10

Anthropology as a Policy Science

The purpose of policy science is to provide information to decision makers in support of the rational formulation, implementation, and evaluation of policy. Policies can be thought of as strategies of action and choice used to achieve desired goals. Mostly we think of policy in the context of various kinds of formal organizations like social agencies, educational institutions, business firms, and governments at all levels. There are many different kinds of policy. We use terms like public policy, social policy, food policy, employment policy, industrial policy, foreign policy, and others to designate the strategies of action and choice used by governments and other organizations in various aspects of life in complex societies. These terms reflect rather different situations in content and scope, yet all relate to the same set of basic issues. That is, all policy is concerned with values.

Policy formulation involves specifying behavior that is to result in achieving a valued condition. In a sense, a policy is a hypothesis about the relationship between behavior and values: if we want to be a certain way, we need to act this way. At a basic level, policies involve allocation decisions—decisions to spend money and time to achieve something. The "something" can be quite diverse, including increases in gross national product, decreases in unemployment, decreases in the relative cost of food staples in urban areas, decreases in the number of teenage pregnancies, or increases in fairness in the allocation of housing. These large-scale national concerns can be matched with smaller-scale, local concerns, such increases in public input in the planning of the construction of a dam, the determination of the usefulness of a particular development project, or the identification of local needs for a certain kind of educational program. Policy research can occur on both sides of a policy issue and can be adversarial. Community groups can carry out policy research as a political counterpoise to research done by the government.

POLICY PROCESS

Policy should be thought of in terms of a process. The policy process is very complex. Stating the process in the simplest possible terms, we can say that the process consists of the following stages:

I. Awareness of need.
II. Formulation of alternative solutions.
III. Evaluation of alternative solutions.
IV. Formulation of policy.
V. Implementation of policy.
VI. Evaluation of implementations.

This process is carried out in the political arena, in which there is much competition for resources. Thus what would appear in a schematic diagram as neatly rational and orderly in reality may be determined by compromise and blunt applications of political power. The basic problem is that everything can not be done at once. Competition forces more careful allocation decisions. The complexity of the competition creates opportunities for policy science.

Policy science includes a large variety of research activities that in one way or another support the process by which needs are identified and policies are formed, implemented, and evaluated. Each stage in the policy process is associated with research needs and opportunities.

The view of policy science taken here is unusually broad; basically it is synonymous with applied research. Much (probably most) policy is formed without the aid of specific research efforts. Then again, social science tends generally to inform participants in the policy arena so that it is continually brought to bear on policy problems without actually being commissioned for a specific policy formation purpose. In these cases we can speak of policy-relevant research. There are many different points in the policy process where research done by cultural anthropologists can be used. Most research by anthropologists in this arena is done because of an existing policy, rather than to determine what the policy should be. Program evaluation, a type of research commonly done by anthropologists, is a good example of this. Some may want to separate policy research from program research.

In any case, this is not new ground for anthropologists. In fact, one could argue that policy research needs accelerated the development of anthropology as a discipline in the nineteenth century. This view is argued in chapter 2 on the history of the development of applied anthropology. In many countries, anthropology emerged as an organized discipline to fulfill policy research needs associated with colonial administration, both internal and external. At the beginning, this took the form of doing basic ethnography in unknown areas or troubleshooting concerning intercultural relationships.

As early as 1895, James Mooney carried out research that had as its goal the determination of what the U.S. Department of War should do in response to the Ghost Dance as practiced among certain Plains Indians (Wallace 1976). The appointment of the early professors of anthropology at the great English universities was based on the need to train colonial administrators. In spite of this time depth, the use of anthropology as a policy science is quite recent. It was not until the 1970s that anthropologists became involved more extensively in policy research efforts. As stated in chapter 2, this involvement relates to both push and pull factors. The push factor is the collapse of the academic job market. The pull factor is the increase in policy research efforts because of federal legislation. This last factor, of course, is most important in the United States.

As a corollary to the policy research function, anthropologists have to some extent become policy makers. This function is rare and very poorly documented. One interesting example is the work of anthropologist Robert Textor in the Peace Corps. Textor participated in the development of the so-called in-up-and-out personnel policy of the Peace Corps, which restricted the length of employment in the Peace Corps so as to maintain a higher rate of innovation and what might be called "organizational youth" (Textor 1966). My own experiences in development administration involved small-scale policy formulation in response to a community development effort on an American Indian reservation.

One can not overlook the cases where anthropologists have assumed high-level administrative positions in federal and state government. Some noteworthy examples are: Philleo Nash, who served both as commissioner of Indian Affairs in the U.S. Department of the Interior, and lieutenant governor of the State of Wisconsin (Landman and Halpern 1989); Aguirre Beltran, who served as director of the National Indian Institute of Mexico; Jomo Kenyatta, who was the first prime minister of Kenya; and Nirmal Kumar Bose, who was appointed Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in India (Sinha 1986). In all these cases these people were intimately involved in policy formation. There are of course a number of knowledgeable applied anthropologists who have argued very eloquently against such involvement. A good example is Homer G. Barnett, who did extensive applied work in the Pacific following World War II. He argued that our effectiveness as applied anthropologists would be reduced if we took over administrative functions (1956).

In any case, most involvement of anthropologists in the policy arena is as researchers. In this framework they are said to be most effective at the local level (Chambers 1977); or, when they work at the level of national policy formation, they function best in large multidisciplinary research teams (Trend 1976). Both Chambers and Trend seem to be arguing from the same ground which is that the traditional, holistic, participant-observation-based research methodology works best in smaller-scale contexts. While this is probably true there are ways of escaping the effects of the constraint. One is to learn other research techniques.

Policy research is not a monolith. There are many different types. For example

each stage in the policy process is associated with different research needs. There are many different types of current policy research practice that see anthropological involvement. Anthropologists conduct evaluation research, needs assessment, social impact assessment, social soundness analysis, and cultural resource assessment, as well as various other kinds of policy research. In addition to the research carried out in support of the development, implementation, and evaluation of specific policies, there is also research that is referenced to general areas of social concern. This can be referred to as policy-relevant research.

In regard to this distinction, it is possible to speak of anthropology *in* policy, and anthropology *of* policy. This follows a contrast originally made by the medical sociologist Robert Straus (1957), who spoke of researchers serving in support of medical care, as opposed to researchers who study medical care. The first was referred to as sociology *in* medicine, the second as the sociology *of* medicine. DeWalt applied this distinction to his analysis of agricultural anthropology (1985). Both are very important. It is, however, important to recognize the distinctions between the two kinds of work. All the policy anthropology that we refer to here is of the "anthropology in policy" type.

All the different types of policy anthropology represent important kinds of research activity for anthropologists in many different employment situations. Further, if one considers all the different purposes and funding mechanisms for research by anthropologists, one finds that the contrast between applied and basic research becomes reduced. We have, on the one hand, research that is specified, bought, and paid for by clients to meet some practical need, and, on the other hand, research planned and carried out by researchers referenced only to their curiosity and sense of the direction of the discipline.

What exists between these polar types is the product of a mix of personal inclination and many different incentives. For example, many programs that fund basic research will fund that research in terms of a set of priorities that are derived from general policy questions. These specific economic incentives come to be converted to "hot topics" and short-run tendencies in research topic selection. Under certain circumstances, research produced for specific applied purposes can begin to appear in print as if it were basic research. This then influences research topic selection in yet another way. The point is that the contrast between applied and basic research is rather weak. Further, there is a great deal of flow between the two realms.

CURRENT TYPES OF POLICY RESEARCH PRACTICE

The types of policy research discussed here range from standardized research methods geared to specific policy issues, to large and generalized research orientations applicable in a wide variety of situations. The contribution of anthropologists to the development of the methods and techniques used varies from a great deal to very little. Except for a few cases, the anthropologist involved in the use of these practices needs to know general social science research methods

in addition to those more traditionally associated with anthropology. As is mentioned in Chapter 12, on evaluation, one needs an integrated research methodology in which the researcher is capable of drawing on a variety of different techniques, depending on the problem at hand.

A glimpse at the various types of policy research is provided below. As suggested above, some of these types have specific technical meanings, while other categories are general and include a wide variety of research functions.

Evaluation. In evaluation, research is done with the goal of determining the worth of something, such as a project, program, or set of training materials. The process can involve a wide variety of research designs, from highly structured experiments with control groups to descriptive ethnographies. Evaluation can serve many purposes. Many evaluations are done to determine the effects of a specific project or program. Evaluation can also be done to see if some activity is working as expected, with the goal of improving it. Evaluators can use a wide variety of data collection techniques. Evaluation can be used to test the feasibility of wider application of innovations. Research can be used to evaluate alternatives in the design process. Evaluation is one of the most important types of policy research done by the applied anthropologist.

There is currently increased interest in the use of ethnography in evaluation. Using this approach, the task becomes one of finding out what is going on in a specific situation, rather than technical determination of effects. The chapter on evaluation includes case studies of evaluations that involved anthropologists. Anthropologists working in evaluation often use case study methodologies. In some cases they serve as ethnographers studying large-scale projects as part of multidisciplinary teams.

Social Impact Assessment. In social impact assessment, research is geared toward predicting the social effects of various kinds of projects. Usually the process involves the examination of unplanned effects of major construction projects on families and communities, before the project is built. In this limited sense, social impact assessment is a kind of effect study. Social impact assessment is especially important in the design process. Usually the process involves the consideration of the effects of various design alternatives. Social impact assessment often involves the use of secondary data.

This is an important kind of policy research for cultural anthropologists. An entire chapter is given to social impact assessment in this text. It is worth noting here that often the research methodologies used in social impact assessment are mandated by the contracting agency. In the United States, various kinds of impact assessment research is done in compliance with a number of different federal laws, including those concerned with protecting the environment.

Chapter 11 contains an expanded discussion of social impact assessment, with a case study of a specific assessment project. You will find that social impact assessment, in part, resembles the traditional anthropological/sociological community study, except that it places emphasis on the use of secondary data. The use of secondary data is encouraged because of the need for speed and stan-

dardization between different project assessments. While social impact assessment can be done in many different settings, it is specifically geared for use in conjunction with the planning of projects in the United States. It is used in a wide variety of settings involving the projection of the effects of everything from dam construction to fisheries management policies. This kind of research is done to evaluate design alternatives prior to implementation.

Needs Assessment. In needs assessment, research is done to determine deficiencies that can be treated through policies, projects, and programs. It is done as part of the planning process and is sometimes thought of as a kind of evaluation. Sometimes needs assessment takes the form of large-scale survey research projects that identify and rank preferences for certain developments. Such surveys usually require two waves of standardized data collection, one to identify and one to rank. Needs assessments can also be based on existing census data used as social indicators. Many factors that are targeted by policy can be measured this way, such as education and income levels, number of violent deaths, and disease rates. Working in smaller-scale contexts, the needs assessment process may involve the use of community meetings of various kinds.

Obviously, needs assessment occurs early in the policy process and can set the scene for a variety of policy research procedures. The operation of many intervention strategies may involve needs assessments of various kinds. The identified needs often are used in program monitoring and evaluation at subsequent stages.

Social Soundness Analysis. Social soundness analysis is used to determine the cultural feasibility of development projects. This generalized approach to project assessment came to be used by researchers working for the U.S. Agency for International Development, starting in the mid-1970s. The approach, in large part, was developed by the anthropologist Glynn Cochrane. Cochrane had done assessment work for various development agencies, including the World Bank and the British Ministry of Overseas Development. The term social soundness analysis comes from U.S. Agency for International Development documents.

The process is described in Cochrane's book *The Cultural Appraisal of Development Projects* (1979). An important element in social soundness analysis is the identification of the different beneficiary groups associated with the effects of a specific project. This is important because of the policy framework of American international development efforts, which, since the amendments made to the Foreign Assistance Act in 1973, have had a mandate to direct their attention to the needs of the "poorest of the poor." This required a commitment to what Cochrane called social mapping. Social mapping is basically a process of ethnography that involves the collection of data on ethnicity, social organization, belief systems, wealth forms, patterns of mobility, and access to basic human needs.

The project design process as outlined by Cochrane directs the attention of the appraiser to a number of criteria that should be considered during project design.

Criteria Used in Cultural Appraisal of Projects

Contextualism—assuring that the project ideas fit with the cultural landscape.

Incrementalism—assessing the magnitude of the social change involved.

Minimum participant profiles—analyzing the social characteristics of project participants.

Spread effects—estimating the magnitude of project impact.

Motivation—providing reasons for participation in projects.

Estimating time factors—approximating the length of time required for social change.

Benefit incidence—observing who gains and who loses during the life of a project.

Communication and learning—seeking ways of facilitating and encouraging innovation and adaptation.

Design of extension efforts—building the organization of extension work.

Using indigenous organization—maximizing the use of local management talent. (Cochrane 1979)

The cultural appraisal process outlined by Cochrane is nontechnical, in that i does not present much beyond a checklist with illustrative cases as a means o specifying the research process. In any case, the approach is currently used in the U.S. Agency for International Development project planning process, in conjunction with other research approaches.

Technology Development Research. In an effort to help assure the appropriateness of technology developed for use in less developed countries, a number of agencies have become committed to the use of social science to inform the technology development process. This is well developed in farming system; research (DeWalt 1989; McCorkle 1989; Norman and Summons 1982; Hildebrand 1976; Ruthenberg et al. 1980). Farming systems research is geared toward linking farmers with those who develop agronomic technology. Part of this linkage is the provision of comprehensive accounts of the farming system. The concept of the farming system is focused on analysis of the production and consumption decisions of farm households. In this research, attention is paid to the identification of development constraints and opportunities. One way tha technology development research can operate in the agronomic context is through on-farm research. This involves the actual implementation of agronomic research on the farms rather than in the experiment stations. In this setting the social scientist can serve as a broker for the experimentation program.

Most farming systems research of the type briefly described here is done in conjunction with the international crop research centers, such as CIMMYT (Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo), or CIP (Centro Internacional de la Papa), or the commodity-focused Collaborative Research Support Program (CRSP), such as INTSORMIL or Small Ruminants. Farming systems research although developed outside of anthropology, is congruent with certain anthropological tendencies in methodology.

Cultural Resource Management. Since the early 1970s a great deal of ar

chaeological research in the United States has been carried out in response to legislative mandates. This has led to the emergence of cultural resources management (CRM). CRM is concerned with identifying the impact of federal and other kinds of development on archaeological sites, historic buildings, and similar things, and then managing the impact in various ways. Management usually involves identification and documentation, but may include mitigation and protection. Mitigation may include thorough research and documentation of the resource. Protection may include physical stabilization and the establishment of zones of protection.

· Large numbers of archaeologists, architectural historians, and other researchers have been active in CRM. Recently this assessment process has begun to be directed toward contemporary communities as cultural resources. The emphasis in this research is toward the documentation of the folk knowledge of communities that are displaced by development projects. This kind of research is not common. The research methodology is based on traditional ethnographic practice. An example of this kind of work is the Big South Fork Project, carried out by Benita Howell and the National Park Services Applied Ethnography Program.

Of course, there are other types of policy research besides those mentioned here. Nevertheless, these are important because of the numbers of anthropologists involved in them. Clearly, the most important are social impact assessment and evaluation research. Anthropologists have also been involved in the development of these research methodologies. This is especially apparent in the area of social impact assessment methodology developed for the Army Corps of Engineers. Also, anthropologists have served as evaluators of the products of social impact assessment and evaluation research. The point is that there are many different ways of participating in policy research endeavors.

INCREASING THE USE OF POLICY RESEARCH

Sometimes research just happens, but usually applied researchers have to work hard at it. The crucial question facing the applied or policy researcher after all this hard work is, "How can I get my research used?" In dealing with the question of utilization it is important to be neither naive nor cynical. It is necessary to recognize that our research, however sound, may not affect the situation. Also in many situations decision makers may be poised to act on the basis of the knowledge provided them through policy research.

The literature on the different types of policy research in all cases contain references to the problem of underuse of research results. It is clear that this is a consistent problem in the policy research realm. It is a problem that stimulates its own research. This section of the chapter, written with Barbara Rylko-Bauer and based on an earlier article (Rylko-Bauer and van Willigen, 1993), is intended to give practical advice on how knowledge utilization can be increased. You could think of it as a theory of research effectiveness. This advice is organized around a series of principles that when followed will help increase the impact

of anthropological research. The advice is intended to be general enough to cut across the various research types.

Before discussing the framework some basics need to be established. First, because we can control our own actions we need to think primarily about what we do rather than what others do. I say this because often researchers blame the agency for not making use of the research. While this may be true to some extent, it is more productive to focus on what we can do to improve the potential for getting research used. Second, we need to treat knowledge use as something that needs to be planned into the design of projects. Research designs guide research projects. Applied research should include a knowledge utilization design or plan. The discussion below suggests elements that can be included in such a plan.

Third, we need to think realistically about our goals and look at utilization broadly. Researchers in this area point out that a narrow conception of utilization overlooks the complexity of policy making, and fails to recognize that reducing uncertainty, clarifying issues, and providing new understanding of how programs work are also real effects (Beyer and Trice 1982; Caplan 1977; Patton 1986; Weiss 1977, 1981). More significantly, research "can gradually cause major shifts in awareness and reorientation of basic perspectives" without seeming to be directly and immediately applied (Weiss 1981:23).

The following discussion includes factors to be considered in developing a utilization design. The context of a research situation will determine which knowledge utilization factors have more relevance.

Collaboration

The most significant factor in getting research findings used is collaboration between researcher and clients (Alkin 1985; Burry 1984; Glaser, Abelson, and Garrison 1983; Leviton and Hughes 1981; Patton 1986; Rothman 1980). Collaboration means involving decision makers and other potential stakeholders, such as community members, in the research process. Carefully working with people to identify their information needs and ways they can use the research will increase their commitment to the application of the research. It is important to foster a relationship with an individual that personally cares about the project and the information it generates. Patton refers to this as the "personal factor" (1986).

User participation presents some potential ethical dilemmas. A frequently noted concern is cooptation of the researcher, which may occur if decision makers shape the research to provide results that support preferred or already existing policies and actions, and do not challenge their role within the organization (Ballard and James 1983; Beyer and Trice 1982; Dawson and D'Amico 1985). Selecting stakeholders involves a judgment about whose questions will guide the research (Mark and Shotland 1985), creating potential for a different sort of cooptation—the preempting of criticism of the project by the inclusion of stake-

holders who might have been likely to do so. Finally, if the researcher does not provide stakeholders with the necessary information for effective and knowledgeable collaboration, then user participation can become a form of "pseudo-empowerment" (Mark and Shotland 1985:143-44).

Models of collaborative research are well developed in anthropology (e.g., Stull and Schensul 1987), and evolved from a value orientation that recognizes the validity of self-determination as a major force in sociocultural change. Recently the idea of user participation has been explicitly suggested as a strategy for increasing the use of anthropological knowledge (Davidson 1987; Schensul 1987; Stern 1985; Whiteford 1987).

Communication

Communication of research findings is often limited to the writing of a final report; yet this is not a very effective way of passing on information, and often results in too much, too late. Perhaps the most important strategy is to discuss preliminary findings throughout the research process and maintain an ongoing dialogue with feedback between researcher and information users (Glaser, Abelson, and Garrison 1983; Rich 1975). This is much easier to do if decision makers are collaborating in the research process (Dawson and D'Amico 1985; Patton 1986).

Other communication strategies include using multifaceted and appropriate means of communication, such as workshops, conferences, trade magazines, journals from other disciplines, and widespread distribution of short draft reports (Ballard and James 1983; Beyer and Trice 1982; O'Reilly and Dalmat 1987; Patton 1986; Schensul 1987). Presenting findings in the language and style of users is supported by our common sense, yet all social scientists have great difficulty avoiding jargon, keeping reports brief, and presenting findings and recommendations in a manner familiar to potential users (Ballard and James 1983; Rothman 1980). It is important to communicate findings directly to relevant decision makers. Practitioners need to provide concrete, specific recommendations about what is to be done, by whom, and when (Patton 1986; Rothman 1980). Policy makers do not usually expect primary data and research reports; they want recommendations on what to do (Cernea 1991).

Client

Collaborative research is more likely to succeed if one understands the client agency, community, or group, and the political context within which the research and knowledge would be used. Do an ethnography of the research situation. Becoming informed about the ways in which communities and groups may be affected by the research, and about the client group and its decision-making process, gives the researcher some understanding of the relationships among

relevant groups, who the key decision makers and community leaders are, and the potential areas of conflict and possible forums for resolving them.

In studying the nature of the client group, one can focus on questions such as who are the relevant decision makers and potential users of the information, how are decisions made within the organization, what are the usual channels of communication, and what are the constraints and/or incentives to use of the information within the agency.

Community and Politics

Always be aware of the potential impact of research findings, and try to understand the relationship that exists between the client agency and those individuals, groups, or communities that may be affected. Often, the client may be in a position of relative power vis-à-vis the community, and the agency's values and bureaucratic needs may conflict with those of community members. Recommendations perceived as threatening by those outside the agency may enable a community to mobilize public support to defeat such action. Conversely, the agency may decide not to act on recommendations perceived as going against its best interest, even if they are beneficial to the community that the agency serves. Research based in an established community institution with political clout has greater likelihood of having an impact and bringing about desired social change (Schensul 1987).

Research Process

Research should be designed, from the onset, with utilization in mind (Patton 1986). There are three features of research that increase the potential for use.

First, diversity of research methods, in particular the creative combination of quantitative and qualitative methods and analysis, can provide an insightful, valid, and convincing representation of social reality. At the same time, diversity can help meet time constraints, as well as criteria of reliability and generalizability that policy makers often expect (Beyer and Trice 1982; Fetterman 1989; Schensul 1987; Trotter 1987).

Second, use of research is directly related to the credibility of the research process (Caplan 1977; O'Reilly and Dalmat 1987; Weiss and Bucuvalas 1980; Whiteford 1987). This includes perceived accuracy, fairness, understandability, and validity of research design and methods (Patton 1986). Research quality issues become more important in situations of political debate, where the policy maker cannot afford to have the research discounted due to uncertain methodology (Weiss and Bucuvalas 1980).

Third, the potential for use also increases if the research focuses on variables that can be acted upon, that are accessible to control (Gouldner 1957). We call this applicability. Several studies suggest that decision makers are more likely

to use findings if recommendations are feasible, and the results conform to users' expectations or existing knowledge (Caplan 1977; Leviton and Hughes 1981; Weiss and Bucuvalas 1980).

Time

Policy research often has a short time frame. Recognition of this has led to many new methods for anthropologists doing policy research (van Willigen and DeWalt 1985). Perhaps most notable is the development of problem-focused, short-term research techniques such as focus groups and rapid appraisal (van Willigen and Finan 1991). One example is the informal or reconnaissance survey done in farming systems research. In these efforts there is a heavy reliance on key informant interviewing, judgmental sampling, use of secondary data, and on-site observation. Another example is "rapid assessment procedures," such as those developed for evaluating and improving primary health services (Scrimshaw and Hurtado 1987).

Advocacy

Promoting one's research findings and recommendations also can improve the prospects for use (Barber 1987; Jones 1976; Rothman 1980; Siegel and Tuckel 1985). Advocacy works best from inside the system. One way of personally ensuring that research is used is to become one of the decision makers. It is much harder to influence the policy process from the outside, and increasingly anthropologists encourage direct involvement in program management and policy making (Cernea 1991). In whatever role you choose, you have to be committed to change.

Clearly there are many variables that influence whether or not research is used. Above all, the policy researcher must include in the design of his or her research a knowledge utilization plan to increase the probability that the research will be used.

SUMMARY

Anthropologists provide a wide variety of research services in response to various needs associated with the process of policy formation, implementation, and evaluation. More detailed charting of the policy process would no doubt produce even more types of applied or policy research. While anthropologists bring certain methodological and conceptual tendencies to these research efforts, the content of these approaches is defined in reference to the policy process itself, as well as other disciplines.

The major types of applied research done in reference to the policy process are: evaluation, social impact assessment, needs assessment, social soundness analysis, technology development research, and cultural resources assessment.

Certainly other specific types will emerge in the future. The differences between these research methods are not based so much on technique and design but on purpose and intent. Further, in some settings the research technique used is really geared toward being appropriate to specific administrative requirements. It is clear that involvement in policy research calls for broad preparation in social science as well as knowledge of the traditions of ethnographic research.

FURTHER READING

Belshaw, Cyril S. 1976. *The Sorcerer's Apprentice: An Anthropology of Public Policy.* New York: Pergamon Press.

A view from the perspective of the British Commonwealth.

Chambers, Erve. 1989. "The Policy Idea," in *Applied Anthropology: A Practical Guide.* Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press.

This chapter discusses the nature of policy and the policy process.

Sanday, Peggy Reeves, ed. 1976. *Anthropology and the Public Interest: Fieldwork and Theory.* New York: Academic Press.

Useful to get a perspective on policy-relevant anthropology.

van Willigen, John, Barbara Rylko-Bauer, and Ann McElroy, eds. 1989. *Making Our Research Useful: Case Studies in the Utilization of Anthropological Knowledge.* Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Presents a variety of case examples of anthropologists having an impact through their research.