1953). The first use of the term applied anthropology occurred in a description of the program at Oxford

(Read 1906). The first professional code of ethics in anthropology was developed by an applied anthropology organization (Mead, Chapple, and Brown 1949).

While the effects of application on the discipline were significant, the basic approaches to using anthropological knowledge remained the same throughout the period. For the most part, anthropologists carried out their research activities using an explicitly "value-free" approach. In fact, anthropologists writing in support of limiting anthropology to the style characteristic of this era often argued that their utility would be dramatically impaired if they did not approach their research from a "value-free" perspective. This was also done in conjunction with issues relating to role extension. Anthropologists argued that the anthropologist *qua* anthropologist cannot legitimately engage in roles other than the core consultant's role. This view was argued repeatedly and effectively until rather late in this particular period in the development of applied anthropology. The essence of this position is simply that when the anthropologist extends her role beyond that of researcher-consultant-instructor she is no longer an anthropologist, she is acting as some other kind of specialist. Others held that involvement beyond the core role required that the value-free position often stressed had to be relinquished.

An early manifestation of anthropology in the United States took the form of the Bureau of American Ethnology (BAE). The BAE is known to us today as a basic research institute. It was, in fact, created as a policy research arm of the federal government. The bureau's first Annual Report notes that it was founded to "produce results that would be of practical value in the administration of Indian affairs" (Powell 1881). The label used to describe this stage, "applied ethnology," was coined by James Mooney for a discussion of the BAE's commitment to policy research in the 1902 Annual Report (Hinsley 1976). Mooney's claims for political relevance were not hollow: his classic account of the Ghost Dance Religion is described by Anthony Wallace as an early policy study done in anthropology (Mooney 1896; Wallace 1976).

The creation of the BAE antedates the organization of the first academic anthropology department in the United States, at Clark University, by a number of years. The bureau served as a model for the social research foundation of some American colonial administration experiences. A similar organization was established by the American government, in the Philippines, in 1906, which was directed by Albert E. Jenks (Kennard and MacGregor 1953). According to Hinsley, the Bureau of American Ethnology's involvement in policy studies lasted only until Charles C. Royce's study of Indian land cessions was published in 1899 (Hinsley 1979).

There are examples of privately sponsored research from this period. One such example is the work of the Women's Anthropological Society of Washington. This organization supported research into the apparently deplorable housing conditions of Washington, D.C. As an outcome of this research an organization was established to improve the quality of housing to the poor. This research was done in 1896 (Schensul and Schensul 1978).

Franz Boas, although not usually thought of as an applied anthropologist, completed some important policy research. Most noteworthy is his research sponsored by the United States Immigration Commission. He documented morphological changes in the substantial United States immigrant population. The research contradicted a number of racist ideas concerning the impact of immigration on the American population. Boas was, of course, a committed anti-racist. This research was published in 1910. Also related to the issue of United States immigration was the work of Albert Jenks at the University of Minnesota. He established an Americanization training course for immigrants in conjunction with the existing anthropology curriculum (Jenks 1921).

As early as 1864, ethnological studies were included in the colonial service training program of the Netherlands (Held 1953; Kennedy 1944). Such training was developed for the Union of South Africa in 1905 (Forde 1953), Anglo-Egyptian Sudan in 1908 (Myres 1928), Belgian territories in 1920 (Nicaise 1960), and Australian-mandated New Guinea in 1925. This type of training was not emphasized in the United States. As colonial administrative experience increased there seemed to be more interest in ethnological training.

The British also made early and intensive use of anthropologists as government staff or contract research consultants. Anthropologists or anthropologically trained administrators provided research products ranging from short-term trouble-shooting to long-term basic research. Such individuals were hired by the foreign office, colonial office, and India office, as well as the military.

During the applied ethnology period there was significant growth and development in applied anthropology. This growth occurred in certain sectors, but was, with few exceptions, limited to research or instructional activities. These developments occurred most dramatically in the United States, Great Britain, Mexico, and the Netherlands. Most typically the activities consisted of the following: first, a number of anthropologists were involved in instruction of government personnel for administrative positions in cross-cultural settings. Second, there are a number of examples of short-term troubleshooting research in which the anthropologist provided cultural data to an administration to solve a problem that had developed precipitously; in some locales, the anthropologist-on-staff seemed to be retained for this purpose. Third, anthropologists were also hired to carry out research in various problem areas at the request of administrators. These activities included national and regional ethnographic surveys, single-culture focused ethnographies, and topic-specialized single-culture ethnographies.

During this era, applied activities made a significant and often overlooked contribution to the anthropological literature. The typical output of anthropologists during this period were research reports. If we consider the output of anthropologists hired to do problem-oriented research for the government or other sponsoring agencies, it becomes apparent that much of the distinguished ethnographic literature produced in the first half of the twentieth century was a

product of applied efforts. This is particularly apparent in African and Pacific ethnography done by British social anthropologists, and North and South American ethnography done by anthropologists from the United States and Mexico.

In summary, during the applied ethnology stage the policy research and administrative training needs of governments were an important stimulus both for early applied work and for the establishment of much organizational infrastructure for the basic discipline. Most applied anthropologists functioned in roles confined to research and teaching. The effects of applied anthropology on the basic discipline consisted largely of stimulating research in new areas and topics. And importantly, the potential for application was used as a justification for the establishment of many of the important academic programs.

THE FEDERAL SERVICE STAGE (1930-1945)

With the coming of the Great Depression and the New Deal, the number of anthropologists employed in application grew dramatically in the United States. This related to an apparent increased need for information on the part of government, as well as a need to provide jobs for anthropologists. It is important to note that the annual production of anthropologists was still quite small. At the same time the academic job market was very limited until World War II. The intensification of anthropological employment in applied work reached a climax with the war. This period is named for the dominant kind of employment.

During the period of federal service, anthropologists came to work in an increasingly large number of problem areas and political contexts. Further, it is apparent that the work of anthropologists improved in quality and appropriateness. In terms of problem orientation the research seemed initially to focus on general ethnography. Later, the research typical of applied anthropologists came to include education, nutrition, culture contact, migration, land tenure, and various other topics. This pattern is particularly characteristic of the development in British colonial territories, but can be applied to describe the development of applied anthropology in the United States as well. Foster suggests at least one difference between the subdiscipline as it was practiced by its British and American practitioners: "the interest of Britain's applied anthropologists in the social aspects of technological development has been relatively modest as compared to that of the Americans" (1969:194).

In the United States a number of applied research organizations were created during this period. One of the first of these groups was the Applied Anthropology Unit established in the Office of Indian Affairs. The purpose of the unit was to review the prospects of certain American Indian tribes to develop self-governance organizations in response to the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934. Research topics included settlement patterns, education policy, and prospects for economic development (Collier 1936; Mekeel 1944; Rodnick 1936; Thompson 1956). The researchers produced a number of reports that had very little impact on the policy-making process. The Applied Anthropology Unit was created by John

Collier, who had been appointed Commissioner of Indian Affairs by Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932. Collier's advocacy of the utility of anthropology is widely viewed as crucial to the rapid expansion of federal employment of anthropologists.

At approximately the same time, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) received the services of a group of anthropologists employed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This program, referred to as the Technical Cooperation Bureau of Indian Affairs, carried out projects relating to economic and resource development on various Indian reservations (Kennard and MacGregor 1953). This group worked in conjunction with various physical scientists, such as geologists, hydrologists, agronomists, and soil conservationists, and produced various studies on the sociocultural aspects of environmental problems. Similar use of anthropologists occurred in the large-scale research project carried out by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in the Rio Grande Basin of the United States (Provinse 1942; Kimball and Provinse 1942). Analysis was directed at Native American, Mexican-American, and Anglo-American residents of the Southwest. Research focused on the cultural factors that had influenced land use.

Involvement of anthropologists in the study of policy questions among rural American communities increased from this point well into the war years. This took a variety of forms. For example, some anthropologists participated in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Rural Life Studies, which produced a series of six community studies that focused on community potential for change. Perhaps most interesting among the policy research done by anthropologists in rural America was that of Walter Goldschmidt, who was involved in a number of studies for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics. These included a study of war mobilization in a rural California county and a study of the political economy of agribusiness in the San Joaquin valley of California. The second study produced a classic account of economic exploitation and led to Goldschmidt's vilification by vested interests in California's agribusiness (1947).

During the mid-1930s early use of anthropology in the context of nursing occurred with the work of Esther Lucille Brown. In addition, pioneering work in educational policy studies were carried out in American Indian education in the form of the Pine Ridge and Sherman-California vocational education surveys.

In 1941, the Indian Personality and Administration Research Project was established. For the most part this was a policy-focused basic research project, which resulted in a number of useful studies of American Indian reservation life, including Papago (Joseph, Spicer, and Chesky 1949), Hopi (Thompson and Joseph 1944), Navajo (Kluckhohn and Leighton 1946; Leighton and Leighton 1944), Sioux (MacGregor 1946), and Zuni (Leighton and Adair 1946). One aspect of this project made use of action research methodology, which exemplifies the primary change associated with this stage. Action research was developed outside of anthropology, largely by psychologist Kurt Lewin. Laura Thompson

applied this technique to stimulate change in Hopi administration. Thompson's description of the technique is cited below:

Action research is normally distinguished by the following characteristics: (1) it stems from an urgent practical problem, a felt need on the part of a group, and is generally solicited voluntarily by the potential users of the findings; (2) it involves both scientists and the user-volunteers as participants in a cooperative effort—namely, the solving of the practical problem; and (3) the scientists involved normally function both as scientist-technicians and as integrative or "democratic" leaders in Kurt Lewin's sense of the term. That is, they endeavor to stimulate, draw out, and foster the talents and leadership qualities of the members of the participant group and to minimize their own roles except as catalysts of group potentialities. In their role as integrative leaders, the staff scientists train and supervise the work of the volunteer user-participant. (Thompson 1950:34)

Also indicative of the expansion into new research areas during this period was the work of the anthropologists associated with the Committee on Human Relations in Industry at the University of Chicago. Included among the anthropologists associated with the committee were W. Lloyd Warner and Burleigh B. Gardner. This period saw major advancements in what came to be called the scientific study of management. The most significant project was the classic Western Electric, Hawthorn Works study of the relationships between working conditions and productivity. This area of work developed very rapidly for a period of time.

The National Research Council established at least two research committees that were to have significant impacts on policy research done by anthropologists in this period. These included the Committee on Food Habits, which included Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, and Rhoda Metraux, among others. This group was to obtain scientific information on nutritional levels of the American population. Also established was the Committee for National Morale, consisting of Gregory Bateson, Elliot Chapple, and Margaret Mead, among others. This committee was to determine how anthropology and psychology could be applied to the improvement of national morale during the war.

This stage in the development of applied anthropology started in the national crisis caused by the Great Depression and concluded in the crisis of war. The intensification of involvement in application caused by World War II is astounding. Mead (1977) estimates that over 95 percent of American anthropologists were involved with work in support of the war effort during the 1940s. By way of contrast, the war in Vietnam had very much the opposite effect on anthropologists. In 1941, the American Anthropological Association passed a resolution placing the "specialized skill and knowledge of its members, at the disposal of the country for the successful prosecution of the war" (American Anthropological Association 1942:42). This effort seemed to increase the self-awareness of applied anthropologists, as well as their concentration in Washington and other places.

Perhaps the most well-known war effort involvements by American anthropologists are the activities on behalf of the War Relocation Authority. The War Relocation Authority was responsible for managing the internment camps established early in the war to incarcerate Japanese-Americans. The use of social scientists grew out of the experiences of the one camp that was under the administrative responsibility of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. At that time the BIA was directed by John Collier. In response to the problems that developed at the other camps, social science programs were developed at all War Relocation Authority facilities (Arensberg 1942; Kimball 1946; Leighton et al. 1943; Spicer 1946a, 1946b). The anthropologists who served in the camps served as liaisons between inmates and camp administration, and as researchers. This involvement by anthropologists is frequently characterized as unethical, being viewed by some as supportive of an illegal and inhumane government program. If one reads their writings or discusses this involvement with them it is clear that they viewed themselves as, ameliorators of a potentially much worse situation. One should read Rosemary Wax's chilling account of her experiences as a community analyst in a camp to get some feeling for the problem (Wax 1971).

In addition to the War Relocation Authority, anthropologists were involved in a variety of other programs. The Far Eastern Civil Affairs Training School was established to prepare administrators for areas that were being recaptured from the Japanese by the Allies. This operation, established at the University of Chicago, was headed by anthropologist Fred Eggan (Embree 1949). The Foreign Morale Analysis Division was created within the Office of War Information. Using various data sources, this organization reported intelligence on the Japanese and other adversaries to the Departments of War, State, and Navy. Some of the information was collected from internment camp inmates. Benedict's *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* (1946) was a by-product of this operation.

' During the war the Smithsonian Institution initiated a number of activities that had significant applied research components. The Institute of Social Anthropology of the Smithsonian, established in 1943, engaged in both basic and applied research projects. The applied activities included very early use of anthropological research to plan and evaluate health programs. The applied aspect of the Institute of Social Anthropology's research program developed under the leadership of George M. Foster. Contemporary applied medical anthropology was, to a large extent, shaped by the program of the Institute of Social Anthropology.

Also of interest are the various war-related compilation and publication programs. These include the Civil Affairs Handbooks published by the Chief of Naval Operations on Japanese-held Pacific territories, and the Handbook of South American Indians published as part of a program to promote relations with Latin America. In addition to the efforts mentioned here, there were activities related to the immediate postwar period. These included research into the effects of the nuclear attack on Japanese cities (Leighton 1949), and studies of occupation problems (Bennett 1951; Gladwin 1950; Embree 1946; Hall 1949; Rodnick 1948).

It is quite clear that applied anthropology grew dramatically during this period and that the major cause was employment opportunities with the federal government relating to the depression and war. One of the products of this expansion was the organization of the Society for Applied Anthropology. Spicer refers to this as "one of the most important events in the development of anthropology in the twentieth century" (1976:335). Now over fifty years old, the society has gone through considerable change and development through the years. In its early phases the society seemed most concerned with bringing together social scientists and administrators, reporting cases where anthropological knowledge had been usefully applied, and advocating the idea that there existed an applicable body of anthropological theory (Spicer 1976:336). An important component of the program of the Society for Applied Anthropology was the publication of the journal *Applied Anthropology*, which was subsequently named *Human Organization*.

The Society for Applied Anthropology developed around local interest groups in Washington, D.C. and Cambridge, Massachusetts, and then subsequently expanded to a national membership. The changes in the Society for Applied Anthropology will be discussed in conjunction with the next two periods in the history of American applied anthropology. In the early days of the society's existence most activities of the organization were directed at creating a professional identity for applied anthropologists.

This period saw major changes in applied anthropology. These included dramatic intensification of involvement of anthropologists in application and the development of a more definite professional identity through the creation of the Society for Applied Anthropology and its publications. For the most part, applied anthropology roles were still limited to policy researcher and trainer, the roles that dominated both the applied ethnology and predisciplinary stages. There are some examples of pioneering assumption of change-producing, action-involved roles, which are a striking feature of the next phase, the value-explicit, role-extension phase.

THE ROLE EXTENSION, VALUE-EXPLICIT STAGE (1945-1970)

The historic course of the development of applied anthropology up to 1945 is characterized by relatively little change in the applied anthropologist's operational strategy. From the initial professionalization of the discipline, around the middle of the nineteenth century, there was little deviation from the core applied anthropology role, which might best be labeled "instructor-researcher-consultant." The history of the field up to 1945 is characterized by continued elaboration of this theme.

The basic pattern of the applied ethnology stage became elaborated as it became more widely accepted by both anthropological producers and administrative consumers. It is inappropriate to suggest that the acceptance of applied anthro-

pology was complete or even extensive. It became more and more useful, more and more important, but one senses a certain reluctance to participate in applied roles. A cadre of applied anthropologists did not develop as such, but a group of anthropologists did exist who oscillated between academic and applied appointments. Further, much employment was in service to colonial regimes (Asad 1973). This may have related to the historic tendency to switch back to academic careers.

In any case, the radical critique of applied anthropology derived a great deal of its impact from an analysis of the anthropologists who served in these capacities (for example, Horowitz 1967; Gough 1968; Berreman 1969; Hymes 1974; Moore 1971). We are faced with an evaluation dilemma, however, for even an unsympathetic review of these efforts reveals that most anthropologists were struggling to increase the fairness and humaneness of various domestic and international colonial systems. To be sure, the anthropological perspective was more ameliorative than revolutionary, and given the power relations extant, it would seem fair to assume that the most positive impact of anthropology on colonialism could be achieved within the system. As history became reconstructed in the postcolonial period, these anthropologists took the brunt of various aggressive criticisms.

The shift in applied anthropology practice that occurred in this stage can be best understood in terms of three basic changes. First, the range of legitimate roles for applied anthropologists expanded beyond the researcher-instructor-consultant core. With role extension came increases in the intensity of participation, that is, the number of aspects of a particular applied problem with which the anthropologist dealt. Anthropologists became more directly involved in implementation and intervention. Instead of merely providing information and an occasional recommendation, anthropologists began to take responsibility for problem solution. Anthropologists were no longer merely monitors and predictors of change but came actually to work as agents of change. In addition, other new roles were explored.

The second major shift occurred in terms of the extent to which anthropologists confronted their own values, directly and explicitly. The "value-free" or, more accurately, the value-implicit approach, came to be more openly questioned. Some anthropologists came to recognize the value-explicit approach as legitimate, after substantial debate. This means that certain anthropologists came to feel that social scientists cannot separate their work from real-world values, and that to do so creates a dangerous illusion of true objectivity. The value-explicit stance implied a willingness on the part of anthropologists openly to define goals and values for clients and client communities. This, of course, led to intense debates concerning ethics for cultural anthropologists of all types. It also led anthropologists to increased political exposure.

The third shift came as a corollary to role extension and value-explicitness. That is, applied anthropology was increasingly action-involved. This means, as suggested above, that the users of the new patterns came to be directly engaged

in change-producing behavior. Their contacts with the *dramatis personae* of the real world were transformed. No longer was their activity limited to the basic researcher-instructor-consultant role, but was extended to include a much wider array of action-involved roles. This change did not result in a single new approach, but a multiplicity of new approaches for applying anthropological knowledge. In addition to the retained and still important activities characteristic of the earlier stages, at least five new value-explicit, role-extended, and action-involved approaches to applications began to emerge during this period. These approaches are: action anthropology, research and development anthropology, community development, community advocacy anthropology, and culture brokerage. Cultural brokerage actually appeared early in the next period, as specified in the historic scheme reported here.

Action Anthropology. Perhaps the first action-involved, value-explicit approach to be developed within anthropology was action anthropology, which grew out of a University of Chicago field school organized by Sol Tax among the Mesquakie residents near Tama, Iowa. The action orientation was not part of the original intent, but emerged because of the sentiments of the participating students. The Fox Project, as it was called, consisted of a dual program of action and research that addressed a complex of ideas associated with self-determination and some more generalized research goals.

Some of the key concepts of the approach are community self-determination and the idea of what might best be called interactive planning. This last idea is rooted in the work of John Dewey and is manifested in a tendency to stress an ambiguous distinction between means and ends, and to reduce the linearity of social planning. The primary proposition is that means and ends are interdependent, and are determined through an oscillating interaction between problems inherent in a situation and various development alternatives. Additionally, goal specification tends to be very general and open-ended. The Fox Project was initiated in 1948 (Gearing, Netting, and Peattie 1960). The action anthropology approach was used in a wide variety of settings.

Research and Development Anthropology. The research and development approach was first attempted in the well-known Vicos Project. Like action anthropology, the research and development process has both scientific and development goals. Defined technically, research and development anthropology is a means of bringing about increases in the net amount and breadth of distribution of certain basic human values through research-based participant intervention in a community. The writings of Allan Holmberg, the primary initiator, are good sources for understanding the transition toward a value-explicit anthropology. Holmberg and his associates assumed that value-free social science was unobtainable, and that the research inevitably influenced the community. He argued that this tendency was better dealt with if it was made explicit and used for the betterment of the society, as well as for scientific advancement.

The goal of research and development anthropology is the wider sharing of the content of basic value categories. The value categories conceptualized in

research and development anthropology are power, respect, enlightenment, wealth, skill, well-being, affection, and rectitude. The conceptualization benefited from the contribution of the political scientist, Harold Lasswell. The specific content of the approach involved identifying baseline data relevant to the specific value categories, and then devising an action response that was calculated to increase the amount and breadth of distribution of the valued content. The Vicos Project took place in highland Peru, and was initiated in 1952 (Dobyns, Doughty, and Lasswell 1971). The approach has been used in a variety of other settings.

Community Development. The community development approach was developed outside of anthropology in the context of British colonial administration, and the social work and agricultural extension disciplines in the United States. It is listed here because a number of anthropologists used and contributed to the approach. A widely used definition of the approach is contained in manuals produced by the International Cooperation Administration (a predecessor of the Agency for International Development):

Community Development is a process of social action in which the people of a community organize themselves for planning and action; define their common and individual needs and problems; make group and individual plans to meet their needs and problems; execute the plans with a maximum of reliance upon community resources; supplement these resources when necessary with services and materials from government and nongovernmental agencies outside the community (1955:1)

Projects using this approach often speak of concepts like felt needs, self-help, and self-determination.

The most visible contributions of anthropologists to this approach are various textbooks, which include *Cooperation in Change* (Goodenough 1963), and *Community Development: An Interpretation* (Brokensha and Hodge 1969). In addition to this, anthropologists have made use of the approach directly (van Willigen 1971, 1973, 1977; Willard 1977).

Community Advocacy Anthropology. Action research, action anthropology, and research and development anthropology represent the first generation of value-explicit applied anthropology approaches. In addition to these approaches, various advocacy anthropology approaches developed in the early 1970s. These were supplemented by an approach called cultural brokerage around the same period. Generally, the advocacy approaches are characterized by a closer administrative relationship between the community and the anthropologist. In some cases, the anthropologist is actually hired by the local community. While this is not strictly true of the case example we are using for this type of anthropology, the relationship between the community and the anthropologists was quite close. It was developed by Stephen Schensul for use in a Latino barrio of Chicago. In this case, the anthropologist worked primarily as a research technician in support of indigenous community leadership. Goals of the sponsoring organization were addressed to a limited extent. The anthropologist also provided technical assistance in training for research and proposal writing.

While the community advocacy role is diverse, it is somewhat more focused upon research done in support of community-defined goals. The anthropologist, although involved in the action, does not serve as a direct change agent, but as an auxiliary to community leaders. The anthropologist does not work through intervening agencies, but instead has a direct relationship with the community. The relationship is collaborative, drawing upon the anthropologist's research skills and the organizational skills of the community's leadership. Typically, the anthropologist's activities include evaluation of community-based programs, whether they are sponsored or managed by people from within or outside the community; needs assessments in anticipation of proposal writing and program design; proposal writing and a wide variety of generalized inputs of a less formal nature. The Chicago project was initiated in 1968 (Schensul 1973).

Cultural Brokerage. Cultural brokerage is an approach to using anthropological knowledge developed by Hazel H. Weidman (Weidman 1973). It is based on a conception of role defined originally by Eric Wolf to account for persons who serve as links between two cultural systems (1956). While Wolf conceptualized the role in the context of the naturally occurring roles that exist between peasant communities and the national system, Weidman applied the term to structures created to make health care delivery more appropriate to an ethnically diverse clientele.

Stimulated by research findings of the Miami Health Ecology Project, Weidman created a position for culture brokers in the Community Health Program of the Department of Psychiatry of the University of Miami. These individuals were social scientists who were familiar with the various ethnic groups found in the "catchment area" of a large county hospital. Within this area, it was possible to find Cubans, Puerto Ricans, blacks, Haitians, and Bahamians, as well as whites. While the cultural brokerage role is quite diverse, its primary goal is the establishment of links between the politically dominant structures of the community and the less powerful, in a way that restructures the relationship in terms of equality.

The commitment to egalitarian intercultural relations in cultural brokerage is manifested in other elements in its conceptual structure. The most important of these conceptual elements are coculture and culture mediation. Coculture is the label used for the components of a culturally pluralistic system. It is a conceptual substitute for subculture.

The development of intervention techniques within anthropology is the most striking characteristic of this particular stage of the development of applied anthropology. Parallel with this new development is the continuation of the basic pattern of research for various administrative authorities that was characteristic of the applied ethnology stage. Much of this research received its stimulus in the early years of the role-extension, value-explicit stage from the forces put in place by World War II. These forces were substantial.

While intervention strategies were developed and used within anthropology, the most important factors that shaped applied anthropology were simple eco-

nomic ones. During this phase there was a tremendous expansion of the academic job market. According to Spicer, "It became a world of academic positions far in excess of persons trained to fill them" (1976:337). This caused a "retreat into the academic world" of substantial proportions. While economic factors associated with the expansiveness of the academic job market were important, the tendency not to take federal employment was enhanced by objections many anthropologists had toward the war the government was waging in Vietnam.

A variety of research projects motivated by basic policy questions led anthropologists to study a variety of new research areas, including native land rights (Goldschmidt and Haas 1946), government policy toward native political organization (Gluckman 1943, 1955), ethnohistory (Stewart 1961), health care (Leighton and Leighton 1944), land tenure (Allen, Gluckman, Peters, and Trapnell 1948), urban life (Beaglehole and Beaglehole 1946), migrant labor (Schapera 1947), relocation (Kiste 1974; Mason 1950, 1958), water resources development (Cushman and MacGregor 1949, Padfield and Smith 1968), health care delivery (Kimball 1952, Kimball and Pearsall 1954), disasters (Spillius 1957), health development (Foster 1953), racial discrimination (Southern Regional Council 1961), and others.

New roles activated by anthropologists include: expert witness (Lurie 1955; MacGregor 1955; Kluger 1976; Stewart 1961; Dobyns 1978), evaluator (Aiyappan 1948; Sasaki 1960; Sasaki and Adair 1952; Foster 1953; Honigmann 1953; Dupree 1956a, 1956b, 1958, Lantis and Hadaway 1957; Ingersoll 1968, 1969; Halpern 1972; Mathur 1977; Elwin 1977; Messing 1965, 1964; Pearsall and Kern 1967; Cain 1968; Sorenson and Berg 1967; Jacobsen 1973), planner (Peattie 1968, 1969a, 1969b; Peterson 1970, 1972, 1978), as well as roles associated with various clinical functions (Landy 1961; Aberle 1950).

Anthropologists invested more effort in the documentation of sound practices for themselves and others. A number of manuals and texts published in this period were intended to provide guidance to development administrators, public health officials, and change agents. These included *Human Problems in Technological Change* (Spicer 1952), *Cultural Patterns and Technological Change* (Mead 1955), *Health, Culture and Community: Case Studies of Public Reactions to Health Programs* (Paul 1955), *Traditional Cultures and the Impact of Technological Change* (Foster 1962), *Cooperation in Change: An Anthropological Approach to Community Development* (Goodenough 1963), and *Applied Anthropology* (Foster 1969).

An important event during this period was the development of an ethics statement by the Society for Applied Anthropology. The statement, written in 1949, was the first within the discipline. This effort has continued to the present day. Interestingly, the statement was developed in reaction to a specific basic research project rather than problems associated with application. The American Anthropological Association did not consider development of an ethics statement for about twenty years.

In summary, the role extension stage saw anthropologists designing and im-

plementing strategies for social change. Alongside this development anthropologists increased the array of new research-based roles. Although the social change strategies developed within anthropology during this stage appear to remain useful, their application has been infrequent in the latest stage of the development of applied anthropology. The development of strategies for social change within the discipline seems to be most common in the United States and Mexico. Perhaps the most important change that shaped applied anthropology during this period was the tremendous expansion of the academic job market.

THE POLICY RESEARCH STAGE (1970 TO THE PRESENT)

The policy research stage is characterized by the emergence of what Angrosino calls the "new applied anthropology" (1976). Expressed simply, this means an increased emphasis on policy research of various kinds done outside of academic employment. The typical pattern of the value-explicit, role-extension period, where the applied anthropologist would take temporary assignments of an applied nature while working as an academic, has been replaced by more employment by consulting firms or as a direct-hire staff member of the agency. This kind of employment results in a dramatic increase in new kinds of research.

This stage appears to be more clearly a return to the pattern of the federal service period than an outgrowth of the role-extension period. It is different in a fundamental way, however. During the federal service period applied anthropologists returned to academia once the employment pressure was off. It appears unlikely that the large numbers of anthropologists entering the job market as practicing anthropologists now will take academic jobs in the future. They will not return because there will not be jobs for them, their salary expectations can not be met, and they just do not want to. It is for this reason that this period is unique.

Applied anthropology of this stage is more clearly a product of external factors. There are two primary external factors: the dramatically shrinking academic job market (D'Andrade, Hammel, Adkins, and McDaniel 1975; Cartter 1974; Balderston and Radner 1971), and (at least in the United States) the creation of a wide array of policy research functions mandated by federal regulation and statute.

The effect of the shrinking academic job market is substantial and increasing. An early estimate predicted that two-thirds of new Ph.D.s produced in anthropology would find employment outside of academia (D'Andrade, Hammel, Adkins, and McDaniel 1975). Recent research on employment summarized by Elizabeth Briody shows that the percentage of each annual cohort of Ph.D.s that enters employment outside academia is increasing (Briody 1988:77). An American Anthropological Association survey indicated that in the 1989-90 cohort of Ph.D.s 59 percent were employed outside of academic departments, although most anthropologists still work in academic positions (American Anthropological Association 1991:1).

Coupled with this big push factor are the pulling effects of legislatively mandated policy research opportunities. To some unspecified degree, the so-called surplus of Ph.D.s is absorbed by other opportunities created by the expansion in policy research. Some of the legislation relevant to this problem is the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Foreign Assistance Act as amended in 1973, and the Community Development Act of 1974. In addition to employment directly related to these policy research needs, a very large array of new types of employment was accepted by anthropologists. Some of this employment involved research, much of it involved assuming other roles. The effects of these pull factors varied considerably. Levels of funding have varied substantially through the years with changing economic conditions, changing political styles, and periodic disillusionment with the utility of policy research.

A confounding factor in employment choice is the political attitude of anthropologists formed by their experiences in the era of the Vietnamese War. For some, employment in United States government agencies with overseas programs was unacceptable for ideological reasons, no matter how hard the push or attractive the pull. This, so it seems, has changed significantly as the job situation has worsened and agency programs have changed.

The changes in anthropology associated with the increase in nonacademic employment are substantial. These can be addressed in terms of three general categories: academic program content, publication and information dissemination, and social organization, as well as some general changes in style.

Academic program content. The most obvious effect has been the creation of academic programs that are specifically focused upon preparation for nonacademic careers (Kushner 1978:23; Trotter 1988; Hyland and Kirkpatrick 1989). Increasingly, these programs are coming to be focused upon more specific policy areas rather than having a general orientation toward applied anthropology (van Willigen 1988). These programs tend to make wider use of internships and practica in their instructional strategy (Hyland et al. 1988; Wolfe, Chambers, and Smith 1981). The number of programs that have application as a focus have increased dramatically (van Willigen 1985; Hyland and Kirkpatrick 1989). It is conceivable that in the future a professional society will develop standards for certification and accreditation.

Publication and information dissemination. The most noteworthy change in publication and information dissemination has been the creation of the publication *Practicing Anthropology. Practicing Anthropology* publishes articles that report the experiences of anthropologists in various kinds of nonacademic employment. Currently its readership is over two thousand. In addition, the Applied Anthropology Documentation Project at the University of Kentucky has resulted in the establishment of a collection of the written products of applied anthropologists (Clark and van Willigen 1981; van Willigen 1981a, 1991). A similar collection of Canadian applied anthropological work, sponsored by the Society for Applied Anthropology in Canada has been organized at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, by Wayne Warry.

The increased interest in application has influenced the publication policies of the major journals. *Human Organization* shows some tendency to return to the publication of application case study materials that dominated its pages in the first decade of publication. *American Anthropologist* publishes book reviews of technical reports that are applied in nature, and a limited number of articles based on practice. The National Association for the Practice of Anthropology publishes a bulletin series that features materials on application.

Social Organization. The most significant change caused by increases in nonacademic employment have been the creation of a large number of local practitioner organizations (LPOs). The first of these was the Society of Professional Anthropologists (SOPA), established in Tucson, Arizona in 1974 (Bennett 1988; Bainton 1975). Although now disbanded, SOPA served as a model for others. Among the organizations currently operating are those in Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, Tampa, Tallahassee, Ann Arbor, and Memphis. In addition the High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology serves a regional consituency in the high plains. These groups are quite variable in size and current levels of activity. The Washington Association of Professional Anthropologists (WAPA) and the High Plains Society for Applied Anthropology (HPSFAA) are clearly the most active. WAPA publishes a newsletter and directory and regularly holds workshops at national association meetings on topics like "Seeking Federal Employment." HPSFAA has a lively annual meeting and a regular publication. Most importantly, the LPOs serve as a mechanism for effective networking in the profession.

At the national level there has been considerable organizational development that has benefited American applied anthropologists. Most important is the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology, organized as a unit of the American Anthropological Association to replace the Society for Applied Anthropology. SfAA and NAPA are currently engaged in various cooperative activities. Canadian anthropologists benefit from the activities of the Society for Applied Anthropology in Canada, organized in 1981 (Price 1987).

Both the American Anthropological Association and the Society for Applied Anthropology have used academically employed and nonacademically employed slates for their elections for some time. Other adaptations have included changing the mix of the national meeting programs so as to increase activities relevant for nonacademically employed anthropologists, and to decrease the part of the program designed for scholarly purposes. Innovations in this area include workshops for gaining skills in various policy research areas, such as social impact assessment and program evaluation. NAPA has provided considerable creative leadership in this regard.

The American Anthropological Association has issued a number of publications that address practical or applied issues. These include publications on the structure of training programs, produced with the Society for Applied Anthropology (Leacock, Gonzalez, and Kushner 1974), the development of training programs (Trotter 1988), approaches to practice (Goldschmidt 1979), practicing

anthropologists (Chatelain and Cimino 1981), and employment (Bernard and Sibley 1975). Also published were a series of training manuals in applied anthropology on various topics including development anthropology (Partridge 1984), medical anthropology (Hill 1984), policy ethnography (van Willigen and DeWalt 1985), and nutritional anthropology (Quandt and Ritenbaugh 1986).

Another potentially significant development has been the modification of ethics statements by the national organizations. The Society for Applied Anthropology approved a new version of their ethics statement in 1983. The committee was charged with adjusting the existing statement to the conditions faced by practicing anthropologists. With this in mind, the committee developed a statement that recognized the "legitimate proprietary" interests of clients in terms of the dissemination of research data, the need for truthful reporting of qualifications, and the need for continuing education to maintain skills, as well as other issues (Committee on Ethics, Society for Applied Anthropology 1983). NAPA also recently issued an ethics statement.

As in the two previous stages, the anthropologists working in application are exploring new areas of research. The growth of new areas of inquiry is dramatic. Some examples of the new developments are research into forestry (Collins and Painter 1986; Murray 1987), drug rehabilitation (Weppner 1973; Marshall 1979), human waste disposal (Elmendorf and Buckles 1978), welfare program reform (Trend 1978), broadcast media (Eiselein and Marshall 1976), social services in boomtowns (Uhlman 1977a, 1977b), educational evaluation (Wax and Breunig 1973; Fitzsimmons 1975; Burns 1975; Clinton 1975), commodity marketing (Lample and Herbert 1988), housing needs and effects (Wulff 1972; Weaver and Downing 1975; Kerri 1977), commodity-focused agricultural research (Werge 1977), wildlife management (Brownrigg 1986), radioactive waste storage siting (Stoffle, Evans, and Jensen 1987), energy extraction (Softestad 1990), rural industrial development (Grinstead 1976), office management (Weaver et al. 1971), employment training (Wolfe and Dean 1974; Naylor 1976), market development (Zilverberg and Courtney 1984), corrections (Alexander and Chapman 1982), building and landscape design (Esber 1987; Low and Simon 1984), fisheries (Stoffle, Jensen, and Rasch 1981; Johnson and Griffith 1985; McCay and Creed 1990), recreational planning (Wulff 1976; Scott et al. 1982), and the effects of power generation (Callaway, Levy, and Henderson 1976). There are, of course, others.

At a somewhat more general level, one can cite development in the areas of social impact assessment and program evaluation. Anthropologists have been involved in some of the pioneering efforts that attempted to predict, for the benefit of planners, some of the social costs and benefits of various kinds of development projects. In domestic settings, we find anthropologists engaged in team research that has developed social impact assessment manuals and standards (Maruyama 1973; Vlachos 1975). Anthropologists have been involved in direct assessment of project effects (Nugent et al. 1978; Jacobs, Schleicher, and Ontiveros 1974; Millsap 1978; Jacobs 1977; Parker and King 1987; Preister 1987;

Stoffle, Evans, and Jensen 1987; McGuire and Worden 1984; Van Tassell and Michaelson 1977; Dixon 1978), and field testing of social impact assessment methodologies (Clinton 1978).

Although the legislative mandate was substantially different, anthropologists have also been engaged in social-impact assessment work in the context of international development. These efforts include the development of manuals for impact assessment methodology (Harza Engineering Company 1980), baseline studies to inform development planning (Werge 1977; Maloney, Aziz, and Sarker 1980; Brown 1980; Scaglion 1981; Green 1982; Reeves and Frankenberger 1981; DeWalt and DeWalt 1982), development of regional development plans (Brokensha, Horowitz, and Scudder 1977), needs assessments (Mason 1979; Practical Concepts, Inc. 1980), social soundness analysis (U.S. Agency for International Development 1975; Cochrane 1979; McPherson 1978), project evaluations (Blustain 1982; Brown 1980; Pillsbury 1986; Williams 1980, 1981), and analysis of program planning documents (Ingersoll, Sullivan, and Lenkerd 1981; Hoben 1980; Britan 1980; Collins and Painter 1986). In addition, there has been basic research into various aspects of development such as decentralization in development (Ralston, Anderson, and Colson 1981), indigenous voluntary associations (Miller 1980), and women in development (Elmendorf and Isely 1981).

The involvement of anthropologists in the evaluation of various domestic social action programs is quite common. Evaluation studies occur in a wide variety of areas, including American Indian education (Fuchs and Havighurst 1970), housing development (Kerri 1977), American Indian tribal governance (Weaver et al. 1971), employment training programs (Wolfe and Dean 1974), rural education (Everhart 1975), welfare reform (Trend 1978), alternative energy source development (Roberts 1978), innovative education programs (Wilson 1977; Fetterman 1987), alcohol abuse curtailment projects (Marshall 1979), and minority employment (Buehler 1981).

The dramatic increase in policy research efforts of various types is not associated with an increase in the use of social intervention techniques, which this chapter describes as characteristic of the pattern of application in the previous stage. There are examples of the use of action anthropology (Schlesier 1974; Stull 1979), research and development anthropology (Turner 1974; Wulff 1977), and various advocacy research approaches. The approaches based on cultural brokerage models developed by Hazel H. Weidman earlier in this stage are still in use. There are two factors that seem to have caused the reduction of this type of application: the radical critique of much of applied anthropology, and the increasing political sophistication of many of the traditional client groups of anthropologists.

A factor that will influence the future of anthropology is the changing circumstances of employment. First, the academic to nonacademic mix has changed. The nonacademic realm is quite variable within itself. The conditions of employment affect both motivation and opportunity to publish, tendency to

participate in anthropological learned societies, extent of interdisciplinary orientation, and the training of future anthropologists. Working in a governmental organization is different than working in the private sector. There are significant differences between profit and nonprofit organizations in the private sector. The biggest differences may occur where the anthropologist owns the firm. Academic employment is also changing in many of the same ways. There seems to be a stronger commitment to consulting and, of course, many nonacademically employed anthropologists have to compete with the academics. Some academics take on research commitments in the policy area so as to provide students with marketable work experiences.

SUMMARY

What is called applied anthropology has grown dramatically since the inception of anthropology as a discipline. In its growth, applied anthropology has manifested an array of tendencies. First, the applied and theoretical aspects of the discipline developed in parallel, application potentials being used as a rationale for the development of academic programs and theoretical research programs. The effect of applied anthropology on theoretical anthropology was often masked because of the nature of publication in applied anthropology and its relative lack of prestige. Second, a major effect of applied anthropology on theoretical anthropology has been the stimulus of interest in new research topics and populations. This effect too has been masked. Third, the development of applied anthropology is best thought of in terms of an additive expansion of research context, topics, and techniques. While there have been intervention techniques developed within anthropology, today these are infrequently applied. Fourth, applied anthropology should be thought of as primarily a product of important external forces rather than a consistent pattern of internally generated change. Mostly, the external forces have been manifested in employment and funded research opportunities brought about by the needs of colonial governance, war, and foreign policy. More recently, a major external factor has been the nature of the academic job market, and to a limited extent an increase in policy research opportunities mandated by federal law.

The nature of the academic job market has resulted in the creation of a large cadre of anthropologists employed outside of academic contexts. The changes wrought by this significant demographic shift are being felt in the discipline now. It is anticipated that other more significant changes will occur in the discipline as the number of nonacademically employed increases to majority, and beyond. Those employed in nonacademic settings will continue to occupy roles that relate in some way to policy research rather than intervention.

FURTHER READING

Eddy, Elizabeth M., and William L. Partridge, eds. 1987. *Applied Anthropology in America*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Contains a number of chapters useful for understanding the history of applied anthropology.

van Willigen, John. 1991. *Anthropology in Use: A Source Book on Anthropological Practice*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Contains brief descriptions of over five hundred cases of the use of anthropology to solve practical problems. It is an excellent source for research paper topics.